



**Texas Education Agency
Information Task Force (ITF)**

January 28, 2026

Zoom

10:00 a.m.

Meeting Minutes

Call Meeting to Order

Catherine Bray, ITF Chair

Catherine Bray called the ITF meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

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

ITF Members Present:

Melinda Arguello, Dana Braun, Catherine Bray, Joe Herrera, Keitha Ivey, D'Lynne Johnson, Georgia Kalligeris, David Marx, John Newcom, Shawna Ohnesorge, Linda Raney, Linda Roska, Elisa Sanchez, Brittany Wright, Sharron Zirkelbach

ITF Alternate Members Present:

Denise Hendricks, Travis Hunt, Justin Jons, Tamara Kavanagh, Andrea Laina, Kim Lyons, Dr. Lindsey McDaniel, Antonio Najera, Stephanie Reis

TEA Staff Present:

Office of Information Technology:

Kathy Adaky, Connor Briggs, David Butler, Naomi Davis, Terri Hanson, Jeanine Helms, Jamie Hicks, Scott Johnson, Ed Linden, Shabana Momin, Jamie Muffoletto, Leticia Ollervidez, Melody Parrish, Leticia Rodriguez, Leanne Simons, Lynne Smith, Crystal Wellborn, Melissa Witcher

Assessment Design, Development, & Quality Department:

Magali Farooqi, Chris Rozunick

1. Early Childhood Data System Collection New Submissions **Action Item**

Background:

During the 89th Regular Legislative Session, House Bill (HB) 2 was passed amending Subchapter A, Chapter 28, Education Code, by adding Section 28.0063 which adds early literacy and numeracy progress monitoring instruments. Section 28.0063 requires the commissioner to adopt a list of approved reading and mathematics instruments for use in kindergarten through grade three. These instruments must be research-based, aligned with state standards, and capable of measuring

foundational literacy and numeracy skills at multiple points during the school year (beginning, middle, and end). The instruments must identify students needing targeted instruction and monitor progress for early grades.

To ensure timely eligibility for supplementary tutoring grants, which are triggered when a student does not meet expectations in two or more consecutive assessments, data must be collected after each assessment window rather than only once a year, as student performance directly impacts financial support and intervention opportunities before the next administration. To comply with these new statutory requirements, the Texas Education Agency (TEA) will expand the Early Childhood Data System (ECDS) collection to include early literacy and numeracy progress monitoring for students in kindergarten through grade three at the beginning, middle, and end of the year.

Overview:

Texas Education Data Standards Changes:

2026-2027

Local Education Agencies (LEAs) will continue to report the ECDS Prekindergarten and Kindergarten Submissions as outlined in the 2026-2027 Texas Education Data Standards (TEDS). TEA will work with all assessment vendors and a limited number of LEAs to test the new ECDS submissions and assess vendor readiness.

2027-2028

TEA proposes the addition of three new submissions, Beginning of Year, Middle of Year, and End of Year to the ECDS Collection. These new submissions will consist of student demographic and assessment information. No staff or section information will be collected in the new submissions. The current ECDS Kindergarten submission will be sunset. There will be no changes to the ECDS Prekindergarten submission. The new submissions will consist of the following:

- Beginning of Year K-3 Submission
- Middle of Year K-3 Submission
- End of Year K-2 Submission

One new common type, AssessmentPeriod, will be added to the StudentAssessment Entity with one new data element, AssessmentPeriod (E3XX1) with a corresponding descriptor table and three new descriptors. One new data element, ReasonNotTested (E3XX2), with a corresponding descriptor table and 11 new descriptors will be added to the StudentAssessment Entity. Eleven

Timelines:

2026-2027

The timeline for testing the changes to ECDS will be provided to the participating LEAs. There are no proposed changes to the existing ECDS Prekindergarten and Kindergarten Submission timelines for 2026-2027.

