Texas Education Agency (TEA)
Information Task Force (ITF)
Tuesday, December 10, 2019

GoToMeeting
Wm. B. Travis Building, 1-110A
1701 N. Congress Avenue
10:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.

Meeting Minutes

Call Meeting to Order   **David McKamie**

Roll call of the ITF members was taken by Stephanie Sharp.

David McKamie chaired the meeting in Nancy Dunnam's place and called the ITF meeting to order at 10:06 a.m.

ITF Members Present

David McKamie, Jennifer Carver, Dara Fuller, Pablo Martinez, Brenda Padalecki, Traci Pesina

ITF Members Present via GoToMeeting:

Dianne Borreson, Dana Braun, Adrian Garcia, Keitha Ivey, D'Lynne Johnson, Tamara Kavanagh, Debbie Largent, David Marx, John Newcom, Linda Raney, John Shaffer, Nancy Smith, Debby Wilburn, Scott Lewis

TEA Staff Present:

Connor Briggs (ITS-BMD), Candice DeSantis (ITS-BMD), Terri Hanson (ITS-BMD), Heather Mauze (Charter Schools), Ryan Merritt (College, Career, and Military Preparation), Leticia Ollervidez (ITS-BMD), Linda Roska (Accountability Research Division), Mary Scott (ITS-BMD), Stephanie Sharp (ITS-BMD), Leanne Simons (ITS-BMD), Steve Smith (College, Career and Military Preparation), Rhonda Williams (ITS-BMD), Andrea Winkler (Strategic Initiatives), Andrew Hodge (Office of Academics), Kathy Adaky (ITS-BMD), Ed Linden (ITS-BMD), Howard Morrison (Early Childhood Education Division), Jacquie Porter (Early Childhood Education Division), Scott Johnson (ITS-BMD), Jeffery Koch (Charter Schools), Melissa Giesberg (Charter Schools)

TEA Staff Present via GoToMeeting:

Jeanine Helms (ITS-BMD), Tammy Pearcy (Federal and State Education Policy), Nina Taylor (Research and Analysis)

Approve Meeting Minutes from the October 22, 2019 ITF Meeting   **Action Item**

David McKamie called for a motion to approve the October 22, 2019 ITF meeting minutes.
Dara Fuller made a motion to approve the minutes and it was seconded by Brenda Padalecki.
The committee voted and approved the minutes as presented.

1. Disciplinary Action Code Table (C164) Updates   Discussion Item

Code Table C164, DISCIPLINARY-ACTION-CODE intermittently outlines relevant statutes in translations for particular codes. This proposal recommends removing unnecessary references to statute to eliminate inaccurate and misinterpreted constraints on action code use and to decrease the likelihood of the need for future modifications to C164. Other minor edits were made to ensure accuracy, consistency, and clarity.

Presentation:

Stephanie Sharp presented the discussion item which includes:

1.   Update translations in code table DISCIPLINARY-ACTION-CODE (C164).

ITF Discussion:
Dara Fuller asked why the references to the TEC are being removed. Mary Scott replied that the TEC was being removed because there were some incorrect references and also due to the frequency of changes to TEC. The important information is related to the disciplinary action.

ITF Action:

N/A

2. HB 446 – Disciplinary Action Reason Code Translation Updates   Action Item

House Bill (HB) 446, 86th Texas Legislature, amended certain sections of the Texas Penal Code effective September 1, 2019. It is no longer an offense under Section 46.02 to carry a club as defined by Section 46.01(1) in unrestricted areas. Local Education Agencies (LEAs) should no longer report students with discipline reason code 13. Knuckles, as defined by Section 46.01(8) of the Texas Penal Code, are no longer listed as one of the prohibited weapons defined in Section 46.05, Penal Code. LEAs should no longer report students found with knuckles with discipline reason code 14.

Presentation:

Stephanie Sharp presented the proposal which includes the following:

1.   Update code table DISCIPLINARY-ACTION-REASON-CODE (C165) to remove code 13 - Unlawful Carrying of a Club under Penal Code 46.02 - TEC 37.007(a)(1).

2.   Update Appendix E discipline guidance related to clubs and prohibited weapons (knuckles).

3.   Update business data validation rules that reference disciplinary action reason code 13.

ITF Discussion:
David McKamie commented that by moving these reasons back under reason code 21, it will be more difficult to track data across years. The districts may continue to track these reasons in their SIS, then crosswalk them to reason code 21. Districts like to look at discipline across years. Rhonda Williams referred to page 8 of the proposal for guidance indicating that students found to be in possession of a club be reported with discipline reason code 02. Also, students found with knuckles may be reported with discipline reason code 21. Terri Hanson clarified that we had to remove knuckles because it was removed from statute. Students may also be reported with other reason codes, such as assault, as applicable.

David McKamie asked if that is why tobacco was removed from the table. Rhonda Williams replied there was previously approved proposal on 11/13/2018 that addressed removing Tobacco and gang related violence from code table C165 as it was no longer a federal reporting requirement. It was never a state requirement. LEAs are to use code 21 for those disciplinary action reasons. This proposal is due to state legislation, not federal.

Linda Raney commented that districts will need to update their Student Code of Conduct. Rhonda Williams confirmed that is correct.

ITF Action:
David McKamie called for a motion to approve the proposal as presented.
Jennifer Carver made a motion to approve the proposal and it was seconded by Dara Fuller.
The committee voted and the motion passed.

