



Texas Education Agency
Policy Committee on Public Education Information (PCPEI)
February 3, 2026
Zoom
10:00 a.m.

Meeting Minutes

Call the Meeting to Order

Marcos Zorola, PCPEI Chair

Marcos Zorola called the PCPEI meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

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

PCPEI Members Present:

Joy Baskin, Eric Combs, Amanda Eisley, Fatuma Ereng, Dr. Morris Lyon, Judd Marshall, Dr. Jeannie Meza-Chavez, Randal Shaffer, Wanda Thomas, Marcos Zorola

PCPEI Alternate Members Present:

Irma Aguilar, Kelley Foley, Deanna Harris, Evelyn Jenkins, Joe Medley, Melissa Urenda, Jay Young

TEA Staff Present:

Office of Information Technology:

Kathy Adaky, Connor Briggs, Naomi Davis, Terri Hanson, Jeanine Helms, Jamie Hicks, Scott Johnson, Ed Linden, Jamie Muffoletto, Leticia Ollervidez, Melody Parrish, Gabriel Perez, Leanne Simons, Lynne Smith, Melissa Witcher

Assessment Design, Development, & Quality Department:

Magali Farooqi, Chris Rozunick

College, Career, and Military Preparation Department:

Mary Hausle

Curriculum Standards & Student Support Department:

Jessica Snyder

Financial Compliance Department:

David Marx

Office of Special Populations & Student Supports:

Jeremy McCaig

Texas Tutoring Supports Department:

Alicia Garcia, Colby Self

ITF Member Present:

ITF Vice-Chair, Joel Garcia

Approve Meeting Minutes from <Date> PCPEI Meeting **Action Item**

Marcos Zorola called for a motion to approve the meeting minutes from the October 28, 2025, PCPEI meeting.

Judd Marshall made a motion to approve the minutes.

Eric Combs seconded the motion.

Vote: Passed

ITF Vice Chair, Joel Garcia, presented the ITF report to PCPEI.

ITF Meeting: November 18, 2025

1. Sunset of New Tech Student Characteristic Proposal **Action Item**

Background:

During the 89th Regular Legislative Session, House Bill (HB) 2 was passed, which amends Section 48.106 (a-1), Education Code, to remove the additional funding previously provided to campuses that are members of the New Tech Network. Specifically, districts were entitled to an extra \$150 per student in average daily attendance (ADA) for students enrolled at New Tech campuses. Due to this change, the Texas Education Agency (TEA) College, Career, and Military Preparation Division has requested that the New Tech student characteristic be sunset for the 2026-2027 school year. The data collected by the New Tech student characteristic was intended to determine if a student was eligible for the additional funding under the New Tech program, which is no longer stipulated in the statute.

Overview:

Texas Education Data Standards Changes:

TEA proposes the sunset of the New Tech descriptor in the StudentCharacteristic (C344) descriptor table used in the PEIMS Fall, Summer, and Extended Year Submissions. Additionally, TEA proposes removing data reporting requirements relating to the New Tech descriptor from the StudentEducationOrganizationAssociation Entity and the PEIMS College and Career Readiness School Models (CCRSM) Resources in the reference section of the TSDS Web-Enabled Data Standards (TWEDS). Reports and data validation rules will be revised or removed in the PEIMS Fall, Summer, and Extended Year Submissions 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. Remove the following descriptor from the StudentCharacteristic (C344) descriptor table:
 - a. 08-
 - Short Description** – New Tech
 - Long Description** – New Tech
2. Remove Data Element Reporting requirements for the StudentEducationOrganization Entity.
3. Remove the New Tech Network Schools information from the PEIMS College and Career Readiness School Models (CCRSM) Resources from the References section of the TSDS Web-Enabled Data Standards (TWEDS).
4. Revise TSDS reports to reflect the changes in this proposal.
5. Remove associated data validation rules to reflect changes in this proposal.

In the Texas Records Exchange Data Standards:

None

ITF Discussion:

ITF Chair, Catherine Bray, called for 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

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.

Deanna Harris seconded the motion.

Vote: Passed

2. StaffClassification and AuxiliaryRoleId Changes for LVN Proposal Action Item

Background:

Local Education Agencies (LEAs) report all professional, paraprofessional, and auxiliary staff employed as of the last Friday in October in the PEIMS Fall Submission. Professional staff are reported using descriptors in the StaffClassification (C021) descriptor table while auxiliary staff are reported using descriptors in the AuxiliaryRoleId (C213) descriptor table. Currently, the StaffClassification (C021) 022 (School Nurse) descriptor includes Licensed Vocational Nurses (LVNs), Registered Nurses (RNs), and Nurse Practitioners (NPs) This classification is inconsistent with the Texas Administrative Code (TAC) §153.1021, which defines a school nurse specifically as a Registered Nurse (RN) licensed to practice professional nursing in Texas. The Financial Compliance Division at the Texas Education Agency (TEA)

has requested that LVNs be removed from being reported using StaffClassification (C021) 022 and a new AuxiliaryRoleId (C213) descriptor be developed for staff such as LVNs, Certified Nursing Assistants (CNAs), and clinic aides who provide basic health services but are not RNs. The change aims to ensure compliance with state regulations and improve data accuracy in personnel reporting.

