



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

August 12, 2025

Zoom

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

Meeting Minutes

Call Meeting to Order

Catherine Bray, ITF Chair

ITF Chair, Catherine Bray called the ITF meeting to order at 10:01 a.m.

Roll call of the ITF members was taken by Lynne Smith.

ITF Members Present:

Melinda Arguello, Dana Braun, Catherine Bray, Joe Herrera, Keitha Ivey, D'Lynne Johnson, Georgia Kalligeris, David Marx, John Newcom, Christopher Pace, Joycelyn Ray, Linda Roska, Elisa Sanchez, Brittany Wright

ITF Alternate Members Present:

Justin Jons, Tamara Kavanaugh, Dr. Lindsey McDaniel, Shawna Ohnesorge, Haily Rambo, Stephanie Reis, Nina Taylor

TEA Staff Present:

Office of Information Technology:

Kathy Adaky, Naomi Davis, Deborah Deberry, Monica Harwig, Becky McCully, Jeanine Helms, Jamie Hicks, John Johnston, Scott Johnson, Melody Keith, Laurie Kelso, Ed Linden, Jamie Muffoletto, Leticia Ollervidez, Melody Parrish, Donna Pruitt, Leanne Simons, Lynne Smith, Melissa Witcher

College, Career, and Military Preparation Department:

Lacy Freeman, Marcette Kilgore, Valarie Londrie

Educator Data, Research, and Strategy Department:

Mark Olofson

Expanded Learning Models Department:

Brian Doran, Ruchamah Belizor

School Finance Department:

Amy Copeland

State Funding Department:

Sara Kohn, Amy Ma

System Support and Innovation Department:

Ann Rajan

Early Education Department

Magali Farooqi

Meeting Minutes from the August 5, 2025 ITF Meeting will be reviewed and approved at the September 9, 2025 ITF Meeting

1. Remote Virtual Instruction Action Item

Background:

Senate Bill (SB) 569 from the 89th Regular Legislative Session repeals Chapter 30A of the Education Code and enacts Chapter 30B, which governs virtual and hybrid **campuses, programs, and courses**. Chapter 30B allows Local Education Agencies (LEAs) three options for delivering virtual and hybrid education.

Every full-time hybrid or virtual **campus** will be assigned a distinct County District Campus Number (CDCN) corresponding to the campus where at least 50 percent of students are enrolled in a full-time hybrid or virtual program authorized under Subchapter C, Texas Education Code (TEC) §30B.101. Students will be reported as present for each day the student is enrolled on the **campus**. A student's scheduled course load determines their eligibility for full-time or half-time funding.

For every full-time hybrid **program** offered by an LEA, a student is in attendance in person for less than 90 percent of the minutes of instruction provided in a school year and the instruction and content may be delivered synchronously or asynchronously over the Internet, in person, or through other means. For every full-time virtual **program** offered by an LEA, a student is in attendance in person minimally or not at all and the instruction and content are delivered synchronously or asynchronously primarily over the Internet. Daily attendance should be recorded in accordance with the LEA's board-approved local policy for asynchronous attendance procedures.

A hybrid **course** offered by an LEA means a student is in attendance in person for less than 90 percent of the minutes of course instruction provided, and the instruction and content may be delivered synchronously or asynchronously over the Internet, in person, or through other means. A virtual **course** offered by an LEA means a course in which instruction and content are delivered synchronously or asynchronously primarily over the Internet. Students enrolled in virtual or hybrid courses who are present on campus for part of the day will have their attendance recorded during their scheduled on-campus class times. If a student is on campus for part of the day but not during the official attendance-taking period, attendance may be recorded during an alternative attendance-taking time.

Overview:**Texas Education Data Standards Changes:**

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) proposes removing two descriptors and adding two new descriptors to the NonCampusBasedInstruction (C182) table. One new common type with one new and two existing data elements will be added to the StudentEducationOrganizationAssociation Entity to indicate the students participating in a virtual or hybrid program. One new CalendarType (C215) will be added to indicate the virtual or hybrid program offered at a campus. The General Reporting Requirements will be updated for the Section, CourseTranscriptExt, CalendarDate and StudentSectionAssociation Entities. The Data Element Reporting Requirements will be updated in the StudentEducationOrganizationAssociation, Calendar, and Section Entities. Reports will be reviewed and updated to reflect the changes in this proposal. Data validation rules will be removed, revised, and added to reflect the changes in this proposal.

