



**Texas Education Agency  
Policy Committee on Public Education Information  
Friday, January 24, 2020**

Texas Education Agency  
WBT G-100 PDC 7  
GoToWebinar  
**10:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.**

**PCPEI Meeting Minutes**

**Call to Order**

Andrew Kim called the meeting to order at 10:01 a.m.

Roll call of the PCPEI members attending the meeting was taken by Stephanie Sharp.

**PCPEI Members Present:**

Priscilla Canales (Weslaco ISD)
Andrew Kim (Comal ISD)
Damon Jackson (Lubbock ISD)

**PCPEI Members Present via GoToMeeting:**

Charlotte Baker (ESC 3)
Patti Blue (Gustine ISD)
Paul Clore (Gregory-Portland ISD)
Carolyn Counce (TASB)
Jeff Goldhorn (ESC 20)
Danny Lovett (ESC 5)
Cody Newcomb (Center Point ISD)
Orlando Riddick (Midland ISD)

**PCPEI Alternates Present via GoToMeeting:**

Evelyn Jenkins (ESC 16)
Amanda Manca (Texarkana ISD)
Mary Beth Matula (ESC 3)

Mary Morgan (ESC 11)
Marcos Zorola (North East ISD)

**ITF Members Present:**

David McKamie (ESC 12, Vice-Chair of ITF)
---

**TEA Staff Present:**

Terri Hanson (ITS/BMD)
Scott Johnson (ITS/BMD)
Leticia Ollervidez (ITS/BMD)
Stephanie Sharp (ITS/BMD)
Leanne Simons (ITS/BMD)

**TEA Staff Present via GoToMeeting:**

Jeanine Helms (ITS/BMD)
-------------------------

**Approve Meeting Minutes from the November 05, 2019 PCPEI Meeting Action Item**

Andrew Kim asked if there were any corrections needed in the November 05, 2019 meeting minutes. Hearing none, he called for a motion to approve.

**Motion:** Damon Jackson made a motion to approve the November 05, 2019 PCPEI meeting minutes as presented.

**Second:** Jeff Goldhorn

**Vote:** The committee voted, and the motion passed.

**Part A: December 10, 2019**

**1. 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.**

**PCPEI Discussion:**

Andrew Kim called for questions, and there were none.

**PCPEI Action:**

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

**Motion:** Jeff Goldhorn made a motion to accept this proposal as presented.

**Second:** Charlotte Baker

**Vote:** The committee voted, and the motion passed.

**2. Out of School Suspension, DAEP and Expulsion Reporting**

**Action Item**

During the 86<sup>th</sup> 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 we will 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.**

**PCPEI Discussion:**

Andrew Kim asked about the timing of this material since the proposal was presented at both the October and December ITF meetings. Terri Hanson responded that this proposal was originally presented in the October 2019 ITF meeting. ITF had requested some clarifications. Leanne Simons added that a revised proposal with clarifications was presented in the December 2019 ITF meeting. David McKamie added that once ITF had the examples and clarification for the December meeting, ITF was able to approve the proposal.

**PCPEI Action:**

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

**Motion:** Damon Jackson made a motion to accept this proposal as presented.

**Second:** Priscilla Canales

**Vote:** The committee voted, and the motion passed.

**3. 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 to table the proposal until the January ITF meeting.**

**PCPEI Discussion:**

Leanne Simons noted that this is a discussion item, stating that this topic will be brought up again in part B of this meeting, therefore no action is needed in response to this agenda item. Terri Hanson suggested that we move to this item in Part B in order to complete this item and PCPEI agreed. Notes are included in Item 1 of Part B.

David McKamie presented the information in Part B of this ITF Report to PCPEI.

**PCPEI Action:**

None. Action taken in item 1 of Part B..

**4. 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.**

**PCPEI Discussion:**

Andrew Kim called for questions or comments on this item.

Priscilla Canales asked whether this motion also includes the special instruction clarification described in the ITF proposal. Andrew Kim confirmed that it does.

**PCPEI Action:**

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

**Motion:** Damon Jackson made a motion to accept this proposal as presented.

**Second:** Priscilla Canales

**Vote:** The committee voted, and the motion passed.

**5. 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.**

**PCPEI Discussion:**

Andrew Kim called for questions or comments on this item and mentioned he has a comment/clarifying question, but he would defer first to anyone on the webinar for any questions.

Mary Beth Matula stated that all of these codes are unclear. She asked if there will be an explanation for each of them so they can explain to districts how to use these codes. Referring to the proposal provided, Terri pointed out that the definitions are included and that guidance will be added to the data standards.

Andrew Kim asked if this was reviewed with accountability, from a CCMR perspective, as it appears the terminology of explorer/concentrator/completer is from an accountability perspective. Terri replied that this is a big initiative coming from the CCMR division. We worked with Ryan Merritt and Heather Justice, who also worked with all divisions at TEA for this change, including accountability and research and analysis. Terri added that we’ve always had LEAs report to us their CTE indicator, but now TEA will calculate it based on the submitted course completion records. LEAs will no longer report to us codes 0-2, which have been in effect since 1993, but instead, TEA will calculate based on course completion. Mary Beth stated she appreciated the clarification and that the review of the definitions made it clearer.