3. Out of School Suspension, DAEP and Expulsion Reporting   Action Item

During the 86th Legislative Session, House Bill (HB) 65, relating to reporting information regarding public school disciplinary actions, passed. HB 65 added Subsection (f) to Section 37.020. This subsection includes a requirement for LEAs to report the number of out-of-school suspensions inconsistent with the guidelines included in the student code of conduct.

Presentation:

Stephanie Sharp presented the proposal which includes the following:

1.   Add new data element INCONSISTENT-CODE-OF-CONDUCT-INDICATOR-CODE (E16XX) to the DisciplineActionExtension complex type to be reported in the PEIMS Summer Submission.
2.   Add guidance associated with INCONSISTENT-CODE-OF-CONDUCT-INDICATOR-CODE (E16XX) to the Texas Education Data Standards (TEDS).
3.   Add INCONSISTENT-CODE-OF-CONDUCT-INDICATOR-CODE (E16XX) to existing TSDS reports.
4.   Add data validation rules to reflect the changes in this proposal.

ITF Discussion:

Dara Fuller asked when will we start collecting this data. Stephanie Sharp replied that TEA would begin collecting the data in the 2020-2021 school year. This proposal was presented at the October ITF meeting, but we tabled it and updated the proposal to clarify the data element name and meaning.

Terri Hanson brought attention to item #2 in the proposal because in the October meeting TEA was asked to provide examples to explain when this indicator would be reported. The new data element will only be reported for out-of-school suspensions (OSS), DAEP placements, and expulsions that are inconsistent with an LEA's student code of conduct.

Rhonda Williams stated she worked with David McKamie and Hays CISD to provide the guidance and examples. This data element will only be reported in certain situations. David McKamie commented that this table really helps explain how a situation could be consistent with TEC 37 but be inconsistent with a code of conduct. One positive is that this motivates districts to update their code of conduct to match the current laws.

David McKamie asked if it would be useful to define "consistent" or "inconsistent" in this context, such as specifically saying that "inconsistent" means the LEA didn't follow their code of conduct? Terri Hanson replied that the definition of the element describes the meaning of "inconsistent". David replied that the law itself uses the term "inconsistent". Terri suggested starting with this definition and guidance, including the examples, and making adjustments as needed in the following year (2021-2022).

ITF Action:

David McKamie called for a motion to approve the proposal as presented.
Jennifer Carver made a motion to approve the proposal and it was seconded by Pablo Martinez.
The committee voted and the motion passed.

4. Add code to DC152 for ECDS   Action Item

PK-SCHOOL-TYPE is reported in the ECDS collection for the PK submissions to indicate the type of PK program offered. The Early Childhood Education Division is requesting a new code for the code table PK-SCHOOL-TYPE (DC152) in order to gather information specific to certain partnership sites authorized by SB 1882 (85th legislative session). This code would be used for PK sites that are operating as an "in-district" charter for a given LEA. A separate code provides the ability to distinguish data between existing PK-SCHOOL-TYPE 02 (Public Pre-K) and an In-District Charter.

Presentation:

Stephanie introduced Ed Linden as the subject matter expert and Howard Morrison and Jacquie Porter from the Early Childhood Education division to answer questions.

Stephanie Sharp presented the proposal which includes the following:

1. Update PK-SCHOOL-TYPE (DC152) code table by adding new code 11.

2. Verify new code and code translation displays for ECDS report(s).

ITF Discussion:
Dara Fuller asked when will this start being collected. Terri Hanson replied that this is for 2020-2021 school year.

David McKamie asked where this request originated from. Howard Morrison added that this was needed to capture a specific program for in-district charters.

David McKamie asked if people will commonly understand what an "In-District Charter" means? Howard responded that "In-District Charter" is the term most frequently used to describe these arrangements.

David McKamie asked how many in-district charters exist. Howard was unsure of the total number.

Dara Fuller asked if the code is being added because TEA needs to know they are an in-district charter, or because they want to be able to identify themselves and code 02 doesn't fit? Wouldn't the charter division have this – if they are in in-district charter? Linda Roska stated that this information is in AskTED. Terri clarified that we know in AskTED that they are an in-district charter campus. Stephanie clarified that this is a college in Midland that is operating as a PK.

Dara Fuller asked what PK-SCHOOL-TYPE is used for in ECDS. Howard stated that it is used to distinguish the types of PK offered. Without this additional value, Howard stated that we would not be able to know how many are participating in an in-district charter program, as we cannot separate that from the codes available. Stephanie noted that this situation was related to Midland where a college, in partnership with Midland ISD was operating a PK. Stephanie noted that these types of PKs weren't sure if they should use PK-SCHOOL-TYPE 02 or 99, so this new code provides a clear way for them to report. Linda Roska asked what the difference is since they are a district. Howard stated that the difference was due to the partnership with the college. Dara Fuller asked if the university was providing the services to the LEA. Howard and Jacquie confirmed yes and Howard stated that this could apply to other entities.

Dara Fuller asked if this is for the situation of a university coming in and running your PK program. Her region had a district that turned their high school campuses into charter schools, so if they run a PK program, should they use new code 11? Terri replied that those campuses are a charter, but they aren't really run by an outside organization, so terminology is key.

Terri suggested calling them "In-District Partnership". David McKamie further suggested "In-District Charter Partnership". Terri asked if "In-District Charter Partnership" will allow those charter campuses to be reported accurately.

Terri agreed that TEA needs to provide more guidance about various situations, such as charters or other organizations providing services to PKs.

David McKamie suggested that this topic should be tabled in order for TEA to obtain additional guidance and information on the definition and terminology of these situations. Terri agreed.

ITF Action:
David called for a motion to table this item until the January meeting to help distinguish codes 02 and 11.
Dara Fuller made a motion to table the proposal and it was seconded by Brenda Padalecki.

