Policy Committee on Public Education Information Meeting Minutes

Tuesday July 23, 2013

William B, Travis Building, Room **3-102 & Webinar**
1701 N. Congress Avenue, Austin, Texas 78701
10:00am – 2:00 p.m.

Members Via Webinar: Mary Ann Whiteker, Paul Clore, Robert Muller, Terry Driscoll, David McKamie
(Information Task Force), Mark White, Bobby Azam, Judi Sparks (alternate), Janet Spurgin,
Mary Beth Matula

Others Attending: Melody Parrish, Bryce Templeton, Terri Hanson, Tessie Bryant, Candice DeSantis, Kelly
Callaway, Julie Wayman, Mike Peebles, Kelly Kravitz, Jeanine Helms

1. **Call to Order:** Mary Ann Whitaker called the meeting to order at 10:07 AM

2. **June 4, 2013 PCPEI Meeting Minutes**

Mary Ann Whitaker introduced the minutes from the June 4, 2013 PCPEI meeting and asked if there was any
discussion. Paul Clore moved to adopt and Robert Muller seconded the motion. The motion carried and the
minutes were adopted by the committee.

3. **ITF Report to the PCPEI Committee**

David McKamie, Information Task Force (ITF) Vice Chair, presented the ITF Report July 16, 2013 for the ITF
meeting. David summarized each of the business items and the corresponding ITF recommendations. The
PCPEI committee discussed and/or voted on each business item as noted below.

Information Task Force (ITF) Report to the
Policy Committee on Public Education Information (PCPEI)
For the July 23, 2013 ITF meeting

Part A: Summary of the ITF Business from the July 16, 2013 meeting

1. Addition of the Dyslexia Indicator Code for Legacy PEIMS **Action Item**

Candice DeSantis presented a proposal to the committee to begin collecting a new data element Dyslexia
Indicator Code. The Texas Education Agency is now required to collect through the Public Education
Information Management System for the 2013-2014 school year, data on students who are identified as
dyslexic or with a related dyslexia order per HB 1264. The information that is required is proposed for

collection in the fall submission only as there is not a stated or implied requirement to collect the Dyslexia information more than once per school year.

The dyslexia data collection requirement does not appear to contain any requirement to further define the kind of dyslexic student and therefore can be collected using the C088 (Yes/No) code table.

Due to the fact that school districts and charter schools are already charged with academic services responsibilities for students identified with dyslexia or related disorders, the ability and mechanisms necessary to identify dyslexic students should already exist at the local level. Therefore, the mandated addition of this data element to the PEIMS data collection system for the 2013-2014 school year should not be an excessive burden on schools.

This new Data Element would be added to the 110 Student Enrollment record for the Fall collection.

ITF Discussion

David McKamie asked if we needed to differentiate as two different codes as dyslexia or related disorders. Kelly Callaway stated that it is too difficult to label the different forms of dyslexia and therefore it is not necessary to distinguish the different forms of dyslexia in a code table. Nancy Dunnam suggested adding that verbiage to the Data Standards and Kelly stated she would be willing to add the part of the statute that says it is required. Keitha Ivey asked if these included students being served with dyslexia or having dyslexia. Kelly stated that this would include students identified as having dyslexia regardless if they are receiving services. Kelly reiterated this is a count of students identified with dyslexia. It was determined it is up to the district personnel to determine if the student has dyslexia. Kelly Callaway stated that in most districts, dyslexia services is an arm of the reading department, but in some districts the special education staff are responsible for dyslexic identification and services.

ITF Recommendation

The ITF Committee made a recommendation to approve adding the new data element Dyslexia Indicator Code to the 110 Student Enrollment record as presented for the 2013-2014 school year.

PCPEI Discussion

None.

PCPEI Action

Motion: Paul Clore made a motion to approve adding the new data element Dyslexia Indicator Code to the 110 Student Enrollment record as presented for the 2013-2014 school year. The motion was seconded by Terry Driscoll.

Vote: The motion passed unanimously.