Texas Records Exchange (TREx) Changes:

None

Presentation:

Jamie Muffoletto presented the proposal, which includes:

In the Texas Education Data Standards:

1. Remove the following descriptors from the NonCampusBasedInstruction (C182) descriptor table:
 - a. 04 –
Short Description: TxVSN Online Schools Program
Long Description: Texas Virtual School Network (TxVSN) Online Schools Program
 - b. 05 –
Short Description: Texas Virtual School Network (TxVSN) Statewide Online Course Catalog
Long Description: Texas Virtual School Network (TxVSN) Statewide Online Course Catalog
2. Revise the following short and long description for descriptor **02** in the NonCampusBasedInstruction (C182) descriptor table:
 - a. **Short Description:** Electronic/Internet/Correspond/Video Conferencing Course (Not TxVSN) **to** Electronic/Internet/Correspond/Video Conferencing Course
Long Description: Electronic/Internet/Correspondence Based/Video Conferencing Course (Not a TxVSN course) **to** Electronic/Internet/Correspondence Based/Video Conferencing Course
3. Add the following new descriptors to the NonCampusBasedInstruction (C182) descriptor table:
 - a. 12 –
Short Description: Local Virtual Course
Long Description: Local Virtual Course Under TEC §30B.001(7)
 - b. 13 –
Short Description: Statewide Virtual Course
Long Description: Statewide Virtual Course Under TEC §30B.057

4. Add the FullTimeHybridVirtualProgramParticipationSet common type to the StudentEducationOrganizationAssociation Entity to be reported as optional in the PEIMS Fall and Summer Submissions.
5. Add the following data elements to the FullTimeHybridVirtualProgramParticipationSet common type:
 - a. FullTimeHybridVirtualProgramParticipation (E3XXX)
 - b. BeginDate (E3010)
 - c. EndDate (E3020)
6. Add the FullTimeHybridVirtualProgramParticipation (CXXX) descriptor table:
 - a. 01 –
Short Description: Full-Time Hybrid Program Participation
Long Description: Full-Time Hybrid Program Participation under TEC §30B.001(2)
 - b. 02 –
Short Description: Full-Time Virtual Program Participation
Long Description: Full-Time Virtual Program Participation under TEC §30B.001(4)
7. Add the following new descriptor to the CalendarType (C215) descriptor table:
 - a. 18 –
Short Description: Full-time Hybrid or Virtual Program
Long Description: Full-time Hybrid or Virtual Program on a campus offering 75,600 operational minutes with a minimum of 240 instructional minutes (Full Day Funding) or 120 instructional minutes (Half-Day Funding)
8. Revise the General Reporting Requirements for the following entities:
 - a. Section Entity
 - b. CourseTranscriptExt Entity
 - c. StudentSectionAssociation Entity
9. Revise the Data Element Reporting Requirements for the following entities:
 - a. Section Entity
 - b. CalendarDate Entity
 - c. StudentEducationOrganizationAssociation
10. Revise associated reports to reflect the changes in this proposal.
11. Revise, delete, and add data validation rules to reflect the changes in this proposal.

ITF Discussion:

Jamie Muffoletto introduced Ann Rajan Manager, from System Support and Innovation Department, to answer any questions.

Dr. Lindsey McDaniel raised a question regarding the funding model for full-time hybrid and virtual campuses. Jamie responded that for a campus, students are reported “present” for each day they are enrolled on the campus. Funding is based on the LEA’s average daily attendance (ADA). Jamie went on to say that for a full-time hybrid or virtual program, funding is based on the LEA’s board-approved model for asynchronous attendance. Jamie confirmed this understanding with Ann, stating that, regardless of the funding model, attendance must still be reported for each student.

Melinda Arguello asked what an LEA should do if, during the school year, an LEA campus has 50% enrollment in a virtual or hybrid program. She asked if the LEA should request the assignment of a

county district campus number (CDCN). Ann responded that any new virtual or hybrid campus must go through an authorization process. The LEA would continue to operate the program and could apply to become a virtual school for the next school year.

Ann added that for the 2025–2026 school year, the only schools that would operate are the ones with a virtual waiver in the 2024–2025 school year. Ann stated that additional guidance would be provided in the upcoming To the Administrator Addressed (TAA) letter. Melinda then inquired about grade level restrictions, asking whether these campuses could serve students from prekindergarten through grade 12, including early education (EE) students. Ann clarified that while there may be differences between existing and new campuses, she does not believe there are grade-level restrictions but will confirm this information.

