



**Texas Education Agency
Policy Committee on Public Education Information (PCPEI)**

February 4, 2025

Zoom

10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.

Meeting Minutes

Call the Meeting to Order

Marcos Zorola, PCPEI Chair

Marcos Zorola called the PCPEI meeting to order at 10:01 a.m.

Roll call of the PCPEI members was taken by Leticia Ollervidez.

PCPEI Members Present:

Eric Combs, Dr. Susana Garza, Dr. Morris Lyon, Amanda Eisley, Judd Marshall, Randal Shaffer, Christopher Pace, Wanda Thomas, Marcos Zorola

PCPEI Alternate Members Present:

Irma Aguilar, Dawn Cummings, Kelley Foley, Evelyn Jenkins, Joe Medley, Mary Morgan, Casey Neal, Melissa Urenda

TEA Staff Present:

David Butler, Deborah DeBerry, Terri Hanson, Monica Harwig, Jeanine Helms, Laurie Kelso, Rebecca McCully, Jamie Muffoletto, Leticia Ollervidez, Melody Parrish, Leanne Simons, Lynne Smith, Melissa Witcher, Alison Wright

College, Career, and Military Preparation Department:

Krystal Garza

Curriculum Standards and Student Support Department:

Jessica Snyder

Educator Data, Research, and Strategy Department:

Mark Olofson

Research and Analysis Department:

Linda Roska, Freya Gaertner, Kayan Lewis, Jennifer Broussard

Special Population Policy, Integration and Tech Assistance Department:

Kristin McGuire

Texas Tutoring Supports Department:

Alicia Garcia, Colby Self

ITF Member Present:

None

Approve Meeting Minutes from October 22, 2024, Meeting **Action**

Item

Marcos Zorola called for a motion to approve the meeting minutes from the October 22, 2024, PCPEI meeting.

Judd Marshall made a motion to approve the minutes.

Eric Combs seconded the motion.

Vote: Passed

Jamie Muffoletto presented the ITF report to PCPEI.

ITF Meeting: January 14, 2025

1. Middle School Advanced Mathematics Student Characteristic **Action Item**

Background:

SB 2124, passed during the 88th legislative session, amended Subchapter B, Chapter 28, Education Code, by adding Section 28.029. Each school district and open-enrollment charter school shall develop an advanced mathematics program for middle school students that is designed to enable those students to enroll in Algebra I in eighth grade.

Texas Administrative Code §74.2101 outlines that each school district and open-enrollment charter school shall annually report to the Texas Education Agency (TEA) data related to student enrollment and performance in the middle school advanced mathematics program in a manner and time to be determined by TEA. The program area has requested an indicator to collect student participation in advanced mathematics programs in middle school.

Overview:

Texas Education Data Standards Changes:

TEA proposes adding one new descriptor to the StudentCharacteristic (C344) table to collect if a student in grades sixth through eighth is participating in an advanced math course as of the PEIMS Fall snapshot date. Based on changes in this proposal, reports, and data validations will be revised or added.

Texas Records Exchange (TREx) Changes:

TEA proposes adding one new data element, MS-ADVANCED-MATH-PARTICIPATION (TEXXX) to TREx to allow an LEA to transfer information about a student’s participation in an advanced mathematics program in grades sixth through eighth.

Presentation:

Jamie Muffoletto presented the proposal, which includes:

In the Texas Education Data Standards:

1. Add the following new descriptor to the StudentCharacteristic (C344) table:
 - a. 24
 - Short Description** – MS Advanced Math Participation
 - Long Description** – Middle School Advanced Mathematics Participation
2. Revise and add reports to reflect the changes in this proposal.
3. Revise and add new data validation rules to reflect the changes in this proposal.

In the Texas Records Exchange Data Standards:

1. Add the new data element MIDDLE-SCHOOL-ADVANCED-MATH-PARTICIPATION (TEXXX) to the Student Record.

ITF Discussion:

Jamie Muffoletto introduced Jessica Snyder from the Curriculum Standards & Student Support Department to address any questions.

Keitha Ivey asked Jessica to clarify the definition of advanced mathematics. Jessica referenced Texas Administrative Code (TAC) §74.2101, explaining that the statute specifically pertains to middle school advanced mathematics and is a course designed for students to be prepared to enroll in Algebra 1 by the eighth grade. Jessica added the statute outlines additional guidelines for LEAs to place a student in the advanced mathematics program based on a student’s performance in fifth grade on the State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR) test and a local measure determined by the LEA. Jessica said that students identified in the fifth grade by the LEA would automatically be enrolled in the advanced mathematics program. Jessica added that the parents can still opt their child out of being automatically enrolled in the advanced mathematics program.

Keitha asked whether the definition of advanced mathematics was included in the Texas Education Data Standards (TEDS) as part of the data reporting requirements. Jamie showed the committee the data element reporting requirements section of the proposal, which outlined what would be added to TEDS. Jamie added if additional information was needed, she would collaborate with Jessica to add it to TEDS. Keitha suggested adding a reference to TAC §74.2101 as an additional resource for LEAs. Jessica welcomed the feedback and added that additional verbiage or a definition of advanced mathematics could be added with the TAC reference to provide better clarification for LEAs.

John Newcom asked if new CourseCodes would be created for an LEA to use when enrolling a student in an advanced mathematics program. Jessica explained that the State Board of Education (SBOE) had directed TEA to convene a workgroup to reorganize the existing Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS) state learning standards for middle school mathematics. With the reorganization of the TEKS learning standards, additional CourseCodes would be developed for LEAs who choose to use the

revised accelerated TEKS learning standards for advanced mathematics. If the SBOE adopts the updated TEKS learning standards in April 2025, CourseCodes would be published for the new courses in the TEDS Addendum version in July.

Catherine Bray asked to clarify that even if the LEA uses the new CourseCodes, each student participating in the advanced mathematics program would be reported using the new StudentCharacteristic descriptor. Jessica confirmed that MS Advanced Math Participation (24) would be reported for all students participating in an advanced mathematics program.

Traci Pesina asked whether the LEA program areas responsible for advanced academics were aware of the proposal. Jessica asked Traci to contact her so they could discuss this. Jessica added that she has communicated with mathematics leadership and the Texas Association of Supervisors of Mathematics (TASM) and has included information in the TEA Math Newsletter.

Brittany Wright asked how TEA would measure students' future performance after participating in the advanced mathematics program. Jessica responded that TEA would use the STAAR test results to measure future performance.

Lauren Price asked if a To the Administrator Addressed Letter (TAA) would be used to communicate the new StudentCharacteristic so Student Information System (SIS) software vendors would be ready to report the data to TEA and include the indicator in the Texas Records Exchange (TReX) extract. Jamie stated that if the proposal passed, the changes would be published in the TEDS Final publication in March 2025, the TReX Data Standards publication in August 2025, and software vendors would be trained on the new StudentCharacteristic during the vendor training on April 1, 2025. Jessica stated that a TAA was not planned but would discuss the request with her leadership.

Traci commented that TAAs are always welcome for changes as they highlight the importance to LEA leadership.

ITF Chair, Joel Garcia, called for additional questions or comments. Hearing none, he requested a motion.

ITF Action:

Traci Pesina made a motion to approve the proposal.

Catherine Bray seconded the motion.

Vote: Passed

PCPEI Discussion:

PCPEI Chair, Marcos Zorola called for questions or comments. Hearing none, he requested a motion.

PCPEI Action:

Amanda Eisley made a motion to approve the proposal.

Dr. Susana Garza seconded the motion.

Vote: Passed

2. New OnRamps Data Element

Action Item

Background:

OnRamps is a dual enrollment program founded by the University of Texas at Austin (UT) in 2011 to increase the number and diversity of students who engage in learning experiences aligned with the expectations of leading universities. The ONRAMPS-DUAL-ENROLLMENT-INDICATOR-CODE (E1597), collected in the PEIMS Summer and Extended Year Submissions, indicated whether the student successfully completed an OnRamps dual enrollment course. This indicator was sunset in the 2020-2021 school year.

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) Performance Reporting Division receives student-level information about OnRamps college course completion, course credit, and credit hours directly from UT. Based on this information, TEA cannot determine which secondary course credit is given to a student by the Local Education Agency (LEA). TEA currently lacks a mechanism to determine which secondary courses align with specific OnRamps courses. It is essential for the program area to have clarity regarding the secondary course credits awarded and the college credit hours earned through OnRamps dual enrollment courses.

Overview:

Texas Education Data Standards Changes:

TEA proposes adding one new data element, OnRampsDualEnrollmentIndicator, (E3XXX) to the CourseTranscript Entity. The data element reporting requirements, TSDS reports, and data validation rules will be updated to reflect the changes in this proposal.

Texas Records Exchange (TREx) Changes:

TEA proposing adding one new code, to the SPECIAL-EXPLANATION-CODE (TC19) code table.

