



Texas Education Agency Policy Committee on Public Education Information Tuesday, July 23, 2019

Texas Education Agency
GoToWebinar
10:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.

Meeting Minutes

Call to Order

Terri Hanson called for a volunteer to chair this PCPEI meeting, as Andrew Kim was called away and Paul Clore was not yet available.

Danny Lovett from Region 5 volunteered to chair the meeting and called the meeting to order at 10:08 a.m.

Roll call of the PCPEI members attending the meeting was taken by Michele Elledge. During the roll call, Andrew Kim joined the meeting and continued as chair.

ITF Members Present at TEA:

Dara Fuller (ESC 6)

PCPEI Members Present via GoToMeeting:

Charlotte Baker (ESC 3)
Patty Blue (Gustine ISD)
Dr. Priscilla Canales (Weslaco ISD)
Paul Clore (Gregory-Portland ISD)
Carolyn Counce (TASB)
Andrew Kim (Comal ISD)
Scott Lewis (LBB)
Danny Lovett (ESC 5)
Amy Peterson (House Committee on Public Education)

PCPEI Alternates Present via GoToMeeting:

Jennifer Carver (ESC 20)
Damon Jackson (Lubbock ISD)
Jackie Janacek (College Station ISD)
Mary Beth Matula (ESC 3)
Nanette Power (Texarkana ISD)
Sharon Wermuth (San Angelo ISD)

TEA Staff Present:

Candice DeSantis (ITS/BMD)
Michele Elledge (ITS/BMD)
Terri Hanson (ITS/BMD)
Scott Johnson (ITS/BMD)
Justin Jons (Financial Compliance)
David Marx (Financial Compliance)
Leanne Simons (ITS/BMD)

TEA Staff Present via GoToMeeting:

Jeanine Helms (ITS/BMD)

Approve Meeting Minutes from the April 30, 2019 PCPEI Meeting**Action Item**

Andrew Kim asked if there were any corrections needed in the April 30, 2019 meeting minutes. Hearing none, he called for a motion to approve.

Danny Lovett made a motion to approve the April 30, 2019 PCPEI meeting minutes.
Charlotte Baker seconded the motion.
The motion passed unanimously.

**Information Task Force (ITF) Report to the
Policy Committee on Public Education Information (PCPEI)
For the July 9, 2019 and the July 16, 2019 ITF Meetings**

Part A: July 9, 2019 ITF Meeting Agenda Items

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.

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 2019-2020, 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 the student’s census block group number. Census block group will not be collected for students who are economically disadvantaged and homeless.

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 group or using the census block group 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 to use to determine the census block group. This tool will be in production by Sept. 1, 2019. TEA is looking into ways for LEAs to possibly use a batch process or APIs to get the census block group 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 provide a file with addresses in the tool and then the tool would return census block group numbers that could 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 and 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 returned with the census block group number.

Keitha asked if the tool would be able to handle a large file, for example, one with 20,000 records. Keitha asked what the limitations were 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 and they do not foresee any issues.

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

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 made 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, 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 (economically disadvantaged). There was discussion about including other students, but it was decided to keep the economically disadvantaged 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 a Community Eligibility Provision (CEP) campus 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 when the district uses a locally developed income survey form, should economically disadvantaged codes 01 and 02 be used to report students who qualify for free/reduced meals, or should code 99 be used. Terri responded that regardless of what form is used, the economic disadvantaged code that reflects the student’s eligibility is the code that should be reported.

Peggy Sullivan stated that Dallas ISD is a CEP 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 disadvantaged 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 the economically disadvantaged code with districts. Terri added that this year TEA added a chart in TEDS to help provide guidance in reporting. She encouraged everyone to let us know if they think of other ways to enhance that guidance.

Keitha stated that she had sent Terri an email 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”.

ITF Action:

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

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.

PCPEI Discussion:

Dara Fuller presented the ITF Report to PCPEI for the topic Student Census Block Group.

Andrew Kim called for questions.

Sharon Wermuth pointed out the notes regarding economic disadvantage codes 01, 02, and 99. She asked if students who are economically disadvantaged with code 99 are to be included in the reporting of a census block. Sharon also asked for more clarification about how to code PK students who qualified for free/reduced lunch, since the Department of Agriculture indicate not to use their form for PK students. Their district had to use code 99 for those students.