Georgia Kalligeris inquired whether the Optional Flexible School Day Program (OFSDP) online dropout recovery program was included in the current proposal. Ann clarified that while OFSDP operates in various formats, including traditional settings with flexible instructional minutes, it remains unchanged in that context. However, dropout recovery programs offering remote or virtual instruction would now be considered virtual hybrid programs under the new definitions. Georgia sought clarification on whether this reclassification affects funding, particularly for dropout recovery schools using the course completion model. Ann will provide additional information on this specific program and noted that Texas Education Code Section 29.081 (e-2) in SB 569 provides changes to OFSDP online dropout recovery programs.

Joycelyn Ray asked if this change would be reflected in the Student Attendance Accounting Handbook (SAAH) for the 2025–2026 school year. David Marx confirmed that the SAAH will not be updated for the 2025–2026 school year but changes would be made in the 2026–2027 publication. David added, in the interim, the TAA would serve as authoritative guidance, and flexibility would be provided during audits to accommodate the transition period.

Catherine explained that Lewisville ISD operated an accelerated block schedule and asked if a student taking one virtual course would need to be enrolled in a virtual program. Under the accelerated block scheduling, one course accounts for 25% of a student's schedule

Jamie asked whether Lewisville ISD was offering a full-time hybrid or virtual program or simply individual virtual courses. Catherine requested clarification on the difference between a course and a program. Ann explained that a program is a structured offering where students are scheduled into multiple virtual or hybrid courses, often with a defined set of policies for the program. In contrast, a course is a standalone virtual class taken by a student enrolled in a traditional setting. Jamie acknowledged the complexity introduced by block scheduling and emphasized that further clarification would be needed if Lewisville ISD chose to offer a virtual or hybrid program. Jamie also noted that most virtual offerings would continue to be offered through the Texas Virtual School Network (TXVSN) for the next two years. Catherine expressed concern about the implications for attendance reporting, particularly if virtual courses are scheduled during official attendance periods. Catherine explained that Lewisville currently avoids scheduling TXVSN courses during funding periods to prevent conflicts. Jamie confirmed that this practice would likely continue under the new model, as attendance must still be taken for students in virtual or hybrid courses. Catherine inquired about

how attendance should be handled during special schedules, such as exam days, and Jamie responded that TEA would review how this has been managed in the past and provide additional guidance, as the policy has not changed.

Catherine asked whether LEAs offering virtual courses this year outside of TXVSN would need to backdate an attendance plan, noting that while attendance planning is not directly part of the current discussion, it is closely connected. Jamie clarified that an asynchronous attendance plan is only required for full-time hybrid or virtual programs, not for individual virtual courses. For courses, attendance must be taken when students are physically on campus—either during the official attendance time or an approved alternate time—and those minutes will still count toward instructional time as they currently do. Catherine then asked whether virtual course minutes would be based on the LEA’s schedule or restricted to the 60-minute cap used by TXVSN, noting that Lewisville ISD typically offers 90-minute blocks but must reduce them to 60 minutes for reporting. Ann stated she would look into it.

Catherine asked a question about whether the current waiver requirement for remote instruction in homebound settings would still apply if the LEA had a remote or hybrid program. Jamie responded that this issue falls outside the scope of the current discussion and would need to be addressed by TEA’s waivers team. Catherine acknowledged this but emphasized that it is another important implication of the legislation.

D’Lynne Johnson raised concerns about the attendance requirements tied to the implementation of virtual programs, specifically questioning whether the upcoming TAA letter would provide sufficient detail. D’Lynne noted that past TAA letters have not typically included this level of information and asked whether the asynchronous attendance policy—required for full-time hybrid or virtual programs—would be clearly outlined. Ann responded that the TAA would include examples of acceptable asynchronous attendance measures and emphasized that the policy must be locally approved by the LEA. Jamie added that if the TAA does not fully address D’Lynne’s concerns, additional information could be provided. D’Lynne also questioned the timing of implementation, given that many schools have already started the academic year. Jamie explained that an LEA already operating a virtual or hybrid campus can continue to operate the campus. If an LEA would like to develop a virtual or hybrid program, the TAA will provide additional information to support its development.