Presentation:

Lynne Smith presented the proposal, which includes:

In the Texas Education Data Standards:

1. Add the new data element OnRampsDualEnrollmentIndicator (E3XXX) to the CourseTranscript Entity in the Student Academic Record Domain to be reported as optional in the PEIMS Summer and Extended Year Submissions.
2. Revise the reporting requirements in the CourseTranscript Entity in the Student Academic Record Domain for the OnRampsDualEnrollmentIndicator (E3XXX) data element.
3. Revise the associated TSDS reports to reflect the changes in this proposal.
4. Revise associated data validation rules to reflect the changes in this proposal.

Texas Records Exchange (TREx) Changes:

1. Add the following new code to the SPECIAL-EXPLANATION-CODE (TC19) code table:
 - a. O – An OnRamps course

ITF Discussion:

Lynne Smith introduced Krystal Garza from College, Career, and Military Preparation Department to address any questions.

Traci Pesina asked if the secondary courses offered by LEAs can be standardized to align with an OnRamps course since the alignment between secondary courses and specific OnRamps courses varies from LEA to LEA. Krystal explained that similar to dual credit courses, some align, like Rhetoric and English. Other secondary course credits and college credit hours earned through specific OnRamps courses are determined differently by each LEA.

Traci asked if the new OnRamps indicator could be used for local courses to show they are an OnRamps course. Jamie Muffoletto stated the indicator would be reported with the course to show that it was taken through OnRamps. An indication that the course taken was an OnRamps course would also appear on the student transcript. Traci asked to confirm that the indicator is reported with the course. Jamie clarified that the new data element would be added to the CourseTranscript Entity and would be reported for the course.

Keitha Ivey asked if the LEA could report college hours for an OnRamps course but could not report the OnRamps course also as a dual credit course. Krystal confirmed that LEAs may report college credit hours for an OnRamps course at their discretion but could not report the same course as a dual credit course. A student could take an OnRamps course, but if the student does not pass the college course and earn college credit, the student would not be reported with college credit hours earned but would be reported as participating in the OnRamps course.

Traci and Keitha requested that the Texas Education Data Standards (TEDS) include additional guidance for when an LEA reports the college credit hours earned by the student for OnRamps and dual credit. Jamie stated additional guidance would be included in TEDS.

Jessica Snyder asked about the process for incorporating feedback from committee members and making changes to the proposal. Jamie explained that changes can be added before the information is published in TEDS. Leanne Simons added that any feedback resulting in changes would be sent to committee members for review and feedback to ensure any revised guidance and special instructions provide clarification that helps the LEA report the data.

Traci asked if the LEA OnRamps program area knew that college credit hours are not reported if a student does not pass the course. Krystal confirmed that TEA has communicated with the LEA OnRamps program areas regarding when to report credit hours. She added that TEA could provide additional communication to ensure the changes are shared with the LEA OnRamps staff. Krystal stated that information would be added to the Advanced Academics Newsletter and discussed during open office hours to inform LEA staff of the changes.

Keitha stated that for dual credit courses, her LEA receives a report from the college showing the number of college credit hours students have earned. Counselors manually enter the data into the transcript before completing the PEIMS Summer Submission. Keitha asked if the University of Texas (OnRamps) would provide a report indicating which students have received college credit hours. Krystal stated she would find out when OnRamps sends the college credits awarded to students to the respective LEA.

Traci and Georgia commented on the need for college credit hours awarded to students for the dual credit program to be provided to LEAs earlier so LEAs can enter and validate the data promptly. Traci added that it would be appreciated if TEA could leverage communication with post-secondary entities to provide data timely. Georgia added that due to a lag in receiving data from the colleges, LEAs cannot enter and validate data by initial submission and use resubmission to enter and validate data.

ITF Chair, Joel Garcia, called for additional questions or comments. Hearing none, he requested a motion.

ITF Action:

Keitha Ivey made a motion to approve the proposal.

D'Lynne Johnson seconded the motion.

Vote: Passed

PCPEI Discussion:

Eric Combs asked if the new code in the Texas Records Exchange (TREx) for OnRamps in the SPECIAL-EXPLANATION-CODE (TC19) code table was an "O," the letter. Jamie Muffoletto confirmed that the code is an "O." Eric also asked if additional special explanation codes were going to be added, such as a fall course taken in the spring or a spring course being taken in the fall. Jamie stated that an update to the Academic Achievement Record has been published, but no additional special explanation codes have been added. Jessica Snyder added that the new special explanation code for OnRamps will not be published in the standards until the Data Governance approval process is completed.

PCPEI Chair, Marcos Zorola called for additional questions or comments. Hearing none, he requested a motion.

PCPEI Action:

Eric Combs made a motion to approve the proposal.

Judd Marshall seconded the motion.

Vote: Passed.

3. Texas Tutoring Supports Accelerated Instruction Changes **Action Item**

Background:

During the 88th Regular legislative session, HB 1416 was passed, amending Subchapter B, Chapter 28.021 of the Education Code. This section states that students who do not perform satisfactorily on the State of Texas Assessment of Academic Readiness (STAAR) test must receive specialized tutoring by subject before or after normal school hours and allows the agency to approve one or more products that use an automated, computerized, or other augmented method for providing supplemental instruction that may be used instead of some or all of the individual or group instruction required.

As a result of HB 1416, Texas Administrative Code (TAC) §104.1001 was adopted, which approved Ratio Waiver List (RWL) products. These products use automated, computerized, or other augmented

methods of instruction which Local Education Agencies (LEAs) can use in place of some or all of the individual or group instruction required under Texas Education Code (TEC) §28.0211(a-4)(6).

The Texas Tutoring Supports Division has determined a need to capture which LEAs are using a product from the RWL and when tutoring is being provided to students. This data will allow the Texas Tutoring Supports Division to provide additional support to LEAs to ensure effective tutoring is being provided to students.

Overview:

Texas Education Data Standards Changes:

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) proposes adding three new data elements AcceleratedInstructionType (E3XX1), RatioWaiverListProductUsed (E3XX2), and CompletedHoursRatioWaiverList (E3XX3) to the PEIMS Summer Submission and a descriptor table, AcceleratedInstructionType (C3XX) with five descriptors. Additionally, reports will be reviewed, and data validation rules will be added as needed.

Texas Records Exchange (TREx) Changes:

TEA proposes adding one new data element YTD-COMPLETED-HOURS-RATIO-WAIVER-LIST (TEXXX).

Presentation:

Leticia Ollervidez presented the proposal, which includes:

In the Texas Education Data Standards:

1. Add the following new data elements to the StudentEducationOrganizationAssociation.AcceleratedInstructionSet Entity in the Student Identification and Demographics Domain to be reported as optional in the PEIMS Summer Submission.
 - a. AcceleratedInstructionType (E3XX1)
 - b. RatioWaiverListProductUsed (E3XX2)
 - c. CompletedHoursRatioWaiverList (E3XX3)
2. Add a new descriptor table AcceleratedInstructionType (C3X1):
 - a. 01-
 - i. **Short Description** – Subsequent Summer
 - ii. **Long Description** – Subsequent Summer – student provided most of accelerated instruction in the subsequent summer
 - b. 02-
 - i. **Short Description** – Before Normal School Hours
 - ii. **Long Description** – Before Normal School Hours – student provided most of accelerated instruction in the following school year before normal school hours
 - c. 03-
 - i. **Short Description** – During Normal School Hours
 - ii. **Long Description** - During Normal School Hours – student provided most of accelerated instruction in the following school year during normal school hours
 - d. 04-
 - i. **Short Description** – After Normal School Hours

- ii. **Long Description** – After Normal School Hours – student provided most of accelerated instruction in the following school year after normal school hours
 - e. 05-
 - i. **Short Description** – Other
 - ii. **Long Description** - Other - student provided most of accelerated instruction in the following school year during Saturday school, intersession, remotely, or any other time not yet defined
- 3. Revise reports in the PEIMS Summer Submission to reflect changes in this proposal.
- 4. Add and revise data validation rules in the PEIMS Summer Submission to reflect changes in this proposal.

In the Texas Records Exchange Data Standards:

- 1. Add the new data element YTD-COMPLETED-HOURS-RATIO-WAIVER-LIST (TEXX) to the Student Record.

ITF Discussion:

Leticia Ollervidez introduced Colby Self and Alicia Garcia from the Texas Tutoring Supports Department to address any questions.

Catherine Bray stated that her LEA is already facing significant challenges with the current reporting process for accelerated instruction. The LEA follows an accelerated block schedule, where students complete a full academic year each semester. This schedule makes it difficult to report accelerated instruction accurately. Catherine noted that substantial time and financial resources were already invested in data entry, and the additional requirements for accelerated instruction make the process nearly unmanageable. Catherine stated that she could not approve the current plan.

Keitha Ivey agreed with Catherine, noting the significant staffing and time required to track and code students. Keitha requested clarity on the necessity and purpose of the data being collected. Colby explained that by collecting which students use the Ratio Waiver List (RWL) products, TEA could evaluate student outcomes using these resources.

Colby explained that the Commissioner's rules required LEAs to monitor student usage of RWL products. Additionally, TEA is responsible for ensuring the effectiveness of these products. Keitha asked if adding an additional data element was the only way to achieve this. Colby replied in the affirmative, stating that each student's usage of the products needed to be linked to their outcomes.