Terri stated the hurdle will not be related to the non-reporting, it will be reviewing reports after the PEIMS Summer First submission to ensure the data looks correct. The data will be based on course completion information.

Andrew stated this is critical from an accountability perspective. He added that the confusion is because this is brand new. The definitions are ok, but it is definitely new terminology, and the difference is very slight. Andrew also asked about industry-based certifications (IBCs) and whether there would be another code for that, because for him, a CTE Completer could mean they have the certification as well. Terri replied that there is another data element and code table for the collection of IBC data, and LEAs can report as many of the IBCs that students earn.

Jeff Goldhorn added a comment to ensure that TEA communicates the importance of this in regard to accountability.

Andrew agreed, the terminology will definitely need to be updated in how this relates to the half-point for accountability, especially if that is going away. Will a participant in a coherent sequence count as much as before? You could get an industry certification as a concentrator or completer, but that could mean different things for accountability.

Jamie Crowe and Ryan Merritt are meeting with the commissioner to determine how this data is going to change accountability. They have an accountability advisory group and there are conversations going on in that group now.

**PCPEI Action:**

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

**Motion:** Jeff Goldhorn made a motion to accept this proposal as presented.

**Second:** Andrew Kim

**Vote:** The committee voted, and the motion passed.

**6. 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.**

**PCPEI Discussion:**

Andrew Kim called for questions or comments, there were none.

**PCPEI Action:**

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

**Motion:** Andrew Kim made a motion to accept this proposal as presented.

**Second:** Damon Jackson

**Vote:** The committee voted, and the motion passed.

**7. 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 proposal 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.**

**PCPEI Discussion:**

Andrew Kim asked if a student or group of students are on a waitlist, can the home school district get that list as well. As superintendent, if kids are on a waitlist, that would be helpful to the LEAs for planning purposes. Terri replied that the organization who submits the data will be able to view that information. Jeff Goldhorn added that he just read a brief on a lawsuit (via TEA news). The nuance was that the charter school wasn't opened yet, so a judge ruled one way instead of the other. The district tried to use the Open Records Act to get the data. He suggested that reading about that lawsuit might provide some insight. Andrew replied that he was hoping this might be shared across districts or statewide. Terri stated we do have statewide reports that might provide some visibility into this data. She added that we would check with legal and the charter school attorney to get clarification and let the committee know at the next meeting. Andrew replied that would work and we could approve the proposal for the data collection as the outcome of the discussion will not impact TEA's ability to collect this data.

Priscilla Canales requested clarification between PEIMS reporting and this new collection. It seems to be the same information for PEIMS. Terri clarified that this is a new core collection, outside of PEIMS, reported as of the last Friday in September. PEIMS uses the last Friday in October. Additionally, this reporting is only for Charter Schools who use a waitlist. Andrew Kim added that this is charter school data, not all school districts are required to report.

Priscilla asked what constitutes a child on a waitlist vs just coming in to gather information. Leanne replied that the Charter school division was required to develop a common application form for charter schools. If the form is filled out for the student and turned in, it means the parent is requesting the student to be admitted to that charter. Leanne said she would have to check with the Charter School Division to see when that admission form will be released.

Andrew Kim asked if we will be collecting the unique student ID as part of this collection, so we can track which district they came from. Leanne replied that the applicant may not know the Unique ID, but charter schools use the UID system and can look it up. Also, parents/students are not required to put their SSN on the common application form which we discussed with legal. Charter schools are to search for the student and determine if they already have a unique student ID. Terri added that based on the results, you would be able to know where the student was last enrolled.

Evelyn Jenkins asked how students on the waitlist with a unique id will impact our leavers in our fall submission. Would a student on a waitlist not be considered a leaver? Terri replied no, this collection does not impact leavers. This collection will only include those on a charter school waitlist and we don't know whether they actually enrolled until the PEIMS Fall submission.

Andrew Kim asked TEA if we could table this proposal. Terri asked what other information is needed. TEA is set to publish this change in March, so if there is a request to table this, we need to know quickly, as we would need to address any concerns via email. Andrew Kim stated he thinks it's important to share the charter waitlist information with districts, so if we could ensure sharing the information in a statewide report. Terri stated that legislation mandates the collection of the data. She added that she understood the question is what does TEA do with the data, but we need to move forward to be able to collect the data first before we can determine who has access to it.

Andrew Kim stated one of his concerns was if we approve this, there won't be any more discussion related to the data sharing. Priscilla Canales agreed. Terri suggested we put a discussion item for the next PCPEI meeting to ensure we have had the conversation with legal regarding sharing data statewide.

Evelyn Jenkins stated that satisfied her concerns.