The committee voted and the motion passed.

5. HB 1051 – High School Equivalency Program   **Action Item**

HB 1051, passed in the 86th Legislative Session, amends TEC 42.006 by adding Subsection (a-8) and (a-9) that requires local education agencies (LEAs) who have been identified as a Dropout Recovery School (DRS) to report through PEIMS, students who enroll in a High School Equivalency Program (HSEP), a dropout recovery program, or an adult education program provided under a high school diploma and industry certification charter school program and who:

1.   are age 18-25,

2.   have not been previously reported to TEA as dropouts, and

3.   enroll in the program after not attending school for a period of at least nine months.

Due to the requirement above, a new data element will be added for LEAs to indicate a student who did not attend school for a period of at least nine (9) months prior to enrolling.

Presentation:

Stephanie Sharp introduced Heather Smalley from the Performance Reporting division.

Stephanie Sharp presented the proposal which includes the following:

1.   Add new data element ADULT-PREVIOUS-ATTENDANCE-INDICATOR-CODE (E16XX) to the StudentExtension complex type to be reported in the PEIMS Fall and Summer Submissions.

2.   Update StudentExtension Complex Type guidance in the Texas Education Data Standards related to the reporting of the ADULT-PREVIOUS-ATTENDANCE-INDICATOR-CODE

3.   Update existing TSDS reports to include new data element.

4.   Add data validation rules to reflect the changes in this proposal.

ITF Discussion:

David McKamie asked about the main intent behind this reporting. The districts struggle to deal with these older students. Is this an attempt to get funding for them? Or is this based on accountability?

Heather Smalley stated that these students are not a current concern for accountability, but we can see that coming in the future. Heather also stated that having this data will provide another way to identify these students that need to be removed for accountability purposes.

Dara Fuller asked if we are looking for students who have been out of school for a while and are now back. Linda Roska confirmed yes.

David asked if "not attending" means not attending that district, or any district. Linda Roska replied any district.

Keitha Ivey asked how a student could not be in school for 9 months but not be considered a dropout. Dara replied that it could be a student who left to homeschool or private school, so they are not reported as a dropout. Brenda Padalecki added that students are not always honest when answering these questions upon enrollment, because they don't want their records to be sent from their previous school. Terri replied that LEAs will just have to use the best information they can get, as the 9-month attendance reference point is in the law.

Candice DeSantis noted that TEA will be able to do some verification if they were enrolled elsewhere, but not if they were homeschooled or attending a private school.

Keitha requested that someone repeat the reason for this collection. Linda Roska replied that TEA needs a way to identify students who need to be removed for accountability purposes.

Debby Wilburn asked if this is a way to go back and mark a student a dropout. Stephanie responded no. This item of data will only be used for a very specific subset of students who previously left for another reason, and now are re-enrolling in one of these special kinds of programs.

Terri added that we can determine all the other factors related to this legislation except for previous 9-month attendance.

David expressed concern that users will interpret this element as being collected for all students. Stephanie suggested adding a statement to the special instructions to more clearly explain that these are only to be reported for students in a dropout recovery program, a High School Equivalency Program (HSEP), or a specific adult education program.

ITF Action:
David McKamie called for a motion to approve the proposal as presented with the adjustment that TEA will add some additional special instructions to clarify the exact population that should report this data.
Dara Fuller made a motion to approve the proposal with that adjustment, and it was seconded by Jennifer Carver. The committee voted and the motion passed.

6. Career and Technology Indicator Auto Calculation   Action Item

Federal Perkins legislation that governs state and local CTE programs using federal funds was reauthorized and signed into federal law on July 31, 2018. The current method Texas uses to meet previous Perkins IV reporting requirements is insufficient to meet Perkins V reporting requirements. Perkins V requires State Education Agencies to report specific CTE indicators that are defined differently than what was previously outlined in Perkins IV.

Presentation:

Terri introduced Steve Smith and Ryan Merritt from College, Career and Military Prep Division.

Terri Hanson presented the proposal which includes the following:

1. Modify the StudentProgramExtension complex type to remove the data element, CAREER-AND-TECHNICAL-ED-IND-CD (E0031).

2. Modify the StudentCTEProgramAssociationExtension Complex Type to be removed from the PEIMS Fall Submission and added to the PEIMS Summer Submission

3. Revise code table CAREER-AND-TECHNICAL-ED-IND-CD (C142).
    Remove existing codes:
    > 0 – Not enrolled in a CTE Course
    > 1 – Enrolled in a CTE Course
    > 2 – Participant in a Coherent Sequence of Course
    Add new codes:
    > 4 – Not CTE
    > 5 – CTE Participant
    > E – CTE Explorer
    > 6 – CTE Concentrator
    > 7 – CTE Completer

4. Add new code table CXXX (State Career Clusters)
5. Add new code table CXXX (Federal Career Clusters)
6. Update StudentProgramExtension complex type guidance in the Texas Education Data Standards related to the calculation of the CTE Indicator code.
7. Add and update TSDS PEIMS reports to reflect the changes in this proposal.
8. Delete and revise associated data validation rules to reflect the changes in this proposal.

ITF Discussion:
Dara Fuller asked if the C142 code table still be in the data standards even though LEAs won't be reporting it. Terri replied, yes it will, with a note that it is calculated by TEA and not reported.