Terri Hanson replied that in collecting the new census block group, we aren't changing anything about how districts report economically disadvantaged. Currently codes 01, 02, and 99 mean a student is economically disadvantaged, and that stays the same. Census block will be collected for non-homeless students who are in membership and are economically disadvantaged.

Terri continued by stating that the new chart in TEDS from the Department of Agriculture provides some helpful guidance about reporting economic disadvantaged students. There is still some confusion about PK students who are automatically qualified for free/reduced lunch. Michele Elledge will be working with the Department of Agriculture in the next week to get more guidance about how to proceed with these PK students.

Andrew Kim asked about an opportunity to demo or test the census block tool and asked why TEA was not collecting the address.

Terri replied that the way the legislation is written, TEA could only collect census block number, not student address, and that TEA will provide a resource for determining census block group. We have heard there are other tools available to provide a census block group. TEA will be using the same vendor that currently provides our district/campus map. We are in the process of finding districts and SIS vendors to help pilot that tool. It's not a requirement for LEAs to use TEA's tool, because there are other tools available to provide this info. We plan to have TEA's tool available September 1.

Andrew commented that, regarding the census block tool, for districts that are rapidly changing, there will be concerns about how the tool will be updated.

Terri responded that the basis of the data used by the census block tool is the 2010 census, but there are updates between each census. TEA will provide guidelines for how to proceed when a student address is not found by the tool.

Andrew asked for confirmation that the census block data will be used for determining the compensatory education funding.

David Marx confirmed. He explained that the student's home residence and information about the neighborhood of that student determines the weight used for funding. TEA's HB3 webpage has an explanation of how TEA came up with the weighting tiers for funding based on the census block group.

Andrew encouraged meeting participants to look at this information and provide feedback because this impacts funding.

David Marx stated that he will be creating an advisory committee, which will help with determining weights and tiers.

Andrew commented that with additional funding available for compensatory education, this will be an important topic going forward. He offered his assistance to help TEA.

Andrew called for additional questions.

Dara Fuller added that census block will only be reported for students in membership, but not for students who are ADA Eligibility of 0 (enrolled, not in membership).

Andrew stated that the security of the census information data is critical.

Terri commented that census block tool will be available from the TEA website, and the only information being passed into the tool will be the address and student unique id. TEA is working with our GIS vendor for security transmitting data back and forth. TEA is not storing that data, just transmitting it. At one point the legislation stated that TEA would collect student address data, but that changed and was removed from the legislation. TSDS is just going to be collecting census block group, and that information will only be available through our system which is accessed through TEAL, our secure log in system.

PCPEI Action:

Andrew Kim called for a motion to approve the recommendation made by ITF to accept this proposal.

Motion: Sharon Wermuth

Second: Nanette Power

The motion passed unanimously.

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.

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 (ADA) that resides in a residential placement facility or is enrolled in 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 know which campuses are dropout recovery campuses and can determine the ADA of students on these campuses. A new element will be added for purposes of reporting attendance for special ed and non-special ed students in residential facilities. There will also be a new data element for flex attendance residential facility days.

Attendance report changes will be in line with the way attendance data is generally reported and data validation rules are similar to other attendance rules, such as making sure the 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. How is this changing? Is this change 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.

Brenda Padalecki asked if there would be additional guidance in the Student Attendance Accounting Handbook (SAAH). Leo responded that they expect to have updated documentation. Leo's team is going to proceed with the publication of version one (1) of the SAAH now, and David Marx is working on a revision to include the 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.

ITF Action:

David McKamie called for a motion to approve the proposal as presented.

Motion: Adrian Garcia

Second: Pablo Martinez

Motion passed.

PCPEI Discussion:

Dara Fuller presented the ITF Report to PCPEI for the topic Residential Facility Attendance Reporting.

Sharon Wermuth asked if the residential facility attendance will be reported per six weeks. Dara replied yes.

Terri Hanson added that this will be another ADA calculation by six weeks like all the others.

PCPEI Action:

Andrew Kim called for a motion to approve the recommendation made by ITF to accept this proposal.

Motion: Danny Lovett

Second: Charlotte Baker

The motion passed unanimously.