Catherine stated that other instructional materials were provided to LEAs without the need to track their effectiveness. Catherine highlighted the significant amount of time currently dedicated to tracking students in accelerated instruction programs, noting that adding additional requirements would compromise data accuracy.

Georgia Kalligeris stated that the difficulty of tracking the accelerated instruction began last year when the data elements were included in the Texas Records Exchange (TREx). Georgia pointed out the challenges in maintaining this data within the Student Information System (SIS) due to the

transient nature of the student population in her LEA. Georgia urged TEA to collaborate with vendors to design the implementation of the new data collection more effectively. Georgia believes that instead of having PEIMS staff adapt to each vendor's system, TEA should work with vendors to ensure consistency and ease of maintenance, thereby improving data accuracy.

Alicia noted that using a product on the RWL is optional and that tutoring can continue with the services and tools LEAs already provide. Keitha noted that the individuals responsible for entering the data were not the ones deciding whether the product was utilized.

Jaylea Wallace asked about the benefits of this type of accelerated instruction and whether monitoring product effectiveness at different times of the day is necessary for achieving the proposal's end goal. Alicia responded that the purpose extends beyond monitoring product effectiveness to identifying when students benefit most from accelerated instruction.

Catherine inquired if this objective could be achieved through alternative methods rather than a PEIMS student-by-student element. Traci proposed using a Qualtrics survey instead of adding the data in PEIMS. Colby mentioned that a statewide survey was attempted when HB 4545 was first introduced but received sparse responses.

Traci asked if the response to the Qualtrics survey could be made mandatory. Colby clarified that collecting the data through PEIMS made it mandatory. Traci pointed out that it fell under the PEIMS Coordinators' responsibilities, which are becoming increasingly difficult to manage due to the volume of data being reported.

Catherine highlighted an unintended consequence of this requirement: LEAs might opt out of using these tools due to the additional data-tracking effort and cost. While the tools might benefit students, this could deter LEAs from utilizing them.

Keitha inquired whether the data could be reported by the school or LEA rather than by individual students.

Georgia acknowledged the value of tracking at the student level and understood the intent. However, Georgia emphasized that the staffing required for this data collection, even at the LEA level, was substantial. Georgia suggested streamlining the process and agreed with Traci that the responsibility often fell on the PEIMS Coordinator to manage all submissions. Georgia stressed the need for a better integrated system to reduce the staff required to enter and report the data. Colby responded that they have presented to LEAs and discussed their SIS and local systems, asking what was being used at the local level and the vision for the PEIMS submissions.

Georgia explained that tracking accelerated instruction involved assigning hours and subjects to students and maintaining attendance records, which requires significant coordination and effort. Georgia stated that if the data went through PEIMS, TEA should collaborate with vendors to automate the process, reducing the burden on the PEIMS Coordinators.

Alicia stated that conversations had been held with vendors, and LEAs had been encouraged to speak with their vendors about what they needed for progress monitoring tracking. Alicia encouraged LEAs to place students with Teacher Incentive Allotment-designated teachers, which eliminates the requirement for the student to participate in accelerated instruction.

Georgia stated that TEA was vested in ensuring efficient and accurate development and should work directly with vendors. Georgia noted that TEA often expects LEAs to negotiate with vendors independently, but she believes TEA should leverage its influence to facilitate these implementations.

Traci commented that the current communication plan is insufficient. Traci suggested including communication to target program personnel, as only posting information on a webpage is inadequate.

ITF Chair, Joel Garcia called for additional questions or comments. Hearing none, he requested a motion.

ITF Action:

No motion to approve the proposal was made.

Lynne Smith called roll to obtain the vote:

Zero committee members voted to approve the proposal.

Eight committee members voted not to approve the proposal.

Seven committee members voted to abstain.

Vote: The committee does not approve the proposal.

Joel requested guidance on the next steps. Leanne Simons stated that the votes would be documented, and the proposal would proceed through to the Policy Committee on Public Education Information (PCPEI) and Data Governance Board (DGB) meetings. Melody Parrish added that the Commissioner of Education had the authority to overrule the committees, as he was responsible for ensuring the implementation of all legislation. Melody assured the committee that all concerns would be documented and communicated to each committee.

PCPEI Discussion:

Judd Marshall asked if there was any feedback or discussion on this proposal during the ITF meeting. Jamie Muffoletto stated that the ITF discussion primarily focused on the burden of additional tracking and collection of the requested information. Judd inquired what the Commissioner may do if the ITF and PCPEI committees do not support the proposal. Jamie said the proposal and committee feedback would be taken to the Data Governance Board. She reiterated that our primary goal is to be able to work with and support the LEAs to collect needed data.

Leanne Simons added that all feedback is presented to the Commissioner for consideration. She noted it is rare for the Commissioner to override the committee, having only done so twice. She stated that he may consult with the program areas to facilitate alternate methods of implementing a process or program. Leanne stressed that the input given at these meetings is not disregarded. She

confirmed that the feedback received is showing a significant burden in tracking, and the LEAs are struggling with it. Judd concurred and stated that he had people reach out to him about the hardships in collecting the current data requested and wanted to ensure he passed those concerns along.

Eric Combs stated that LEAs are already tracking accelerated instruction data and wondered if using a product on the ratio waiver list is already being tracked. Jamie responded that the LEA may be tracking the use of a product on the ratio waiver list, and TEA is only asking if a product is used, not the specific product.

Marcos Zorola asked what sending the accelerated instruction data elements would look like in Ed-Fi. Jamie referred to the proposal to show the new data elements in the current entity. She highlighted the three new data elements, AcceleratedInstructionType, RatioWaiverListProductUsed, and CompleteHoursRatioWaiverList, and stated that they clarified what TEA was already collecting.

Eric asked if this data would be collected in the PEIMS Summer Submission. Jamie confirmed that it would be collected in the PEIMS Summer Submission.

PCPEI Chair, Marcos Zorola called for additional questions or comments. Hearing none, he requested a motion.

PCPEI Action:

No motion to approve the proposal was made.

Leticia Ollervidez called roll to obtain the vote:

0 committee members voted to approve the proposal.

7 committee members voted not to approve the proposal.

6 committee members voted to abstain.

Vote: The committee does not approve the proposal.

Note: Beginning on February 14, 2025, an action item for Texas Tutoring Supports Accelerated Instruction Changes was sent to the ITF committee to consider and vote on the proposal through email. ITF voted to pass the proposal and on February 19, 2025, the PCPEI committee was asked to consider and vote on the proposal through email. PCPEI voted to pass the new proposal. Information about the proposal can be found at the end of these minutes.

4. New Classroom Position for Teacher Resident Descriptor **Action Item**

Background:

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) developed the Teacher Residency initiative to address the scale of, access to, and sustainability of high-quality teacher preparation through incentives and support to Local Education Agencies (LEAs) and Education Preparation Program (EPP) Partnerships to implement paid teacher residency programs. In the past three years, a teacher resident preparation route and talent strategy have been developed, supporting teacher candidates completing a year-long clinical residency under the direct supervision of a host teacher to complete their preparation, which occurs before certification and serving as a teacher of record. This model leverages a role for residents in the classroom. This clearly defined position allows teacher residents to gain hands-on experience

while working under the guidance of experienced educators. Resident teachers who complete a residency route and pass the required certification exams receive an enhanced standard certification.

With the formal approval of residency routes and authorization of the enhanced standard certificate by the State Board for Educator Certification (SBEC), there is a need for greater clarity regarding the classification and reporting of this role through TSDS PEIMS. The program area has requested a new classroom position to help identify those individuals serving as teacher residents.

Overview:

Texas Education Data Standards Changes:

TEA proposes adding one new descriptor to the ClassroomPosition (C309) descriptor table. Additionally, TEA is proposing to revise the Data Element Reporting Requirements for the StaffSectionAssociation Entity in the Teaching and Learning Domain and revising associated TSDS reports and data validation rules to reflect the changes in this proposal.

Texas Records Exchange (TReX) Changes:

None

Presentation:

Lynne Smith presented the proposal, which includes:

In the Texas Education Data Standards:

1. Add the following new descriptor to the ClassroomPosition (C309) descriptor table:

- a. 06-

Short Description: Teacher Resident

Long Description: Teacher Resident – Indicates a supervised educator completing a residency through a partnership between an Educator Preparation Program with a residency route approved by the State Board for Educator Certification and a public school accredited by the TEA or other school approved by the TEA for the purpose that may lead to completion of an enhanced standard certificate.

2. Revise ClassroomPosition (E1454) data element definition and associated data element reporting requirements guidance.
3. Revise the associated TSDS reports to reflect the changes in this proposal.
4. Revise associated data validation rules to reflect the changes in this proposal.

In the Texas Records Exchange Data Standards:

None

ITF Discussion:

Lynne introduced Melissa Yoder from Educator Quality Department and Mark Olofson from Educator Data, Research, & Strategy Department to address any questions.