David McKamie asked if the terminology "CTE Completer" could get confused with similar dropouts/graduates "Completer" terminology. Ryan Merritt stated that the term was used because it's really the completion of the course of study. David asked if the student would have received credit. Ryan replied that completers have received credit. It was asked if adding "CTE Program Completer" helped. David stated that it would be a training/learning issue because some users may get confused, and "completer" may be defined elsewhere in a different way. Dara stated that she likes the idea of adding "Program" to the description. Ryan stated that they have been discussing with CTE coordinators who seem to understand the "completer" term, but that they don't have a problem adding "Program" to the code translation for code 7. Dara suggested it also be added to the translation for code 6. Ryan agreed. David added that during training we will also call it CTE Program Completer.

Terri asked if the ITF members think that the SIS vendors will try to emulate the CTE calculation being done by TEA in their SIS software. Jennifer Carver responded that it would be a discussion for them to have. Terri stated that she welcomes the double-check.

ITF Action:
David McKamie called for a motion to approve the proposal with the revision to change the code translation for 6 to "CTE Program Concentrator" and code translation for 7 to "CTE Program Completer".
Adrian Garcia made a motion to approve the proposal as presented and it was seconded by Jennifer Carver.
The committee voted and the motion passed.

7. Sunset - Career and Technical Education Course Extension complex type   Action Item

In researching the requirements for the auto calculation of the CTE Indicator, it was determined that there are no program areas currently utilizing the CareerAndTechnicalEducationCourseExtension complex type or any of its data elements.

Presentation:

Candice DeSantis presented the proposal which includes:

1.   Remove the CareerAndTechnicalEducationCourseExtension Complex Type from the InterchangeStudentEnrollmentExtension in the PEIMS Fall Submission.

   a.   Remove all guidance associated with the CareerAndTechnicalEducationCourseExtension complex type.

2.   Remove and revise existing TSDS reports to reflect the changes in this proposal

   a.   PDM1-122-001 Career and Technical Education Students by Sex and Ethnicity and Courses

   b.   PDM1-122-002 Career and Technical Education Courses

   c.   PDM1-122-004 Career and Technical Roster by Career and Technical Indicator Code

3.   Remove associated data validation rules to reflect the changes in this proposal.

ITF Discussion:
David McKamie opened the floor for discussion, and there was none.

ITF Action:
David McKamie called for a motion to approve the proposal as presented.
Brenda Padalecki made a motion to approve the proposal as presented and it was seconded by Dara Fuller.
The committee voted and the motion passed.

8. SB 2293 – Charter School Wait List   **Action Item**

Beginning with the 2020-2021 school year, TEA is proposing a new Core Collection, the Charter School Waitlist Collection. Charter schools will be required to report the data as of the last Friday in September and it will be due to the agency on the last Friday in October, per legislation. For each charter holder's campus, they must report the number of students enrolled, the educational enrollment capacity, and if the charter holder uses a waiting list for admission to the campus. If a waiting list is used by a campus, to determine the number of students on the waiting list, the charter campus must report student-level waiting list information. This data collection will require the reporting of students who have applied to but are not enrolled in the charter school.

Presentation:

Leanne introduced Heather Mauze, Melissa Giesberg, and Jeff Koch from the Charter School Division.

Leanne Simons presented the discussion item which includes:

1.   Add three new data elements to the SchoolExtension complex type in the InterchangeEducationOrganizationExtension to be collected in the TSDS collection.

   a.   NUMBER-CHARTER-STUDENTS-ENROLLED (EXXXX)
   b.   CHARTER-EDUCATIONAL-ENROLLMENT-CAPACITY (EXXXX)
   c.   CHARTER-ADMISSION-WAITLIST-INDICATOR-CODE (EXXXX)

2.   Add new data element CHARTER-WAITLIST-INDICATOR-CODE (EXXXX) to the StudentExtension complex type in InterchangeStudentExtension to be collected in the TSDS collection.

3.   Add Guidance associated with the new data elements.

4.   Add new TSDS reports to reflect the changes in this proposal.

5.   Add associated data validation rules to reflect the changes in this proposal.

Leanne pointed out that this new collection would include potential PK students who have never been enrolled or students from out of state, so they may not have a Unique ID. SB 2293 added requirements for Charter Schools to add a common admission application form and report to the agency, no later than the last Friday in October, the number of students enrolled, per grade, the educational capacity for the school and whether the school uses a waitlist. If the school uses a waitlist, they must also report the number of students on the waitlist. The data reported on the last Friday in October must be as of the last Friday in September. Due to the timing of this reporting requirement, and the way the legislation is written in terms of the reporting requirements, a new core collection is being proposed.

ITF Discussion:
David McKamie stated that his staff describes these waitlists as fairly fluid. He asked if this collection of data will be as of a certain date. Leanne responded that it will be as of the last Friday in September.

Heather Mauze stated we had hoped to use the PEIMS Snapshot data but because of the language we could not accommodate that.

Leanne also noted that a student can be on multiple waitlists. Heather added that part of the bill's purpose was to gather information needed to identify students on more than one waitlist.

David asked if this will also collect information as to why the student is on the waitlist, such as capacity. Heather replied that gathering the capacity info would provide that. Prior to this legislation we didn't have authority to collect any of this data. We will be looking at the capacity of the charter schools in comparison to their enrollment.

Terri Hanson noted that not all charters use wait lists. Heather confirmed that some schools are "first come first served" and some use waitlists.

David asked for information about charters having boundaries, and if it would be possible for a student to be on a waitlist even though they aren't eligible to enroll there. Heather replied that all charters have a geographic boundary area that they are allowed to pull students from. The charter application form for admission is not supposed to identify that information. It's not until the student is enrolled that the charter verifies the eligibility. TEA is working on new a standard charter admission form that is going to be required for all students requesting enrollment in a charter. That form will likely include info that can be used to identify the student's location to

verify they are in the geographic boundary. That process will help prevent students on the waitlist that aren't eligible to enroll in that charter due to where they live.

