



Texas Education Agency (TEA)  
Policy Committee on Public Education Information  
January 28, 2021

Zoom  
10:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.  
**Meeting Minutes**

**Call the Meeting to Order** **Andrew Kim, PCPEI Chair**

PCPEI Chair, Andrew Kim, called the meeting to order at 10:02 a.m.  
Roll call of the PCPEI members was taken by Stephanie Sharp.

**PCPEI Members Present:**

Andrew Kim, Joel Garcia (ITF), Mary Beth Matula, Jackie Janacek, Amanda Manca, Damon Jackson, Danny Lovett, Dianne Borreson (ITF), Eric Combs, Jennifer Carver, Marcos Zorola, Mary Morgan, Patti Blue, Scott Lewis, Casey Neal, Jeff Goldhorn

**TEA Staff Present:**

Terri Hanson (ITS-BMD), Leanne Simons (ITS-BMD), Jamie Muffoletto (ITS-BMD), Stephanie Sharp (ITS-BMD), Leticia Ollervidez (ITS-BMD), Jeanine Helms (ITS-BMD), Scott Johnson (ITS-BMD), Connor Briggs (ITS-BMD), David Marx (Financial Compliance), Deborah DeBerry (ITS-Training), Alison Wright (ITS-PM), Justin Jons (Financial Compliance), Zane Wubbena (Special Education), Tammy Pearcy (Special Education)

**Approve Meeting Minutes from September 29, 2020, PCPEI Meeting Action Item**

PCPEI Chair, Andrew Kim, called for a motion to approve the meeting minutes from the September 29, 2020 PCPEI meeting.

Patti Blue made a motion to approve the minutes.

Danny Lovett seconded the motion.

**Vote:** Passed.

**Part A: December 08, 2020**

## **1. Residential Facility Tracker Submission Due Date Change Action Item**

Local Education Agencies (LEAs) serving students with disabilities who reside in Residential Facilities (RF) located within the LEAs' geographic boundaries and/or jurisdictions use the RF Tracker system in order to gain compliance with TAC §97.1072. The due date for the first RF tracker collection was July 30, 2020.

AskTED houses the organization information used by the RF tracker collection. Due to the AskTED year-end rollover that occurs the last week of July, it is requested that beginning with the 2020-2021 school year, the RF Tracker submission due date be moved to a different week. This new due date will allow for submission close, extension exceptions and quality assurance (QA) completion before the AskTED rollover event.

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) is proposing to move the RF Tracker Collection due date to the fourth week of June. For the 2020-2021 RF Tracker Collection the due date would be June 24, 2021 rather than July 29, 2021. This new due date is the same as the Special Education Language Acquisition and Early Childhood Data System Pre-Kindergarten collection due dates.

### **Presentation:**

Jamie Muffoletto presented the proposal which includes:

1. Change RF Tracker Submission Due Date
  - a) Change due date to June 24, 2021

### **ITF Discussion:**

ITF Chair, Nancy Dunnam, called for questions or comments. Traci Pesina, Linda Raney, Irma Hasnain and Sandra Kratz voiced concerns that by moving this collection, there will now be three collections due on the same day, the week after the PEIMS Summer Submission closes.

Leanne Simons acknowledged the ITF members concerns and clarified that the reason we have to move the date is due to end-of-year processing that occurs in the last week of July for AskTED. The AskTED application houses data used by the RF Tracker collection, and when a facility does not submit data, they may be deactivated in AskTED during the end-of-year processing. Leanne further added that the Research and Analysis Division, who manages the AskTED database, requested this change in order to allow the submission to be closed, extensions granted, and quality assurance completed before the end-of-year processing. Leanne stated that TEA is open to pushing the due date to the first week of July, but wanted to point out that if we do, the first week of July includes the 4<sup>th</sup> of July holiday. Some school districts are closed and program staff may not be as readily available. Leanne also wanted to remind the ITF committee that the RF Tracker due date is only the latest date that the data must be submitted to TEA. RF Tracker was developed to have data submitted throughout the year.

Leanne asked the ITF committee for date recommendations. Traci thanked Leanne and suggested a mid-July due date. Leanne responded that there would not be a lot of wiggle room in this proposed timeline.

Leanne added that historically when RF Tracker was reported via the legacy system, the due date was June 1<sup>st</sup>. When the collection was moved to the Texas Student Data System (TSDS), TEA was able to offer more flexibility in the due date and it was set for the last week of July. Since then, it was requested that the due date be moved to account for the AskTED end-of-year processing. TEA will get with the program areas and provide a new date to ITF if approved by the program area.

Nancy asked if the ITF Committee could approve the change via email if the program areas approved a mid-July due date. Leanne agreed an approval could be handled through email, or at the January ITF meeting.

Linda Raney asked if the original due date June 1<sup>st</sup> was a possibility since this would be prior to the PEIMS Summer Submission. Nancy mentioned Region 18 only has two RF Tracker districts and thinks that June 1<sup>st</sup> could be best, from a district perspective.

Leanne introduced Tammy Percy and asked her to speak to the June 1<sup>st</sup> due date. Tammy confirmed June 1<sup>st</sup> was the due date for RF Tracker in the legacy system. She added that the problem was that district calendars can extend into June and students can continue to move in and out of facilities on or after June 1<sup>st</sup>. Tammy stated the issue with the current July due date is that the RF Tracker data needs to be submitted prior to end-of-year processing, with time to allow for resolving duplicate entries or data cleanup for the organizations in AskTED.

Nancy asked about the suggested mid-July due date. Tammy responded that by only having two weeks prior to the AskTED end-of-year processing it would put their team on a very tight timeline. Tammy is also unsure if AskTED could move the end-of-year processing. Kathy Adaky added that if TEA moves the RF Tracker collection due date to mid-July, it would be harder for a district to get approved for an extension due to the timeframe of the due date and end-of-year processing.

Nancy asked TEA to review other potential dates. Leanne agreed TEA will review with the program areas and also provide a list of pros and cons for each of the proposed dates.

**ITF Action:**

No vote was taken due to the follow up required.

**Vote:** N/A

**PCPEI Discussion:**

No follow up discussion. Voting for this item is documented in Part B.

**2. Special Education Language Acquisition Changes      Action Item**

House Bill (HB) 548, passed in the 86th Legislative Session, amended Subchapter I, Chapter 29, Education Code by adding Section 29.316. This section requires the commissioner of the Texas Education Agency (TEA) 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.

The Special Education Language Acquisition (SELA) data is reported through TSDS each year no later than the fourth Thursday in June. The Special Education program staff have requested changes in order to only collect the necessary information and not require Local Education Agencies (LEAs) to report additional data when a student is not receiving services.

Beginning with the 2021-2022 school year, TEA is proposing changes to data elements FREQUENCY-OF-SERIVCES (E1663) and HOURS-SPENT-RECEIVING-SERVICES (E1664) from “Conditionally Mandatory for Collection/Submission” to “Optional for Collection/Submission” in the StudentSpecialEdProgramAssociationExtension complex type. This will no longer require an LEA to report the elements for students that do not receive services.

TEA is also proposing changes to code tables LANGUAGE-ACQUISITION-SERVICES-PROVIDED-CODE (DC156) and HOURS-SPENT-SERVICES-CODE (DC158).

Additionally, TEA is proposing the addition of a new element ELIGIBILITY-DATE (E17XX) in the Disability sub-complex type within the StudentExtension complex type.

All necessary reports will be updated to reflect changes. Finally, rules will be added, revised, and deleted in order to ensure high quality data is collected.