Keitha Ivey asked how to appropriately word a motion to approve the proposal, acknowledging that while approval is necessary, numerous unanswered questions need clarification. Keitha expressed concern about ensuring that the committee’s concerns are addressed and reflected in the motion. Leanne Simons responded that while some of the questions raised are not directly related to the proposal, they are still valid and will be addressed. Leanne recommended wording the motion to approve the proposal “pending clarification on questions asked during this session,” particularly regarding the removal of the TXVSN references, which may remain in place for the next two years. Leanne assured the committee that follow-up communication would be sent promptly to clarify decisions, and she committed to working with Jamie and Ann to provide timely updates. Keitha expressed feeling conflicted, noting the pressure to approve the proposal despite lingering concerns, and emphasized the importance of ensuring committee members feel heard. Leanne acknowledged

the complexity and affirmed that the proposal would move forward with the understanding that TEA would address the questions, objections, and concerns raised during the discussion.

Georgia stated she was not opposing the proposal. However, she expressed concern about the timing and clarity surrounding the implementation of new reporting requirements, noting that school has already started and the committee was being asked to vote on a motion while still lacking critical guidance. Georgia emphasized the difficulty of implementing a virtual or hybrid program without the information about what is needed in a locally adopted asynchronous attendance policy. Georgia echoed the broader sentiment of uncertainty shared by other committee members.

Leanne acknowledged the challenge and explained that the agency is working as quickly as possible to address questions and finalize guidance. Leanne noted that legislative language can often be vague, requiring collaboration across TEA program areas and with the commissioner to develop clear rules. Leanne affirmed the value of the committee's input and assured members that their questions would be addressed.

Georgia suggested TEA provide working groups with TEA staff to help to help the committee navigate specific implementation issues, such as coding and funding for OFSDP programs. Georgia also recommended creating a program area contact list. Leanne agreed to take the recommendation back for discussion.

Keitha raised a question about the historical cutoff deadlines for the Texas Education Data Standards (TEDS), noting that in the past, there were clearly defined timelines for updates, similar to the current SAAH timelines. She expressed concern that these hard deadlines seem to have disappeared and asked what had changed. Leanne responded that hard deadlines for the TEDS still exist, but legislative mandates operate outside those deadlines. Leanne explained that while program areas must adhere to established timelines for changes not driven by legislation, recent legislative sessions have introduced an unprecedented volume of changes impacting education. Leanne shared that TEA has been working closely with the commissioner to delay some legislative implementations originally scheduled for the 2025–2026 school year to 2026–2027. Leanne stated that TEA continues to follow internal deadlines for preliminary, final, and addendum TEDS updates, and that the agency is actively communicating those expectations to program areas. Keitha acknowledged the challenges, noting the overwhelming number of changes and the difficulty in maintaining clarity and accuracy.

Catherine expressed that while she does not oppose the proposal, she shares the concerns voiced by other members and is deeply concerned about the implications. She acknowledged the collaborative efforts between TEA and committee members but emphasized the overwhelming challenge this proposal poses to the LEA, making implementation cumbersome. Catherine requested that her concerns be formally recorded, noting that although the committee will move forward with a motion for a vote, the scale and timing of the changes are deeply challenging for LEAs.

Catherine requested clarification on what would happen if the committee's questions led to changes in the proposal after the meeting. Leanne responded that due to the tight timeline specifically, the need to present the proposal to the Policy Committee on Public Education Information (PCPEI) committee the following Tuesday, August 19, 2025, any resulting changes would be communicated to

the ITF committee via email. Leanne added that if the changes involved data elements or descriptors previously proposed for removal, the email would outline those updates and provide committee members with an opportunity to ask further questions or offer approval. Leanne noted that while TEA generally avoids email-based approvals, it may be necessary in this case due to time constraints.

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

ITF Action:

Catherine requested a motion for a vote;

Keitha made a motion to approve the proposal with the understanding TEA will clear all questions obtained.

Melinda seconded the motion.

Vote: Passed

2. IBC Reimbursements

Action Item

Background:

During the 89th Regular Legislative Session, House Bill (HB) 120 and HB 2 passed, which amended Education Code, Section 48.156. Currently, the Texas Education Agency (TEA) will reimburse the cost paid by the local education agency (LEA) for one industry-based certification (IBC) examination. HB 120 and HB 2 increase the number of IBC examinations for which an LEA can receive reimbursement from one to two. Additionally, LEAs can request reimbursement for the background check (fingerprinting or criminal history record information review) as needed for the industry certification. TEA will need to collect the cost of the background check (fingerprinting or criminal history record information review) separately due to a state-wide cap on reimbursement. Finally, TEA will no longer collect the IBC information for examinations failed by a student.