David asked if the charter would need a unique id for each student. Leanne replied that if they come from another school, they may already have a UID. The only students that may not have a UID are those entering PK, new to the state, in private school, or homeschool. Similar to enrolling students, new students will be given the option to not provide SSN and instead be assigned an S number. Terri added that charters may need to perform research and possibly assign the UID for these students.

David commented that October has Class Roster due in mid-October, this new collection will be due at the end of October, most Service Centers have Fall Submission due mid-November, while software companies are trying to get software releases out during this timeframe. Software companies may need an extra release for this collection.

Leanne stated that we pushed back significantly on this due date, got legal involved, and discussed with legislators who wrote the bill. The intent of the legislation was that this would align with PEIMS, but they did not write the legislation that way, so we had no choice but to create a new collection. We are hoping in the next session that this could be adjusted to at least be aligned with PEIMS timelines.

ITF Action:
David McKamie called for a motion to approve the proposal as presented.
Debbie Largent made a motion to approve the proposal as presented and it was seconded by Jennifer Carver.
The committee voted and the motion passed.

9. HB 3 – Additional Days   **Action Item**

From the 2019 legislative session, Section 1.014 of House Bill 3 (HB3) requires the commissioner to adjust the average daily attendance of a school district or open-enrollment charter school under Section 48.005 that offers an additional 30 days of half-day instruction for students enrolled in prekindergarten through fifth grade.

Presentation:

Andrew Hodge, Director of Innovative Instructional Models introduced himself.

Terri Hanson presented the proposal which includes the following:

1. Add new data element ADDITIONAL-DAYS-PROGRAM-INDICATOR-CODE (E16X1) to the SchoolExtension complex type to be reported in the PEIMS Extended Year submission.

    a. Add reporting guidance to SchoolExtension regarding the reporting of ADDITIONAL-DAYS-PROGRAM-INDICATOR-CODE.

2. Add new data element ADDITIONAL-DAYS-PROGRAM-PARTICIPATION-INDICATOR-CODE (E16X2) to the StudentProgramExtension complex type to be reported in the PEIMS Extended Year submission.

    a. Add reporting guidance to StudentProgramExtension regarding the reporting of ADDITIONAL-DAYS-PROGRAM-PARTICIPATON-INDICATOR-CODE.

3. Capture information about the Additional Days School Year program by using the ReportingPeriodExtension complex type and the CalendarDateExtension complex type to be reported in the PEIMS Extended Year submission.

    a. Add reporting guidance to ReportingPeriodExtension and CalendarDateExtension regarding the reporting Additional Days School Year program calendar information.

4. Add a new code to the REPORTING-PERIOD-INDICATOR-CODE (C130) code table to indicate a reporting period for the Additional Days School Year Program.

5. Add a new code to the INSTRUCTIONAL-PROGRAM-TYPE (C215) code table to indicate the Additional Days School Year Program.

6. Capture attendance information on students who attend the Additional Days School Year program by using the BasicReportingPeriodAttendanceExtension complex type and the SpecialProgramsReportingPeriodAttendanceExtension complex type to be reported in the PEIMS Extended Year submission.

    a. Add reporting guidance to BasicReportingPeriodAttendanceExtension and SpecialProgramsReportingPeriodAttendanceExtension regarding the reporting of Additional Day School Year program student attendance information.

7. Add new data element ADDITIONAL-DAYS-PROGRAM-TEACHER-INDICATOR-CODE (E16X3) to the StaffResponsibilities complex type to be reported in the PEIMS Extended Year submission.

8. Capture information about teachers and courses taught in the Additional Days School Year program by using the StaffExtension complex type and the StaffResponsibilitesExtension Complex type to be reported in the PEIMS Extended Year submission.

    a. Add reporting guidance to StaffExtension and StaffResponsbilitiesExtension regarding the reporting Additional Day School Year program staff information.

9. Update existing PEIMS reports or add new PEIMS reports to reflect the changes in this proposal.

10. Add, update, and remove associated data validation rules to reflect the changes in this proposal.

ITF Discussion:

Dara Fuller asked if LEAs can have any model for Additional Days and Andrew confirmed that is correct. Brenda Padalecki asked what must be provided for these Additional Days and Andrew stated that instruction must be provided.

Adrian Garcia asked if a district must to apply in order to provide and get funding for these additional days. How does a district take advantage of this program? Andrew replied that the additional half day of funding is accessed via the average daily attendance, when the attendance is reported. Terri Hanson added that there no additional application required to offer this, and that all the data will be collected via TSDS PEIMS Submission 4.

David McKamie asked if this program is offered by individual campuses or is a program for an entire district. Terri replied that the program must be associated with a campus that administers the program. For example, one elementary campus would offer this in the summer, but students from other campuses could attend there. Terri added that they are only funded for half day, so days eligible and days absent will be reported in half days. There is a minimum of 120 instructional minutes in a day, if they offer more the funding is still limited to half day.

Brenda Padalecki asked why this proposes to have the indicator on student level but also gather their attendance. Terri replied that this helps us keep track of these students separately from those who may be reported for other reasons in Extended Year.

Brenda inquired about the difference between this and Expanded Learning Opportunities (mentoring, tutoring etc.) Terri responded that it depends upon the curriculum. Andrew stated that an LEA can get funding for this but not for ELO, but that he would have to follow up with Christine McCormick.