Traci Pesina asked the program area to clarify what “direct LEA communication” means, as stated in the Communication Plan. Melissa stated that they have several ways to communicate changes to partnered Teacher Resident LEAs that have been approved by the State Board of Educator

Certification (SBEC). Melissa added communication avenues included direct emails and regular email distribution notifications. Melissa added the program area would consider sending a To the Administrator Addressed (TAA) letter. Mark added that the currently established communication routes with the preparation program would be leveraged to communicate with current teacher residences.

Traci stated that her LEA had staff employed as resident teachers in the past and clarified that because of this participation, they had a representative who was part of the communication network. Melissa confirmed that if an LEA had participated in the teacher residency program in the past, they were part of the communication network and would be notified of this change.

Keitha Ivey asked if there was a list of LEAs participating in the Resident Teacher Program and if it was available to the public. Melissa stated that the program area had an approved Teacher Residency Program partners list. Melissa added as the SBEC-approved teacher residency programs, those programs were asked to submit their partners. At this time, TEA relied on grant participation to identify the partners.

Keitha stated that her LEA employs staff called “resident teachers” and asked how an LEA could determine if these staff members were part of the SBEC-approved residency program. Mark acknowledged that many “residency” programs were not part of the SBEC-approved residency program. Mark asked committee members for feedback on whether it would be beneficial to inform LEAs how to distinguish the use of this new ClassroomPosition, TeacherResident (06), specifically for those participating in the SBEC-approved Teacher Residency Program, through communication with education service centers or additional documentation in the Texas Education Data Standards (TEDS). Keitha replied that guidance in TEDS needed to clarify that the new ClassroomPosition applied to the SBEC-approved residency program.

Jamie stated she would work with Melissa and Mark to obtain additional information and update guidance so PEIMS coordinators know when to use the new descriptor. Keitha asked if current resident teachers should be reported as ClassroomPosition, Teacher of Record (01). Melissa stated that some LEAs would report resident teachers as the teacher of record or as a substitute. LEAs’ inability to report a resident teacher resulted in inconsistent data reporting. Jamie stated the proposal resulted from questions raised by LEAs on how to report resident teachers if they should not be reported as the teacher of record. Jamie added the new descriptor Teacher Resident (06), should help LEAs report more accurate data when reporting resident teachers participating in an SBEC-approved residency program.

Traci asked how a resident teacher would be coded if the resident teacher was coded in the Fall and then dropped or was removed from the program before completing a year. Melissa responded that during rulemaking, a year was defined as a calendar year, not a school year, indicating that candidates could begin their residency in January. If the candidate completed the last and first days of school (even if not in the same school year), it still counted as a year of clinical practice.

Keitha asked if the teacher resident should be used in the Class Roster Winter Submission or just the PEIMS Fall Submission. Jamie replied that reporting the resident teacher would also apply to the Class

Roster Winter Submission. Keitha asked if the teacher resident would be reported for the Early Childhood Data System (ECDS) Collection. Jamie replied that she would need to ask the Early Childhood program area.

ITF Chair, Joel Garcia, called for additional questions or comments. Hearing none, he requested a motion.

ITF Action:

Keitha Ivey made a motion to approve the proposal.

Traci Pesina seconded the motion.

Vote: Passed

PCPEI Discussion:

Judd Marshall shared that the Teacher Residency program was discussed during the last two commissioner cabinet meetings, and he supports this proposal wholeheartedly.

Eric Combs asked if there is a resource to see the state-approved list. Mark Olofson stated that the program area is exploring options to make the state-approved list public. He stated the key is that preparation programs and participating LEAs are aware of the partnerships. He stressed that the program area recognizes the benefit of having a centralized place for this data and is working on that.

PCPEI Chair, Marcos Zorola called for additional questions or comments. Hearing none, he requested a motion.

PCPEI Action:

Judd Marshall made a motion to approve the proposal.

Eric Combs seconded the motion.

Vote: Passed

5. Special Education Update of Data Elements, Descriptor Tables, and Guidance

Action Item

Background:

During the summer of 2024, the program area audited all special education-related data components and guidance in the Texas Education Data Standards (TEDS) for accuracy and alignment with proposed changes to Texas Administrative Code (TAC) §89.1040 adopted on July 26, 2024, and TAC §89.1070 adopted on November 01, 2024. As a result of this audit, the Special Populations Strategic Supports and Reporting Department requested revisions to data element definitions, descriptor tables and guidance.

Overview:

Texas Education Data Standards Changes:

For the 2025-2026 school year, the Texas Education Agency (TEA) is proposing to update one data element name, PPCDSERVICELOCATION (E1077). TEA will also revise the data element definitions and requirements for SPEDSTUDENTAGERANGE (E3059), ELIGIBILITYDETERMINATIONDATE (E1716), and

ResidentialFacilityStudentSchoolDayLength (E1637). Additionally, TEA is proposing to update the short and long descriptions in five descriptor tables: SPEDProgramSvc (C341), PPCDServiceLocation (C184), DiplomaType (C062), PopulationServed (C030) and SPEDStudentAgeRange (C342), as well as the Data Element Reporting Requirements, and TSDS reports and data validation rules to reflect the changes in this proposal.

Texas Records Exchange (TREx) Changes:

TEA proposes updating the data element definition for IEP-INDICATOR (TE050) and additional text changes in the data standards.

Presentation:

Leticia Ollervidez presented the proposal, which includes:

In the Texas Education Data Standards:

1. Revise the data element name and definition for PPCDServiceLocation to ECSEServiceLocation (E1077).
2. Revise the data element definition for the SPEDStudentAgeRange (E3059) data element.
3. Revise the data element definition for the EligibilityDeterminationDate (E1716) data element.
4. Revise the data element definition for the ResidentialFacilityStudentSchoolDayLength (E1637) data element.
5. Revise the following in the SPEDProgramSvc (C341) descriptor table:
 - a. 23
Short Description: Special Education Student Does Not Receive Speech Therapy **to** Student Receiving SPED Svc Does Not Receive Speech Therapy
Long Description: Special Education Student Does Not Receive Speech Therapy **to** Student Receiving Special Education Services Does Not Receive Speech Therapy
 - b. 24
Short Description: Special Education Student Receives Speech Therapy Only **to** Student Receiving SPED Svc Receives Speech Therapy Only
Long Description: Special Education Student Receives Speech Therapy Only **to** Student Receiving Special Education Services Receives Speech Therapy Only
 - c. 25
Short Description:
 Special Education Student Rec Speech Therapy and Other SPED Instr Setting **to** Student Receiving SPED Svc Rec Speech Therapy and Other SPED Instr Setting
Long Description: Student Receives Speech Therapy Along With Service Through Another Special Education Instructional Setting **to** Student Receiving Special Education Services Receives Speech Therapy Along With Service Through Another Special Education Instructional Setting
6. Revise the following descriptor table name:
 - a. PPCDServiceLocation to ECSEServiceLocation(C184)
7. Revise the following in the ECSEServiceLocation (C184) descriptor table:
 - a. 1
Short Description: PPCD EC Prog 10 Hrs Per Week and Majority of SPED Svcs in Reg EC Prog **to** ECSE EC Prog 10 Hrs Per Week and Majority of SPED Svcs in Reg EC Prog

Long Description: (A1) PPCD child participates in a regular early childhood program at least 10 hours per week and receives the majority of his/her special education services in the regular early childhood education program **to** (A1) ECSE child participates in a regular early childhood program at least 10 hours per week and receives the majority of his/her special education services in the regular early childhood education program.

b. 3

Short Description: PPCD SPED Prog Majority Svcs in Class With 50 percent of disabled children **to** ECSE SPED Prog Majority Svcs in Class With 50 percent of disabled children

Long Description: (C1, C2, C3) PPCD child participates in a special education program and receives the majority of his/her special education services in a program that is specifically or primarily designed for children with disabilities and includes (at the time of the placement decision) a majority of at least 50 percent of disabled children (i.e., children with an individualized education program (IEP)) **to** (C1, C2, C3) ECSE child participates in a special education program and receives the majority of his/her special education services in a program that is specifically or primarily designed for children with disabilities and includes (at the time of the placement decision) a majority of at least 50 percent of disabled children (i.e., children with an individualized education program (IEP)).

c. 4

Short Description:

PPCD EC Less Than 10 Hrs Per Week and Majority of SPED Svcs in Reg EC Prog **to** ECSE EC Less Than 10 Hrs Per Week and Majority of SPED Svcs in Reg EC Prog

Long Description: (B1) PPCD child participates in a regular early childhood program less than 10 hours per week, and receives the majority of his/her special education services in the regular early childhood education program **to** (B1) ECSE child participates in a regular early childhood program less than 10 hours per week, and receives the majority of his/her special education services in the regular early childhood education program.

d. 5

Short Description: PPCD EC At Least 10 Hrs Wk And Major Of SPED Svcs Outside Reg EC Prog **to** ECSE EC At Least 10 Hrs Wk And Major Of SPED Svcs Outside Reg EC Prog