2027-2028

Due Date	Submission
ECDS - PK	
First Monday in August	TSDS ready to load data to IODS

Due Date	Submission
First Thursday in May	ECDS Prekindergarten ready for users to complete
Fourth Thursday in June	ECDS Prekindergarten Submission due date for LEAs
2 Weeks After Fourth Thursday in June	ECDS Prekindergarten data available to customers
Beginning Of Year (BOY) – K - 3	
First Monday in August	TSDS ready to load data to IODS
Last Monday in October	ECDS Kindergarten - 3rd grade ready for users to complete
Second Thursday in November	ECDS Kindergarten - 3rd grade Submission due date for LEAs
2 Weeks After Second Thursday in November*	ECDS Kindergarten - 3rd grade data available to customers
Middle Of Year (MOY) – K- 3	
First Monday in August	TSDS ready to load data to IODS
Last Monday in January	ECDS Kindergarten - 3rd grade ready for users to complete
Second Thursday in February	ECDS Kindergarten - 3rd grade Submission due date for LEAs
Two Weeks After Second Thursday in February	ECDS Kindergarten - 3rd grade data available to customers
End Of Year (EOY) – K- 2	
First Monday in August	TSDS ready to load data to IODS
First Monday in May	ECDS Kindergarten - 2nd grade ready for users to complete
First Thursday in June	ECDS Kindergarten - 2nd grade Submission due date for LEAs
Two Weeks after First Thursday in June	ECDS Kindergarten - 2nd grade data available to customers

*May adjust based on the Thanksgiving holiday.

Texas Records Exchange (TReX) Changes:

None

Presentation:

Leticia Ollervidez presented the proposal, which includes:

In the Texas Education Data Standards:

1. Add new ReasonNotTested (E3XX2) data element to the StudentAssessment Entity to be reported in the new ECDS submissions.
2. Add the new AssessmentPeriod common type to the StudentAssessment Entity to be reported in new ECDS submissions including the following data element:
 - a. AssessmentPeriod (E3XX1)
3. Revise the Data Element Reporting Requirements for the StudentAssesment Entity in the Assessment Domain.
4. Add a new descriptor table ReasonNotTested (C3X2):
 - a. **01-**

Short Description – Student Absent – No Make-Up (Reading Readiness - BOY)

Long Description – Student was absent during the LEA’s Kindergarten Reading Readiness assessment window (beginning of year), and no make-up opportunity was provided.

b. 02-

Short Description – Kindergarten Student Not Enrolled in LEA (Reading Readiness - BOY)

Long Description – Student was not enrolled in the LEA during the Kindergarten Reading Readiness assessment window (beginning of year).

c. 03-

Short Description – No participation in Kindergarten Reading Readiness per ARD decision (BOY)

Long Description – Student is unable to participate meaningfully in the Kindergarten Reading Readiness assessment due to the student’s disability, as determined by the Admission Review and Dismissal Committee and documented in the student’s Individualized Education Program. Supporting documentation must be maintained at the LEA level.

d. 04-

Short Description – No Approved Instrument Administered (Reading Readiness) (BOY)

Long Description – No commissioner-approved Kindergarten Reading Readiness instrument was adopted and administered by the LEA for the student.

e. 05-

Short Description – Other – Documentation Required (Reading Readiness) (BOY)

Long Description – Reason not listed in the kindergarten readiness section above; detailed justification and supporting documentation must be kept at the LEA.

f. 06-

Short Description – Student Absent – No Make-Up (Early Lit/Early Num)

Long Description – Student was absent during the Early Literacy or Early Numeracy assessment window, and no make-up opportunity was provided.

g. 07-

Short Description – Student Not Enrolled in LEA (Early Lit/Early Num)

Long Description – Student was not enrolled in the Local Education Agency during the Early Literacy or Early Numeracy assessment window. f.

h. 08-

Short Description – No participation in Early Literacy/Numeracy per ARD decision

Long Description – Student is unable to participate meaningfully in the Early Literacy and/or Early Numeracy Assessment(s) due to the student’s disability, as determined by the Admission Review and Dismissal Committee and documented in the student’s Individualized Education Program. Supporting documentation must be maintained at the LEA level.

i. 09-

Short Description – Parent Opt-Out: Early Literacy/Numeracy Assessment (Written Notice)

Long Description – Parent or guardian submitted written notice to opt the student out of the required Early Literacy and/or Early Numeracy instrument(s). The LEA may not encourage or direct this request. This provision is allowed for Early Literacy or Early Numeracy Assessments under Texas Education Code (TEC), §28.0063(j). Supporting documentation must be maintained at the LEA level and will not be submitted to TEA.

j. 10-

Short Description – No Approved Instrument Administered (Early Lit/Early Num)

Long Description – No commissioner-approved Early Literacy or Early Numeracy instrument was adopted and administered by the LEA for the student.

k. 11-

Short Description – Other –Documentation Required (Early Lit/Early Num)

Long Description – Reason not listed in the Early Literacy and Early Numeracy Instruments section; detailed justification and supporting documentation for Early Literacy or Early Numeracy assessment must be kept at the LEA.