**Presentation:**

Jamie Muffoletto presented the proposal which includes:

1. Change data elements FREQUENCY-OF-SERVICES (E1663) and HOURS-SPENT-RECEIVING-SERVICES (E1664) from “Conditionally Mandatory for Collection/Submission” to “Optional for Collection/Submission” in StudentSpecialEdProgramAssociationExtension.
  - a. Update Data Element Reporting Requirements for StudentSpecialEdProgramAssociationExtension
2. Update special instructions for data elements FREQUENCY-OF-SERVICES (E1663) and HOURS-SPENT-RECEIVING-SERVICES (E1664).
3. Update SELA collection code tables:
  - a. Remove code “Consultative” (Code 03) and change “Indirect” (Code 02) to “Indirect/Consultative” (Code 02) in LANGUAGE-ACQUISITION-SERVICES-PROVIDED-CODE table (DC156).
  - b. Remove code “None” (Code 00) from FREQUENCY-OF-SERVICES-CODE table (DC157).
  - c. Remove code “0 Hours” (Code 00) from HOURS-SPENT-SERVICES-CODE table (DC158).
4. Update data element and add new data element in StudentExtension complex type:
  - a. Update EFFECTIVE-DATE (E1632) from “Optional for Collection/Submission” to “Conditionally Mandatory for Collection/Submission”.
  - b. Add new data element ELIGIBILITY-DATE (E17XX) to the Disability sub-complex type.
  - c. Update Data Element Reporting Requirements for StudentExtension.
5. TSDS Collection Reports Impact

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

**ITF Discussion:**

ITF Chair, Nancy Dunnam, called for questions or comments. Nancy asked about the definition of ‘Conditionally Mandatory’ in relation to the data element and where she can find the definition. Jamie explained that by changing the field to conditionally mandatory now if the disabilities subcomplex type is reported, then both EFFECTIVE-DATE (TX-EffectiveDateDisabilities), DISABILITY and now ELIGIBILITY-DATE (TX-EligibilityDateDisabilities) must all be reported.

Connor Briggs stated there is guidance for the effective date in TEDS. Connor further added that the guidance is not changing but SELA uses a slightly different definition which is why the new data element was proposed. Nancy asked to confirm if this date is reflected in the Individual Education Plan (IEP). Jamie confirmed that this date is part of the IEP. Jamie also added that the guidance was clarified to assist PEIMS coordinators and Special Education Directors.

Nancy called for additional questions or concerns. Hearing none, she requested a motion to accept the changes as proposed.

**ITF Action:**

Dianne Borreson made a motion to approve the proposal.

David McKamie seconded the motion.

**Vote:** Passed.

**PCPEI Discussion:**

PCPEI Chair, Andrew Kim, called for questions or comments. Hearing none, he requested a motion.

**PCPEI Action:**

Motion: Damon Jackson

Second: Eric Combs

**Vote:** Passed.

**3. Expansion of Teacher Incentive Allotment Data in the Class Roster Collection**

**Action Item**

House Bill (HB) 3 established local optional teacher designation systems and the Teacher Incentive Allotment (TIA) that are dedicated to recruiting, rewarding, and retaining highly effective teachers in all schools.

Local Education Agencies (LEAs), if they choose, can designate high performing teachers as Master, Exemplary, or Recognized based on statewide performance descriptors for these designations. LEAs will receive \$3,000 - \$32,000 per year for every designated teacher they employ. LEAs receive greater funding for designated teachers who work on rural and/or high-needs campuses. At least 90% of the Teacher Incentive Allotment funds must be used on teacher compensation on the campus where the designated teacher works. The remaining funds could be used for costs associated with implementing the local designation system or to support teachers in obtaining designations. National Board Certified Teachers will

automatically earn a Recognized designation. TIA funding goes to the campus where the teacher works and not directly to the teacher. The TIA department selected the Class Roster Winter Submission to determine which campus receives the funding based on where a teacher works on the last Friday in February.

Currently in the Class Roster Winter Submission, only teachers with a TeacherSectionAssociation and students are reported to TEA. Upon review of the data received, it was discovered that teachers in various other teaching roles (intervention teacher, dyslexia teacher, centrally assigned teacher and gifted and talented teacher etc.) were not reported since they may not have a TeacherSectionAssociation and students reported at a campus. In order to continue to use Class Roster Winter Submission for TIA purposes and capture all necessary information for the teachers in various other teaching roles, TEA will be activating a former Texas Student Data System (TSDS) dashboard only complex, TeacherSchoolAssociation. This will allow an LEA to report a TIA designated teacher in the Class Roster Winter Submission even if they do not have a TeacherSectionAssociation.

Additionally, in order to obtain the needed information for all designated and pending designation teachers in the Class Roster Winter collection, TEA is proposing the addition of two new data elements. First, the TEACHER-INCENTIVE-ALLOTMENT-DESIGNATION-CODE indicates a teacher holds an active National Board Certification, holds a current designation (Recognized, Exemplary, or Master) and/or has been submitted by an LEA for a new or change of designation for the Teacher Incentive Allotment. Second, the CREDITABLE-YEAR-OF-SERVICE-INDICATOR-CODE indicates that a teacher reported with a TEACHER-INCENTIVE-ALLOTMENT-DESIGNATION-CODE (01-03) has been employed and compensated or will be compensated for a creditable year of service for the current school year by the LEA.

**Presentation:**

Jamie Muffoletto presented the proposal which includes:

1. Activate TeacherSchoolAssociation complex type
  - a. Add complex type to the Class Roster Winter Submission
  - b. Add reporting requirement guidance for the Class Roster Winter Submission
2. Changes to StaffExtension Complex Type:
  - a. Add new data element CREDITABLE-YEAR-OF-SERVICE-INDICATOR-CODE (E17X1) to the StaffExtension complex as “optional” in the Class Roster Winter Submission.
  - b. Add new sub-complex type TX-TeacherIncentiveAllotmentDesignation in the StaffExtension complex type as “optional” in the Class Roster Winter Submission.
  - c. Add new “unbounded” data element TEACHER-INCENTIVE-ALLOTMENT-DESIGNATION-CODE (E17X2) to the sub-complex type TX-TeacherIncentiveAllotmentDesignation as “conditionally mandatory” in the Class Roster Winter Submission.
  - d. Add Reporting Requirements Guidance to StaffExtension Complex Type
3. Add new code table TEACHER-INCENTIVE-ALLOTMENT-DESIGNATION-CODE (CXX1)
4. Update existing TSDS reports to include data new to the Class Roster Winter Submission.
5. Data Validation Rule Changes

**ITF Discussion:**

ITF Chair, Nancy Dunnam, called for questions or comments. Dianne Borreson asked if the Teacher Incentive Allotment was tied to academic performance, and how can districts prove eligibility on teachers if they are not recorded as a 'Teacher of Record'. Jamie introduced Lyra Swinney, Project Coordinator for the Teacher Incentive Allotment and Grace Wu, Director of Strategic Compensation, to assist in answering questions.

Lyra stated TEA will not be using the Teacher Incentive Allotment reporting for academic performance tracking. Local districts capture these designations, and TEA is using them to verify the individual is a teacher, where they are teaching, and that they have met a 'creditable year of service'.

Nancy asked if there is going to be a validation against the Teacher Retirement System (TRS) or anywhere else the creditable years of service could be verified. Nancy recalls a report from TEA when creditable years of service was submitted through PEIMS and the inaccuracies of the report. Lyra clarified this new data element is only to indicate the individual has one creditable year of service, not to be confused with "years of service". Jamie added that the new data element only requires a yes or no response.

Nancy called for additional questions or concerns. Hearing none, she requested a motion to accept the changes as proposed.

**ITF Action:**

Traci Pesina made a motion to approve the proposal.

Pablo Martinez seconded the motion.

**Vote:** Passed.

**PCPEI Discussion:**

PCPEI Chair, Andrew Kim, called for questions or comments. Andrew requested clarification that the new data element is just a yes or no indicator. ITF member, Joel Garcia, confirmed that is correct and asked if a district is not participating in the Teacher Incentive Allotment (TIA), would they be required to report "No," or leave the data element blank. Jamie Muffoletto added that the two new data elements, CREDITABLE-YEAR-OF-SERVICE-INDICATOR-CODE and TEACHER-INCENTIVE-ALLOTMENT-DESIGNATION-CODE would only be reported by an LEA participating in the TIA or an LEA employing a designated teacher. If an LEA is not participating in the TIA and does not employ any designated teachers the new data elements would not be reported.