Overview:

Texas Education Data Standards Changes:

TEA proposes removing one descriptor and adding one descriptor to the StaffClassification (C021) descriptor table and adding one new descriptor to the AuxiliaryRoleId (C213) descriptor table. Reports and data validations rules will be revised based on the changes in this proposal.

Texas Records Exchange (TREx) Changes:

None

Presentation:

Leticia Ollervidez presented the proposal which includes:

In the Texas Education Data Standards:

1. Remove the following descriptor from the StaffClassification (C021) descriptor table:
 - a. 022
Short Description – School Nurse
Long Description - School Nurse - A person that complies with TEC 21.003(b), "is licensed by the state agency that licenses that profession", [Nurse Practitioner (NP), Registered Nurse (RN), Licensed Vocational Nurse (LVN)] is employed/contracted by the school district, and whose primary job responsibility is that of school nurse. Only persons licensed by the state agency that licenses nurses may be employed as a school nurse.
2. Add the following new descriptor to the StaffClassification (C021) descriptor table:
 - a. 122 –
Short Description – Registered Nurse/Nurse Practitioner
Long Description – Registered Nurse/Nurse Practitioner - A person that complies with TEC 21.003(b), "is licensed by the state agency that licenses that profession", [Nurse Practitioner (NP), Registered Nurse (RN)] is employed/contracted by the school district, and whose primary job responsibility is that of school nurse. Only persons licensed by the state agency that licenses nurses may be employed as a school nurse.
3. Add the following new descriptor to the AuxiliaryRoleId (C213) descriptor table:
 - a. 212 -
Short Description – Non-RN Clinic Staff
Long Description – Non-Registered Nurse Clinic Staff - Licensed Vocational Nurse (LVN), Certified Nursing Assistant (CNA), or clinic aide.
4. Revise TSDS reports to reflect the changes in this proposal.
5. Revise associated data validation rules to reflect changes in this proposal.

In the Texas Records Exchange Data Standards:

None

ITF Discussion:

Leticia Ollervidez introduced David Marx, Executive Director, Financial Compliance, to address any questions.

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

ITF Action:

Sharron Zirkelbach 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:

Dr. Morris Lyon made a motion to approve the proposal.

Jay Young seconded the motion.

Vote: Passed

Other Business

Discussion Item

Open Forum

Jamie Muffoletto announced that the next Information Task Force (ITF) meeting is scheduled for January 13, 2026. The Texas Education Agency (TEA) will present additional updates for the 2026-2027 school year.

Upcoming Meetings:

January 13, 2026

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.

Keitha Ivey made a motion to adjourn.

Shawna Ohnesorge seconded the motion.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:15 a.m.

ITF Meeting: January 13, 2026

1. New Pathways In Technology Early High School, Year 5 and year 6 Student

<u>Characteristic Descriptors</u>	<u>Action Item</u>
-----------------------------------	--------------------

Background:

Current Texas Education Code (TEC) §§29.551-29.557, states that the Pathways in Technology Early College High School (P-TECH) program must allow a participating student to complete high school and receive a high school diploma and an associate degree, a two-year postsecondary certificate, or industry certification, and complete work-based training on or before the sixth anniversary of the date of the student's first day of high school. To capture P-TECH participation, TEA-designated P-TECH programs code P-TECH students in TSDS PEIMS using StudentCharacteristic (E3063) 07 (P-TECH).

During the 89th Regular Legislative Session, House Bill (HB) 2 was passed, establishing the following requirements for P-TECH Year 5 and Year 6 students. Year 5 students refer to P-TECH students continuing the P-TECH program for one year following high school graduation. P-TECH Year 6 students refer to P-TECH students continuing the P-TECH program for a second year following high school graduation.

- TEC §28.0095, Financial Aid for Swift Transfer (FAST) Program, is amended to expand FAST eligibility to students who have graduated from high school but are enrolled at a campus designated as a P-TECH school
- TEC §48.003(a), Student Eligibility, is amended to entitle students who have graduated from high school, but are enrolled at a campus designated as a P-TECH to the benefits of the Foundation School Program
- TEC §48.0035, Use of Funding for Certain Purposes, is amended to allow school districts to use funding outlined in §48.0035 to educate P-TECH students who have graduated from high school but are enrolled in the P-TECH program

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) College, Career, and Military Preparation Division is requesting two new student characteristics. The first new student characteristic would identify P-TECH Year 5 students, and the second would identify P-TECH Year 6 students.

Overview:

Texas Education Data Standards Changes:

TEA proposes adding two new descriptors to the StudentCharacteristic (C344) descriptor table collected in the PEIMS Attendance, Fall Enrollment, Fall, Summer and Extended Year Submissions. Additionally, TEA proposes adding data reporting requirements relating to the new P-TECH descriptors to the StudentEducationOrganizationAssociation Entity. Reports and data validation rules will be revised and added in the PEIMS Attendance, Fall Enrollment, Fall, Summer, and Extended Year Submissions based on the changes in this proposal.