**PCPEI Action:**

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

**Motion:** Evelyn Jenkins made a motion to accept this proposal as presented.

**Second:** Jeff Goldhorn

**Vote:** The committee voted, and the motion passed.

**8. 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-PARTICIPATION-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 StaffResponsibilitiesExtension Complex type to be reported in the PEIMS Extended Year submission.
	a. Add reporting guidance to StaffExtension and StaffResponsibilitiesExtension 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 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 is 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.**

**PCPEI Discussion:**

Terri stated that this proposal was from a portion of HB 3 which expanded funding for those districts that chose to offer an extended school year (Additional Days) for PK-5th grade. Most important of these items on the list is adding a new reporting period “nine” (9). Right now, there are only eight (8) allowable reporting periods. Adding this additional ninth (9th) reporting period will allow districts to report they offer these additional days of instruction, whether in the summer or during the year. There is a minimum 2-hour instructional requirement for each of the additional 30 half days provided, and in order to receive the additional days funding, LEAs are required to report the attendance data on those additional days.

Terri pointed out that there is one requirement in order to qualify - your current calendar has to allow for 180 days. Andrew Kim requested clarification that it is days, not minutes. David McKamie stated we asked that too and have confirmed it is 180 instructional days.

Terri continued that TEA also needed to capture special services for those additional days, and which teachers are teaching in this additional day’s program. David McKamie clarified that this is administered by campus, not district, so all the campuses in the district can have the additional days at one campus. David also mentioned using a different track for the calendar year for those who opt-in.

Andrew Kim asked in terms of reporting, most of the extended year opportunities are during the summer, so is this part of the PEIMS Fall collection? David McKamie stated it will be part of the PEIMS Extended Year collection. Terri added that any district who offers this during the school year or in the summer use the PEIMS Extended Year submission.

Andrew Kim stated the last paragraph of the ITF minutes is kind of confusing. Andrew was referring to the example of counting five (5) days of absences in order to meet the 180-day requirement; it almost seems like a loophole. Terri agreed, and stated it is like a loophole, and we requested clarification from David Marx who was the one who provided the example of counting the five (5) days as absences. Terri added districts would have to look at the financial implications to determine the feasibility of providing the additional days program.

Evelyn Jenkins asked if this was done during Saturday school, for example. Would that be a flexible Saturday, or would we have to build that additional day into our calendars at the very beginning of the school year? Terri replied that for these additional days program, you’ll need to have a separate calendar track. She added that those 30 half-day dates can after school, holidays, Saturdays, or whichever days the campus decides. Evelyn requested further clarification that the calendar should be set at the beginning of the year, not figured out midway. Terri responded it has to be set at the beginning of the school year so that parents/students know the additional days being offered.

Evelyn stated that we don’t have a lot of districts meeting the 180-day requirement anymore. Andrew Kim agreed and stated that is a quandary. He asked if legislation requires the 180 days and Terri confirmed.

Andrew added that this may be part of HB 3 cleanup, and hopefully they will change the language to reference minutes to give flexibility to the school districts.

Jeff Goldhorn added what he remembers from the bill was that the intended consequence was to get districts to provide more than 180 days. Terri added that a survey was sent to Superintendents to ask if they were going to use this additional day program. Andrew noted that calendars are going to the school boards for adoption with minutes, not days.

**PCPEI Action:**

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

**Motion:** Damon Jackson made a motion to accept this proposal as presented.

**Second:** Jeff Goldhorn

**Vote:** The committee voted, and the motion passed.

**9. 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.**

**PCPEI Discussion:**

Andrew Kim called for questions and there were none.

**PCPEI Action:**

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

**Motion:** Damon Jackson made a motion to accept this proposal as presented.

**Second:** Andrew Kim

**Vote:** The committee voted, and the motion passed.

## **10. 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 Percy to clarify which data was being gathered from eGrants. Tammy Percy 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.**

**PCPEI Discussion:**

Andrew Kim would like to see some clarification on the word "unduplicated". Does that refer to staff? Stephanie replied that "unduplicated" refers to the students, not the staff. Stephanie also stated that we had to add the data element GRADE-LEVEL-CODE to the StaffResponsibility complex type in order for the program area to be able to separate the counts of students by grade level.

Andrew asked if professional staff refers to counselors or other professional staff the student gets services from on a regular basis. Stephanie asked if a counselor is considered a paraprofessional and Andrew replied they are considered professional. Stephanie stated that the collection is just for the paraprofessionals. The reason we are adding this collection is because previously TEA would get this data via the eGrants PR1500, Data Equity Survey. However, that survey is being retired and so there is a need to gather the data another way.

**PCPEI Action:**

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

**Motion:** Damon Jackson made a motion to accept this proposal as presented.

**Second:** Jeff Goldhorn

**Vote:** The committee voted, and the motion passed.

**11. 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 Percy 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-COMMUNICATION-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 Percy 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.**

**PCPEI Discussion:**

David McKamie pointed out that this is a whole new collection, our second new collection in addition to Charter School Waitlist. He confirmed with his special ed coordinator that this data has never been collected before. Leanne pointed out that this was presented in the January ITF meeting so it is also presented in Part B of this report with several changes, including clarifying the name of the collection, therefore we will go to Item 3 in Part B of the ITF Report to PCPEI for additional notes and voting actions.