**PCPEI Action:**

Motion: Danny Lovett

Second: Eric Combs

**Vote:** Passed.

**4. Teacher Incentive Allotment Access PEIMS Fall Data Discussion Item**

House Bill (HB) 3 established district local optional teacher designation systems and the Teacher Incentive Allotment (TIA) that are dedicated to recruiting, rewarding, and retaining highly effective teachers in all schools.

Local Education Agencies (LEAs), if they choose, can designate high performing teachers as Master, Exemplary, or Recognized based on statewide performance descriptors for these designations. LEAs will receive \$3,000 - \$32,000 per year for every designated teacher they employ. LEAs receive greater funding for designated teachers who work on rural and/or high-needs campuses. At least 90% of the Teacher Incentive Allotment funds must be used on teacher compensation on the campus where the designated teacher works. The remaining funds could be used for costs associated with implementing the local designation system or to support teachers in obtaining designations. A National Board Certified Teacher will automatically earn a Recognized designation.

The TIA department would like access to the following current and future year PEIMS Fall data once the collection is in Accepted status and released to the TEA program areas:

1. DISTRICT-ID (E0212)
2. CAMPUS-ID (E0266)
3. SERVICE-ID (E0724)
4. ROLE-ID (E0721)

Accessing the data reported in the PEIMS Fall Submission will allow the TIA department to ensure that designations processed each year in April follow commissioner rules.

Additionally, this data will allow the TIA department to:

1. Verify that LEAs are only submitting designations for teachers who are employed in the current year on an approved campus with a teaching assignment (ROLE-ID 087). The TIA department will be comparing teacher data from the Strategic Compensation Operations Management System (SCOMS) to the PEIMS Fall data.
2. The TIA department will look at the placement of all currently designated teachers and flag any districts that did not receive TIA funding in the previous year. The department will then communicate with the LEA and let them know about the Class Roster Winter reporting requirements. This will give the LEA ample time to develop a spending plan for the TIA funding they will receive for this teacher.
3. Through an external process, LEAs submit teachers in October to the TIA department that they will be reporting as pending designation in the Class Roster Winter Collection. The TIA department will look at the ROLE-ID that was reported in PEIMS Fall submission to ensure that the staff member was reported with an 087. If a staff member was not reported with that ROLE-ID, the TIA department will reach out to determine if the teacher was coded incorrectly in the PEIMS Fall submission and provide assistance to ensure they are reported correctly in the Class Roster Winter Collection.

**Presentation:**

Jamie Muffoletto presented the proposal which includes:

The following staff responsibility data will be reviewed:

1. DISTRICT-ID (E0212)
2. CAMPUS-ID (E0266)
3. SERVICE-ID (E0724)
4. ROLE-ID (E0721)

**ITF Discussion:**

ITF Chair, Nancy Dunnam, called for questions or comments. Nancy asked for clarification about a new special warning for centrally assigned teachers seen during the Fall collection that may cause confusion to districts. Nancy wanted clarification on how any changes would impact the special warning. Jamie will look into this and provide an answer to ITF.

Traci Pesina requested clarification on who would be the point of contact in the district for the TIA department. Lyra Swinney stated if the district already has a local designation system, TEA has a point of contact established. Currently, TEA has a point of contact established for close to 800 districts. Lyra added if there is no current point of contact, the TIA program will contact the human resource department at the district.

Nancy Dunnam called for additional questions or comments.

As this was a discussion item, no vote was required.

**PCPEI Discussion:**

PCPEI Chair, Andrew Kim, called for questions or comments. Patti Blue requested clarification whether districts not participating in the Teacher Incentive Allotment (TIA) are required to report TIA data. If the district hires a teacher with a TIA designation, would the district be required to report TIA data at that time? Jamie Muffoletto confirmed the TIA designation, and the allotment funds follow the teacher. Leanne Simons added that the TIA department would access the PEIMS Fall data to contact a district not participating in TIA. If an LEA not participating in the TIA employs a TIA designated teacher, the LEA would be required to report the designated teacher in Winter Class Roster.

Andrew's concern is with the potential financial inequities between TIA and non-TIA districts. Due to the higher salary of a TIA designated teacher, a non-TIA district may not be able to afford teachers at the higher price point. Jamie informed the members that we can invite the TIA department to the next PCPEI meeting to answer any questions or provide clarification. Andrew agreed that would be helpful.

Andrew Kim noted this was a discussion item, so no vote was required.

**5. 2021-2022 IBC-EXAM-FEE-AMOUNT Updates Action Item**

Under House Bill 3 (HB 3) of the 86th legislative session, local education agencies (LEAs) are entitled to a reimbursement to help defray the cost of industry certification exams and college preparation assessments. Each LEA cannot receive more than one industry certification exam reimbursement per student and a student may not receive more than one subsidy. Each student cannot generate more than one industry certification exam reimbursement. Funds to reimburse LEAs that pay for an industry certification assessment for a student will be provided by the Texas Education Agency (TEA) to LEAs as authorized under HB 3.

During the October 22, 2019 ITF meeting, a proposal to determine the amount of subsidy to which an LEA is entitled was approved for the 2020-2021 school year. This proposal stated that TEA must collect the certification exam fee and the vendor/organization who

administered the exam. Per legislation, a student may not receive more than one subsidy. Therefore, only one LEA can receive a subsidy for that student.

The StudentExtension complex type was modified to add a new sub-complex type, TX-IndustryCertifications which includes the data element, E1654 IBC-EXAM-FEE-AMOUNT and is conditionally mandatory. Currently, LEAs are required to report an IBC-EXAM-FEE-AMOUNT greater than \$0 for the certification for which they wish to be reimbursed. Additionally, an LEA is required to report an IBC-EXAM-FEE-AMOUNT of \$0 in order to report the certification earned when there is no reimbursement requested.

TEA is proposing to modify the data element, E1654 IBC-EXAM-FEE-AMOUNT to be optional. This would result in an LEA not being required to report an IBC-EXAM-FEE-AMOUNT of \$0 when no reimbursement is requested.

Additionally, the College, Career, and Military Preparation (CCMP) Division has requested to allow the use of decimals in E1654 IBC-EXAM-FEE-AMOUNT. The length of the element would change from three (3) to six (6), to account for the decimal places. There are no rule impacts associated with this change.

**Presentation:**

Jamie Muffoletto presented the proposal which includes:

1. Modify TX-IndustryCertifications sub-complex type reported with StudentExtension complex type in the PEIMS Fall and Summer Submissions.
  - a. Change IBC-EXAM-FEE-AMOUNT from Conditionally Mandatory (C) to Optional (Y)
2. Modify Data Element IBC-EXAM-FEE-AMOUNT (E1654) to allow reporting of cents and increase length from three to six.
3. Update existing TSDS reports to reflect the changes in this proposal
  - a. PDM1-120-001 Industry-Based Certification Roster
  - b. PDM3-nnn-nnn Industry-Based Certification Roster
4. Update data element reporting guidance to reflect the changes in this proposal

**ITF Discussion:**

ITF Chair, Nancy Dunnam, called for questions or comments. Hearing none, she requested a motion to accept the changes as proposed.

**ITF Action:**

Traci Pesina made a motion to approve the proposal.  
Dianne Borreson seconded the motion.  
Vote: Passed.

**PCPEI Discussion:**

PCPEI Chair, Andrew Kim, called for questions or comments. Hearing none, he requested a motion.

**PCPEI Action:**

Motion: Damon Jackson

Second: Danny Lovett

**Vote:** Passed.

## **6. Expand ELO Data Elements Action Item**

Senate Bill 1404, passed in the 85th legislative session, requires that each school district and open-enrollment charter school report through the Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) the following:

- availability of expanded learning opportunities (ELOs) as described in Texas Education Code (TEC) 33.252.
- number of students participating in each of the categories of expanded learning opportunities listed under 33.252 (b).

During the 86th legislative session, House Bill 3 was passed which removed the requirement to report student participation in each of the ELO categories.

Beginning in the 2019-2020 school year, each school district and open-enrollment charter school was required to submit ELO data in the PEIMS Summer and Extended Year submissions.

The program area has determined that the data provided did not include the needed length of time for each ELO activity offered.

