Members: **Nancy Dunnam, Chair** **David McKamie, Vice Chair** **Dianne Borreson** **Aaron Daitz** **Belinda Dyer** **Dara Fuller** **Adrian Garcia** **Keitha Ivey** **Beverly Meyer** **Debbie Largent** **Kim O'Leary** **Brenda Padalecki** **Tom Priem** **Linda Roska** **Janet Spurgin** **Patty Streat** **Peggy Sullivan**	# *Information Task Force (ITF) Meeting Minutes October 31, 2013* **1:30 PM to 2:30 PM** **William B. Travis Bldg** **Hosted in 2-160** **Webinar Meeting**

Member Attending:	***Tom Priem, Linda Roska***
Members via Webinar:	***Nancy Dunnam, David McKamie, Aaron Daitz, Belinda Dyer, Dara Fuller, Adrian Garcia, Patty Streat, Keitha Ivey, Debbie Largent, Kim O'Leary, Brenda Padalecki, Peggy Sullivan, Beverly Meyer***
Alternates via Webinar:	
Alternates Attending:	***Brenda Richmond***
Others Attending:	***Bryce Templeton, Terri Hanson, Candice DeSantis, Tessie Bryant, Fernando Garcia, Shannon Housson, Shelly Ramos, Nina Taylor***

Call the Meeting to Order: Nancy Dunnam called the meeting to order at 1:30. Nancy asked Bryce Templeton to facilitate the meeting from this point forward.	
Approval of the October 22, 2013 ITF Meeting Minutes Bryce Templeton introduced the minutes from the October 22, 2013 ITF Meeting and asked for any needed corrections. Having no corrections offered, Bryce Templeton called for a motion to accept the minutes as presented. Patty Streat made a motion to approve the October 22, 2013 ITF Meeting Minutes as presented. Keitha Ivey seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.	**Action Item**
District and Campus Performance Indicator Proposal for Legacy PEIMS system Bryce Templeton and Fernando Garcia presented a data collection proposal to the ITF committee to collect new school district/charter school and campus performance data as required by HB5 from the 83rd legislative session. Schools would evaluate themselves and then assign and report a performance rating of exemplary, recognized, acceptable, or unacceptable for the district/charter school and each campus, based on locally-determined criteria certain programs and/or categories. The criteria for rating the district/charter school and each campus must to be developed by local committee. House Bill 5 from the 2013 regular legislative session added TEC 39.0545 that requires:	**Action Item**

1. districts and charter schools (LEAs) to evaluate their district/charter and each of their campuses and assign a performance rating for their community and student engagement, and compliance for the following factors: **fine arts, wellness and physical education, community and parental involvement, 21st Century Workforce Development program, the second language acquisition program, the digital learning environment, dropout prevention strategies, educational programs for gifted and talented students**.

2. LEAs must rate themselves and each campus and assign a performance rating overall for the collective group of categories/factors identified in number 1.

3. LEAs must rate themselves and each of their campuses and assign a performance rating regarding compliance with statutory reporting and policy requirements

School districts and charter schools are required to assign a performance rating of exemplary, recognized, acceptable, or unacceptable to the district and each campus, based on locally-determined criteria for each of the above mentioned programs and/or categories. The criteria for rating the district and each campus are to be developed by local committee.

TEA is seeking approval to collect the following data based on the requirements derived from House Bill 5 Section 46 (TEC 39.0545) and Section 60 TEC 39.363) beginning with the 2013-2014 school year in Submission 3 (Summer Submission).

The legislation requires that the performance ratings be submitted to the TEA by August 8, 2014 and made available publicly by the districts. Note: This date will be made flexible in order to work within the PEIMS summer submission timelines. Given the PEIMS submission deadlines, TEA would still be able to post the data on the TEA public website as required by October1, 2014.

The data collection for this new requirement will need to begin with the Summer PEIMS Collection of the 2013-2014 school year on the 010 District Organization record and the 020 Campus Organization record.