**PCPEI Action:**

None. Discussion continues in item 3 part B of the ITF report to PCPEI. .

**12. 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:

11.	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

**PCPEI Discussion:**

Terri Hanson stated that starting in 2020-2021, a student discipline policy guide will be made available. It will include the appropriate legal references and will be the best source of this information.

**PCPEI Action:** N/A

**Part B: January 14, 2020****1. 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 Partnership. There are no changes to existing data validations or rules.

**Presentation:**

Stephanie Sharp noted that this proposal was presented at the December 10, 2019 ITF meeting originally and after meeting with internal staff regarding using information from AskTED instead of adding a new code, it was determined this information is not present in AskTED and therefore the program area still needs this new code to distinguish these PK-SCHOOL-TYPE.

Stephanie presented the proposal which includes the following:

3. Update PK-SCHOOL-TYPE (DC152) code table by adding new code 11.
4. Update guidance related to PK-SCHOOL-TYPE in TEDS.
5. Verify new code and code translation displays for ECDS report(s).

**ITF Discussion:**

Nancy Dunnam called for comments or questions and there were none.

**ITF Action:**

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

Dianne Borreson made a motion to approve the proposal and it was seconded by Dara Fuller.

**The committee voted and the motion passed.**

**PCPEI Discussion:**

**From Part A:** Leanne Simons noted that this is discussion item at this point of the meeting, stating that this topic will be brought up again in part B of this meeting, therefore no action is needed in response to this agenda item. Terri Hanson suggested that we could skip down to this item in Part B in order to complete this item and PCPEI agreed.

**Part B Discussion:** Terri pointed out that some of the confusion during the December discussion was about the types of organizations that are involved with these partnerships. ITS worked with the Early Childhood Division to come up with a clear definition and guidance. Terri added that the translation of code 11 in code table DC152 was changed to “In-District Charter Partnership”. For the districts that have these partnerships for a Prekindergarten program, they can report them with this new code. Terri also pointed out the updates to the guidance in the January ITF proposal. Terri referred the committee to page 3 of the proposal provided. She showed the code table definition in addition to reviewing the guidance that was clarified. Damon Jackson added that his district includes these special in-district partnerships, so the definition and guidance is very clear and looks great.

Evelyn Jenkins asked whether these in-district charters will know they are an in-district charter. Damon Jackson replied he was confirming, but if the district has an 1882 partnership, they would know and this helps keep track of those operating as an in-district charter. Andrew Kim added that he is aware of districts having these partnerships. He asked for confirmation that if your district initiates an 1882 partnership, and they are a private or public institution, then you would funnel that information to this code. Terri replied yes, that is correct.

**PCPEI Action:**

Andrew Kim called for a motion to approve the recommendation made by ITF to accept the proposal presented at the January ITF meeting.

**Motion:** Damon Jackson made a motion to accept this proposal.

**Second:** Evelyn Jenkins

**Vote:** The committee voted, and the motion passed.

**2. Removal of KG Assessments**

**Action Item**

Section 2.012 of HB 3 amended TEC Section 28.006 to remove statute related to the commissioner's list of approved assessments for Kindergarten students and instead instructs the commissioner to adopt one multidimensional assessment tool that includes a reading instrument that tests at least three developmental skills.

**Presentation:**

Stephanie Sharp presented the proposal which includes:

1. Remove code values from Code Table DC154 ASSESSMENT-TITLE-CODE.
2. Update guidance in TEDS Section 10 (TWEDS > Data Submission > Data Submission Purpose & Requirements > ECDS).

Stephanie introduced Scott Bodnar and Howard Morrison from the Early Childhood Education Division. Howard noted that this proposal covers removing all the KG assessments except for the TX-KEA. However, TEA is in the process of possibly offering an alternate assessment. Should there be an alternate approved, that information will be forthcoming. Howard expects to receive a final decision on the alternate assessment in February, in time for the March publication.

**ITF Discussion:**

Nancy Dunnam referred to the To The Administrator Addressed letter from December 18, 2019. The wording in that letter states that LEAs must use the TX-KEA or an alternate assessment approved by the commissioner that is free to the school district. Howard confirmed that vendors are to submit a proposal to provide an alternative assessment by the end of January. TEA is reviewing and will make an announcement if an alternate assessment is chosen by February 28, 2020. Nancy asked for confirmation that LEAs do not need to make any adjustments. Howard confirmed, since we don't yet know if there will be an alternate approved. The only currently approved assessment is TX-KEA.

**ITF Action:**

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

Adrian Garcia made a motion to approve the proposal and it was seconded by D'Lynne Johnson.

**The committee voted and the motion passed.**

**PCPEI Discussion:**

Andrew Kim asked for any questions, comments or concerns. He reiterated that TX-KEA is the only Kindergarten assessment.

**PCPEI Action:**

**Motion:** Andrew Kim made a motion to accept this proposal as presented

**Second:** Damon Jackson

**Vote:** The committee voted, and the motion passed.

**3. HB 548 – Special Education 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 noted that this proposal was originally presented and approved in the December 10, 2019 ITF meeting, but design changes have been made and based upon the requests to provide additional guidance and to rename the collection to “Special Education Language Acquisition”, the proposal has been amended. We made some changes to the location of the new data elements being collected (moved out of StudentExtension to StudentSpecialEdProgramAssociationExtension). These changes are highlighted in green in the proposal being presented today.