Long Description: (A2) PPCD child participates in a regular early childhood program at least 10 hours per week, and receives the majority of his/her special education services in another location outside of the regular early childhood program **to** (A2) ECSE child participates in a regular early childhood program at least 10 hours per week, and receives the majority of his/her special education services in another location outside of the regular early childhood program.

e. 6

Short Description:

PPCD EC Less Than 10 Hrs Per Week And Majority Svc In Other Location **to** ECSE EC Less Than 10 Hrs Per Week And Majority Svc In Other Location

Long Description: (B2) PPCD child participates in a regular early childhood program less than 10 hours per week, and receives the majority of his/her special education services in another location outside of the regular early childhood program **to** (B2) ECSE child participates in a regular early childhood program less than 10 hours per

week, and receives the majority of his/her special education services in another location outside of the regular early childhood program.

f. 7

Short Description: PPCD Not Regular Edu Or Special Edu In Home **to** ECSE Not Regular Edu Or Special Edu In Home

Long Description: (D1) PPCD child participates in a neither a regular education or special education program and receives the majority of his/her special education services in the principal residence of the child's family or caregiver **to** (D1) ECSE child participates in a neither a regular education or special education program and receives the majority of his/her special education services in the principal residence of the child's family or caregiver.

g. 8

Short Description:

PPCD Not Regular Edu Or Special Edu In Svc Provider Location **to**
ECSE Not Regular Edu Or Special Edu In Svc Provider Location

Long Description: (D2) PPCD child participates in a neither a regular education or special education program and receives the majority of special education services in an service providers locations setting but does not participate in a regular early childhood program designed for typically developing children **to** (D2) ECSE child participates in a neither a regular education or special education program and receives the majority of special education services in an service providers locations setting but does not participate in a regular early childhood program designed for typically developing children.

8. Revise the short and long description for descriptor 35 in the DiplomaType (C062) descriptor table:

a. 35

Short Description:

Minimum Curriculum for Special Education Students **to** Minimum Curriculum for Student Receiving Special Education Services

Long Description:

Completion of Minimum Curriculum And Credit Requirements for Graduation Applicable To Students In General Education And Participated In The Exit-Level Assessment Instrument Identified in The IEP-Foundation High School Program TAC 89.1070(b)(1), Revised January 1, 2015. [39 TexReg 10446] **to** Completion of Minimum Curriculum And Credit Requirements for Graduation Applicable To Students In General Education And Participated In The Exit-Level Assessment Instrument Identified in The IEP-Foundation High School Program TAC 89.1070(b)(1), Revised November 7, 2024

9. Revise the short and long description for descriptor 06 in the PopulationServed (C030) descriptor table:

a. 06

Short Description:

Special Education Students **to** Students Receiving Special Education Services

Long Description: Special Education Students: Those students served in special education programs as determined by the admission, review, and dismissal committee

to Student Receiving Special Education Services: Those students served in special education programs as determined by the admission, review, and dismissal committee.

10. Revise the short and long description for descriptor 00 in the SPEDStudentAgeRange (C342) descriptor table:
 - a. 00

Short Description: Not Providing Services to Special Education Students **to** Not Providing Special Education Services to Student

Long Description:
Not Providing Services to Special Education Students **to** Not Providing Special Education Services to Student
11. Revise the general and data element reporting requirements for the StudentSpecialEducationProgramAssociation Entity in the Student Special Education Program Eligibility Association Domain.
12. Revise the data element reporting requirements for the StudentSpecialEducationProgramEligibilityAssociation Entity in the Student Special Education Program Eligibility Association Domain.
13. Revise the data element reporting requirements for the Section Entity in the Teaching and Learning Domain.
14. Revise the data element reporting requirements for the StaffEducationOrganizationAssignmentAssociation Entity in the Staff Domain.
15. Revise the data element reporting requirements for the StudentEducationOrganizationAssociation Entity in the Student Identification and Demographics Domain.
16. Revise the data element reporting requirements for the StudentAcademicRecord Entity in the Student Academic Record Domain.
17. Revise Reference – PEIMS Leaver Data – Documentation Requirements by ExitWithdrawType.
18. Revise associated reports to reflect changes in this proposal.
19. Revise associated data validation rules to reflect changes in this proposal.

In the Texas Records Exchange Data Standards:

1. Revise IEP-INDICATOR (TE050) data element definition.
2. Revise Section 2 TReX Requirements and Overview data standard guidance:
 - a. 2.1 Introduction
 - b. 2.3.4 File Requirements – Attachments
 - c. 2.15 Attachments

ITF Discussion:

Letty introduced Kristin McGuire and Jeremy McCaig from the Special Populations Department to address any questions.

ITF Chair, Joel Garcia, called for questions or comments. Hearing none, he requested a motion.

ITF Action:

Traci Pesina made a motion to approve the proposal.

Keitha Ivey seconded the motion.

Vote: Passed

PCPEI Discussion:

PCPEI Chair, Marcos Zorola called for questions or comments. Hearing none, he requested a motion.

PCPEI Action:

Judd Marshall made a motion to approve the proposal.

Amanda Eisley seconded the motion.

Vote: Passed

Prior to the presentation for the On-Time Federal Reporting proposals, Leanne Simons acknowledged that there were still concerns about the proposed changes, which Jamie Muffoletto would address. Leanne stated that TEA had received feedback in the last few days and was still working to assess it. Leanne added that the presentation of the proposal would be based on the version sent to the committee members and asked if members have any new concerns, to raise them briefly in the interest of time. Leanne added all information would be considered. Once all feedback has been received, staff will meet to review and discuss. Leanne concluded by stating that a vote would be taken at the end of the presentation, and the proposal would proceed through the data governance process. Leanne thanked members for all the feedback TEA has received.

Jamie presented the On-Time Federal Reporting: Focus Group Follow-Up presentation slideshow and summarized the Focus Group's discussion. Traci Pesina expressed her appreciation for the opportunity to participate in the focus group, noting that talking to the team and other program areas at TEA was beneficial.

6. New PEIMS Fall Enrollment Submission

Action Item

Background:

The U.S. Department of Education (ED) expects state data submissions to be timely, complete, and accurate on the due date. The Texas Education Agency (TEA) has never complied with meeting the federal reporting deadlines for certain EDFacts and Perkins submissions. To comply with all the federal reporting deadlines, it was determined that the student snapshot demographic and program information would need to be collected earlier than when it is currently collected in the Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) Fall Submission.

Overview:

Beginning in the 2026-2027 school year, TEA will add a new submission to PEIMS. The PEIMS Fall Enrollment Submission will be based on students enrolled on the first Friday in October. The submission will include student demographic and program data based on the snapshot. This data will be collected to assist in determining the LEA continuers.

Timeline:

Due Date	Submission
09/25/2025	2025-2026 Close of School Start Window
10/31/2025	2025-2026 PEIMS Fall Snapshot Date
12/11/2025	2025-2026 PEIMS Fall Submission Due
01/15/2026	2025-2026 PEIMS Fall Resubmission Due
09/25/2026	2026-2027 Close of School Start Window
10/02/2026	2026-2027 PEIMS Fall Enrollment Snapshot
10/15/2026	2026-2027 PEIMS Fall Enrollment Submission Due
10/30/2026	2026-2027 PEIMS Fall Finance and Staff Snapshot
12/10/2026	2026-2027 PEIMS Fall Finance and Staff Submission Due
01/21/2027	2026-2027 PEIMS Fall Finance and Staff Resubmission Due

Presentation:

Jamie Muffoletto presented the proposal, which includes:

Texas Education Data Standards:

1. Add the following entities to the PEIMS Fall Enrollment Submission:
 - a. LocalEducationAgency
 - b. School
 - c. StudentSchoolAssociation
 - d. Student
 - e. StudentEducationOrganizationAssociation
 - f. Program
 - g. StudentLanguageInstructionProgramAssociation
 - h. StudentSpecialEducationProgramAssociation
 - i. StudentTitleIPartAProgramAssociation
 - j. StudentAcademicRecord
2. Add submission specific General and Data Element Reporting requirements to the following entities:
 - a. LocalEducationAgency
 - b. School
 - c. StudentSchoolAssociation
 - d. Student
 - e. StudentEducationOrganizationAssociation
 - f. Program
 - g. StudentLanguageInstructionProgramAssociation
 - h. StudentSpecialEducationProgramAssociation
 - i. StudentTitleIPartAProgramAssociation
 - j. StudentAcademicRecord
3. Add a new data element AsOfStatusFirstFridayOctober (E3XXX) with a corresponding descriptor table to the Student entity.
4. Add existing student PEIMS Fall Submission reports to the PEIMS Fall Enrollment Submission.
5. Add existing student PEIMS Fall Submission and new data validations to the PEIMS Fall Enrollment Submission.

6. Review and analyze existing processes such as Duplicate Enrollment, Underreported, and Reconciliation to determine impact.

ITF Discussion:

Joyce Ray commented that the submission timeline had a tight turnaround, especially for large LEAs. Joyce had concerns with the PEIMS Fall Enrollment Snapshot being on October 2, 2026, and the PEIMS Fall Enrollment Submission Due date on October 15, 2026.