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.

HB 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:

1.	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).
2.	Add a new code table BILINGUAL/ESL-FUNDING-CODE (Cxxx).
3.	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.
4.	Update LEP-INDICATOR-CODE (C061) code table to clarify new Bilingual Education Allotment scenarios.
5.	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.
6.	Update BILINGUAL-PROGRAM-TYPE-CODE (E1042) reporting guidance in TEDS.
7.	Update existing TSDS reports to reflect the changes in this proposal. Add new reports to display detailed Bilingual/ESL Attendance.
8.	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 the bilingual education allotment amount.

ITF Discussion:

Jay Young asked if it is possible for a student's LEP-INDICATOR-CODE code to change midway through a reporting period. Terri indicated that technically it is a possibility, but she deferred to Carli Thomas for a response. Carli 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 clarified that each time a student changes programs, a new instance of complex type is reported. Terri confirmed.

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 also asked if smaller LEAs 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 if the bilingual staff at ESCs would be trained by TEA so the ESC Champions as trainers will know when they 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 2019-2020, 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 present at the TSDS 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 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 the 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 10 of the proposal as a reference. 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 the codes (0, F, S, 3, 4, 5) to which the bottom row is referring to make it more clear 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. LEAs are encouraged to implement these programs carefully and Carli's group has resources (rubrics etc.) to help them with this process.

ITF Action:

David McKamie called for a motion to approve the proposal as presented.

Motion: Brenda Padalecki

Second: Dianne Borreson

Motion passed.

PCPEI Discussion:

Dara Fuller presented the ITF Report to PCPEI for the topic Bilingual Services Reporting.

Andrew Kim noted that this will positively affect many school districts because of additional funding for their language programs.

Terri Hanson presented page 10 of the proposal showing the table explaining the funding levels based upon the language program and LEP indicator.

PCPEI Action:

Andrew Kim called for a motion to approve the recommendation made by ITF to accept this proposal.

Motion: Sharon Wermuth

Second: Damon Jackson

The motion passed unanimously.

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 the 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 the New Tech Network. The 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 element 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 course or group of courses. Stacy Avery stated that a New Tech Network school implements a 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 the 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, the campus enters into an implementation agreement with the New Tech Network, and the campus pays to use this New Tech model. David clarified stating that this program could not be implemented in a matter of days. Stacy confirmed. She indicated that the New Tech Network is a non-profit based in California. She stated that the New Tech Network must meet with the campus and go through one full year of planning before they can implement the program and be eligible for funding. David McKamie asked if this meant that the only LEAs that would report this for 2019-2020 would be those already approved. Stacy confirmed. She stated that there are four 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 two and three have funding. Phase four

(alumni) means there is no longer an agreement with the New Tech Network, therefore no funding is 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 at some point have access to this list of campuses so they would know if any campuses in their region have implemented the New Tech Network program. Stacy replied that she is working with the New Tech Network to get the correct campus identification 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 that the list will be posted. 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 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.

ITF Action:

David McKamie called for a motion to approve the proposal.

Motion: Jay Young

Second: Dara Fuller

Motion passed.

PCPEI Discussion:

Dara Fuller presented the ITF Report to PCPEI for the topic New Tech Indicator and Expansion of Career and Technical Education.

Andrew Kim called for questions. There were no questions or comments.

PCPEI Action:

Andrew Kim called for a motion to approve the recommendation made by ITF to accept this proposal.

Motion: Charlotte Baker

Second: Danny Lovett

The motion passed unanimously.

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 being 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 2019-2020 school year. Terri confirmed that it is for the 2019-2020 school year.

ITF Action:

David McKamie called for a motion to approve the proposal as presented.

Motion: Adrian Garcia

Second: Keitha Ivey

Motion passed.

PCPEI Discussion:

Dara Fuller presented the ITF Report to PCPEI for the topic Gifted and Talented Program Code.

Andrew Kim called for questions. There were no questions or comments.

PCPEI Action:

Andrew Kim called for a motion to approve the recommendation made by ITF to accept this proposal.

Motion: Sharon Wermuth

Second: Nanette Powers

The motion passed unanimously.