Texas Records Exchange (TReX) Changes:

None

Presentation:

Lynne Smith presented the proposal, which includes:
TEA proposes the following changes:

In the Texas Education Data Standards:

1. Add the following new descriptors to the StudentCharacteristic (C344) descriptor table:
 - a. 26-
Short Description – P-TECH, Year 5
Long Description – Pathways in Technology Early College High School program, Year 5
 - b. 27-
Short Description – P-TECH, Year 6
Long Description – Pathways in Technology Early High School program, Year 6
2. Add Data Element Reporting requirements to the StudentEducationOrganizationAssociation Entity.
3. Revise TSDS reports to reflect the changes in this proposal.
4. Add and revise associated data validation rules to reflect changes in this proposal.

In the Texas Records Exchange Data Standards:

None

ITF Discussion:

Lynne Smith introduced Krystal Garza, Deputy Director, Postsecondary Preparation Programs and Mary Hausle, College and Career Readiness School Models Coordinator to answer questions.

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

ITF Action:

Sharron Zirkelbach 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:

Amanda Eisley made a motion to approve the proposal.

Deanna Harris seconded the motion.

Vote: Passed

2. New Descriptors for Accelerated Instruction Descriptor Tables Action Item

Background:

During the 88th Legislative Session in 2023, House Bill (HB) 1416 amended Section 28.0211 of the Texas Education Code to strengthen requirements for accelerated and supplemental instruction for students who do not meet satisfactory performance on state assessments administered under Section 39.023. Under this legislation, students who fail to achieve satisfactory performance must receive at least 15 hours of supplemental instruction, or 30 hours if their performance is significantly below satisfactory, as defined by commissioner rule.

As part of the initial response, TEA introduced changes for the 2023–2024 school year through the Texas Records Exchange (TREx), adding new data elements and code tables to enable the transfer of accelerated learning plan information. For the 2024–2025 school year, TEA expanded these efforts by updating the Texas Education Data Standards (TEDS), creating a new common type, AcceleratedInstructionSet, with associated data elements and descriptor tables within the StudentEducationOrganizationAssociation Entity. This new data was collected for the first time in the 2024-2025 PEIMS Summer Submission.

Based on the analysis of the initial data collection, the program area has determined that additional descriptors are needed in existing descriptor tables to improve data accuracy, consistency, and reporting.

Overview:

Texas Education Data Standards Changes:

TEA proposes adding one new descriptor to the StudentAcceleratedInstructionParticipation (C353) descriptor table and one new descriptor to the DifferenceReasonHoursAcceleratedInstruction (C354) descriptor table used in the StudentEducationOrganizationAssociation Entity, collected in the PEIMS Summer Submission. Reports and data validation rules will be revised in the PEIMS Summer Submission based on the changes in this proposal.

Texas Records Exchange (TREx) Changes:

TEA proposes adding one new code to the STUDENT-ACCELERATED-INSTRUCTION-PARTICIPATION (TC50) code table.

Presentation:

Lynne Smith presented the proposal, which includes:

TEA proposes the following changes:

In the Texas Education Data Standards:

1. Add the following new descriptor to the StudentAcceleratedInstructionParticipation (C353) descriptor table:
 - a. 07
Short Description – Student Participates – Parent Reduced or Modified Accelerated Instruction
Long Description – Student Participates – Parent Reduced or Modified Accelerated Instruction
2. Add the following new descriptor to the DifferenceReasonHoursAcceleratedInstruction (C354) descriptor table:
 - a. 08
Short Description – Student Completed More Hours Than Assigned
Long Description – Student Completed More Hours Than Assigned
3. Revise TSDS reports to reflect the changes in this proposal.
4. Revise associated data validation rules to reflect changes in this proposal.

In the Texas Records Exchange Data Standards:

1. Add the following new code to the STUDENT-ACCELERATED-INSTRUCTION-PARTICIPATION (TC50) code table:
 - a. 07 - Student Participates – Parent Reduced or Modified Accelerated Instruction

ITF Discussion:

Lynne Smith introduced Alicia Garcia, Texas Tutoring Content and Partnership Manager, to answer questions.

Kim Lyons asked whether the new StudentAcceleratedInstructionParticipation (C354) descriptor 07 (student participates, parent reduced/modified accelerated instruction) and descriptor 08 (student completed more hours than assigned) are related or independent. Alicia clarified that descriptor 07 applies when fewer accelerated instructional hours than assigned are completed due to parent modification or reduction. In contrast, descriptor 08 applies when a student completes more accelerated instructional hours than assigned.

Georgia Kalligeris asked if there is a minimum number of accelerated instructional hours to which parents can reduce the assigned hours. Alicia stated there is no statutory minimum and emphasized that decisions should be a collaborative conversation between parents and the LEA, focusing on what is best for the student. Parents have the right to reduce or remove the number of accelerated instructional hours.