Traci Pesina stated that a student enrolled on the PEIMS Fall Enrollment Snapshot and eventually identified as an emergent bilingual (EB) student may not be reported as an EB student in this new submission. Traci asked if the program identification reported in the PEIMS Summer Submission would be used so the LEA would receive funding for the EB student.

Jamie confirmed that funding for EB is based on the data reported in the PEIMS Summer Submission. She added that if a student is in a STAAR-assessed grade, the student program information could be updated in the Test Information Distribution Engine (TIDE) system for accountability. Jamie also mentioned that TEA would provide information to committee members on which data elements could be updated in the TIDE system.

Catherine Bray expressed her appreciation for participating in the focus group and raised an overarching concern about the Student Attendance Accounting Handbook (SAAH). She noted that the SAAH is usually not approved by the proposed PEIMS Fall Enrollment Submission due date. Changes made in the SAAH may impact what an LEA reported in the PEIMS Fall Enrollment Submission. Catherine stated that LEAs verify their program data every six weeks and voiced concern about the accuracy of the reported data if LEAs do not have time to perform this review before the PEIMS Fall Enrollment Submission due date.

Catherine asked about the federal reporting timeline and what specifically needed to be reported. Catherine added that it seemed that the data required was for only a subset of students and not all students. Catherine suggested that TEA could retain the PEIMS Fall Enrollment Submission and that LEAs would not report program data for all students but would only provide program data for the smaller subset of students while meeting federal reporting requirements. Catherine added that the concern for data integrity would be lessened by reporting program data for a subset of students rather than all students. Catherine stated that the implementation of Ed-Fi was intended to make it easier to get the needed data.

Leanne thanked Catherine for meeting with her and Linda Roska and added that a follow-up would occur with the information provided. Leanne added that TEA would continue to assess the feedback to determine what could be changed in the proposal.

Leanne stated that with the transition to the Ed-Fi data standards, TEA acknowledged that the first year would be difficult and hoped the following years would improve. Leanne encouraged LEAs to

keep entering tickets on issues related to the Upgrade so TEA could help. Leanne said that leadership would discuss the comment about when the SAAH is approved and the lack of a six-week verification window for LEAs.

Linda thanked members for their feedback and asked Catherine to clarify her comment regarding the verification of students. Catherine explained that if the proposal required data for all enrolled students to be reported, the percentage of inaccurate data could be significant. Catherine outlined the timeline for identifying emergent bilingual (EB) students. Catherine emphasized that LEAs struggle to meet the current timelines. Linda acknowledged the need to work through these issues but noted that TEA did not have unlimited time to meet the required timeline. Linda added that the federal government had already given TEA some conditions. Additional consequences would be imposed if TEA did not meet the reporting requirements by January 2027. Linda stressed the importance of identifying all issues so TEA could address them.

Melody Parrish stated that when Linda's and Terri Hanson's teams started working on this issue, they aimed to implement the change in 2025-2026 but were able to work with the federal government to get the deadline moved to January 2027. Melody noted that non-compliance with federal dates would negatively affect the agency and possibly the LEAs.

Traci asked if the new timeline and coding could result in underreporting student program information, affecting College, Career, and Military Readiness (CCMR) student achievement and accountability measures. Traci inquired about the consequences for the LEA and whether the student data could be updated in the PEIMS Summer Submission. Leanne stated that this question would be referred to the accountability program area for a response.

Catherine mentioned that if a data element was reported in PEIMS and the LEA tried to change the data in the accountability system; the LEA would receive an error. Catherine noted that the accountability system would not allow changes to PEIMS reportable data. Jamie stated that data such as Industry Based Certifications (IBCs) and the associate degree indicator, which are used for CCMR, could not be updated in the accountability system and did need to be reported in PEIMS. Additionally, Jamie stated that the IBCs and associate degree indicator would no longer be reported in the PEIMS Fall Submission but have been moved to the PEIMS Summer and Extended Year Submissions. Jamie assured the committee that TEA would provide updated guidance for reporting this data in the submissions.

Georgia Kalligeris asked if TEA had any control over the school start window. Georgia also asked about the resubmission for the PEIMS Extended Year and how LEAs could make data corrections if leavers enrolled after the PEIMS Fall Enrollment Submission due date. Leanne stated that the Texas Education Code dictated the earliest date an LEA could start school, and that TEA could not lobby for a change as a state agency. Leanne added that TEA had developed a proposed timeline as part of this proposal, showing when the PEIMS Extended Year Submission would be due in the 2026-2027 school year.

Leanne stated that TEA needed, at minimum, enrollment data for all students and program data for a subset of students. TEA aimed to minimize duplicate data collection and did not want separate data sets for federal and state reporting, as this would result in a disconnect. Leanne asked committee members for their thoughts on sending student data for the Fall Enrollment Submission and submitting the same student data in the PEIMS Fall Submission. Leanne stated that feedback from the focus group indicated that LEAs did not want to send the data two times.

Leanne clarified that it would involve sending all student enrollment data in the PEIMS Fall Enrollment Collection plus a small subset of program data and then sending all student data with program data in the PEIMS Fall Submission. Catherine stated that when the focus group looked at proposed deadlines for LEAs to report student data in order to meet federal reporting deadlines, it seemed that the data needed for federal reporting were not for every student but a smaller subset. Catherine suggested that the PEIMS Fall Enrollment Submission would include every student but only program information for a subset of students, allowing LEAs to retain the PEIMS Fall Submission and Resubmission.

Leanne stated that TEA was requesting additional feedback and mentioned that another suggestion from the focus group was to bring back the Class Roster Fall Submission, which received pushback. Leanne added that what Catherine proposed would result in a new submission. Linda clarified that the new submission would include all enrolled students and may include seven indicators: Homeless, Foster Care, Military-Connected, Special Education (SPED), Migrant, Economically Disadvantaged, and Emergent Bilingual (EB). Linda added that what was submitted for federal reporting had to be used for Federal and State Accountability.

Keitha asked if TEA could define the subset of students needed for federal reporting. Linda explained that the subset referred to the continuers which are needed for the graduation rate. Linda added that the Research and Analysis team might be unable to identify continuers, so only those students could be reported in the PEIMS Fall Enrollment Submission.

Keitha asked if prior year data could be used for the necessary program data for continuers or if the data had to be from the current school year. Linda stated that the TEA-approved definition of continuers did not use prior-year program data. Linda added that using prior year data would require changing the definition of continuers. Keitha suggested that if TEA could use prior year data for the seven indicators, there would be no need to change the PEIMS Fall Submission, minus the leaver data already removed from the PEIMS Fall Submission. Linda stated that her team would need to consider this option with the Accountability Department. Melody asked Linda to consider how it would look on a federal audit using prior year school data for performing calculations in the current school year.

John Newcom stated if TEA used the prior-year PEIMS Summer Submission data for program participation, enrollment data would still need to be reported early in the fall to meet the federal

deadline. Linda confirmed that the enrollment and special education data would still need to be reported in early fall.

Melody asked committee members to consider their daily tasks and asked if reporting student data twice would be simpler. Melody then asked Leanne if a vote needed to occur and if there was a second proposal that went with the current one. Leanne explained that the next proposal involved removing student data from the PEIMS Fall Submission. Leanne added that members had two options: take a vote or table the proposal. If the proposal were tabled, another ITF meeting would need to be scheduled with full member participation within a week. Melody asked Leanne to confirm that if the vote was taken and the proposal did not pass, the proposal would still proceed to the PCPEI committee for consideration. Leanne confirmed that the proposal would proceed to PCPEI, along with committee members' concerns, suggestions, and the vote results.

Keitha asked if the suggestions provided by members were helpful to TEA in making changes to the proposal. Leanne replied that the suggestions were helpful but needed to be discussed with other program areas within TEA before making any changes. Keitha stated that if the suggestions could be used to update the proposal, she preferred to wait and discuss it at another ITF meeting. Keitha recommended voting now if TEA did not plan to change the proposal based on the suggestions. Leanne said that feedback from Catherine has caused TEA to pause and seek additional feedback. Leanne emphasized that TEA was looking for feedback on how LEAs would be impacted and the workload involved with the new collection. Leanne mentioned that members could send feedback via email, with all feedback due to TEA, by noon on Wednesday, January 15, 2025.

Georgia recommended having another ITF meeting to discuss whether the Division of Research & Analysis could consider using prior year data for the seven indicators. She suggested that an additional ITF meeting would allow for further discussion. Georgia reiterated that with no resubmission, LEAs need ample time to ensure the data submitted has been validated and it is accurate.

Leanne suggested tabling the New PEIMS Fall Enrollment Submission Proposal and scheduling another ITF meeting on either January 21, 2025, or January 28, 2025, before the PCPEI meeting on February 4, 2025. Leanne asked committee members to notify TEA of any conflicts with the proposed dates to ensure representation at the next ITF meeting. Leanne then suggested moving to the discussion item on the agenda.

ITF Action:

Proposal tabled.