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 the proposal which includes the following:

1.	Remove all data elements and complex types associated with collecting student level participation in ELOs from the StudentProgramExtension complex type. This includes the following:
	EXPANDED-LEARNING-OPPORTUNITY-INDICATOR-CODE (E1613)
	Complex Type TX-StudentELOS
	Complex Type TX-StudentELO
	CAMPUS-ID-OF-ENROLLMENT (E0782)
	ELO-TYPE-CODE (E1614)
	ELO-PARTICIPATION-DAYS (E1622)
	ELO-RIGOROUS-COURSEWORK-INDICATOR-CODE (E1615)
	ELO-MENTORING-INDICATOR-CODE (E1616)
	ELO-TUTORING-INDICATOR-CODE (E1617)
	ELO-PHYSICAL-ACTIVITY-INDICATOR-CODE (E1618)
	ELO-ACADEMIC-SUPPORT-INDICATOR-CODE (E1619)
	ELO-EDUCATIONAL-ENRICHMENT-INDICATOR-CODE (E1620)
2.	Remove guidance associated with the reporting of student participation in ELOs from Section 2.4 Student Category Data Submission Requirements of the Texas Education Data Standards (TEDS).
3.	Update and remove PEIMS reports and content pertaining to student participation in ELOs.
4.	Update and remove business validation rules pertaining to the reporting of student participation in ELOs.

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 clarification that nothing has changed for the reporting of the campus level Expanded Learning Opportunity code and the School ELO complex type. Christine confirmed that this has not changed. 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 a chess club be considered an ELO? Christine stated that for determining what to report for 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 to develop more guidance that will come from the rule making process. Those rules will contain more guidance from the questions they received from the March roll out.

Keitha asked about an after-school day care, that is educationally based, but parents pay for their children to attend. Is that something that would be reported? Christine responded, yes, if the program operates with the campus, but not if someone rents the space to provide the service. If the activity is coordinated with that campus and the school day to help students do better during the day, provides hands-on activities that are

coordinated with the curriculum, and identified based on student needs (assessment or grades, social emotional) then this would qualify as an ELO. Whether or not parents paying for the program isn't the factor that determines if it is an ELO, 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.

ITF Action:

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

Motion: Peggy Sullivan

Second: Dara Fuller

Motion passed

PCPEI Discussion:

Dara Fuller presented the ITF Report to PCPEI for the topic Expanded Learning Opportunities (ELO), Campus Level Only.

Andrew Kim called for questions. There were no questions or comments.

PCPEI Action:

Andrew Kim called for a motion to approve the recommendation made by ITF to accept this proposal.

Motion: Charlotte Baker

Second: Sharon Wermuth

The motion passed unanimously.

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 for any questions.

This is an Early Notice item for 2019-2020 TEDS because LEAs must start tracking students who leave for these reasons during the 2019-2020 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 stated that their district has used the overnight stay/one night guideline for these scenarios. She asked if 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 stated that they are still working on guidance on this, because they definitely don't want students who should be served to not be served.

Dara Fuller asked if either or both of these new leaver reason codes would be included in the TEA dropout rate calculation or the federal dropout rate. Linda stated that both new codes are included as dropouts in the federal dropout 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 which 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.

ITF Action :

David called for a motion.
 Motion: Pablo Martinez
 Second: D'Lynne Johnson
 Motion passed.

PCPEI Discussion:

Dara Fuller presented the ITF Report to PCPEI for the topic Leaver Reason Codes for 2020-2021 school year.

Andrew Kim called for questions. There were no questions or comments.

PCPEI Action:

Andrew Kim called for a motion to approve the recommendation made by ITF to accept this proposal.

Motion: Paul Clore

Second: Damon Jackson

The motion passed unanimously.

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 2020-2021

ITF Action:

David called for a motion
 Motion: Dianne Borreson
 Second: D'Lynne Johnson
 Motion passed.

PCPEI Discussion:

Dara Fuller presented the ITF Report to PCPEI for the topic Class Roster Supplemental Item.

Andrew Kim called for questions. There were no questions or comments.

PCPEI Action:

Andrew Kim called for a motion to approve the recommendation made by ITF to accept this proposal.

Motion: Paul Clore

Second: Charlotte Baker

The motion passed unanimously.

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 to determine at risk status.