This new data reporting requirement will be effected by adding a new code table:

- PERFORMANCE-RATING-CODE (C198)
  00 Not Applicable
  01 Exemplary
  02 Recognized
  03 Acceptable
  04 Unacceptable

- 10 new data elements:

  1) FINE-ARTS-CATEGORY-CODE (E1531)
  2) WELLNESS-AND-PHYSICAL-ED-CATEGORY-CODE (E1532)
  3) COMMUNITY-AND-PARENTAL-INVOLVEMENT-CATEGORY-CODE (E1533)
  4) 21ST-CENTURY-WORKFORCE-DEVEL-PGM-CATEGORY-CODE (E1534)
  5) SECOND-LANG-ACQUISITION-PGM-CATEGORY-CODE (E1535)
  6) DIGITAL-LEARNING-ENVIRONMENT-CATEGORY-CODE (E1536)
  7) DROPOUT-PREVENTION-STRATEGIES-CATEGORY-CODE (E1537)
  8) EDUCATIONAL-PGM-FOR-GT-STUDENTS-CATEGORY-CODE (E1538)
  9) OVERALL-RATING-CATEGORY-CODE (E1539)
  10) STATUTORY-REPORTING-AND-POLICY-COMPLIANCE-CODE (E1540)

These new data elements would capture the information needed for the TEA to publish the performance ratings assigned by districts, charters and their campuses by the October 1, 2014 deadline as required in HB5 Section 60 - TEC 39.363.

Fernando Garcia illustrated to ITF the proposal that would add the 10 new data elements listed above to the 010 District record and the 020 Campus record. Each new data was discussed and it was illustrated that each data element would be reported with a value from

the new PEIMS code table C198 as listed above. Shannon Housson stated that since this proposal had been finalized, that TEA upper management was discussing the possibility of not collecting the data for the STATUTORY-REPORTING-AND-POLICY-COMPLIANCE-CODE (E1540) with code table C198 and possibly using PEIMS code table C088 (Yes/No) to collect the information for this data element. Fernando Garcia and Bryce Templeton continued the presentation by presenting the edits (data validations) that would be implemented for the 2013-2014 school year to ensure the data quality of this new information. The edits for this information would require that this information be reported in submission 3 and not be allowed in submissions 1, 2, or 4. The edits for this information would warn a district/charter school if data elements E1531 – E1538 were all reported as "00" – Not Applicable for a district/charter or campus. The edits would not allow a district/charter or campus to report data elements E1539 – E1540 with a value of "00" – Not Applicable. Note: IF TEA upper management decides that the E1540 data element should be reported with PEIMS code table C088, then E1540 would be removed from the criteria of this edit. **ITF Discussion** Aaron Daitz asked if this data collection was going to be for summer only. Bryce Templeton responded that this data collection would be for submission 3 only. Aaron asked about year round schools as they are in school through August. Bryce responded that there were approximately 5 weeks after the last due date for year round schools and that TEA would be able to meet the publication deadline of October 1. Peggy Sullivan asked if this was a new TEA data collection or has this data been collected previously. Bryce stated that this was a completely new data collection. Beverly Meyer asked why TEA decided PEIMS was selected as the means to collect this data. Bryce stated that TEA upper management determined that because of the high level of data quality for information collected through PEIMS that this would be the best option. Beverly asked if this was going to be an annual collection or if this was a onetime collection. Bryce responded that this was an annual collection for submission 3. David McKamie posed a question regarding a districts timeframe to collect this data, would it be at the end of the school year, was this flexible, will the performance code change throughout the school year or can they change? Shannon Housson responded that senior management's directive was that the information reported is a local decision and this would be our basic response to questions. TEA is not allowed to give any guidance on how the districts go about assigning these performance measures. David asked if there were anything to determine when a district assigns the performance measure or does the law not specify. Shannon stated that it would be a local decision. + Debbie Largent asked if the districts have been notified. Shannon responded that TEA has not notified schools of this change. TEA has been receiving calls regarding HB 5, and callers have been told that the bill was being analyzed. Brenda Richmond stated that the administration at HayCISD was aware of the changes and how would the districts be notified. Bryce sated that once the proposal is approved at the Data Governance Board notifications would be sent to the superintendents. David asked a question about any data checking for districts that have a campus marked as unacceptable in a particular data element but have that same data element marked as exemplary at a district level. Bryce stated that TEA would not be validating the data at this level; at least not in the first year of collection. It is up to a local committee to determine the criteria developed and then the LEA to assign the ratings for the district/charter and the campuses. David stated that there were no edits to police the data and Bryce responded	