David McKamie noted that parents often don't bring students to these types of programs, and there are high absences in the summer. You only get paid for when the student attends. Terri replied that this would be a consideration for districts when deciding about offering these kinds of programs.

Brenda asked if a district can have a program where students attend on a Saturday or staff development day in order to get this funding. Andrew replied as long as it's instructional and that it meets the 120 minutes' requirement, schools would get funding for it.

Traci Pesina asked if this will have any impact on the calendar track. Terri replied that it is recommended that you use a different track than what you use in the regular school year, but since it's already on a different reporting period, it won't impact the tracks for the other reporting periods. David Marx confirmed.

Pablo Martinez asked if this program is offered in the summer, would students from several campuses attend at one campus. Andrew stated yes and Dara added that the attendance will be reported at the campus they attend for the program. Andrew confirmed yes.

Terri noted that that this attendance will be separated into a separate reporting period to distinguish from other attendance.

Terri stated that for students who receive Bilingual/ESL, PRS, or Special Ed services on these additional days, they need to report those days of service on StudentSpecialProgramReportingPeriodAttendance since they will receive funding for these services. Flexible attendance is not included in this reporting.

David asked if someone is doing year-round school, does that change anything? Andrew replied that to qualify for this program, the school has to offer 180 instructional days. For example, a campus with 175 days and 5 waiver days would not qualify for this funding.

Terri asked David Marx – if a district does not have 180 instructional days in the regular school year, then they try to report data using reporting period code 9, what will happen? David Marx replied that days won't count unless they have 180 days in the regular school year. Terri asked for confirmation that they won't be funded for the additional days. Andrew replied that the LEA won't get funding for the additional days.

David Marx confirmed that if the school only has 175 instructional days, they could report 5 days of absences for all students and then report the additional days. Terri then asked if just the students in the program should be reported with the absences, or if it would be everyone on the campus. David Marx replied that it would be everyone for that campus.

Terri stated that she will make that information more prominent in the guidance.

David McKamie asked about LEAs that use minutes and not days. Terri asked David Marx if this requirement applies to 180 days or 75,600 minutes. David Marx confirmed that it is both. An LEA must have 180 days and 75,600 minutes.

David McKamie asked if an LEA could be using Saturdays during the school year to provide this service. Andrew confirmed that they could as long as their instructional days in the regular school year already offers 180 instructional days/75,600 minutes.

ITF Action:
David McKamie called for a motion to approve the proposal as presented.
Jennifer Carver made a motion to approve the proposal as presented and it was seconded by Dianne Borreson. The committee voted and the motion passed.

10. HB 548 Truancy   **Action Item**

House Bill (HB) 548, passed in the 86th Legislative Session, amends TEC 42.006 by adding Subsection (a-6) that requires local education agencies (LEAs) to report through PEIMS at a campus and grade level, truancy information, including the number of children required to attend but have excessive unexcused absences, the number of students the school has initiated a truancy prevention measure on, and the number of parents who have had a complaint filed under TEC 25.093 (PARENT CONTRIBUTING TO NONATTENDANCE).

Presentation:

Stephanie Sharp presented the proposal which includes the following:

1. Add a new complex type, StudentTruancyExtension to be reported in the PEIMS Summer submission in InterchangeStudentAttendanceExtension.

    1a. Include existing data elements in this new complex type:
    - i. TX-UNIQUE-STUDENT-ID (E1523)
    - ii. CAMPUS-ID-OF-ENROLLMENT (E0782)
    - iii. GRADE-LEVEL-CODE (E0017)

    1b. Add new data elements to this new complex type:
    - i. EXCESSIVE-UNEXCUSED-ABSENCE-INDICATOR-CODE (E16X1)
    - ii. TRUANCY-PREVENTION-MEASURE-INDICATOR-CODE (E16X2)
    - iii. TRUANCY-COMPLAINT-FILED-INDICATOR-CODE (E16X3)

2. Add Guidance associated with the new complex type and data elements.

3. Add new TSDS reports to reflect the changes in this proposal.

4. Add associated data validation rules to reflect the changes in this proposal.

ITF Discussion:

Terri Hanson stated that the laws about truancy have been in effect for a long time, but we have not collected information about this at TEA in a few years. Districts will continue to do exactly what they do now in terms of recording unexcused absences and truancy actions. The only change related to this proposal is what is required to be reported to TEA.

David McKamie asked about tracking absences in a 6-month period vs. the school year. Terri replied that attendance systems should already be addressing truancy based upon 6-month periods, so local policy applies.

Terri noted that several years ago we collected truancy data through discipline, but that was discontinued.

ITF Action:

David McKamie called for a motion to approve the proposal as presented.
Dara Fuller made a motion to approve the proposal as presented and it was seconded by Adrian Garcia.
The committee voted and the motion passed.

11. Special Education Teachers and Paraprofessional Reporting   **Action Item**

Section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) requires that each state submit data about children with disabilities, ages 3 through 21, who receive special education and related services under Part B of IDEA. The Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) requires states to report the unduplicated number of children served and the full-time equivalents (FTEs) of Certified/Non-Certified Special Education Teachers or Paraprofessionals.

Presentation:

This presentation was moved to just before the Language Acquisition agenda item.

Stephanie Sharp presented the proposal which includes the following:

1. Add existing data element GRADE-LEVEL-CODE (E0017) to the StaffResponsibilitiesExtension complex type to be reported in the PEIMS Fall Submission.

   a. Add reporting guidance to StaffResponsibilitiesExtension regarding the reporting of GRADE-LEVEL-CODE.