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 and 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 is 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 as to why this 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

PCPEI Discussion:

Dara Fuller presented the ITF Report to PCPEI for the information discussion items.

Terri Hanson pointed out that reason 14 was added. TEA doesn't collect the reason, just a yes/no for at-risk indicator. Districts need to know this information. New code 14 is for a student who was incarcerated or had a parent incarcerated. Also, students who are in an adult education program under a specific high school diploma and industry certification charter are considered at-risk.

Andrew Kim asked if there is any overlap between census block data collection and at-risk. Terri replied that for TSDS, they are two different things. Whether there is connection at the program level would be determined by the program.

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)
----	--

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 that David was correct. The complex type was not previously identified.

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

ITF Action:

N/A

PCPEI Discussion:

Dara Fuller presented the ITF Report to PCPEI for the Residential Facility Tracker information item.

Andrew Kim called for questions. There were no questions or comments.

Part B: July 16, 2019 ITF Meeting Agenda Items**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. Michele introduced Jacquie Porter and Justin Jons on the phone to help address additional questions regarding the proposal

ITF Discussion:

Nancy Dunnam asked if a student was eligible as a three-year-old, but not eligible as a four-year-old, then would they use this new element? Michele confirmed that the situation Nancy described 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 this scenario would make them eligible for funding. Michele replied yes; they would be eligible for funding.

Brenda Padalecki described a situation where their district doesn't offer a three-year-old program, and a student attended another district's PK program as a three-year-old, then that student came to their district as a four-year-old. She asked for confirmation about whether this makes the student eligible in their district, and if this is when the 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 four-year-old program in the 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 the new eligible previous year indicator is for PK students only. Michele confirmed that this element will be collected for PK students only and that it is not mandatory.

Michele reviewed the tables in the proposal to clarify further.

Nancy Dunnam asked if there are any questions they should be asking which 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 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 as it is not as clear in the proposal. TEA confirmed that they would ensure this was clear in the guidance.

ITF Action:

Nancy called for a motion.

Motion: Brenda Padalecki

Second: Dara Fuller

Motion passed.

PCPEI Discussion:

Dara Fuller presented the ITF Report to PCPEI for the topic Prekindergarten Programs Eligibility and Funding.

Andrew Kim called for questions. There were no questions or comments.

PCPEI Action:

Andrew Kim called for a motion to approve the recommendation made by ITF to accept this proposal.

Motion: Paul Clore

Second: Nanette Powers

The motion passed unanimously.

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.

ITF Discussion:

Brenda Padalecki asked that, now that code 14 is available, should a district's full day PK program use code 14? The check for 32,400 minutes is no longer needed because they now offer 75,600 minutes. Michele confirmed that a district's full day PK program should use code 14, that the check for 32,400 instructional minutes will no longer be used, and full day PK programs will be checked for 75,600 operational minutes.

Nancy Dunnam asked if those PK students would be on a separate instructional track. Jacquie replied that yes, since the PK students 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 it was 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 when talking about operational minutes versus instructional minutes. Michele confirmed, that 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 the 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.

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 the student is full day or half day.

Brenda asked if code 04 is only for half day programs for three-year-olds, or if it should also be used to report ineligible tuition-based four-year-old programs. .

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 four-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 clearer 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 three-year-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 four-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 clearer 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- and 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 us the instructional or operational minutes 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 75,600 minutes. Individual students are coded with ADA eligibility and PK funding type to determine eligibility and funding.

Jacquie suggested the translation of code 14 would then read “Full day prekindergarten program for eligible or ineligible students following 75,600 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 clearest 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 the data validation rules.

Adrian asked if there is an edit that checks new code 15 against 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 Action:

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

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

Second: Adrian Garcia

Motion passed.

PCPEI Discussion:

Dara Fuller presented the ITF Report to PCPEI for the topic Prekindergarten Minutes and Instructional Programs.

Andrew Kim asked about the use of waivers for a PK program using 75,600 operational minutes. Can it be assumed that any waivers granted for other grades will apply to the PK program as well? Terri Hanson replied yes, and David Marx confirmed that waivers are at the campus level. Terri continued by stating that even when you have a different track for the PK students, the waiver minutes can be applied to PK and non-PK tracks.