Overview:

Texas Education Data Standards Changes:

TEA proposes adding a new data element, IBCBackgroundCheckCost (E3XXX), to the IndustryBasedCertificationSet Common Type in the StudentAcademicRecord Entity to be reported in the PEIMS Summer and Extended Year Submissions. This element will capture the costs of a background check (fingerprinting or criminal history record information review) if required for a student to earn an industry-based certification. TEA will update reporting requirements in the StudentAcademicRecord Entity. Additionally, one descriptor will be removed from the PostSecondaryCertLicensureResult (C232) table. Lastly, reports and data validation rules will be updated to reflect these changes.

Texas Records Exchange (TReX) Changes:

TEA proposes updating the definition of the IBC-REIMBURSEMENT-INDICATOR (TE132) data element. Additionally, a new code table, IBC-REIMBURSEMENT-NUMBER (TCXX), will be introduced with two codes to specify the number of IBC certification reimbursement requests submitted by the LEA for a student.

Presentation:

Leticia Ollervidez presented the proposal, which includes:

In the Texas Education Data Standards:

1. Add the new data element IBCBackgroundCheckCost (E3XXX) to the IndustryBasedCertificationSet Common Type in the Student Academic Record Domain to be reported as optional in the PEIMS Summer and Extended Year Submissions.
2. Revise the Data Element Reporting Requirements in the StudentAcademicRecord Entity.
3. Remove the descriptor 03 – IBC Failed – IBC Failed from the PostSecondaryCertLicensureResult (C232) descriptor table.
4. Revise TSDS Reports to reflect the changes in this proposal.
5. Add and revise associated data validation rules to reflect the changes in this proposal.

In the Texas Records Exchange Data Standards:

1. Revise the data element definition for the IBC-REIMBURSEMENT-INDICATOR (TE132).
2. Add a new code table IBC-REIMBURSEMENT-NUMBER (TCXX) code table:
 - a. 01 – Reimbursement Requested for One Industry Certification Exam
 - b. 02 – Reimbursement Requested for Two Industry Certification Exams

ITF Discussion:

Leticia Ollervidez introduced Valarie Londrie, Senior Director of College, Career, and Military Preparation, Marcette Kilgore, Director of Career and Technical Education and Lacy Freeman, Statewide Career and Technical Education Coordinator to address any questions.

Melinda Arguello asked if there is a way for LEAs to determine that an Industry-Based Certification has been reimbursed for a student, outside of what is sent through the Texas Records Exchange (TReX). Jamie Muffoletto clarified that the only way for a new LEA to know if a student has been reimbursed is through the TReX IBC-REIMBURSEMENT-INDICATOR. Jamie added, there is no statewide repository for an LEA to check this information.

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

ITF Action:

Keitha Ivey made a motion to approve the proposal.

D'Lynne Johnson seconded the motion.

Vote: Passed

3. Teacher Retention Allotment Update**Action Item****Background:**

During the 89th legislative session, House Bill (HB) 2 was passed which amends Subchapter D, Chapter 48, Education Code, by adding Section 48.158. In this new section “classroom teacher” has the meaning assigned by Section 5.001, except that the term also includes: (1) a person who is not

required to hold a certificate issued under Subchapter B, Chapter 21, who otherwise meets the definition of a classroom teacher under Section 5.001; and (2) a person, including a person described by Subdivision (1), employed by an entity with which a school district has entered into a contract who otherwise meets the definition of a classroom teacher under Section 5.001. Additionally, HB 2 amends Section 21.001, Education Code, by adding Subdivision (3-b) to read: “Teacher of record” means a person employed by a school district who teaches the majority of the instructional day in an academic instructional setting and is responsible for evaluating student achievement and assigning grades.

Overview:

Texas Education Data Standards Changes:

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) proposes revising the long description for “087” in the StaffClassification (C021) descriptor table and the long description for “1” and “4” in the StaffType (C181) descriptor table. ~~One Two~~ new data elements, ~~Years~~TRATeachingExperience (EXXX1X) and LEADeterminedTRAEligibility (EXXX2) will be added to the PEIMS Fall Submission. Lastly, TEA will revise the data element definition, general and data element reporting requirements for the StaffType (E1073) data element. Reports will be revised, and data validation rules will be added and revised based on the changes in this proposal.