Leanne presented the proposal which includes the following (only the items highlighted in green were presented):

1. Add new sub-complex type, TX-SpecialEducationLanguageAcquisition, with one new data element to the StudentSpecialEdProgramAssociationExtension Complex Type
  - a) PREFERRED-HOME-COMMUNICATION-METHOD (EXXX9)
2. Add new unbounded sub-complex type, TX-LanguageAcquisitionServicesProvided, with three new data elements to the TX-SpecialEducationLanguageAcquisition sub-complex type within the StudentSpecialEdProgramAssociationExtension Complex Type.
  - d) LANGUAGE-ACQUISITION-SERVICES-PROVIDED (EXXX1)
  - e) FREQUENCY-OF-SERVICES (EXXX2)
  - f) HOURS-SPENT-RECEIVING-SERVICES (EXXX3)
3. Add new unbounded sub-complex type, TX-HearingAmplification, with three new data elements to the TX-SpecialEducationLanguageAcquisition sub-complex type within the StudentSpecialEdProgramAssociationExtension Complex Type.
  - d) HEARING-AMPLIFICATION-TYPE (EXXX4)
  - e) HEARING-AMPLIFICATION-ACCESS (EXXX5)
  - f) HEARING-AMPLIFICATION-AVERAGE-DAILY-USE (EXXX6)
4. Add new unbounded sub-complex type, TX-LanguageAcquisitionAssessmentReportingCategory, with two new data elements to the TX-SpecialEducationLanguageAcquisition sub-complex type within the StudentSpecialEdProgramAssociationExtension Complex Type.
  - c) TOOL-OR-ASSESSMENT-USED (EXXX7)
  - d) ASSESSMENT-RESULTS-OBTAINED (EXXX8)
5. Add new code table LANGUAGE-ACQUISITION-SERVICES-PROVIDED-CODE (DCXX1)
6. Add new code table FREQUENCY-OF-SERVICES-CODE (DCXX2)
7. Add new code table HOURS-SPENT-SERVICES-CODE (DCXX3)
8. Add new code table HEARING-AMPLIFICATION-CODE (DCXX4)
9. Add new code table PERIOD-OF-TIME-ACCESS-CODE (DCXX5)
10. Add new code table AVERAGE-TIME-CODE (DCXX6)
11. Add new code table TOOL-ASSESSMENT-CODE (DCXX7)
12. Add new code table ASSESSMENT-RESULTS-OBTAINED-CODE (DCXX8)

13. Add new code table PREFERRED-HOME-COMMUNICATION-CODE (DCXX9)
14. **Modify StudentSpecialEdProgramAssociationExtension Complex Type to include new sub-complex types and data elements**
  - a) Add TEDS **StudentSpecialEdProgramAssociationExtension** General and Data Element Reporting Requirements guidance associated with the new sub-complex types and data elements.
15. Modify the StudentExtension Complex Type by adding an **existing data element to the Disabilities sub-complex type.**
  - EFFECTIVE-DATE (E1632) **(TX-EffectiveDateDisabilities)**
    - a) Add TEDS StudentExtension General and Data Element Reporting Requirements guidance for the newly added data element.
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:

Dara Fuller asked for a reminder about the collection due dates for this collection. Leanne replied that the collection will be due in June and that in December we discussed the pros and cons about when within the month of June would be best for the LEAs but that we had left the decision of the actual due date in June to the ITF Committee.

It was stated that from a PEIMS Coordinator point of view, making this collection due in July would be preferred since there are many other due dates in June. Leanne responded that, although we understand that June is busy, the program area needs this data sooner than July in order to produce the required reports by August.

Dara Fuller suggested a due date after the PEIMS Summer first submission due date but before the end of June. David McKamie stated that he can see the pros of having this data due near the other collection due dates, because it allows for coordination with vendors, getting it done before vacations, and fitting it into the work and deadline structure that is already in place. It was stated that during the June due date timeframe, there are often bottlenecks with poor performance and servers going down.

Nancy added that she would prefer something after the PEIMS submission cut off because in her region most districts will limit the number of data loaders, and most will be their PEIMS people. She does not know if a lot of her Special Ed personnel will have the role as loader. Terri Hanson responded that Special Ed staff may not have the data loader role, but they will do the promoting and the checking of reports/verifying. Nancy replied that she is anticipating what Terri stated, but they are still working it out. Terri understands the data loader is likely to be technical staff, and TEA is assuming that other staff will promote and run the reports. Nancy added that staff in her district who load the PEIMS data generally leave after the load is successful and are not working during the rest of the summer. Terri replied that the people who are going to complete these collections (RF, SPPI) will typically be the special ed staff, so we need to consider when these staff are available in the summer months.