2. Add new data element PARAPROFESSIONAL-CERTIFICATION-INDICATOR-CODE (E16XX) to the StaffExtension complex type to be reported in the PEIMS Fall Submission.

   a. Add reporting guidance to StaffExtension regarding the reporting of PARAPROFESSIONAL-CERTIFICATION-INDICATOR-CODE.

3. Update existing TSDS reports to reflect the changes in this proposal.

   a. PDM1-111-001 Individual Staff Profiles

4. Add data validation rules to reflect the changes in this proposal.

ITF Discussion:

Dara Fuller asked about the correct way to report the situation where Special Education students are in a classroom with other students, and the staff responsibility is reported with population served 01 to reflect the non-special education students. Candice DeSantis replied that the responsibility should use the population served based on what the class is designed for, not necessarily who the students are in the class.

David McKamie asked if this collection will provide all the information that was gathered via eGrants. Stephanie replied that it's going to be a little better, since currently agency staff cross walk the Service IDs based upon grade level type, but now they will have the information about the grade level.

Dara asked about an aide in the class serving the Special Education students. The aid could be reported as population served 06 and the teacher as population served 01? Candice confirmed that is correct.

Terri Hanson asked Tammy Pearcy to clarify which data was being gathered from eGrants. Tammy Pearcy explained that eGrants PR1500 data was collecting paraprofessional data for Title I federal reporting and TEA will need that data for IDEA even though the PR1500 collection is being retired. That data was incomplete already because it was only gathered from Title I campuses, but our federal reporting requirement is not limited to Title I campuses. Gathering this info via PEIMS will allow us to get all the paraprofessional data needed for federal reporting.

Dara asked for clarification on reporting population served in a class that is a mix of Special Education students in a regular class. Should we still use population served 01? The paraprofessional may be in the class just to serve the Special Education student(s), and they will still be set up with population served 01. Has anyone checked existing data to make sure the correct population served will be available? We want to be sure they get the info they need for the federal reporting. Stephanie explained that Joel Zhou has looked at PEIMS data to see if we can use what we have, but we still needed to add grade level.

Candice asked if the paraprofessional would be reported with a different service ID for serving the Special Education students. Stephanie replied that paraprofessionals are only allowed to report certain service IDs, which could be different than the teacher's service ID in that class.

Dara requested that the guidance is clear for population served. Terri added that population served guidance will be enhanced to clarify how it should be reported.

Keitha Ivey asked what does "certified" mean in the definition for PARAPROFESSIONAL-CERTIFICATION-INDICATOR-CODE. Does it mean certificated in special education? Tammy replied that there is not a Special Education paraprofessional certification, so it means a level 1, 2, 3. Keitha requested more clarification for people like her who do not have much experience with paraprofessional certifications. Dara noted that paraprofessionals aren't required to have a certification. Terri pointed out that this data element is just a Y or N response, we don't need to know the level of certification, just whether or not they're certified.

Keitha suggested the scenario of a resource teacher that works with several levels of students in an inclusion classroom and moves around with students in different grades. She stated that they typically just report her as general Special Education. How do you associate that teacher with more than one grade level? Do you need a different responsibility record for each grade level they serve? What grade level should they report? Candice asked what service ID is used. Keitha responded that they use the service ID for Special Education and Role ID of teacher (087/047). Dara asked if that responsibility uses population served 06. Keitha confirmed that it does. Dara then stated that Keitha needed to report a responsibility for each grade level of student being served by that teacher.

Updates to guidance related to these elements is required.

ITF Action:
David McKamie called for a motion to approve the proposal as presented.
Dara Fuller made a motion to approve the proposal as presented and it was seconded by Dianne Borreson.
The committee voted and the motion passed.

12. HB 548 – Language Acquisition   Action Item

House Bill (HB) 548, passed in the 86th Legislative Session, amends Subchapter I, Chapter 29, Education Code by adding Section 29.316. This section requires the commissioner of the Texas Education Agency and the executive commissioner of the Health and Human Services Commission (HHSC) to ensure that the language acquisition of each child eight years of age or younger who is deaf or hard of hearing is regularly assessed using a tool or assessment.

Presentation:

Leanne Simons introduced Connor Briggs as the Subject Matter Expert. She also introduced Tammy Pearcy who was participating remotely.

Leanne Simons presented the proposal which includes the following:

1. Add new sub-complex type TX-LanguageAcquisition with two existing data elements and one new data element to StudentExtension.

    a) INSTRUCTIONAL-SETTING-CODE (E0173)
    b) EFFECTIVE-DATE (E1632)
    c) PREFERRED-HOME-COMMUNICATION-METHOD (EXXX9)

2. Add new unbounded sub-complex type TX-LanguageAcquisitionServicesProvided with three new data elements to the TX-LanguageAcquisition sub-complex type within StudentExtension.

    a) LANGUAGE-ACQUISITION-SERVICES-PROVIDED (EXXX1)
    b) FREQUENCY-OF-SERVICES (EXXX2)
    c) HOURS-SPENT-RECEIVING-SERVICES (EXXX3)

3. Add new unbounded sub-complex type TX-HearingAmplification with three new data elements to the TX-LanguageAcquisition sub-complex type within StudentExtension.

    a) HEARING-AMPLIFICATION-TYPE (EXXX4)
    b) HEARING-AMPLIFICATION-ACCESS (EXXX5)
    c) HEARING-AMPLIFICATION-AVERAGE-DAILY-USE (EXXX6)

4. Add new unbounded sub-complex type TX-LanguageAcquisitionAssessmentReporting with two new data elements to the TX-LanguageAcquisition sub-complex type within StudentExtension.