Keitha Ivey asked what documentation is required when parents reduce or modify accelerated instructional hours. Alicia stated that a handwritten letter from the parent requesting a reduction or modification is sufficient documentation under the statute and that the LEA should retain the letter. Keitha asked how long a student must receive classroom instruction from a Teacher Incentive Allotment (TIA) designated teacher to avoid further supplemental accelerated instruction. Alicia replied that the student must receive instruction for an entire semester, typically the fall semester, as the spring semester is shortened with testing.

Kim asked whether the requirement that a student receive instruction for an entire semester from a TIA-designated teacher should be included in the Texas Education Data Standards (TEDS) reporting requirements or in guidance materials. Alicia stated that the requirement is included in the program area's Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) document. Jamie Muffoletto and Alicia would discuss adding a link to the FAQ in TEDS.

Dr. Lindsey McDaniel asked what happens if a student completes more than 60 hours of accelerated instruction in non-reading subjects. Jamie explained that, currently, a fatal validation error occurs when hours exceed 60 in non-reading subjects. TEA is reviewing these rules and may add exceptions for students reported with the new descriptors.

Catherine Bray asked how LEAs should report partial completion if a parent opts out after some hours are completed. Alicia stated that LEAs should report the completed hours and use descriptor 07

(parent reduced or modified accelerated instruction). If a parent opts out completely before any hours are completed, no hours should be reported. Catherine asked if the LEA should use descriptor 03 (student did not attend) when there is no documentation of parent reduction. Alicia confirmed that if there is no documented parent request, the LEA should use descriptor 03.

Keitha asked how LEAs would receive guidance and support for these changes. Jamie stated that TEA plans to provide clearer guidance, examples, and resources to help LEAs navigate data submissions.

Catherine asked whether LEAs are still prohibited from informing parents that they have the option to reduce accelerated instructional hours or opt out. Alicia clarified that LEAs should not encourage parents to opt out or reduce hours but may provide information if parents inquire. Communication must avoid the appearance of encouraging opting out, and decisions should remain student-centered.

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.

Sharron Zirkelbach seconded the motion.

Vote: Passed

PCPEI Discussion:

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

PCPEI Action:

Deanna Harris made a motion to approve the proposal.

Eric Combs seconded the motion.

Vote: Passed

3. New ReasonNoSPEDServices Data Element and Descriptor Table Action Item

Background:

Beginning with the 2021-2022 school year, the Texas Education Agency (TEA) began collecting data for the SPPI-11 and SPPI-12 indicators through the Child Find Collection in the Texas Student Data System (TSDS). In this new collection, a data element, IDEAIndicator (E1717), was added to indicate if a student was determined eligible and enrolled in special education and related services as a result of the full and individual initial evaluation (FIIIE) report and the admission, review, and dismissal (ARD) committee meeting decision.

Currently, when the indicator is false, there is no distinction between a student who did not receive services because of ineligibility under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and a student who was determined eligible, but whose parent refused services. Further, there is no distinction regarding whether a child will have an Individualized Services Plan (ISP) when the parent refuses special education services at the public school, but the child is enrolled in an eligible private school. Parent refusal can occur whether the student is enrolled in the LEA, enrolled in a private

school, or not enrolled at all, such as in cases involving children under age five. This lack of resolution limits the ability to monitor parent refusals versus “Did Not Qualify” outcomes, which is essential for compliance and program oversight. It also prevents an accurate assessment of LEA obligations for equitable services and a proportionate share for private school students. Increasing the granularity of this data will strengthen monitoring, improve reporting accuracy, and ensure alignment with IDEA requirements.

The Special Populations and Student Supports Division has determined that this data element does not provide sufficient information for accurate special education monitoring and compliance.

Overview:

Texas Education Data Standards Changes:

TEA proposes adding one new data element, ReasonNoSPEDServices (E3XXX), revising one existing data element, IDEAIndicator (E1717), and adding one new descriptor table, ReasonNoSPEDServices (C3X1), with four descriptors to the StudentSpecialEducationProgramEligibilityAssociation Entity to be collected in the Special Education Data System Summer Submission. Additionally, TEA proposes revising and adding data reporting requirements to the StudentSpecialEducationProgramEligibilityAssociation Entity. Reports and data validation rules will be revised and added in the Special Education Data System Summer Submission based on the changes in this proposal.

Texas Records Exchange (TREx) Changes:

None

Presentation:

Lynne Smith presented the proposal, which includes:

TEA proposes the following changes:

In the Texas Education Data Standards:

1. Add the new data element ReasonNoSPEDServices (E3XXX) to the StudentSpecialEducationProgramEligibilityAssociation Entity in the Student Special Education Program Eligibility Association Domain to be reported as optional in the Special Education Data System Summer Submission.
2. Revise the data element definition and special instructions for the IDEAIndicator (E1717).
3. Add a new descriptor table ReasonNoSPEDServices (C3X1):
 - a. 01 -
Short Description – Ineligible For Special Education
Long Description – Child is not eligible/did not qualify (DNQ) for special education under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA); services are not applicable.
 - b. 02 -
Short Description – Eligible for SPED, Not Receiving SPED, Not Enrolled In Eligible Private School
Long Description – Child is eligible for special education under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), but **parent did not consent/refused** special education services, and child is not enrolled in an eligible private school
 - c. 03 –