David mentioned how the vendors could roll in this extraction in with the other extraction work. Terri responded that these students are identified throughout the school year, so in order to avoid the bottlenecks, we need to move toward loading this data throughout the school year. She understands this year vendors had some delays getting the extraction processes ready and available. We want to move toward the due date just being when data is being validated and finalized, so the LEA clicks the complete button to say they are ready for TEA to see that data, but that they are loading data continuously throughout the year.

Leanne mentioned that there have been some tickets and discussions about the RF Tracker collection due date. The program area is requesting that data be sent sooner throughout the year. Guidance indicates the data should be sent when the student enters the RF, not at the due date. If the program areas are going to provide due dates earlier in the school year, TEA needs to find ways to communicate the dates to users in the field. As



students are identified for this collection, the data should be loaded to TSDS at that time. We will discuss this topic during the upcoming training. We are unable to have a due date later than June.

Dara suggested the due date for this collection be one week after the PEIMS Summer first submission due date. So, if the PEIMS Summer submission is due on June 17, 2021 this collection is due June 24, 2021. Leanne replied that she will go back to program area with recommendation of the due date being the 4<sup>th</sup> Thursday of June. TEA will let the ITF committee know the final outcome of the due date. Nancy asked for confirmation this will be collected for the first time in June 2021. Leanne confirmed June 2021.

**ITF Action:**

Nancy Dunnam called for a motion to approve the proposal, with the due date to be finalized. Dianne Borreson made a motion to approve the proposal as presented and it was seconded by Brenda Padalecki.

**The committee voted and the motion passed.**

After the vote, Nancy commented that she assumes this group will not be voting on the due date. Leanne confirmed that a vote will not be needed. She will notify ITF if the program area has any issues with the 4<sup>th</sup> Thursday in June.

**PCPEI Discussion:**

**From Part A:** David McKamie pointed out that this is a whole new collection, our second new collection in addition to Charter School Waitlist. He confirmed with his special ed coordinator that this data has never been collected before. Leanne pointed out that this was presented in the January ITF meeting so it is also presented in Part B of this report with several changes, including clarifying the name of the collection, therefore we will go to Item 3 in Part B of the ITF Report to PCPEI for additional notes and voting actions.

**Part B Discussion:** Leanne mentioned changes made between December and January ITF meetings are highlighted in Green. In the updated proposal presented at the January ITF meeting, which was also projected during the meeting, the collection name was modified to add “Special Education” to Language Acquisition to read Special Education Language Acquisition. Additionally, all sub-complex types were renamed to match and additional guidance was developed. Also, we moved the entire sub-complex type to be under the StudentSpecialEdProgramAssociationExtension as opposed to the StudentExtension.

Andrew Kim asked about Section 504 students and whether they would be considered part of this, or was there any discussion regarding section 504 students. Terri replied this collection is strictly for Special Education students identified with one of the two allowable disability codes. Students with those specific disability codes are already in special education.

**PCPEI Action:**

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

**Motion:** Damon Jackson made a motion to accept this proposal as presented.

**Second:** Priscilla Canales

**Vote:** The committee voted, and the motion passed.

**4. Removal of studentGPS® Dashboard-Only Data Elements****Action Item**

Per the To the Administrator Addressed (TAA) correspondence titled, 2019-2020 studentGPS Dashboards, sent on November 1, 2019, TEA will remove the studentGPS® Dashboard data elements from the Texas Education Data Standards (TEDS) as TEA will no longer host the Dashboards.

**Presentation:**

Stephanie Sharp presented the proposal and explained that TEA will no longer host the studentGPS® Dashboards and that LEAs have the flexibility to work with their vendors to come up with a dashboard solution. She explained that this information was not sent out state-wide to all LEAs but only to those that have opted into the studentGPS® Dashboards. She also showed the committee additional documents embedded in the proposal to review the actual changes to the complex/sub-complex types.

1. Remove Dashboard-only Complex Types with their Data Elements from TEDS.
  - a) Remove Dashboard-only data elements from complex types that only include Dashboard data elements.
  - b) Remove complex types that only include Dashboard data elements.
2. Update TEDS Complex Types used by both Dashboards and other collections to remove Dashboard-only data elements.
3. Remove Code Tables associated to Dashboard-only data elements from TEDS.
4. Update and/or remove TSDS reports that display Dashboard-only data elements.
5. Update and/or remove data validation rules that use Dashboard-only data elements.

**ITF Discussion:**

Dara Fuller asked for the date of the TAA letter. Stephanie replied that it was sent November 1, 2019, but it was only sent to LEAs that use the Dashboards. Terri Hanson added that most TAAs are sent to all districts, but in this case the letter was only sent to Dashboard users and champions, such as ESCs that support LEAs that use Dashboards (approximately 86 districts).

David McKamie asked if the removal of these Dashboard items reduce or restrict the ability for Region 13 or other vendors to get data out to Dashboards used across Texas. Terri replied that this will actually be the opposite. As vendors become Ed-Fi certified, they can extract the data based upon Ed-Fi standards, which then opens up the availability to all the Dashboards available through the Ed-Fi community instead of being limited to just the studentGPS® Dashboards. TEA hosting the data at TEA limited interest from districts in using the studentGPS® dashboards.