5. Add a new descriptor table AssessmentPeriod (C3X1):

a. 01-

Short Description – Beginning of Year

Long Description – Beginning of Year

b. 02-

Short Description – Middle of Year

Long Description – Middle of Year

c. 03-

Short Description – End of Year

Long Description – End of Year

6. Revise descriptor table ReportAssessmentType (C306) to remove one and add 11 new descriptors:

Remove:

a. 01 –

Short Description: ECDS-KG

Long Description: ECDS-KG

Add

b. 03 –

Short Description: ECDS-BOY KG

Long Description: ECDS- Beginning of Year Kindergarten

c. 04 –

Short Description: ECDS- BOY Grade 1

Long Description: ECDS- Beginning of Year Grade 1

d. **05 –**

Short Description: ECDS- BOY Grade 2

Long Description: ECDS- Beginning of Year Grade 2

e. **06-**

Short Description: ECDS- BOY Grade 3

Long Description: ECDS- Beginning of Year Grade 3

f. **07-**

Short Description: ECDS- MOY KG

Long Description: ECDS- Middle of Year Kindergarten

g. **08-**

Short Description: ECDS- MOY Grade 1

Long Description: ECDS- Middle of Year Grade 1

h. **09-**

Short Description: ECDS- MOY Grade 2

Long Description: ECDS- Middle of Year Grade 2

i. **10-**

Short Description: ECDS- MOY Grade 3

Long Description: ECDS- Middle of Year Grade 3

j. **11-**

Short Description: ECDS- EOY KG

Long Description: ECDS- End of Year Kindergarten

k. **12-**

Short Description: ECDS – EOY Grade 1

Long Description: ECDS - End of Year Grade 1

l. **13-**

Short Description: ECDS – EOY Grade 2

Long Description: ECDS- End of Year Grade 2

7. Add new and revise existing ECDS reports to reflect the changes in this proposal.
8. Add new and revise associated data validation rules to reflect the changes in this proposal.

In the Texas Records Exchange Data Standards:

None

ITF Discussion:

Leticia Ollervidez introduced Magali Farooqi, Program Manager, Early Childhood Assessment, to answer any questions.

- **Approved Instruments List:** Georgia Kalligeris asked when the Commissioner-approved instrument lists would become available. Magali responded that the preliminary list of assessments for the Local Education Agencies (LEAs) participating in the pilot year is anticipated to be released in Fall 2026, with the finalized statewide list scheduled for release in Spring 2027.
- **Vendor Readiness and Data Submission Challenges:** Georgia noted ongoing challenges coordinating data across multiple systems, especially as new collections are added. She explained that vendors are often not prepared to support timely submissions. Georgia shared that her LEA has struggled to submit data on time for the last four years due to system limitations and recurring errors. She acknowledged TEA's vendor-relationship efforts but emphasized the need for a coordinated approach to ensure vendor readiness as data collection requirements expand. Jamie Muffoletto acknowledged these concerns and explained that TEA is planning a full year dedicated to vendor readiness. For the 2026–2027 school year, TEA will work closely with a small group of LEAs representing a variety of vendors to ensure vendor readiness. Jamie noted that the TSDS product owner team is collaborating with Magali's team to develop vendor participation requirements. Jamie added that legislation required TEA to collect the information beginning in 2026–2027. TEA determined that a year was needed to ensure vendors are ready, with full implementation targeted for 2027–2028. Jamie stated that TEA is modeling this process based on committee feedback.
- **Program Area Feedback to LEAs:** Georgia asked if the program area would begin providing feedback to LEAs based on the significant increase in assessment data collected across grade levels. Georgia explained that with increased data collection frequency, she wondered whether program areas would analyze and share insights with LEAs, particularly when patterns or issues arise. Magali responded that her team is collaborating with other groups, including the Texas Public Education Information Resource (TPEIR) team, to determine how best to analyze and use the incoming data. Magali noted that there are also financial implications when a student does not meet expectations in two consecutive literacy assessments, as LEAs must then ensure tutoring is available to students. Magali stated that TEA plans to report relevant feedback to LEAs so they can make informed local decisions.
- **ReasonNotTested Descriptor Table:** Catherine Bray noted that in the new ReasonNotTested descriptor table, descriptors 01–05 reference kindergarten only. Catherine asked whether the assessment reasons are intended exclusively for kindergarten students. Magali explained that kindergarten beginning-of-year (BOY) assessments fall under the kindergarten readiness statute. The new literacy and numeracy assessment requirements are based on a different statute with different testing frequency, BOY, middle-of-year (MOY), and end-of-year (EOY).