Short Description – Eligible for SPED, Enrolled In Eligible Private School, with ISP

Long Description – Child is eligible for special education under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), parent did not consentrefused special education services, and child is enrolled in an eligible private school with an Individualized Services Plan (ISP)

d. 04 –

Short Description – Eligible For SPED, Enrolled In Eligible Private School, No ISP

Long Description – Child is eligible for special education under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), parent did not consentrefused special education services, and child is enrolled in an eligible private school without an Individualized Services Plan (ISP)

4. Revise the Data Element Reporting requirements in the StudentSpecialEducationProgramEligibilityAssociation Entity.
5. Revise TSDS reports to reflect the changes in this proposal.
6. Add and revise associated data validation rules to reflect changes in this proposal.

In the Texas Records Exchange Data Standards:

None

ITF Discussion:

Lynne Smith introduced Kristin McGuire, Deputy Commissioner, Office of Special Populations and Student Supports, to answer questions.

Georgia Kalligeris shared questions via email, asking how LEAs should handle cases in which parents initially refuse special education services but later consent within the same school year. Kristin clarified that LEAs are only required to report the ReasonNoSPEDServices data element in the Special Education Data Systems Summer Submission and that this information does not need to be updated mid-year. Kristin added, if a parent initially refuses services and later consents, the LEA does not need to revise the descriptor. Kristin emphasized that this data element is intended to help LEAs track students eligible for special education services and enrolled in private schools. Kristin noted that the data would not be used for federal reporting or state accountability, and no penalties are associated with it.

Dr. Lindsey McDaniel asked whether the Admission, Review, and Dismissal (ARD)/Individualized Education Program (IEP) meeting date serves as the deadline for determining if a student is enrolled in a private school. Dr. McDaniel also inquired about cases in which an LEA evaluates a student, finds the student eligible for special education services, but the student is not enrolled in the LEA. Kristin confirmed that consent was received at the ARD meeting and explained that eligibility determination includes verifying enrollment status as of the IEP meeting date. If the student enrolls in a private school after the ARD meeting, the student would be counted as not enrolled. Kristin added that TEA can clarify which homeschools qualify as eligible private schools. The ARD committee and the LEA program area determine eligibility based on enrollment in an eligible private school.

Kristin also addressed a question regarding descriptor 02, parent refused services. Kristin noted that TEA may revise this language to -did not consent to services to cover situations where parents either refused or did not respond to consent requests.

Dr. McDaniel asked whether a private daycare that offers kindergarten instruction qualifies as a private school or remains classified as a daycare facility. Kristin responded that it depends on whether the daycare meets requirements outlined in 19 Texas Administration Code (TAC) 89.1096-Provision of Services for Students Placed by their Parents in Private Schools or Facilities, including being a nonprofit, having a curriculum with scope and sequence, and providing regular progress reporting. If the ARD committee has documentation confirming these criteria, the facility can be considered an eligible private school under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) equitable services provisions.

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

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.

Eric Combs seconded the motion.

Vote: Passed

4. New Education Savings Account Student Characteristic Action Item

Background:

During the 89th legislative session, Senate Bill (SB) 2 amends Chapter 29 of the Texas Education Code (TEC) by adding Subchapter J, Education Savings Account (ESA) program. Subchapter J, Section 29.3611 addresses funding and accountability measures when a child transitions from participating in an ESA to a public school or open-enrollment charter school during the school year. The purpose of this section is to ensure that local education agencies (LEAs) receive adequate financial support for students who re-enter the public education system after participating in an ESA, while also providing a fair approach to accountability evaluations. Specifically, the legislation grants an additional allotment to the basic allotment for the child's average daily attendance during that school year, supplementing the standard funding the district or charter school would normally receive. Furthermore, the child's performance is excluded from accountability ratings during the school year the student returns from participating in an ESA.

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

TEA proposes adding one new descriptor to the StudentCharacteristic (C344) descriptor table to be reported in the PEIMS Attendance, Fall, and Summer Submissions. Additionally, TEA proposes adding data reporting requirements relating to the new Education Savings Account descriptor to the StudentEducationOrganizationAssociation Entity. TEA will analyze reports and data validations in the PEIMS Attendance, Fall, and Summer Submissions based on the changes in this proposal.

Texas Records Exchange (TREx) Changes:

None

Presentation:

Leticia Ollervidez presented the proposal, which includes:

TEA proposes the following changes:

In the Texas Education Data Standards:

1. Add the following new descriptor to the StudentCharacteristic (C344) descriptor table:
 - a. 28-
 - Short Description** – Former ESA Student
 - Long Description** – Former Education Savings Account Student
2. Add Data Element Reporting Requirements to the StudentEducationOrganizationAssociation Entity.
3. Analyze TSDS reports to reflect the changes in this proposal.
4. Analyze data validation rules to reflect the changes in this proposal.