David McKamie stated that time will still be needed to get things aligned with Ed-Fi in order for LEAs to take advantage of this. Does this still leave a hole or gap for those who want to use dashboards but aren't ready to go to the Ed-Fi standard? That gap between where vendors are now and when they would be ready to move to Ed-Fi could create issues. Terri replied that because the state data warehouse is on Ed-Fi, most vendors are taking the step to become Ed-Fi certified. TEA collects a subset of the entire Ed-Fi schema. As vendors become Ed-Fi certified, they will have more flexibility to exchange the data with other software vendors. Now, TEA is narrowing the Ed-Fi data even more, to just the data elements needed to be collected by TEA. The vendors will have all the Ed-Fi elements available to exchange with other third-party vendors. David clarified that there is no need to identify some field needed by majority of dashboards in this structure. Terri answered that TEDS needs to only document and identify that data that TEA needs loaded into the TEA-hosted ODS. It is not TEA's place to identify those data elements that third-party vendors might want to use. There could be a gap, but there already is one.

**ITF Action:**

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

David McKamie made a motion to approve the proposal and it was seconded by Adrian Garcia.

**The committee voted and the motion passed.**

**PCPEI Discussion:**

Terri Hanson provided the summary of this proposal and some history about the optional studentGPS® Dashboard application screen. Over the years, fewer districts opted-in to use the dashboards. TEA decided 2019-2020 would be the last year to offer the application. For the 2020-2021 school year, it will be removed from TSDS and TEDS. This proposal is to remove those data elements and complex types used only for the Dashboards

**PCPEI Action:**

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

**Motion:** Damon Jackson made a motion to accept this proposal as presented.

**Second:** Jeff Goldhorn

**Vote:** The committee voted, and the motion passed.

**5. Add New Language Code to C092****Action Item**

The English Learner Support Division has requested to add a code for American Sign Language to C092, LANGUAGE-CODE code table to properly identify ASL as a language option. The English Learner Support Division has partnered with Special Education to create detailed guidance on how to identify, service and reclassify English learners who are deaf/hard of hearing.

**Presentation:**

Letty Ollervidez introduced Carlene Thomas from the English Learner Support Division on the phone.

Letty presented the proposal which includes the following:

1. Add new code to code table C092, LANGUAGE-CODE
  - a. 6B – American Sign Language (ASL)
2. Update existing TSDS PEIMS report to reflect the changes in this proposal.
  - a. PDM1-120-002 - LEP/BIL/ESL and Parental Denial Students by Program and Grade
  - b. PDM1-120-012 - Student Indicator Report by Grade

Carlene Thomas stated that TEA is working to solidify guidance across the state about how to appropriately identify those who are deaf/hard of hearing as being English Learners. English Learner Support is coordinating with Special Education to identify and provide appropriate Bilingual/ESL programs where there is a need. Adding this language code provides the ability to distinguish students who use ASL, which also helps us identify services needed, as well as resources and tools for our regional day schools and districts that serve the deaf and hard of hearing population.

**ITF Discussion:**

Nancy Dunnam called for comments or questions, and there were none.

**ITF Action:**

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

Dianne Borreson made a motion to approve the proposal and it was seconded by D'Lynne Johnson.

**The committee voted and the motion passed.**

**PCPEI Discussion:**

Andrew Kim asked for clarification on the intended use of this new code. Terri replied that this is from the Home Language survey when a student enrolls. ASL will be another option for that survey. Terri added that from what Carlene is telling us, this will help the English Learner Support Division with the next steps for providing other services to these students.

Andrew Kim asked for clarification on additional changes in the future related to ASL. Terri replied that we will check with Jessica Snyder. .

**PCPEI Action:**

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

**Motion:** Priscilla Canales made a motion to accept this proposal as presented.

**Second:** Damon Jackson

**Vote:** The committee voted, and the motion passed.

**6. TREx Industry Based Certification and Reimbursement & SAT/ACT Indicator** **Action Item**

For the 2019-2020 TSDS PEIMS Collection, student post-secondary industry certification and licensure information is being collected in the Fall and Summer Submissions. Industry certifications earned between September 1 and May 31 of a given year are reported in the PEIMS Summer Submission and certifications earned between June 1 and August 31 of a given year are reported in the PEIMS Fall Submission.

The program area is requesting that both the industry-based certifications earned and an indicator stating that the prior LEA has already been reimbursed for the student be transmitted via TREx.

**Presentation:**

Leanne Simons presented the proposal which includes the following:

1. Add new data element IBC-REIMBURSEMENT-INDICATOR (TE132).
2. Add new data element SAT-ACT-REIMBURSEMENT-INDICATOR (TE134)
3. Add new data element POST-SECONDARY-CERTIFICATION-LICENSURE-EARNED (TE133).
4. Add new code table INDUSTRY-CERTIFICATION-LICENSURE-CODE (TC44).

Leanne pointed out that since this proposal was first emailed last week, the third paragraph of the Overview section has been adjusted to add “ACT, Inc.” along with College Board.