that the reporting wide open based upon the district/charter determinations for reporting. Shannon Housson stated that there is currently a discussion regarding data element E1540 and that TEA upper management is working with the Legislature to determine if this data element should be a yes/no type of response instead of using code table C198. David McKamie asked if code 00 – Not applicable would be used for other collections not collecting this data. Bryce responded that in collection 1, 2, & 4 these performance indicator data elements would need required to be blank. Aaron Daitz asked if a campus were to report N/A for all categories such as PK campuses that report all N/A, would the edits check for this scenario. Bryce stated that the edits would warn a campus if all of the individual performance indicators were reported as 00 – Not Applicable. David McKamie asked if there would be a check between the 010 and 020 records where there were 020 records that were reported with n/a and 010 record did not match. Bryce stated that there would not be a data check on this situation as this was local decision. David made a statement regarding ESCs giving guidance to their districts and Bryce responded that if TEA cannot give guidance then the ESCs should not give guidance either. Shannon stated that he and Shelly Ramos would be developing a commissioner's rule where the guidance for district/charters and campuses would be covered in the rule. Peggy Sullivan asked if it would be possible to extend the school name element to 50 characters to match what is in the TSDS system. Bryce stated that it would not be a possibility with legacy system given the restraints on available space for the remaining few years the Legacy system must operate. **ITF Recommendation** Dara Fuller made a motion to approve the new data collection for school districts and charter schools to assign and report a performance rating of exemplary, recognized, acceptable, or unacceptable to the district and each campus, based on locally-determined criteria for the proposed new data elements E1531 – E1540 with the understanding that the criteria for rating the district/charter school and their respective campuses would be developed by a local committee. Brenda Richmond seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.	
District and Campus Performance Indicator Proposal for TSDS PEIMS system Tessie Bryant and Fernando Garcia presented a proposal to the ITF committee to approve the addition of the Performance Indicator data elements approved for the PEIMS Legacy system to the Texas Student Data System (TSDS) Texas Education Data Standards for the 2013-2014 school year. The definitions of each data element and the use of the new code table would be identical to the Legacy system proposal. TEA is seeking approval to add the following data elements to the TSDS Texas Education Data Standards to the LocalEducationAgencyExtension Complex Type and the SchoolExtension Complex Type: 1) TX-FineArtsCategory (E1531) 2) TX-WellnessAndPECategory (E1532) 3) TX-CommunityAndParentalInvolvementCategory (E1533) 4) TX-21stCenturyWorkforceDevelPgmCategory (E1534) 5) TX-SecondLanguageAcquistionPgmCategory (E1535) 6) TX-DigitalLearningEnvironmentCategory (E1536) 7) TX-DropoutPreventionStrategiesCategory (E1537) 8) TX-EducationalPgmGTStudentsCategory (E1538) 9) TX-OverallRatingCategory (E1539) 10) TX-StatutoryReportingAndPolicyCompliance (E1540)	**Action Item**

Add code table • C198 – PERFORMANCE-RATING-CODE - TX-PerfomanceRatingIndicatorType 00 Not Applicable 01 Exemplary 02 Recognized 03 Acceptable 04 Unacceptable **ITF Discussion** Brenda Richmond asked how the early adopters would be notified of these changes. Tessie Bryant responded that once the proposal reached its final approval there would be a vendor webinar to discuss the changes related to this data collection. Debbie Largent asked if this data collection would always be in the summer collection and Bryce responded that this information would always be collected in the summer collection because there is not enough time with the time constraint of posting the information by October 1 to collect the data in the extended year collection. **ITF Recommendation** Aaron Daitz made a motion to approve a new data collection for school districts and charter schools to assign and report a performance rating of exemplary, recognized, acceptable, or unacceptable to the district and each campus, based on locally-determined criteria for each of the above mentioned programs and/or categories. Adrian Garcia seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.	
Other Business: None.	**Discussion Item**
Upcoming ITF Meetings The next ITF meetings are scheduled as follows: **Meeting Date** January 7, 2014 January 21, 2014 Tom Priem made a motion to adjourn the meeting and Aaron Daitz seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 2:24pm.	**Discussion Item**