ITF Discussion:

Keitha Ivey and Georgia Kalligeris asked how an LEA would know if a student participated in an Education Savings Account (ESA) program during the current school year. Terri Hanson explained that enrollment forms typically ask where a student was previously enrolled and suggested adding a question to see if the student participated in an ESA. Terri asked members for input on whether this question could be asked during enrollment. Keitha expressed concern about obtaining accurate answers from parents, and Travis Hunt noted the need for a reliable data source, as wording the question clearly could be challenging. Terri invited members to brainstorm ways to capture information that would reliably indicate whether a student had participated in an ESA prior to enrolling in the LEA.

Catherine Bray highlighted complexities, such as students enrolling in one LEA after participating in an ESA and then transferring to a new LEA within the same year, raising questions about which LEA receives funding and accountability adjustments. Terri clarified that data would be collected in the PEIMS Attendance, Fall, and Summer Submissions, and the requirement applies only to the current school year. Terri acknowledged the need to consult state funding rules for scenarios involving multiple moves.

Georgia questioned whether LEAs would need to verify parent responses and what documentation would be required. Georgia added her concern that parents are unlikely to provide additional

documentation beyond basic enrollment requirements, such as a birth certificate and Social Security card. Georgia noted that expecting parents to supply proof of ESA participation may not be realistic. Terri clarified that there is no requirement for LEAs to collect documentation; they only need to obtain the information. Terri emphasized that, for an LEA to receive accountability exclusions and funding, the student must have participated in an ESA program during the current school year. Terri stated that additional input from the program area and possibly legal would be needed.

Catherine asked whether students applying for ESA funds through the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts could be assigned a TSDS unique identification number (UID), similar to the process used with the Texas Workforce Commission (TWC), to enable matching and reduce the burden on parents. Catherine suggested that if ESA participants were loaded into TSDS, LEAs could easily identify them without relying on parent-provided information. Terri responded that TEA has had ongoing discussions with the Comptroller's office regarding this issue. Terri explained that TEA does not administer the ESA program. Terri noted that assigning UIDs to students who have attended only private schools poses challenges, as many may never enroll in public schools. Assigning these students a UID could result in TSDS maintaining data on students outside the public education system. Terri added that similar concerns arose with TWC, where assigning UIDs through an external entity introduced additional complications.

Leanne Simons added that matching students who were never enrolled in public schools, including homeschool ESA participants, could be problematic, similar to the Pandemic Electronic Benefit Transfer (P-EBT) program. LEAs experienced matching issues based on student name and date of birth.

Sharron Zirkelbach observed that parents may not provide accurate prior school information due to concerns about losing ESA funds.

Terri concluded that TEA still needs the student ESA information in PEIMS, whether collected from LEAs or supplemented by other sources.

Kim Lyons asked if the Comptroller's office could provide a list of ESA participants to LEAs. Terri confirmed that the Comptroller's office tracks this data but noted privacy and data-sharing concerns.

Terri summarized that members do not believe parents would reliably provide ESA participation information on enrollment forms. Instead, the preference is to establish a verification process using data maintained by the Comptroller's office to confirm whether students participated in an ESA program.

Leanne stated that we will take this back and discuss with other TEA staff. She reiterated that TEA has no authority over private or home schools.

During the discussion, Keitha expressed reservations about approving the proposal, citing uncertainty regarding how LEAs would receive information identifying a student as an ESA recipient. Travis stated that he was willing to second the motion, even though he was not completely comfortable with the lack of clarity on this issue. Catherine requested guidance from Jamie Muffoletto on how to proceed

with obtaining a vote. Jamie noted that if there was an objection, a roll-call vote could be conducted and asked Leanne whether TEA should proceed in that manner. Keitha clarified that her comment was not intended as an objection but rather as a concern. Leanne advised that the committee could proceed with a vote and include in the minutes that there was uncertainty about the source of data populating the StudentCharacteristic (C344) descriptor 28 (Former ESA Student). Members agreed on this approach. Sharron clarified her vote to Keitha, emphasizing that the data must be collected regardless of the source to comply with the legislative requirements of Senate Bill 2.

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

ITF Action:

Sharron Zirkelbach made a motion to approve the proposal.

Travis Hunt seconded the motion.

Vote: Passed

PCPEI Discussion:

Eric Combs raised concerns similar to those previously discussed during the ITF meeting on how the Education Savings Account (ESA) data will be verified and the importance of understanding the data source. Eric acknowledged that one approach would be to add a question to the student enrollment form to determine whether the student was an ESA recipient and whether families may need to provide documentation. Jamie Muffoletto stated that discussions with the Texas Education Agency (TEA) program area are ongoing to determine which options may be available to LEAs for verifying ESA data. Jamie also emphasized the importance of capturing ESA data and confirmed the need to move forward with adding a student characteristic in the Texas Education Data Standards (TEDS) to identify students who enroll in a public school from an ESA. Jay Young asked whether the ESA indicator would apply only to current school-year students or would include prior school years. Jamie clarified that the ESA indicator applied only when a student enrolled in a public school from an ESA within the same school year. Jamie added that the student would be excluded from accountability calculations and that the LEA may receive additional funding for one year. Jay asked about students who begin the school year in public school, begin participating in an ESA, and do not return to the public school that same year. Leanne Simons clarified that in this scenario, the student would not be reported with the ESA indicator. The indicator is specifically intended for students enrolling in a public school from an ESA. Leanne also confirmed that students who attended an ESA in a prior school year and enrolled in public school at the start of the next school year would not be reported with the ESA indicator.