Catherine asked what would happen if a student completed the literacy assessment but not the numeracy assessment. Magali clarified that if a student misses one or both assessments, TEA needs the reason for the missed assessment. Magali noted that descriptors 01–05 apply only to Kindergarten BOY, while descriptors 06–11 are used for BOY, MOY, and EOY for grades 1–3 for early literacy and numeracy, and BOY for kindergarten numeracy and MOY and EOY for kindergarten early literacy and numeracy.

Kim Lyons raised concerns that the ReasonNotTested descriptor table needs clearer differentiation between kindergarten-only and other grade descriptors. Kim suggested adding a subheader before descriptor 06, noting that descriptors 06–11 apply only to MOY and EOY. Keitha Ivey agreed, stating that distinguishing descriptors 01–05 (BOY only) from descriptors 06–11 (MOY/EOY and grades K–3) is confusing. Magali responded that TEA could clarify the wording, particularly around descriptors 06–11. Magali explained that BOY kindergarten readiness uses only a limited set of instruments. In contrast, MOY and EOY will involve a broader list of instruments, which is why the table is split into two separate sections. Jamie added that further revisions can be made.

Catherine asked whether the kindergarten BOY includes numeracy reporting. Magali confirmed that numeracy is not required at kindergarten BOY.

Brittany Wright asked whether the descriptors 01 and 06, Student Absent-No Make-Up, apply to both students who miss long periods of school and those who are absent only on the main test day and not offered a make-up session. Magali confirmed that both situations use the same descriptor.

Brittany suggested adding a descriptor to distinguish students who transfer during the window and were tested at the previous LEA. A new descriptor would provide more information about why the student was not tested in their new LEA. Magali thanked Brittany for the suggestion and noted it as valuable feedback.

Catherine asked for clarification on when descriptor 10, No Approved Instrument Administered – K-3 Early Lit/Early Num, would be used. Magali explained that some LEAs would continue to administer instruments not approved by the Commissioner. Descriptor 10 would document this and help TEA explain to parents why their student may not be eligible to receive supplemental grant funds. Magali noted that TEA currently sees similar situations in kindergarten submissions. Georgia asked how an LEA would report this reason if the vendor does not submit data to TEA because they are not approved. Magali acknowledged this concern and said TEA will review whether the descriptor should remain in place.

Catherine asked for confirmation that the ReasonNotTested is reported only when no score is present, and that providing a score means the ReasonNotTested is not required. Jamie confirmed that if the student does not take the assessment, the ReasonNotTested would be

reported; otherwise, only the assessment results would be submitted. Chris Rozunick noted that the process differs from STAAR and clarified that this is intentional.

- **Location of Assessment Reason Descriptors (Assessment Vendor vs. SIS):** Catherine asked where the assessment reasons would be reported from. Would they be reported from the Student Information System (SIS) or by the assessment vendor? Jamie Muffoletto responded that these descriptors would reside in the assessment software. Catherine confirmed that student demographic information would still originate from the SIS. Jamie clarified that all student-level entities, LocalEducationAgency, School, Student, StudentEducationOrganization, and StudentSchoolAssociation, would continue to come from the SIS, while assessment entities would come from the assessment vendor.

Catherine asked if LEAs would need to load student roster information from the SIS into their vendor system. Jamie confirmed that the vendor would determine the roster process within their system.

- **Vendor Contract Considerations:** Catherine shared that her team is concerned about vendor readiness, especially for grades 1–3, where the Commissioner-approved assessments are currently optional. Catherine noted that canceling contracts with vendors not on the approved vendor list could have financial implications, and she wanted the group to be aware as vendors begin bidding. Magali acknowledged the potential financial implications and noted that some LEAs choose to use an alternate assessment in the first year of transition. Magali stated that TEA is preparing communications, expected this week or next, to help LEAs plan for the 2026–2027 and 2027–2028 school years. TEA will issue multiple To the Administrator Addressed (TAA) letters and launch a dedicated webpage. The first communication will outline what LEAs need to know for contract planning and upcoming vendor requirements.