PCPEI Discussion:

No discussion needed

PCPEI Action:

No action taken

7. PEIMS Fall Submission Changes

Action Item

Background:

The U.S. Department of Education (ED) expects state data submissions to be timely, complete, and accurate on the due date. The Texas Education Agency (TEA) has never complied with meeting the federal reporting deadlines for certain EDFacts and Perkins submissions. To comply with all the federal reporting deadlines, it was determined that the student snapshot demographic and program information would need to be collected earlier than when it is currently collected in the PEIMS Fall Submission. As a result, the PEIMS Fall Submission will consist of only budget and staff data elements.

Overview:

Beginning with the 2026-2027 school year, TEA will change the PEIMS Fall Submission to only include Finance and Staff data and change the name to the PEIMS Fall Finance and Staff Submission.

Timeline:

Due Date	Submission
10/31/2025	2025-2026 PEIMS Fall Snapshot Date
12/11/2025	2025-2026 PEIMS Fall Submission (No changes to the data submission)
01/15/2026	2025-2026 PEIMS Fall Resubmission (No changes to the data submission)
10/30/2026	2026-2027 PEIMS Fall Finance and Staff Snapshot
12/10/2026	2026-2027 PEIMS Fall Finance and Staff Submission
01/21/2027	2026-2027 PEIMS Fall Finance and Staff Resubmission

ITF Discussion:

The proposal was not presented to members.

ITF Chair, Joel Garcia, left the meeting at 1:00 p.m.

Other Business – ITF

Discussion Item

Special Education Code Table Changes – Texas Records Exchange (TREx)

Leticia Ollervidez presented the Special Education Code Table Changes – Texas Records Exchange (TREx) discussion item to the committee members.

The Academic Achievement Record (AAR) is an official and permanent record of a student's academic performance during high school and, in some cases, of high school courses completed prior to high school.

Each local education agency (LEA) is required to report the AAR of students who have completed the Foundation High School Program or Texas First Early High School Completion program on State Board of Education (SBOE) approved transcript forms ([19 Texas Administrative Code \(TAC\) §74.5](#)).

During the August 2024 annual review process, the Texas Education Agency (TEA) began reviewing the Minimum Standards for the Academic Achievement Record maintained by the Curriculum Standards and Student Support Division. As a result of the review, it was determined the SPECIAL-EXPLANATION-CODE (TC19) table in the Texas Records Exchange (TREx) Data Standards contain specific Texas Administrative Code (TAC) references and additional code translation guidance that did not align with the language approved for use in the Minimum Standards for the Academic Achievement Record.

ITF Discussion:

Leticia Ollervidez, called for questions or comments. There were none.

ITF Adjournment:

A motion was not taken to adjourn.

Jamie Muffoletto adjourned the meeting at 1:23 p.m.

PCPEI Discussion:

Marcos Zorola called for additional questions or comments. There were none.

ITF Meeting: January 28, 2025

1. On-Time Federal Reporting Changes

Action Item

Background:

The U.S. Department of Education (ED) expects state data submissions to be timely, complete, and accurate on the due date. The Texas Education Agency (TEA) has never complied with meeting the federal reporting deadlines for certain EDFacts and Perkins submissions. To comply with all the federal reporting deadlines, it was determined that the student enrollment and special education program information would need to be collected earlier than when it is currently collected in the Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) Fall Submission.

Overview:

Beginning in the 2026-2027 school year, TEA will add a new submission to PEIMS. The PEIMS Fall Enrollment Submission will consist of: (1) all students enrolled on the first Friday in October with their Special Education program determination and (2) students in grades 7-12 enrolled at any point during the school start window (first day of school through the last Friday in September). This data will be collected to complete certain federal submissions and for statewide leaver reconciliation. Additionally, the TEA program area will update the program data used for continuers to begin using the data reported in the prior-year PEIMS Summer Submission.

Timeline:

Due Date	Submission
09/25/2025	2025-2026 Close of School Start Window
10/31/2025	2025-2026 PEIMS Fall Snapshot Date
12/11/2025	2025-2026 PEIMS Fall Submission Due
01/15/2026	2025-2026 PEIMS Fall Resubmission Due
09/25/2026	2026-2027 Close of School Start Window
10/02/2026	2026-2027 PEIMS Fall Enrollment Snapshot
10/15/2026	2026-2027 PEIMS Fall Enrollment Submission Due
10/30/2026	2026-2027 PEIMS Fall Snapshot
12/10/2026	2026-2027 PEIMS Fall Submission Due
01/21/2027	2026-2027 PEIMS Fall Resubmission Due

Presentation:

Jamie Muffoletto invited Linda Roska to comment on the new On-Time Federal Reporting Changes proposal. Linda expressed her gratitude to the committee members and their patience in finding a solution. Linda Roska explained that these proposed changes are the minimum changes that would still allow the Texas Education Agency (TEA) to comply with the U.S. Department of Education. The changes are requiring TEA to change some current processes that have been in place and redefines how to determine their continuers.

Jamie presented the proposal, which includes:

Texas Education Data Standards:

1. Add the following entities to the PEIMS Fall Enrollment Submission:
 - a. LocalEducationAgency
 - b. School
 - c. StudentSchoolAssociation
 - d. Student
 - e. StudentEducationOrganizationAssociation
 - f. Program
 - g. StudentSpecialEducationProgramAssociation
2. Add submission specific General and Data Element Reporting requirements to the following entities:
 - a. LocalEducationAgency
 - b. School
 - c. StudentSchoolAssociation
 - d. Student
 - e. StudentEducationOrganizationAssociation
 - f. Program
 - g. StudentSpecialEducationProgramAssociation
3. Add a new data element AsOfStatusFirstFridayOctober (E3XXX) with a corresponding descriptor table to the Student entity.
4. Add student PEIMS Fall Submission reports to the PEIMS Fall Enrollment Submission.
5. Add new data validations to the PEIMS Fall Enrollment Submission.

ITF Discussion:

Jamie Muffoletto described the new PEIMS Fall Enrollment Submission as a census of enrolled students on the first Friday in October, with information about their Special Education (SPED) programs. Additionally, students in grade levels 7-12 enrolled at any time during the school start window would be reported in the new submission.

Traci Pesina asked Jamie to clarify the negative impact on the LEA when a new student was enrolled on the first Friday in October, but the LEA did not identify the student as SPED. Traci also asked if the SPED data would be reported in the PEIMS Fall Submission and, if so, how each piece of data reported was used.

Jamie stated that SPED data would also be reported in the PEIMS Fall Submission. Jamie added that if the LEA did not report the student as SPED in the PEIMS Fall Enrollment Submission because the student was not yet identified, the student should be reported in the PEIMS Fall Submission if the identification has occurred by that submission.

Jamie said that the SPED data collected in the PEIMS Fall Enrollment Submission is data needed for federal reporting and invited Linda Roska to provide additional information. Linda stated that if the data is available, it would be used for the Federal Exit file for students who exited from the SPED program. Traci asked Linda if she knew the negative impact of the SPED record not being reported in the PEIMS Fall Enrollment Submission. Linda stated that she did not know the impact.

Georgia Kalligeris stated she provided some questions to TEA about the leavers and graduates being reported in the PEIMS Summer and Extended Year Submissions. Georgia asked if TEA would consider extending the PEIMS Extended Year Resubmission due date so LEAs can focus on the new PEIMS Fall Enrollment Submission.

Jamie replied that TEA would review Georgia's questions and added that TEA would provide more information about the changes to leavers and graduate reporting. Jamie clarified that the On-Time Federal Reporting Changes proposal presented was for capturing the data for continuers and added that TEA would provide Georgia feedback.

Georgia asked if TEA would provide reports to LEAs to help determine their leavers, duplicate enrollment, and underreported students in the new PEIMS Fall Enrollment Submission. Jamie reminded the committee that leavers and graduates would be reported in the PEIMS Summer and Extended Year Submissions and stated that LEAs would have the same resources and reports currently available in the PEIMS Fall Submission to assist with leaver determinations. Jamie added that the new PEIMS Fall Enrollment Submission was for continuers. Jamie stated TEA would be happy to discuss the leaver and graduate changes in a future ITF meeting.

Catherine Bray thanked TEA for considering all the feedback provided by committee members and providing a new option for reporting data to meet federal requirements. Jamie thanked Catherine for the opportunity to collaborate and develop a resolution that meets everyone's needs.

ITF Chair, Joel Garcia called for additional questions or comments. Hearing none, he requested a motion.

ITF Action:

Traci Pesina made a motion to approve the proposal.

Catherine Bray seconded the motion.

Vote: Passed

PCPEI Discussion:

Amanda Eisley stated that as a PEIMS Coordinator for 16 years and after participating in the On-Time Federal Reporting Focus Group, this proposal is a great compromise for TEA and the districts. Amanda thanked the TEA staff present who worked on the proposal.

Jamie Muffoletto acknowledged that the focus group participants were great advocates and partners in developing this proposal.

PCPEI Chair, Marcos Zorola called for additional questions or comments. Hearing none, he requested a motion.