Texas Records Exchange (TREx) Changes:

None

Presentation:

Jamie Muffoletto presented the proposal, which includes:

In the Texas Education Data Standards:

1. Revise the long description for descriptor 087 in the StaffClassification (C021) descriptor table from Teacher - A professional employee who is required to hold a valid teacher certificate or permit in order to perform some type of instruction to students; (combination of former codes 025 and 029) **to** Teacher – A certified (holds a valid teacher certificate or permit) or non-certified professional employee who teaches in an academic instructional setting or a career and technology instructional setting.
2. Revise the data element definition and general and data element reporting requirements for StaffType (E1073).
3. Revise the following long descriptions in the StaffType (C181) descriptor table:
 - a. 1 – School District or Charter School Employee **to** School District or Charter School Employee, including staff employed by the district at an in-district charter campus
 - b. 4 – from Teacher Employed At The In-District Charter By Org Granted A Campus Charter Under TEC, Chapter 12, Subchapter C And Is Eligible For Benefits Under TEC, §11.174 And 11.147(b) **to** Teacher Employed At The In-District Charter By Org Granted A Campus Charter Under TEC, Chapter 12, Subchapter C.
4. Add new data element ~~Years~~TRATeachingExperience (EXXX1X) to the Staff Entity in the Staff Domain to be reported as optional in the PEIMS Fall Submission.
5. Add new data element LEADeterminedTRAEligibility (EXXX2) to the Staff Entity in the Staff Domain to be reported as optional in the PEIMS Fall Submission.

6. Revise TSDS reports to reflect the changes in this proposal.
7. Revise associated data validation rules to reflect the changes in this proposal.

ITF Discussion:

Jamie Muffoletto introduced Mark Olofson, Director of Educator Data, Research, and Strategy to answer questions.

Keitha Ivey requested confirmation regarding Full Time Equivalent (FTE) determinations. Keitha clarified that if a LEA reports a teacher is eligible for the teacher retention allotment, but the FTE calculation shows less than 0.5, payment will still be made this year. Conversely, if the FTE calculation indicates more than 0.5 FTE but the LEA reports the teacher is not eligible for the teacher retention allotment, payment will not be made. Jamie stated that for the first year, the LEA will report in the LEADeterminedTRAEligibility data element what TEA uses to determine teacher eligibility. TEA will compare the reported information to the FTE calculations to help identify issues in reporting monthly minutes and the FTE calculation process. Jamie additionally acknowledged that discrepancies exist and emphasized the intent to provide a “hold harmless” approach for the first year. Allowing the LEA to determine teacher eligibility ensures teachers and LEAs are paid while allowing time to improve the accuracy of monthly minute reporting.

Keitha asked about how minutes will be reported using the software, giving an example of a French teacher instructing multiple levels in one period. Keitha asked if each class should be reported with a portion of the total minutes. Jamie responded that TEA would start the conversation with the student information system vendors to understand the setup for monthly minutes and to express the need for flexibility for LEAs to report their monthly minutes. Keitha also raised concerns about elementary scheduling. She pointed out that reporting minutes for every employee and every class could be overwhelming from a campus perspective.

Mark added that while the challenges around minute reporting are valid and appreciated, the current proposal before the members does not resolve those issues. Instead, it gives LEAs the authority to make determinations, with broader discussions on minute reporting to follow.

Catherine Bray thanked Jamie for her efforts and contributions, noting that she had provided examples and data throughout the process. She asked if, under the “Special Instructions” section of the new data element, the final statement could be revised to clarify that the LEA will have the final authority in determining the data. Catherine referenced similar language found in the data element reporting requirements and suggested adding a note there as well to make the clarify the guidance.

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

ITF Action:

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

Melinda Arguello seconded the motion.

Vote: Passed

4. Additional Day School Year Program – Data Element and Guidance Changes

Discussion Item

Background:

House Bill (HB) 2 from the 89th Regular Legislative Session amends Texas Education Code (TEC) §48.0051, which provides the requirements for the Additional Days School Year (ADSY) program, by reducing the required number of instructional days from 180 to 175 for schools participating in the Additional Days School Year (ADSY) Program. It also expands eligibility from prekindergarten through fifth grade to prekindergarten through eighth grade. Additionally, schools offering at least 200 full days of instruction will receive a 50% increase in average daily attendance funding.