Terri Hanson stated that data will come to TEA from both College Board and ACT, Inc., but LEAs need to communicate with each other via TREx to determine whether or not an LEA has received the reimbursement for either of these tests.

**ITF Discussion:**

Nancy Dunnam called for comments or questions, and there were none.

**ITF Action:**

Nancy Dunnam 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.**

**PCPEI Discussion:**

Terri Hanson clarified that TEA already collects the IBC reimbursement information through PEIMS. HB3 provides for the funding for getting reimbursed for taking an IBC and a college entrance exam. There is a one-time reimbursement per student. One reimbursement per student for IBC, as well as once per student for a college entrance exam (ACT or SAT). When students move between LEAs, the new LEA will want to know if the reimbursement has happened.

Leanne noted that this is not a data collection for TEA to use. It is in TREx in order to pass the information between LEAs when students move between LEAs.

**PCPEI Action:**

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

**Motion:** Damon Jackson made a motion to accept this proposal as presented.

**Second:** Charlotte Baker

**Vote:** The committee voted, and the motion passed.

**7. Code Table Changes, C022/C214****Discussion Item**

The TEA Curriculum Division has additions, deletions, and revisions to the SERVICE-ID (C022) code table for the 2020-2021 school year. There are no reports or data validation rule impacts from these changes.

The TEA College, Career, and Military Preparation Division has one new code for the INDUSTRY-CERTIFICATION-LICENSURE-CODE (C214) code table, and one code to be deleted because it is a duplicate of another code. There are no reports or data validation rule impacts from these changes.

**Presentation:**

Stephanie Sharp presented the discussion item which includes the following:

1. Add, update, and delete entries in code table SERVICE-ID (C022).
  - 1a. Add 03200800 – English Language Development and Acquisition (First time taken)
  - 1b. Add 03200810 – English Language Development and Acquisition (Second time taken)
  - 1c. Update subheading to replace “Minimum High School Program (MHSP)” with “foundation high school program.”
  - 1d. Update I3100500 translation
  - 1e. Update I3100600 translation
  - 1f. Update I3100700 translation
  - 1g. Update I3100800 translation
  - 1h. Delete N1280040 - Foundations of Intensive Language Acquisition and Support
  - 1i. Delete N1280042 - Newcomers' English Language Development A
  - 1j. Delete N1280043 - Newcomers' English Language Development B
2. Add and delete entries in code table INDUSTRY-CERTIFICATION-LICENSURE-CODE (C214).
  - 2a. Add 931 Medical Laboratory Technician
  - 2b. Delete 400 Certified Patient Care Technician (CPCT) (duplicate of 786)

**ITF Discussion:**

Nancy Dunnam called for comments or questions, and there were none.

**ITF Action:** N/A**PCPEI Discussion:**

Andrew Kim called for questions or comments, and there were none.

**PCPEI Action:** N/A

### **Confirmation of ITF Committee Members**

Leanne Simons stated that two ITF members are retiring. Dara Fuller from Region 6 and Adrian Garcia from Pharr-San Juan-Alamo ISD.

Leanne Simons stated Dara Fuller recommended her current alternate John Shaffer from Region 15 as her replacement on ITF. Adrian Garcia has recommended Joel Garcia as his replacement on ITF.

Since PCPEI approves ITF members, TEA is bringing this recommendation to PCPEI.

### **PCPEI Action:**

Andrew Kim called for a motion to approve the recommendation made by TEA to accept the recommendations of new ITF members John Shaffer from Region 15 and Joel Garcia from Pharr-San Juan-Alamo ISD.

**Motion:** Andrew Kim made a motion to accept the recommendations of new ITF members.

**Second:** Damon Jackson

**Vote:** The committee voted, and the motion passed.

### **Open Forum**

Andrew Kim noted that that in our next meeting we will have more discussion about the charter school waitlist information. Also, more guidance about the 180-day requirement to qualify for the additional days funding.

Andrew called for any other discussion or requests to TEA.

Jacqueline Janacek reported Dr. Clark Ealy who is on the PCPEI Committee is changing districts. Would he stay on the Committee or does he need to be replaced or reconfirmed to serve from his new position? Terri replied that PCPEI member changes need to go through Commissioner Morath's office for consideration so we will provide this information to him.

Andrew expressed appreciation to everyone for their participation, as these topics impact funding, accountability, etc. for the districts.

### **Next PCPEI Meeting**

### **Discussion Item**

The next scheduled PCPEI meeting is April 28, 2020.

Terri Hanson stated that this next meeting should be relatively short. The December and January ITF meetings covered the last of the legislation that needed to be dealt with. The April meeting will be a few minor items and follow up with more information regarding ongoing efforts.

Andrew Kim asked about the reading academies under HB 3 and if there would be anything related to that subject coming up. Terri replied that TEA doesn't collect anything about reading academies, so we don't think that legislation impacts TSDS.

### **Adjournment**

Andrew Kim called for a motion to adjourn the meeting. Damon Jackson made a motion to adjourn. The committee voted and the motion passed.

The meeting adjourned at 11:59 a.m.