PCPEI Action:

Amanda Eisley made a motion to approve the proposal.

Eric Combs seconded the motion.

Vote: Passed

2. PEIMS Fall Submission Changes

Action Item

Background:

The U.S. Department of Education (ED) expects state data submissions to be timely, complete, and accurate on the due date. The Texas Education Agency (TEA) has never complied with meeting the federal reporting deadlines for certain EDFacts and Perkins submissions. To comply with all the federal reporting deadlines, it was determined that the student enrollment and specific program information for a small subset of students would need to be collected earlier than when it is currently collected in the PEIMS Fall Submission.

Overview:

Beginning with the 2026-2027 school year, the PEIMS Fall Submission will only include students enrolled, staff employed, and budget data as of the last Friday in October.

Timeline:

Due Date	Submission
10/31/2025	2025-2026 PEIMS Fall Snapshot Date
12/11/2025	2025-2026 PEIMS Fall Submission

Due Date	Submission
	(No changes to the data submission)
01/15/2026	2025-2026 PEIMS Fall Resubmission (No changes to the data submission)
10/30/2026	2026-2027 PEIMS Snapshot
12/10/2026	2026-2027 PEIMS Fall Submission
01/21/2027	2026-2027 PEIMS Fall Resubmission

Presentation:

Jamie Muffoletto presented the proposal, which includes:

Texas Education Data Standards:

1. Remove the AsOfStatusLastFridayOctober (E3007) data element and corresponding descriptor table from the PEIMS Fall Submission.
2. Update General Reporting Requirements and Data Element Reporting Requirements as needed to reflect the changes to the PEIMS Fall Submission.
3. Revise the associated TSDS reports to reflect the changes in this proposal.
4. Revise the associated data validation rules to reflect the changes in this proposal.

ITF Discussion:

ITF Chair, Joel Garcia called for questions or comments. Hearing none, he requested a motion.

ITF Action:

Traci Pesina made a motion to approve the proposal.

D'Lynne Johnson seconded the motion.

Vote: Passed

PCPEI Discussion:

Jamie Muffoletto reiterated that Continuers (students enrolled during the school start window) will no longer be included in the PEIMS Fall Submission as they will now be reported in the new PEIMS Fall Enrollment Submission. She emphasized that the PEIMS Fall Submission will truly be a snapshot of students enrolled on the last Friday in October.

PCPEI Chair, Marcos Zorola called for additional questions or comments. Hearing none, he requested a motion.

PCPEI Action:

Judd Marshall made a motion to approve the proposal.

Eric Combs seconded the motion.

Vote: Passed

Other Business - ITF**Discussion Item**

Jamie Muffoletto thanked everyone for their feedback and collaboration with TEA. Jamie stated the proposals would be presented to the Policy Committee on Public Education Information (PCPEI) and Data Governance Board (DGB) and added that if passed, the information would be available as an

Early Notice in the Texas Education Data Standards (TEDS). Leanne Simons thanked members for their participation and feedback.

ITF Chair, Joel Garcia informed ITF members of the upcoming March 4, 2025, and the April 8, 2025, ITF meetings.

Adjournment:

ITF Chair, Joel Garcia, called for questions or comments. Hearing none, he requested a motion to adjourn.

Catherine Bray made a motion to adjourn.

Traci Pesina seconded the motion.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:28 a.m.

PCPEI Discussion:

Membership Changes:

Jamie Muffoletto informed the committee that Jackie Janacek from College Station ISD has retired and made a recommendation for her replacement on the PCPEI committee. This recommendation will be taken to the commissioner for approval.

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

- Lauren Price, an ITF member representing Houston ISD has requested new employee Joycelyn Ray be the Primary and Travis Hunt fill the vacant Alternate position.
- Round Rock ISD has requested that Debbie Wilburn, their Alternate ITF member, be replaced by Andrea Laina from Education Service Center 13.

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

PCPEI Action:

Judd Marshall made a motion to approve the ITF member changes.

Dr. Susana Garza seconded the motion.

Vote: Passed

Open Forum:

Eric Combs asked about SPECIAL-EXPLANATION-CODE (TC19) '10' in the Texas Records Exchange (TReX) discussed during the ITF meeting on January 14, 2025. Eric believes all courses are part of the Foundation High School Program and wanted to know when the code would be used. Jamie Muffoletto stated that she would follow up with the program area for an answer.

Note: Following the meeting, Jessica Snyder provided an answer to Eric's question. She stated that all courses are not part of endorsements. There are 22 credits defined for the Foundation High School Program, and then students must complete the specific, additional curriculum requirements to earn

an endorsement. There are also options for some endorsements that are not explicitly defined and open to some local determinations, such as what is an advanced course or a coherent sequence of courses. Here's a good example from the multidisciplinary endorsement that could vary widely between students and be difficult for a receiving district to identify:

(5) Multidisciplinary studies. A student may earn a multidisciplinary studies endorsement by completing the requirements specified in subsection (e) of this section and:

(A) four advanced courses that prepare a student to enter the workforce successfully or postsecondary education without remediation from within one endorsement area or among endorsement areas that are not in a coherent sequence; or

(B) four credits in each of the four foundation subject areas to include chemistry and/or physics and English IV or a comparable AP or IB English course; or

(C) four credits in Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, or dual credit selected from English, mathematics, science social studies, economics, languages other than English, or fine arts.

Upcoming PCPEI Meetings:

Marcos informed attendees of the upcoming PCPEI Meeting, April 22, 2025.

PCPEI Adjournment:

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

Eric Combs made a motion to adjourn.

Judd Marshall seconded the motion.

Vote: Passed.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:01 a.m.

Revised Proposal and Email Vote

Beginning on **Friday, February 14, 2025**, the ITF Committee was asked to consider and vote on the following proposal through email. On **Wednesday, February 19, 2025**, the PCPEI Committee was asked to consider and vote on the following proposal through email.

Note: Changes from the original proposal are reflected in green below.

Texas Tutoring Supports Accelerated Instruction Changes Action Item

Background:

During the 88th Regular legislative session, HB 1416 was passed, amending Subchapter B, Chapter 28.021 of the Education Code. This section states that students who do not perform satisfactorily on the State of Texas Assessment of Academic Readiness (STAAR) test must receive specialized tutoring by subject before or after normal school hours and allows the agency to approve one or more products that use an automated, computerized, or other augmented method for providing

supplemental instruction that may be used instead of some or all of the individual or group instruction required.

As a result of HB 1416, Texas Administrative Code (TAC) §104.1001 was adopted, which approved Ratio Waiver List (RWL) products. These products use automated, computerized, or other augmented methods of instruction which Local Education Agencies (LEAs) can use in place of some or all of the individual or group instruction required under Texas Education Code (TEC) §28.0211(a-4)(6).

The Texas Tutoring Supports Division has determined a need to capture which LEAs are using a product from the RWL and when tutoring is being provided to students. This data will allow the Texas Tutoring Supports Division to provide additional support to LEAs to ensure effective tutoring is being provided to students.

Overview:

Texas Education Data Standards Changes:

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) proposes adding ~~one three~~ new data elements ~~AcceleratedInstructionType (E3XX1), RatioWaiverListProductUsed (E3XX2), and CompletedHoursRatioWaiverList (E3XX3)~~ to the PEIMS Summer Submission ~~and a descriptor table, AcceleratedInstructionType (C3XX) with five descriptors~~. Additionally, reports will be reviewed, and data validation rules will be added as needed.

Texas Records Exchange (TREx) Changes:

~~TEA proposes adding one new data element YTD COMPLETED HOURS RATIO WAIVER LIST (TEXXX).~~
None

Proposal:

In the Texas Education Data Standards:

4. Add the following new data elements to the StudentEducationOrganizationAssociation.AcceleratedInstructionSet Entity in the Student Identification and Demographics Domain to be reported as optional in the PEIMS Summer Submission.
 - ~~a. AcceleratedInstructionType (E3XX1)~~
 - ~~b. RatioWaiverListProductUsed (E3XX2)~~
 - ~~c. CompletedHoursRatioWaiverList (E3XX3)~~
5. ~~Add a new descriptor table AcceleratedInstructionType (C3X1):~~
 - ~~a. 01~~
 - ~~iii. Short Description Subsequent Summer~~
 - ~~iv. Long Description Subsequent Summer student provided most of accelerated instruction in the subsequent summer~~
 - ~~f. 02~~
 - ~~iii. Short Description Before Normal School Hours~~
 - ~~iv. Long Description Before Normal School Hours student provided most of accelerated instruction in the following school year before normal school hours~~
 - ~~g. 03~~
 - ~~iii. Short Description During Normal School Hours~~

- [illegible]

In the Texas Records Exchange Data Standards:

1. Add the new data element YTD-COMPLETED-HOURS-RATIO-WAIVER-LIST (TEXX) to the Student Record.

None

ITF Action:

An email vote was requested on February 14, 2025, and the proposal was approved.

Vote: Passed

PCPEI Action:

An email vote was requested on February 19, 2025, and the proposal was approved.

Vote: Passed