    a) TOOL-OR-ASSESSMENT-USED (EXXX7)
    b) ASSESSMENT-RESULTS-OBTAINED (EXXX8)

5. Create new code table LANGUAGE-ACQUISITION-SERVICES-PROVIDED-CODE (DCXX1)

6. Create new code table FREQUENCY-OF-SERVICES-CODE (DCXX2)

7. Create new code table HOURS-SPENT-SERVICES-CODE (DCXX3)

8. Create new code table HEARING-AMPLIFICATION-CODE (DCXX4)

9. Create new code table PERIOD-OF-TIME-ACCESS-CODE (DCXX5)

10. Create new code table AVERAGE-TIME-CODE (DCXX6)

11. Create new code table TOOL-ASSESSMENT-CODE (DCXX7)

12. Create new code table ASSESSMENT-RESULTS-OBTAINED-CODE (DCXX8)

13. Create new code table PREFERRED-HOME-COMMUNCATION-CODE (DCXX9)

14. Modify StudentExtension to include new sub-complex types and data elements.

15. Add TEDS Guidance associated with the new sub-complex types and data elements.

16. Add new TSDS reports to reflect the changes in this proposal.

17. Add associated data validation rules to reflect the changes in this proposal.

ITF Discussion:

Candice asked for clarification of the levels of the sub-complex types. Leanne and Connor confirmed that the sub-complex types are two levels deep, with all the new elements and sub-complex types within the TX-LanguageAcquisition sub-complex type.

David McKamie asked for confirmation that these are always going to be Special Education students. Stephanie confirmed, yes, with those three specific disabilities. David suggested these data elements could have more Special Education language to make that clear. The sub-complex title will be "Special Education Language Acquisition".

Leanne mentioned that the program area was originally hoping to use some of the information reported via PEIMS, but because of the timing, we needed to report this in a separate collection.

Terri asked Tammy Pearcy to confirm that this data has never been officially reported by the LEAs to TEA, as well as how LEAs know this information. Tammy replied that the language acquisition assessment is a component of the students IEP, but they haven't had to report it to TEA. They just gathered the data for the ARD committee meetings related to the IEP. So, this is brand new reporting requirement for all districts.

Terri asked Tammy if her group will be doing some training about the collection of the data. The IT team will train on the technical part of the data collection, but Tammy's team will be communicating to LEAs about the need to gather this info. Tammy responded that they do have a plan for training and communication to LEAs, starting in the spring. The approved list of assessments is to be published in the spring. After that there will be training as well as spreading information to the districts about reporting on the assessment results. The guidance will be about how to understand, extract, and report this data accurately. Because this reporting is an annual report on each of these students who are deaf, hard of hearing, or deaf/blind, it is a new piece of their reporting requirements rather than just documentation progress in the IEP.

For the Period-Of-Time access data element response and corresponding Average-Daily-Use data element, Tammy pointed out that average time is only applicable if hearing amplification access indicates they are only partial day.

Dara asked what effective date refers to. Tammy replied that it is the effective date of when they entered special education with one of the applicable disability codes. It is recorded in their IEP documentation.

Candice asked about dependencies between the data elements. For example, if the frequency of services is monthly, does the hours spend receiving services mean the hours in the month? Leanne confirmed, and noted that if they select certain frequency of services, there will be controls in place so that they can only report certain values in other elements.

Dara asked if that additional guidance would be presented in the January meeting. Leanne replied that it will be addressed in some of the rules, but that the guidance for the data elements can be updated to be more clear.

Dara pointed out that new rule 40100-new1 says "less than 8" when it should it be "less than 9". Stephanie confirmed and said that would be corrected when the rule is added to TEDS.

Traci asked if this collection will be due before or after PEIMS Summer due date. Leanne replied that we haven't set the specific due date yet. Tammy added the public report will be due August 31, but we knew we would need the collection sometime in June in order to meet that August deadline. Terri asked the meeting attendees if they have a preference as to this being due before the PEIMS submission or after. David McKamie replied that it may help vendors and PEIMS folks if the dates are coordinated because staff is available.

Melody Parrish asked if any of this data shared between the PEIMS Summer submission. Leanne answered that it is not because the PEIMS Summer data would be too late for the August report.

David asked when RF Tracker data is due. Terri responded that RF Tracker is due in July.

Leanne requested that ITF members provide feedback on the best time to set the specific due date for this collection, as there is some flexibility on the date in June.

Terri added that TEA encourages LEAs to be sending data throughout the year, instead of waiting to send the data closer to the due date.

David asked if the superintendent will need to approve this submission. Terri replied no.

ITF Action:
David McKamie called for a motion to approve the proposal with the addition of "Special Education" to make the collection named "Special Education Language Acquisition".
Jennifer Carver made a motion to approve the proposal as presented and it was seconded by Brenda Padalecki.
The committee voted and the motion passed.

Other Business   **Discussion Item**

Terri Hanson stated that, as far as we know, all the 2019 session legislation has been processed through data governance. She thanked the ITF members for all their help.

Terri stated that there is one item of legislation still pending analysis, which is Senate Bill 11 regarding School Safety.

Melody Parrish noted that TEA will be collecting some kind of data, in some way, but maybe not through TSDS.

Terri continued by saying that the January 14, 2020 ITF meeting will be reviewing anything we agreed to bring back from today's meeting, as well as a proposal about studentGPS Dashboards data elements being removed. The March 3rd and April 7th ITF meeting dates will be kept as placeholders in case they are needed.

Adjournment

David McKamie called for a motion to adjourn the meeting.

Pablo Martinez made a motion to adjourn the meeting and it was seconded by Dara Fuller.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:35 p.m.