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) is proposing to modify the SchoolExtension complex type to remove the individual data elements related to the types of ELO activities, E1615 through E1621 from the TX-SchoolELOS sub-complex type. TEA is proposing to add a new unbounded sub-complex type, TX-SchoolELOActivity, and replace the individual ELO data elements with one new data element, ELO-ACTIVITY-CODE (E17X1), that utilizes a new code table, ELO-ACTIVITY-CODE (CXXX) that has six codes, each corresponding to the six ELO activities offered.

Additionally, TEA is proposing to add a new data element, ELO-DAYS-SCHEDULED-PER-YEAR (E17X2), to the new unbounded TX-SchoolELOActivity sub-complex. The new data element, when used in conjunction with existing data element, E1621 ELO-MINUTES-SCHEDULED-PER-DAY, will allow TEA to calculate the total amount of time each activity is offered during the school year.

Lastly, TEA is proposing to remove code "03", 'Voluntary Expanded Learning Opportunity - Before School and After School (Submission 3 Only)' from the existing code table, ELO-TYPE (C218), and add two new codes to allow for distinction between before and after school.

### **Presentation:**

Stephanie Sharp presented the proposal which includes:

1. Modify the TX-SchoolELO sub-complex type within the SchoolExtension Complex Type:
  - a. Remove the following data elements:
    - ELO-RIGOROUS-COURSEWORK-INDICATOR-CODE (E1615)
    - ELO-MENTORING-INDICATOR-CODE (E1616)
    - ELO-TUTORING-INDICATOR-CODE (E1617)

- ELO-PHYSICAL-ACTIVITY-INDICATOR-CODE (E1618)
  - ELO-ACADEMIC-SUPPORT-INDICATOR-CODE (E1619)
  - ELO-EDUCATIONAL-ENRICHMENT-INDICATOR-CODE (E1620)
- b. Add new un-bounded sub-complex type, TX-SchoolELOActivity to the un-bounded TX-SchoolELO sub-complex type with the following two new data elements:
- ELO-ACTIVITY-CODE (E17X1)
  - ELO-DAYS-SCHEDULED-PER-YEAR (E17X2)
2. Add new code table ELO-ACTIVITY-CODE (CXXX) with six new codes.
3. Update code table ELO-TYPE (C218) to delete code “03”, revise code “04”, and add two new codes.
4. Update the SchoolExtension complex type Data Element Reporting Requirements.
5. Update existing TSDS reports to reflect the changes in this proposal:
- a. PDM3-116-008 Organization Expanded Learning Opportunities
  - b. PDM4-116-008 Organization Expanded Learning Opportunities
6. Add, update, and remove associated data validation rules to reflect the changes in this proposal.

**ITF Discussion:**

ITF Chair, Nancy Dunnam, called for questions or comments. David McKamie asked if reporting Expanded Learning Opportunities helps with a district’s accountability ratings. Jamie responded that TEA will follow up with the program area to respond to this question.

Traci Pesina asked if the target audience for this change are the PEIMS coordinators or do other groups need to be aware of this information. Jamie will follow up with the program area to respond to this question. Traci added that her district struggled to get the information collected.

David McKamie asked ITF Members who the typical subject matter expert (SME) is for their ELO collection. Joel Garcia responded his district does not have a contact person for the ELO data so the PEIMS department sent a google form to the campus principals.

Leanne requested examples of issues found when collecting ELO data to send to the program area.

Nancy Dunnam called for additional questions or comments. Hearing none, she requested a motion to accept the changes as proposed.

**ITF Action:**

Dianne Borreson made a motion to approve the proposal.

Jennifer Carver seconded the motion.

Vote: Passed.

**PCPEI Discussion:**

PCPEI Chair, Andrew Kim, called for questions or comments. Hearing none, he requested a motion.

**PCPEI Action:**

Motion: Patti Blue

Second: Eric Combs

**Vote:** Passed.

## **7. Child Find**

## **Discussion Item**

Each state is required to develop a six-year State Performance Plan (SPP) that evaluates the state's efforts to implement the requirements and purposes of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004 (IDEA 2004), Section 616(b). The SPP illustrates how the state will continuously improve upon this implementation and includes updates through the Annual Performance Report (APR) submitted in February each year.

In alignment with IDEA, the US Department of Education/Office of Special Education Programs (ED/OSEP) identifies five monitoring priorities that are addressed by 17 SPP compliance and performance indicators:

- Monitoring Priority: Free Appropriate Public Education in the Least Restrictive Environment
  - o Graduation (Indicator 1)
  - o Dropout (Indicator 2)
  - o Participation and Performance on Statewide Assessment (Indicator 3A-C)
  - o Suspension/Expulsion (Indicator 4A-C)
  - o Educational Environment (School Age), Ages 6-21 (Indicator 5A-C)
  - o Preschool Environment, Ages 3-5 (Indicator 6A-B)
  - o Preschool Outcomes (Indicator 7A-C)
  - o Parent Involvement (Indicator 8)
- Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality
  - o Disproportionate Representation by Racial/Ethnic Groups (Indicator 9)
  - o Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability (Indicator 10)
- Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B/Child Find
  - o Child Find (Indicator 11)
- Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B/Effective Transition
  - o Early Childhood Transition (Indicator 12)
  - o Secondary Transition (Indicator 13)
  - o Post-School Outcomes (Indicator 14A-C)\*
- Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B/General Supervision
  - o Resolution Sessions (Indicator 15)
  - o Mediation (Indicator 16)
  - o State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) (Indicator 17)

\***Note:** Post-School Outcomes (Indicator 14A-C) is currently collected in the TSDS SPPI-14 Core Collection.

This ITF proposal is to add State Performance Plan Indicator 11 (SPPI-11) and State Performance Plan Indicator 12 (SPPI-12) to the TSDS Core Collection. SPPI-11 refers to the timely evaluation of students ages 3-21 for special education services under Part B of IDEA. SPPI-12 refers to children who are referred from Part C of IDEA prior to age 3, found eligible for Part B of IDEA, and have an individualized education plan (IEP) developed and implemented by their third birthday to receive early childhood special education (ECSE) services from a local education agency (LEA). Both SPPI-11 and SPPI-12 are compliance indicators and data are needed to meet federal reporting requirements related to special education Child Find activities.

Both SPPI-11 and SPPI-12 share common data elements. Data necessary for determining SPPI-11 and SPPI-12 compliance are currently collected in aggregate form at the LEA level using the legacy, State Performance Plan (SPP) application located via the Texas Education Agency Login (TEAL) application.

Beginning with the 2021-2022 school year, the Texas Education Agency (TEA) is proposing to add a new core collection, Child Find, to the Texas Student Data System (TSDS). The Child Find collection will include SPPI-11 and SPPI-12. The Child Find collection will collect data at the student-level rather than the district-level and will incorporate the entire Child Find process from birth to age 21 for students considered for special education services. Moreover, it will help to streamline the data collection process and decrease the duplicative reporting burden placed on LEAs annually.

The Child Find collection will include existing and new data elements for submitting student level data in TSDS.

**Timeframe:**

The annual data collection timeframe ranges from July 1st to June 30th. LEAs will have the ability to report student data to TSDS throughout the school year, but the final data reporting deadline for LEAs to submit data to the agency will be no later than the last Friday in July.

**ITF Discussion:**

Jamie introduced Tammy Percy and Zane Wubbena from the Special Education Department and Connor Briggs who will be the subject matter expert for the new collection.

ITF Chair, Nancy Dunnam, asked Jamie to confirm there was no handout for the Child Find proposal. Jamie Muffoletto informed the ITF Committee the official Child Find proposal will be presented during the January 12, 2021 ITF meeting so there was no handout for the discussion today.

Zane provided background on the requirements for this collection. The State Performance Plan (SPP) is a six year compliance plan that utilizes performance indicators and targets. The data is then used to build the federally required Annual Performance Report (APR). SPPI-11 and 12 monitor timeliness compliance and are tied specifically to IDEA Part B and C. Moving SPPI-11 and 12 to TSDS should help reduce the current high level of non-compliance.