Catherine asked whether any grants would be available to offset the costs of canceling existing vendor contracts. Magali responded that no grants are available at this time, but because 2026–2027 is a vendor readiness year, TEA hopes LEAs will have sufficient time to adjust or exit contracts.

- **Accountability Use of Assessment Data:** Catherine asked if there are plans to tie the new assessment data to accountability. Magali responded that there is no plan at this time. Magali noted, however, that the data does carry financial implications, including supplemental tutoring grants and LEA allotments, but nothing related to accountability.
- **Vendor Rostering and Integration Flexibility:** Georgia shared concerns that some vendors struggle to roster students correctly, leading to mismatches in data. Georgia noted that certain vendors require LEAs to purchase additional third-party products to support rostering and asked whether TEA could require vendors to support more flexible integration options, such as Application Programming Interface (API) connections with the SIS. Magali confirmed that she would work with the TSDS team to incorporate vendor requirements into the solicitation process to ensure expectations are clear from the outset. Magali emphasized that TEA does not want LEAs to incur additional costs. Jamie added that because there is no longer a teacher-level requirement attached to these assessments, the data needs have been reduced, which TEA hopes will simplify rostering.

- **Grade Levels and Assessment Windows:** Kim asked if the EOY excluded grade 3 because of the State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR) taken by students in grade 3. Magali confirmed that the statute requires only BOY and MOY for grade 3 because grade 3 students are assessed via the STAAR.

Catherine asked if the LEA should report descriptor 07 (Student Not Enrolled in LEA – K-3 Early Lit/Early Num) when a student participates in the MOY assessment but withdraws before the end of the assessment window. Magali stated that if a student was assessed, their data must be submitted, even if they withdrew during the assessment window.

Dr. Lindsey McDaniel asked how testing windows would be determined for each assessment period. Magali stated that LEAs will have the flexibility to define their own administration schedules, as long as they meet the submission deadlines.

Dr. McDaniel asked whether TEA would recommend a testing-window length, noting that LEAs might otherwise create windows ranging from two days to two months. Magali responded that TEA plans to publish an administration manual to include testing window recommendations, but final decisions will remain with the LEA.

- **TREx Implications for Student Mobility:** Kim asked if a new LEA needed to receive assessment results when a student transfers mid-year. Magali explained that she is working with the TSDS team to determine how assessment results could be sent when a student transfers. Magali noted that if a student transfers and has not met expectations in two or more consecutive assessments, the receiving LEA needs the information to provide interventions. Jamie added that TEA is reviewing TREx to determine whether additional information needs to be transferred to ensure LEAs have access to complete assessment histories.

Catherine raised concerns about manual entry when assessments are transferred in TREx since LEAs may use different assessment vendors. Catherine also pointed out that a SIS may not have a place to enter the assessment score for a student and if the LEA does not use the same assessment vendor the assessment score may not have a place for the transferred score. Magali stated that further discussions would occur to determine how the information could be transferred.

Georgia suggested an approach similar to how prior-year discipline records are transferred in TREx. Jamie responded that TEA is still evaluating all TREx-related options and is not ready to discuss any changes.

- **Submission Due Dates:** Kim asked why the EOY submission is due on the first Thursday in June instead of the second Thursday, to align with BOY and MOY timelines. Jamie stated that TEA would review the dates but noted that some deadlines are driven by the agency's internal timelines for data use. Leanne Simons added that TEA tries to align all submissions to a standard timeline, but holidays and calendar variations may require adjustments.

ITF Chair, Catherine Bray called for additional questions or comments. Hearing none, she requested a motion.

ITF Action:

Shawna Ohnesorge made a motion to approve the proposal.
Keitha Ivey seconded the motion.

Vote: Passed

Other Business

Discussion Item

ITF Upcoming Meetings

March 3, 2026

April 14, 2026

Adjournment:

ITF Chair, Catherine Bray, called for additional questions or comments. Hearing none, she requested a motion to adjourn.

Travis Hunt made a motion to adjourn.

Sharron Zirkelbach seconded the motion.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:58 a.m.