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

PCPEI Action:

Jay Young made a motion to approve the proposal.

Fatima Ereng seconded the motion.

Vote: Passed

5. New Applied Sciences Pathway Program Participation Student Characteristic Action Item

Background:

House Bill (HB) 20 from the 89th Regular Legislative Session amends Subchapter Z, Chapter 29, Education Code, by adding Section 29.914. This section establishes the Applied Sciences Pathway program, which allows high school students to concurrently earn a high school diploma and a certificate from an institution of higher education. The program targets high-wage, high-growth industries such as plumbing, electrical, welding, and HVAC. It mandates partnerships between school districts or charter schools and higher education institutions.

Overview:

Texas Education Data Standards Changes:

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) proposes adding one new descriptor to the StudentCharacteristic (C344) descriptor table collected in the PEIMS Fall, Summer, and Extended Year Submissions. Additionally, TEA proposes adding data reporting requirements relating to the new Applied Sciences Pathway Program Participation descriptor to the StudentEducationOrganizationAssociation Entity. Reports and data validation rules will be revised and added in the PEIMS Fall, Summer, and Extended Year Submissions based on the changes in this proposal.

Texas Records Exchange (TREx) Changes:

None

Presentation:

Lynne Smith presented the proposal, which includes:

TEA proposes the following changes:

In the Texas Education Data Standards:

TEA proposes the following changes:

In the Texas Education Data Standards:

1. Add the following new descriptor to the StudentCharacteristic (C344) descriptor table:
 - a. 29-
 - Short Description** – Applied Sciences Pathway Program Participation
 - Long Description** – Applied Sciences Pathway Program Participation
2. Add Data Element Reporting requirements to the StudentEducationOrganizationAssociation Entity.
3. Revise TSDS reports to reflect the changes in this proposal.
4. Add and revise associated data validation rules to reflect changes in this proposal.

In the Texas Records Exchange Data Standards:

None

ITF Discussion:

Lynne Smith introduced Valarie Londrie, Senior Division Director of College Career and Military Preparation, and Jessical Snyder, Senior Division Director of Curriculum Standards and Student Support to answer questions.

Catherine Bray asked whether each campus in an LEA must apply to participate in the Applied Sciences Pathway Program when a LEA operates a centralized Career and Technical Education (CTE) center that serves students from multiple campuses. Valarie clarified that participation depends on the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) and noted that if there is a centralized CTE campus, the application should reflect each campus that sends students to the centralized CTE campus. Valarie also said that a valid campus number is required and assured that the application process will accommodate multiple campus numbers.

Valarie noted that the program area would provide a list of approved programs like P-TECH, so that a fatal edit can be implemented to allow only approved programs to report the new student characteristic.

Jaylea Wallace asked if the list of approved campuses would be available to LEAs. Jamie confirmed that the program area will provide the list, and TEA will publish it in the Texas Education Data Standards (TEDS).

Catherine inquired if the Applied Sciences indicator would be used for College, Career, and Military Readiness (CCMR) credit. Valarie explained that the Applied Sciences Pathway program primarily allows districts to substitute CTE courses for graduation requirements.

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

PCPEI Discussion:

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

PCPEI Action:

Eric Combs made a motion to approve the proposal.

Deanna Harris seconded the motion.

Vote: Passed

6. New Armed Forces Qualification Test Score Data Element Action Item

Background:

House Bill (HB) 8 from the Second Special Session of the 89th Texas Legislature, amends Texas Education Code (TEC) §39.053, to include new performance indicators for evaluating high school campuses and districts that include high school campuses. Among these indicators is a measure that accounts for students who demonstrate military readiness by achieving a passing score as set by the commissioner on the Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery (ASVAB) Test.

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

TEA proposes adding one new data element, ArmedForcesQualificationTestScore (E3XXX), to the StudentEducationOrganizationAssociation Entity to be collected in the PEIMS Summer Submission. Additionally, TEA proposes revising the data reporting requirements in the StudentEducationOrganizationAssociation Entity. Reports and data validation rules will be revised and added to the PEIMS Summer Submission based on the changes in this proposal.

Texas Records Exchange (TREx) Changes:

None

Presentation:

Lynne Smith presented the proposal, which includes:

TEA proposes the following changes:

In the Texas Education Data Standards:

1. Add the new data element ArmedForcesQualificationTestScore (E3XXX) to the StudentEducationOrganizationAssociation Entity in the Student Identification and Demographics Domain to be reported as optional in the PEIMS Summer Submission.
2. Revise the Data Element Reporting Requirements for the StudentEducationOrganizationAssociation Entity in the Student Identification and Demographics Domain.
3. Revise TSDS reports to reflect the changes in this proposal.
4. Add associated data validation rules to reflect the changes in this proposal.