Nancy asked the program area to explain what types of issues are making the state non-compliant. Zane stated that SPPI-11 requires an evaluation of a student to be completed within 60 days of the parental consent. Texas currently considers an LEA to be in compliance with this piece if the evaluation is completed within 45 school days of the parental consent. Tammy added that TEA is forced to work backwards in the current legacy system to understand the prior year's data. Additionally, Tammy stated that the data is reported in the aggregate form from districts and can have data quality errors. Nancy asked for examples of what aggregate data is reported. Tammy replied that a district is required to report the total number of students that have had an evaluation. In addition districts report how many

evaluations exceeded the 45-day timeframe and then if the timeframe was exceeded by 1-30 days or 30 or more days.

With the move to TSDS, the collection will allow LEAs to report data year-round rather than just one time at the end of the year. Jamie presented a high level overview of the Child Find proposal showing the use of existing interchanges and complex types. In addition to existing data elements, Jamie described nine new data elements and two new code tables. Jamie completed the presentation by explaining, as Tammy pointed out that, TEA currently collects this information at the district level in aggregate form and will now collect the data at the student level. Districts will report the student level information and TEA will provide the calculations for the APR. The proposed name for the new collection is Child Find Collection.

Nancy Dunnam called for additional questions or comments.

As this was a discussion item, no vote was required.

**PCPEI Discussion:**

No follow up discussion. Voting for this item is documented in Part B.

**Other Business**

**Discussion Item**

ITF Chair, Nancy Dunnam, reached out to TEA to ensure reports are vetted prior to voting on new collections. Jamie Muffoletto confirmed that moving forward we would ensure that proposals include reports as needed. Nancy added that she encourages ITF members to reach out to TEA staff if additional information is needed when reviewing the proposals.

Leanne Simons stated that TEA will be sending updated meeting invitations to the committee members, for the summer dates due to the upcoming legislative session. ITF and PCPEI Chairs provided input on the added dates. Leanne added that based on the timeline from the last session, all the bills were passed by the middle of June. As the legislative session progresses, Leanne will send updates as needed.

Pablo Martinez asked when districts can expect to receive the 2021-2022 C022 change log. Jamie will contact Jessica Snyder in Curriculum and provide information at the next ITF meeting. Additionally, Pablo asked TEA to confirm that military enlistment is no longer part of CCMR, and if the data element will be removed for reporting purposes. Jamie confirmed that a To The Administrator Addressed (TAA) letter was sent stating the element is no longer used by TEA. Jamie is working with the Performance Reporting Division and when a change is needed, a proposal will be brought to ITF.

Leanne informed ITF that materials for the next ITF meeting scheduled for Tuesday, January 12, 2021 may be delayed due to the holidays.

David McKamie asked to return to the discussion of reports. David believes that there should be a report to validate data when LEAs load data into the operational data store (ODS) for something other than an official collection. This issue was brought to TEA by Nancy as well.

Leanne added that moving forward, TEA recommends loading the data to the ODS and then promoting the data to PEIMS. Once the data has been promoted to PEIMS, the LEA can run reports to verify the data. Leanne further clarified that there is not this type of reporting functionality in ODS. In the future, TEA will ensure there is a method for LEAs to run reports and validate the submission of data.

David McKamie wanted to poll ITF members on the late notice received from TEA regarding validating data for the RF Tracker collection by December 4, 2020. Sandra Kratz reported her district did not have an issue with that specifically but wanted to voice her concerns about the new RF Tracker due date being the same day as two other collections in light of the recent TEA server issues.

Terri Hanson added that a TAA letter was released in the summer of 2020 to explain the requirement for existing RF Tracker data to be promoted and validated by Dec 4<sup>th</sup>. Terri added this was also added to the Texas Education Data Standards (TEDS). Terri clarified that validated means the data is promoted, validated and fatal free. TEA will update the TEDS to reflect that the data must be promoted, validated and fatal free.

Terri also addressed the overall performance issues with the TEA servers and informed the ITF committee a dedicated team is addressing the performance issues. Terri responded to the concerns about moving the RF Tracker due date by reminding the committee the collection cannot be completed until after the school year ends since students will still enter and leave facilities up until the last day of school. Terri reminded the committee that even though the due date is June 24, 2021, the LEA should promote and validate data throughout the year. Additionally, LEAs can finalize the collection prior to June 24, 2021. TEA tries to keep maintenance weekends to a minimum during peak submission times. Leanne added that the IT governance team reviews each request for maintenance and attempts to limit downtime as much as possible.

## **Part B: January 19, 2021**

### **1. CTE Update TREx**

### **Action Item**

On December 10, 2019, ITF passed the TSDS-PEIMS proposal, Career and Technology Indicator Auto Calculation in which the Texas Education Agency (TEA) would no longer collect the Career and Technology Education (CTE) indicator from a Local Education Agency (LEA). Starting in the 2020-2021 school year, new CTE indicator codes were defined. TEA will now calculate the appropriate CTE indicator code(s) to assign to all students in grades 6-12. The calculation will be based on the student's course completion data collected in the PEIMS Summer Submission.

Due to the implementation of the auto-calculation, the CAREER-TECH-ED-INDICATOR (TE014) and corresponding code table TC03 will be updated to reflect the auto calculation codes in order for the LEA to transfer a student's code to a new LEA beginning in the 2021-2022 school year. TEA will provide the LEAs a report containing the auto calculated values.

### **Presentation:**

Leticia Ollervidez presented the proposal which included:

1. Update data element CAREER-TECH-ED-INDICATOR (TE014)
2. Update code table CAREER-TECH-ED-INDICATOR (TC03)

**ITF Discussion:**

ITF Chair, Nancy Dunnam called for questions or comments. Hearing none, Nancy requested a motion.

**ITF Action:**

David McKamie made a motion to approve the proposal.

Traci Pesina seconded the motion.

**Vote:** Passed.

**PCPEI Discussion:**

PCPEI Chair, Andrew Kim, called for questions or comments. Andrew requested clarification regarding the military designation and if the Texas Education Agency (TEA) has any advanced knowledge. Jamie Muffoletto asked Andrew to clarify his question. Andrew explained he is asking how this indicator will be collected. Jamie stated TEA is currently looking at how and what is being received directly from the military, and the timing impact. Jamie will follow up with any information to the committee once it is finalized.

Andrew called for additional questions or comments. Hearing none, he requested a motion.

**PCPEI Action:**

Motion: Danny Lovett

Second: Damon Jackson

**Vote:** Passed.

**2. School Day Event Code Additions Action Item**

COVID-19 continues to have an impact on Texas education making it necessary for Local Education Agencies (LEAs) to move from fully on-campus instruction to restricted access in certain situations. Due to updated guidance released on November 19, 2020 by the Texas Education Agency (TEA) in the SY 20-21 Attendance and Enrollment FAQ (On-Campus Attendance Requirements Q14 and Calendars and Minutes Requirements Q10), LEAs will need to report the reason for restricted access to on-campus instruction.

TEA proposes the addition of two new SCHOOL-DAY-EVENT-CODEs (C208) for use in the 2020-2021 school year. These new codes will allow the LEA/campus to indicate if the campus has restricted access to on-campus instruction close due to the following reasons:

1. COVID-19: Restricted Access to On-Campus Instruction – TEA Approved Reason
2. COVID-19: Restricted Access to On-Campus Instruction – Reason Other than TEA Approved Reason

The new codes will be reported in the 2020-2021 PEIMS Summer Submission.

**Presentation:**

Jamie Muffoletto presented the proposal which included:

1. Add two new codes to SCHOOL-DAY-EVENT-CODE (C208)
  - a. 03 - COVID-19: Restricted Access to On-Campus Instruction – TEA Approved Reason
  - b. 04 - COVID-19: Restricted Access to On-Campus Instruction – Reason Other than TEA Approved Reason
2. Update guidance for CalendarDateExtension.
3. Update existing TSDS reports to reflect the additional SCHOOL-DAY-EVENT-CODEs.
4. Add and update associated data validation rules to reflect the additional SCHOOL-DAY-EVENT-CODEs

**ITF Discussion:**

Jamie introduced Justin Jons from the Financial Compliance Division to assist in answering any questions.