Overview:

Texas Education Data Standards Changes:

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) proposes the following in the School Entity:

1. Revise one existing data element definition– AdditionalDaysProgram (E1671)
2. Revise data element reporting requirements

TEA proposes the following in the StudentEducationOrganizationAssociation Entity:

1. Revise data element reporting requirements

TEA proposes the following in the CalendarDate Entity:

1. Revise data element reporting requirements

Reports will be revised and data validation rules will be added and revised based on 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. Revise the data element definition for the AdditionalDaysProgram (E1671).
2. Revise the Data Element Reporting Requirements for the School Entity in the Education Organization Domain.
3. Revise the Data Element Reporting Requirements for the StudentEducationOrganizationAssociation Entity in the Student Identification and Demographics Domain.
4. Revise the Data Element Reporting Requirements for the CalendarDate Entity in the School Calendar Domain.
5. Revise TSDS reports to reflect the changes in this proposal.
6. Add and revise associated data validation rules to reflect the changes in this proposal.

ITF Discussion:

Lynne Smith introduced Brian Doran, Director of Expanded Learning Modules, and Ruchamah Belizor, Manager of Additional Days School Year, to address any questions.

Melinda Arguello asked if examples for half-day and three-quarter day funding could be added to the Calendar Type Reporting chart in the data element reporting requirements in the CalendarDate Entity. Jamie Muffoletto stated that the data standard team would work with the TEA program area to add examples.

ITF Chair, Catherine Bray, called for additional questions or comments.

5. Sunset EarlyReadingIndicator Data Element Discussion Item

Background:

House Bill (HB) 2 from the 89th Regular Legislative Session repeals Texas Education Code (TEC) §28.006(g). Due to this change, the Texas Education Agency (TEA) Early Childhood Division has requested the EarlyReadingIndicator (E1522) is sunset for the 2025-2026 school year. The data collected by the EarlyReadingIndicator was intended to determine if a student was eligible for accelerated reading instruction, which is no longer stipulated in the statute.

Overview:

Texas Education Data Standards Changes:

TEA proposes the sunset of the EarlyReadingIndicatorSet Common Type, which includes the data elements EarlyReadingIndicator (E1522), BeginDate (E3010), and EndDate (E3020), as well as the associated descriptor table C195. Additionally, one report from the PEIMS Fall and Summer Submissions will be removed. Two data validation rules from the PEIMS Fall and Summer Submissions will also be removed.

Texas Records Exchange (TREx) Changes:

None

Presentation:

Jamie Muffoletto presented the proposal, which includes:

In the Texas Education Data Standards:

1. Remove the EarlyReadingIndicatorSet Common Type and the following data elements from the StudentEducationOrganizationAssociation Entity in the Student Identification and Demographics Domain reported in the PEIMS Fall and Summer Submissions:
 - a. EarlyReadingIndicator (E1522)
 - b. BeginDate (E3010)
 - c. EndDate (E3020)
2. Remove the descriptor table EarlyReadingIndicator (C195).
3. Remove the following reports:
 - a. PEIMS Fall Submission – PDM1-120-015 – Student Roster Summary by Early Reading Indicator
 - b. PEIMS Summer Submission – PDM3-120-001 – Student Roster Summary by Early Reading Indicator
4. Remove two PEIMS Fall and Summer Submissions data validation rules.

ITF Discussion:

Jamie Muffoletto introduced Magali Farooqi, Early Childhood Assessment Specialist from the Early Childhood Education Department, to address any questions.

Georgia Kalligeris requested confirmation that the proposal would be shared with the members. Jamie stated the proposal would be sent to ITF members after the meeting.

ITF Chair, Catherine Bray, called for additional questions or comments.

Other Business

Discussion Item

Jamie Muffoletto shared that TEA has one final item for email vote: Additional Instructional Days for Reading Interventions, to be reported in the 2025–2026 PEIMS Extended Year. The item will be emailed to members once internal program changes are finalized.

Upcoming Meetings

September 9, 2025

October 14, 2025

November 18, 2025

January 13, 2026

March 3, 2026

April 14, 2026

Adjournment:

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

Melinda Arguello made a motion to adjourn.

Elisa Sanchez seconded the motion.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:08 p.m.