PCPEI Action:

Andrew Kim called for a motion to approve the recommendation made by ITF to accept this proposal.

Motion: Sharon Wermuth

Second: Paul Clore

The motion passed unanimously.

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.

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 two codes.

Nancy Dunnam asked if this information would be presented on the same report with 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 on a brand new report so it can show all of the services provided along with the 504 information.

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 more clear and consistent.

ITF Action:

Nancy called for a motion to accept the 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

Motion passed.

PCPEI Discussion:

Dara Fuller presented the ITF Report to PCPEI for the topic Dyslexia and Related Disorder Services.

Dara noted that the definition for the new Dyslexia Services Code will change from “at least one day” to “at any time during the school year” to be consistent with other similar data. Dara also presented the specific codes in the new Dyslexia Services code table. She continued to state that if more than one service is provided to a student, more than one can be reported.

Andrew Kim called for questions or comments.

Andrew Kim asked why there is a code 00 for not receiving services. If a student doesn't receive dyslexia services, wouldn't they just not report it? Dara replied that the Dyslexia Services Code is mandatory. Terri continued by stating that typically the SIS Vendor will default a mandatory data element to 00, then the user would be able to change the value from the default 00. Andrew commented that this would be something that needs to be explained to users in training to make them aware of the need to change a value from a default. Dara commented that it may vary by SIS vendor, and some provide a mass update capability.

PCPEI Action:

Andrew Kim called for a motion to approve the recommendation made by ITF to accept this proposal.

Motion: Charlotte Baker

Second: Danny Lovett

The motion passed unanimously.

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.

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
Motion passed.

PCPEI Discussion:

Dara Fuller presented the ITF Report to PCPEI for the topic Attribution Code for Students of Charter School Employees.

Andrew Kim called for questions. There were no questions or comments.

PCPEI Action:

Andrew Kim called for a motion to approve the recommendation made by ITF to accept this proposal.
Motion: Danny Lovett
Second: Sharon Wermuth
The motion passed unanimously.

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
Motion passed.

PCPEI Discussion:

Dara Fuller presented the ITF Report to PCPEI for the topic Harassment Discipline Reason Code.
Andrew Kim called for questions. There were no questions or comments.

PCPEI Action:

Andrew Kim called for a motion to approve the recommendation made by ITF to accept this proposal.
Motion: Damon Jackson
Second: Priscilla Canales
The motion passed unanimously.

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 guidebook 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

Motion passed.

PCPEI Discussion:

Dara Fuller presented the ITF Report to PCPEI for the topic Bullying Discipline Reason Code.

Andrew Kim called for questions. There were no questions or comments.

PCPEI Action:

Andrew Kim called for a motion to approve the recommendation made by ITF to accept this proposal.

Motion: Nanette Powers

Second: Charlotte Baker

The motion passed unanimously.

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 Rodriguez 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

Motion passed.

PCPEI Discussion:

Dara Fuller presented the ITF Report to PCPEI for the topic Military Connected Students.

Andrew Kim called for questions. There were no questions or comments.

PCPEI Action:

Andrew Kim called for a motion to approve the recommendation made by ITF to accept this proposal.

Motion: Sharon Wermuth

Second: Priscilla Canales

The motion passed unanimously.

Open Forum

Andrew Kim opened the floor for discussion items. No additional topics were brought forward.

Next PCPEI Meeting

Discussion Item

The next scheduled PCPEI meeting is October 1, 2019.

Terri Hanson thanked everyone for their participation in this extra meeting that wasn't originally on the schedule. These extra meetings are in response to recent legislation, much of which is beneficial to district funding for the 2019-2020 school year, House Bill 3 in particular. It is not our usual timing and practice to have changes at this point in the school year.

Terri continued by explaining that there are other pieces of legislation that passed in the session that will be implemented in the 2020-2021 school year on topics such as truancy. The October PCPEI will be used to present these items.

Andrew Kim responded that he is looking forward for more information and discussion about census block.

Terri replied that David Marx will be having additional meetings and an advisory group about census block, so David will be in touch with some PCPEI members.

Adjournment

Andrew Kim called for a motion to adjourn the meeting.

Motion: Paul Clore

Second: Sharon Wermuth

The motion passed unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 11:16 am.