ITF Chair, Nancy Dunnam, called for questions or comments.

Nancy asked for confirmation that this change is for the 2020-2021 PEIMS Summer submission. Jamie confirmed the new SCHOOL-DAY-EVENT-CODEs would be reported in the 2020-2021 PEIMS Summer submission.

Kim O’Leary asked if the new codes require districts to update their Student Information Systems (SIS) calendar days from the start of the 2020-2021 school year. Justin confirmed a district may need to update their calendar from the start of the school year using the two new codes.

Nancy asked ITF members in larger school districts and vendors for specific questions or comments. Traci Pesina was concerned about making changes to the calendar for a large district. Joel Garcia added that depending on the district’s SIS, the attendance calculations may need to be run again.

Justin clarified the new codes were not changing the number of instructional days. Traci asked if the district would be required to recalculate the number of minutes when using one of the new codes and, if the district now fell short of the required minutes, would the district need to add minutes to meet the requirement. Justin confirmed a district would still need to meet the required minutes and that the new codes did not change anything about prior guidance that had already been released via the Attendance and Enrollment FAQ.

Sandra Kratz asked if a district started the school year remotely but came back to in person instruction 3-4 weeks later, would the district need to update the School Day Event codes from the beginning of the school year or is it just when the district came back to in-person instruction. Justin Jons stated the district will need to add a school day event code to the

back-to-school transition days. Leanne stated TEA has added specific guidance on how those days should be coded in the proposal and the Attendance and Enrollment FAQ.

Nancy asked how the new codes would be used by TEA. David Marx responded TEA will utilize the additional codes along with existing codes, to verify the required minimum minutes have been met. David added if a district does report a code '04', the district will only report half of the operational minutes for the day. A district may need to add additional operational minutes to equal the required minimum 75,600 minutes.

Catherine Bray asked if the new guidance regarding STAAR testing falls under either of these two new codes. Justin replied the new guidance provides an approved reason to restrict access to on-campus instruction for some students. A district would use code '03' and report full operational minutes. David McKamie asked if not meeting the 75,600 minutes could impact the funding an LEA would receive. Justin confirmed if an LEA did not meet the 75,600 minute requirement, funding could be impacted.

Nancy asked how this information will be communicated to districts. Jamie stated the information will be shared in the Field Coordination Network (FCN) newsletters and webinars. Justin added the program area will provide additional trainings. David Marx will include the new codes in the Attendance and Enrollment FAQ. Additionally, the new codes will be included in the Commissioner calls with superintendents.

Nancy requested a To The Administrator Addressed (TAA) letter be sent outlining the new codes. David Marx responded that TEA will send a TAA letter.

Nancy reminded TEA that there is a timeline set for changes to the Texas Education Data Standards (TEDS). The timing of this proposal does not meet the guidelines for TEDS changes.

Nancy called for additional questions or comments. Hearing none, Nancy requested a motion.

ITF Action:

D'Lynne Johnson made a motion to approve the proposal.

Joel Garcia seconded the motion.

**Vote:** Passed.

**PCPEI Discussion:**

PCPEI Chair, Andrew Kim, called for questions or comments. Hearing none, he requested a motion.

**PCPEI Action:**

Motion: Eric Combs

Second: Patti Blue

**Vote:** Passed.



Traci Pesina made a motion to approve the proposal with the July 15, 2021 due date for RF Tracker.

Sandra Kratz seconded the motion.

**Vote:** Passed.

**PCPEI Discussion:**

PCPEI Chair, Andrew Kim, called for questions or comments. Damon Jackson stated July is a preferred date due to the multiple submissions due at the end of June. Eric Combs agreed and added that because the RF Tracker collection uses PEIMS Summer data, it would make more sense to have the RF Tracker collection due date be the same due date as the PEIMS Summer re-submission. Andrew requested confirmation that there is no extension with the July 15<sup>th</sup> recommendation because that is a hard date for TEA. Leanne Simons confirmed that July 15, 2021 is a hard date. TEA needs time to finalize the data collection prior to the AskTED end-of-year processing.

Andrew Kim called for additional questions or comments. Hearing none, he requested a motion to approve the proposal with Option B, July 15, 2021, due date.

**PCPEI Action:**

Motion: Damon Jackson

Second: Eric Combs

**Vote:** Passed.

**4. Child Find**

**Action Item**

Each state is required to develop a six-year State Performance Plan (SPP) that evaluates the state's efforts to implement the requirements and purposes of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004 (IDEA 2004), Section 616(b). The SPP illustrates how the state will continuously improve upon this implementation and includes updates through the Annual Performance Report (APR) submitted in February each year.

In alignment with IDEA, the US Department of Education/Office of Special Education Programs (ED/OSEP) identifies five monitoring priorities that are addressed by 17 SPP compliance and performance indicators:

- Monitoring Priority: Free Appropriate Public Education in the Least Restrictive Environment
  - Graduation (Indicator 1)
  - Dropout (Indicator 2)
  - Participation and Performance on Statewide Assessment (Indicator 3A-C)
  - Suspension/Expulsion (Indicator 4A-C)
  - Educational Environment (School Age), Ages 6-21 (Indicator 5A-C)
  - Preschool Environment, Ages 3-5 (Indicator 6A-B)
  - Preschool Outcomes (Indicator 7A-C)
  - Parent Involvement (Indicator 8)
- Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality
  - Disproportionate Representation by Racial/Ethnic Groups (Indicator 9)

- Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability (Indicator 10)
- Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B/Child Find
  - Child Find (Indicator 11)
- Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B/Effective Transition
  - Early Childhood Transition (Indicator 12)
  - Secondary Transition (Indicator 13)
  - Post-School Outcomes (Indicator 14A-C)\*
- Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B/General Supervision
  - Resolution Sessions (Indicator 15)
  - Mediation (Indicator 16)
  - State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) (Indicator 17)

\*Note: Post-School Outcomes (Indicator 14A-C) are currently collected in the TSDS SPPI-14 Core Collection.

This ITF proposal is to add State Performance Plan Indicator 11 (SPPI-11) and State Performance Plan Indicator 12 (SPPI-12) to the TSDS Core Collection. SPPI-11 refers to the timely evaluation of students, ages 3-21, for special education services under Part B of IDEA. SPPI-12 refers to children who are referred from Part C of IDEA prior to age 3, found eligible for Part B of IDEA, and have an individualized education plan (IEP) developed and implemented by their third birthday to receive early childhood special education (ECSE) services from a local education agency (LEA). Both SPPI-11 and SPPI-12 are compliance indicators and data are needed to meet federal reporting requirements related to special education Child Find activities.

Both SPPI-11 and SPPI-12 share common data elements. Data necessary for determining SPPI-11 and SPPI-12 compliance are currently collected in aggregate form at the LEA level using the legacy, State Performance Plan (SPP) application accessed through the Texas Education Agency Login (TEAL) application.

Child Find continues to have more non-compliance reported than other federally required compliance indicators and has been cited as noncompliant at the State level by the federal monitoring arm within the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP). The state needs better data for required improvement to monitoring activities communicated to OSEP via the Corrective Action Response (CAR) and in response to the cited State noncompliance to address and improve timely evaluation of children for Special Education.

Beginning with the 2021-2022 school year, the Texas Education Agency (TEA) is proposing to add a new core collection, Child Find, to the Texas Student Data System (TSDS). The Child Find collection will include SPPI-11 and SPPI-12. LEAs currently collect student level data, but only report that data in the aggregate form to TEA. The Child Find collection will begin collecting the data at the needed student-level rather than at the LEA-level. This data collection will require the reporting of some students referred for Special Education evaluation, but not enrolled in the local education agency such as homeschooled students, students attending a private school or children who received Early Childhood Intervention services through another state agency. Moreover, it will help to streamline the data collection process.

The annual data collection period ranges from July 1st to June 30th for both SPPI-11 and SPPI-12. For example, students with an eligibility determination dated from July 1, 2021 to June 30, 2022 would be included in the federal fiscal year data collection/reporting period. The final data reporting deadline for LEAs to submit data to the agency will be no later than the last Friday in July. The final data reporting period must include an Eligibility Determination date less than or equal to June 30th.