In the Texas Records Exchange Data Standards:

None

ITF Discussion:

Lynne Smith introduced Katherine Beck, Senior Division Director of Performance Reporting, to answer questions.

Travis Hunt asked whether the Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery (ASVAB) results are considered auditable records that must be maintained to support coding. Jamie Muffoletto directed the question to Katherine, asking whether LEAs should keep auditable records of the Armed Forces Qualification Test (AFQT) scores, as they affect accountability. Katherine advised that LEAs should maintain these records, as they can be audited.

Jaylea Wallace noted that the domain of values for the new data element is only 0–99 and asked if that is the highest possible score. Travis confirmed that 99 is the highest percentile on a score that a student can earn as an ASVAB test result.

Catherine Bray asked whether ASVAB scores are provided by the Department of Defense (DoD) or by students. Katherine explained that the DoD does not provide scores to LEAs or to TEA, so LEAs must obtain them from students.

Catherine also asked if Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps (JROTC) completion is reported through course completion. Katherine confirmed that TEA would use course completion to determine whether a student completed JROTC, since completing JROTC and earning a passing score on the ASVAB are factored into earning College, Career and Military Readiness (CCMR) credit for accountability purposes.

Keitha Ivey asked if LEAs should report all AFQT scores received from students. Katherine advised that if the LEA receives an AFQT score from a student, they should report the score. Katherine informed the committee that students receive a test report, which includes the AFQT score. Under House Bill 8, TEA is required to determine a minimum AFQT passing score. LEAs may choose whether to enter scores below the minimum. Keitha asked if scores should be reported even if students do not plan to join the military. Katherine confirmed that scores should still be reported, as they may contribute to CCMR credit if the student also completed JROTC.

Kim Lyons asked where LEAs can find information on the minimum passing score. Katherine stated that the accountability manual, updated annually, will include the minimum passing score. The review process is underway, and the anticipated minimum score is 31. The manual will be published around August 2026, with extensive communication to LEAs.

Jaylea asked whether the new data element is optional and whether it should be reported only for JROTC students or for all students who take the ASVAB. Katherine explained that the statute requires both JROTC completion and a passing ASVAB score for military readiness, but LEAs may report ASVAB scores for any student to ensure data availability. Jaylea asked if scores can be reported retroactively if a student later joins JROTC. Jamie confirmed that reporting scores whenever available is acceptable and noted that the ASVAB can be taken at any time between 10th and 12th grade.

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

ITF Action:

Jaylea Wallace made a motion to approve the proposal.

Shawna Ohnesorge 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

Other Business

Discussion Item

Early Childhood Data System Collection Changes

Jamie Muffoletto informed the committee that, based on House Bill 2, TEA will need to make changes to the Early Childhood Data System (ECDS) collection. Jamie added that the proposal was not ready for a vote, but TEA wanted to share the topic for questions and input. Jamie noted that an additional ITF meeting would be scheduled to review the proposal.

Leticia Ollervidez presented preliminary information regarding upcoming changes to the Early Childhood Education System for the 2027–2028 school year. Leticia noted that vendor readiness will be conducted during the 2026–2027 school year.

Leticia Ollervidez introduced Magali Farooqi, Program Manager for Early Childhood Assessment, from the Assessment Design, Development, and Quality Department, to answer questions.

Catherine Bray asked if the testing vendors would have an Application Programming Interface (API) connection with TEA and whether the TEA Commissioner would determine which vendors would be used for grades 1–3. Magali confirmed this, explaining that TEA is soliciting new vendors and expanding requirements to include numeracy alongside literacy. Vendors must comply with API requirements similar to those for existing prekindergarten (PK) and kindergarten (KG) assessment vendors, and TEA will only accept data from approved vendors.

Catherine asked when the approved vendors will be released. Magali stated that communications will go out within the next month, outlining timelines, implementation requirements, and the deadline for LEAs to have an approved vendor in place. Catherine also asked whether approved vendors will be free or have standard pricing. Magali explained that the statute requires TEA to negotiate pricing with vendors, similar to PK vendor arrangements, and that TEA will provide a list of pricing for LEAs.

Jamie Muffoletto thanked members for their input and encouraged them to email any additional questions promptly so TEA can address them. Jamie noted that another ITF meeting will be scheduled within the next two weeks to revisit this topic.

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 11:58 a.m.

ITF Meeting: January 28, 2026

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
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.
 - 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

PCPEI Discussion:

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

PCPEI Action:

Jay Young made a motion to approve the proposal.

Deanna Harris 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.

Other Business – PCPEI

Discussion Item

PCPEI Upcoming Meetings

April 28, 2026

PCPEI Adjournment:

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

Judd Marshall made a motion to adjourn.
Eric Combs seconded the motion.

Vote: Passed.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:29 a.m.