**Presentation:**

Jamie Muffoletto presented the proposal which included:

1. Create StudentChildFindAssociationExtension complex type containing five new sub-complex types and ten new data elements. Use one existing data element:
  - TX-ChildFind (SPPI-11)
    - CAMPUS-ID-EVALUATION (EXXX1)
    - INSTRUCTIONAL-TRACK-INDICATOR-CODE (E0975)
    - STUDENT-ABSENCES-WITHIN-TIMEFRAME (EXXX2)
  - TX-EarlyChildhoodTransition (SPPI-12)
    - ECI-NOTIFICATION-DATE (EXXX3)
    - ECI-TRANSITION-CONFERENCE-DATE (EXXX4)
  - TX-ChildFindInitialEvaluation (SPPI-11 and SPPI-12)
    - PARENTAL-CONSENT-DATE (EXXX5)
    - INITIAL-EVALUATION-DATE (EXXX6)
  - TX-ChildFindEligibilityDetermination (SPPI-11 and SPPI-12)
    - SPED-ELIGIBILITY-DETERMINATION-DATE (EXXX7)
    - SPED-DETERMINATION-CODE (EXXX8)
  - TX-EvaluationDelay (SPPI-11 and SPPI-12)
    - EVALUATION-DELAY-REASON (EXXX9)
2. Add new code table EVALUATION-DELAY-REASON-CODE (DCXX1)
3. In the StudentSpecialEdProgramAssociationExtension, add existing sub-complex type TX-SpecialEdServicesType to the Child Find TSDS Collection as “Optional for Collection/Submission”.
  - Add EFFECTIVE-DATE (E1632) (TX-EffectiveDateServices) to the Child Find TSDS Collection as “Conditionally Mandatory for Collection/Submission”.
  - Add EARLY-CHILDHOOD-INTERV-IND-CODE (E0900) to the Child Find TSDS Collection as “Conditionally Mandatory for Collection/Submission”.
4. Add existing ReportingPeriodExtension as “Mandatory”.
5. Add existing CalendarDateExtension as “Mandatory”.
6. Add new TSDS reports to reflect the changes in this proposal.
7. Add associated data validation rules to reflect the changes in this proposal.

**ITF Discussion:**

ITF Chair, Nancy Dunnam called for questions or comments.

Nancy requested clarification if this collection will use PEIMS Summer submission data from the year prior and PEIMS Fall submission data, or if this is a separate submission. Jamie stated this will be a new collection called Child Find submitted in the TSDS Core Collection. Nancy asked when the submission is due. Jamie introduced Zane Wubbena. Zane stated the collection period is from July 1st to June 30th of a given year. The collection is reported

for any student that had an eligibility date between July 1<sup>st</sup> and June 30<sup>th</sup>. Zane stated all districts that have a special education program in Texas are required to submit data in aggregate by August 14, 2021. Nancy was unable to determine the due date of the collection from the proposal and stated ITF would not vote until a due date was presented.

Sandra Kratz asked if this collection will require a mid-year check point like RF Tracker (RFT). Leanne Simons will confirm with the program area if a check point is needed in addition to determining the submission due date.

David McKamie asked how this information is reported now, when it is due, and which staff typically complete the submission. Jamie replied that the collection is currently reported through the State Performance Plan (SPP) application in TEAL.

Nancy asked how this new collection will impact districts that participate in a Special Education Co-Op. Zane stated the reporting requirements are not changing. If the Special Education Co-Op currently reports the information, they should continue to report via the new TSDS Child Find collection. Zane reported that SPPI-11 has some of the highest non-compliance rates due to errors in calculating timeliness. Zane stated that collecting the raw data as part of this new collection will allow TEA to relieve the burden on the districts in calculating timelines.

Nancy stated concern for reporting individual student information for this collection. In her region, the individual student data is maintained at the district level, not at the Co-Op. Nancy believes the Special Education Director at the Co-Op currently submits the data. The individual school districts collect the data at the student level and sends just the aggregate data to the co-op for reporting. Nancy believes with this new collection the submission will need to move back to the district as many Co-Ops do not have access to the student databases.

Nancy asked David McKamie his thoughts on reporting this collection since his region has Special Education Co-Ops. David stated his concern would be if the Co-Op received access to the entire student databases to report the special education student information. Terri Hanson stated from a TSDS standpoint, TEAL roles are provided for those individuals to promote and approve the data. Zane stated currently, Special Education directors coordinate with districts to send student information to TEA so there should not be an issue with confidentiality.

Keitha Ivey asked how and in what format is this information currently submitted. Zane replied that the information is entered as aggregated data in the required fields of the SPP Application for the district. In the instance of non-compliance, the Special Education Director at the Co-Op or district enters the student level data in the SPP Application.

Keitha wanted to point out that her district uses Skyward for their Student Information System (SIS), but their Special Education department uses a third party vendor software. Keitha asked how, as PEIMS coordinator, can she guarantee a third party vendor software has the capability to collect new data. Keitha asked if any ITF members have this same concern. Traci Pesina has a similar concern.

Traci added that her main question is about the communication and training for the collection. In her experience, once the collection is put into TSDS, the PEIMS coordinator becomes the expert and becomes responsible for the data collection. Keitha agreed and added that the program area sends corrections back to the PEIMS coordinator. Zane responded that TEA is planning to provide detailed training, including Train the Trainer sessions, working directly with districts, hosting webinars with specific guidance, especially in regard to the complex federal legislation. Leanne clarified that the ITF members were trying to convey is that even though the collection moves to TSDS, the responsibility of the data collection does not move to the PEIMS coordinator. The responsibility remains with the person who is required to report the data now. Traci agreed this is the concern. Leanne suggested that Zane provide some of the communication to a few ITF members for review to help communicate the new data collection expectations with the districts.

Nancy added that districts are concerned about loading data into the ODS and most districts limit who has permission to do this. Leanne agreed, from a data loading perspective allowing less people to load data is the preference. Leanne further stated that the responsibility to promote, validate and run reports lies with the Special Education department, not the PEIMS coordinators. Zane confirmed that the Special Education directors will be responsible for this data, especially if there is non-compliance, as there are additional requirements when there is non-compliance.

Nancy requested to include the TSDS core roles needed to complete the collection in the proposal. Leanne explained that the TEAL roles needed are the TSDS core roles with a new permission that may be called Child Find. The user would need to request access to the permissions when available.

Traci Pesina stated concern about the timing of changes. Traci asked if TEA is sending third party vendors this information so they can make changes to the software. Traci added that currently it is a struggle to get the data ready for the Special Education Language Acquisition (SELA) collection. Terri replied that TEA will communicate with third party special education vendors. Terri stated that the Child Find data collection is comparable to the Early Childhood Data Submission and the assessment vendors. Terri suggested that LEAs contact their third party special education vendor to discuss the changes. Terri added that TEA will also solicit information through our FCNs and add any identified third party vendors to be included in webinars and training.

Nancy stated that the changes TEA made for ECDS and the recommendations provided to the vendors was monumental. Terri stated that TEA will try to make the rollout smoother by getting the third party special education vendor contact information and using the lessons learned from ECDS.

Terri requested ITF members provide to Jamie and Leanne any special education third party vendors they use.

Nancy opened discussion concerning the possible due date for this collection and added it is currently due August 14, 2021. Leanne informed ITF, based on submissions being due on Thursdays, August 12 could be an option for the due date. Traci pointed to page three of the proposal concerning the deadline. The proposal states the collection would be due no later

than the last Friday in July and asked if that date could be changed. Zane confirmed that the date could be changed if needed. Leanne clarified that during internal discussions, it was determined an August due date would be too late. The data is needed by the program area in September and it takes about two weeks for to review before the data can be released to the program area. An August due date would not allow districts time to make corrections while allowing TEA to QA and release the data to meet the September timeline. Nancy asked for the due date to be the last Thursday in July. Leanne agreed the due date would be the last Thursday in July or July 28, 2022. Nancy asked if there was any concern with this date and heard none.

Zane added that letters of non-compliance are mailed to districts in September and districts have a year to make any needed corrections. TEA submits the data to the Office of Special Education (OSEP) for all 17 State Performance Plan Indicators on February 1<sup>st</sup>.

Leanne asked Zane to clarify if the collection requires a check point throughout the year like the RF Tracker collection. Zane confirmed there is no current requirement for data to be loaded before the due date but does recommend loading data as assessments are completed for students.

Nancy Dunnam offered a suggestion when special population directors are trained that TEA include which reports should be reviewed for each submission.

Leanne requested the ITF committee vote on the proposal with adding the due date of July 28, 2022. TEA will email an updated proposal including the due date.

Nancy Dunnam called for any additional questions or comments. Hearing none, Nancy requested a motion.

**ITF Action:**

Traci Pesina made a motion to approve the proposal.

Sandra Kratz seconded the motion.

**Vote:** Passed.

**PCPEI Discussion:**

PCPEI Chair, Andrew Kim, called for questions or comments. Andrew asked Zane Wubbena from the Special Education department what the timeframe is for training. Zane replied that the goal would be to have the training rolled out by the summer of 2021. Andrew stated it has been a tough year for everyone and requested that TEA be mindful of the training timeframe to allow staff time off between the end of the school year and when the training would begin.

Zane clarified that this data is collected by the Special Education department and currently reported at the district level. With the addition of the new collection, the data will be collected and reported at the student level. Special Education department personnel are responsible for this data. The new process will not fall to the PEIMS coordinators due to the requirements when there is non-compliance identified.

Andrew asked if the PEIMS coordinator and the Special Education department representative should both attend the initial training. Zane agreed it would be helpful if both the PEIMS Coordinator and the Special Education department representative could attend training together.

Zane introduced Tammy Percy from the Special Education department. Tammy added that TEA is modeling the new Child Find collection after the SPPI-14 rollout. Additionally, Tammy stated it is up to the districts to determine who is responsible for reporting this data. There is no set requirement stating the Special Education department or the PEIMS coordinators are responsible for this collection. Ultimately, the local district will designate who will report the data.

Andrew called for additional questions or concerns. Hearing none, he requested a motion.

**PCPEI Action:**

Motion: Damon Jackson

Second: Eric Combs

**Vote:** Passed.

**Other Business**

**Discussion Item**

Nancy and David McKamie will both be out of the office for Spring Break when the next ITF meeting is scheduled (March 9<sup>th</sup>) and would like to reschedule the meeting. Leanne suggested the meeting be rescheduled to March 23, 2021. Nancy called for any concerns with moving the date and heard none. The next ITF meeting will be moved to March 23, 2021.

Jamie Muffoletto presented the following items for discussion by ITF.

1. LEAVER-REASON-CODE '16' will be changed from "Return to Home Country" to "Return to Home Country or Emigrate to Another Country" for the 2021-2022 school year.
2. CAREER-AND-TECHNICAL-ED-IND-CODE '5' will be changed from "a student completing at least one course but not two or more high school CTE courses for two or more credits defined by 19 TAC Chapter 126 (C), 127 (B) or 130 (the student does not have to pass or receive credit)" to "a student completing one or more courses for less than two credits defined by 19 TAC Chapter 126 (C), 127 (B) or 130 (the student does not have to pass or receive credit)".

**December Follow Up Information**

Jamie Muffoletto presented the following items as follow up from the December 8, 2020 meeting:

**Centrally Assigned Teachers Special Warning**

Rule 30305-0026 is being seen by districts when reporting a TeacherSectionAssociation without a StudentSectionAssociation. Typically a TeacherSectionAssociation would not be reported without a corresponding StudentSectionAssociation, but LEAs are going to see this when reporting teachers for the Teacher Incentive Allotment who are centrally assigned. For the 2021-2022 school year, this will be changed based on the new reporting guidelines

approved during the December 8, 2020 ITF meeting. Until the 2021-2022 school year, LEAs will still see this error when reporting a centrally assigned teacher without a StudentSectionAssociaiton. During Winter Class Roster, the LEA should confirm that this information is correct.

**ITF Discussion:** None

### **2021-2022 C022 Table Updates**

Jamie confirmed with Jessica Snyder that changes to the C022 Service ID code table will be released in the March standards. The State Board of Education (SBOE) does make updates in the June meeting for innovative courses and those would be updated in the July addendum release. Jessica does not foresee a big change to the code table this year.

**ITF Discussion:** Nancy requested that Jamie ask Jessica if the SBOE could review the innovative courses earlier. Jamie will check with Jessica and follow up with ITF.

### **Military Enlistment Indicator Code**

Jamie spoke with the performance reporting department concerning the Military Enlistment Indicator Code and if the code would be removed since TEA is receiving the information directly from the military. Performance Reporting will determine if additional information is required and if not, TEA will be asking the ITF committee to remove the data element.

**ITF Discussion:** None

### **Residential Facility Due Dates**

Jamie informed the ITF committee that in the March data standards publication an update will be made to the Residential Facility Tracker data submission timeline. For the December due date the data standards will now state the following: “All RF Tracker data up to this point must be, promoted, validated and fatal free.”

**ITF Discussion:** None.

Nancy asked if TEA has published what the audit documentation should look like for this year for attendance. Justin asked Nancy for clarification. Nancy clarified she is asking if the 6 weeks and 9 weeks reports will look the same. Jamie stated that the attendance reports will look different with the addition of the remote synchronous (RS) and remote asynchronous (RA) attendance for present days and for each program attendance. Leanne will check the release schedule for when updates to reports will be available, but believes it is set to be released in the next month. Leanne added that TEA created a workgroup with ESC representatives to review report changes. Not every report is being modified, but the group identified important reports that would use the RS and RS data elements.

### **Adjournment**

ITF Chair, Nancy Dunnam called for additional questions or comments. Hearing none, Nancy requested a motion to adjourn.

Jennifer Carver made a motion to adjourn.

Traci Pesina seconded the motion.

**Vote:** Passed.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:40 a.m.

## **Other Business**

## **Discussion Item**

Terri Hanson thanked ITF member Joel Garcia for presenting the ITF Report to PCPEI.

Leanne Simons informed the committee that TEA added a PCPEI meeting for August 3, 2021, due to the 87<sup>th</sup> legislative session.

Mary Beth Matula requested to know the status of the recommendations she provided for ITF membership changes. Leanne Simons stated that TEA is still evaluating the recommendations that have been sent for ITF and PCPEI. Mary Beth thanked her for the information. Leanne added that TEA had been asked to assess ITF and PCPEI membership to ensure coverage from all size districts, charters and education service centers within the state, in addition to analyzing meeting attendance. Andrew asked if TEA would be able to finalize the recommendations by the next PCPEI meeting. Leanne agreed to finalize the ITF recommendations by the next PCPEI meeting. For PCPEI, the membership comes from the Commissioner, so Melody Parrish and Terri Hanson will work on those recommendations.

Jamie Muffoletto informed the committee there are some ITF member changes that need to be voted on:

- ESC 20 requested the current ITF Alternate, Jay Young, be replaced with Alyssa Sanchez due to a position change.
- Tamara Kavanagh was mistakenly added as the Primary ITF Member from Skyward, John Newcom should be the Primary and Tamara Kavanagh the Alternate.
- Pablo Martinez left Houston ISD. Houston ISD has requested the Primary ITF Member to be Roshunda Roberts-Jackson, who is the Director of Counseling and Compliance. Additionally, and they requested Kim Lyons, Region 4 ESC PEIMS Coordinator, to be the Alternate.

PCPEI Chair, Andrew Kim, called for questions or comments. Hearing none, he requested a motion to approve the ITF member changes.

### **PCPEI Action:**

Motion: Danny Lovett

Second: Eric Combs

**Vote:** Passed.

## **Adjournment**

PCPEI Chair, Andrew Kim, called for additional questions or comments. Hearing none, he requested a motion to adjourn.

Damon Jackson made a motion to adjourn.

**Vote:** Passed.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:09 a.m.