2. Addition of the Foster Care Indicator Code for Legacy PEIMS   Action Item

Candice DeSantis presented a proposal to the ITF committee to, as stated in SB 833, begin collecting foster care status for all students. The data collection for this new requirement will be effected by adding a new data element to be called Foster Care Indicator Code (E1528). This element will capture the information needed for both the Pre-Kindergarten foster care eligibility requirement as well as the latest requirement for collecting the foster care status of all students.

The new FOSTER-CARE-INDICATOR-CODE (E1528) indicates whether a student is in the conservatorship of the Department of Family and Protective Services (DFPS) currently, or for certain students that were previously in the conservatorship of DFPS.

The proposal deletes the current PK-FOSTER-CARE-INDICATOR-CODE from the 110 Student Enrollment record and adds a new universal FOSTER-CARE-INDICATOR-CODE to the 102 Student Demographic record.

A new code table will also be added that will allow the State Funding program area and the Foster Care Program area of TEA to

0 - Student is not in the conservatorship of the Department of Family and Protective Services

1 - Student is in the conservatorship of the Department of Family and Protective Services

2 - Pre-kindergarten student was previously in the conservatorship of the Department of Family and Protective Services following an adversary hearing held as provided by Section 262.201, Family Code.

3 - Student since the age of 13 was previously in the conservatorship of the Texas DFPS.
This code is for the purposes of college planning outreach, and information on financial assistance available to former foster care students.

The data would be collected in submission 1 and 3 only.

A chart is included with the reporting instructions to assist schools in understanding the age and grade levels that should be associated with each Foster Care Indicator Code.

Chart for determining Foster Care Indicator Code

Foster Care Indicator Code	Student Age	Student Grade level	Student Foster Care Status
0	Any	Any	Student is not in the conservatorship of the Department of Family and Protective Services
1	Any	Any	Student is currently in the conservatorship of the Department of Family and Protective Services
2	3 or 4 on September 1	PK	Pre-kindergarten student was previously in the conservatorship of the Department of Family and Protective Services following an adversary hearing held as provided by Section 262.201, Family Code.
3	13 or older	Any applicable	Student since the age of 13 was previously in the conservatorship of the Texas DFPS.

ITF Discussion
A request was made to update the Foster Care chart to include PK with EE, K-12 for code 1. Bryce Templeton stated we would make that change. Keitha Ivey asked when this data would need to be collected for the student. Julie Wayman responded that the foster care data would need to be collected upon enrollment. Brenda Richmond asked if there was an obtainable list that identified these students; a list from the Department of Family and Protective Services. Julie replied that there currently was not a list and

that the student's caregivers should have a DFPS Form 2085 or a court order to document the foster care status of the child. Julie also noted that once the student was coded as Foster Care they would remain with that status for the remainder of the school year for PEIMS reporting purposes. It was requested that code '0' be updated to 'not currently in'. Nancy Dunnam asked how the district would know if there were any change to the status for code '3'. Julie stated that each district is required to have a Foster Care liaison and this person would be responsible for setting the codes. Keitha asked if TREx would be able to transfer this information. Bryce stated that according to Glenn Shelton TREx would be updated in the next release to accommodate this new data element.

Peggy Sullivan asked if the age 13 associated with code '3' was determined by their age as of snapshot. Bryce replied that age 13 is literal; Since the student had turned 13 years of age, were they ever in foster care; If a 13 year old or older student is currently in foster care at the time of enrollment, then the student should not be coded as a during that school year. Bryce also stated that the foster care status determination should be part of the enrollment process; however, TEA should not tell schools collect it. Julie agreed with Bryce. Keitha Ivey asked about a list of students and Julie stated that she would check with DFPS to see if that was possible, but as of now, there is not a distributable list of foster care students.

Nancy asked if this data collection could be moved to submission 3 for this first year. It was noted that moving the PK indicator to submission 3 would affect funding. Julie also stated she needed this information for leavers. Bryce Templeton stated that if the new foster care collection was delayed to start in the summer collection of 2013-2014, that the PK Foster Care Code would have to remain in the fall collection for 2013-2014 and then schools would still have to report the universal foster status of students back to their first day of enrollment in the 2013-2014 school year.

Julie and Kelly Kravitz agreed to meet with Bryce and Candice in the afternoon to discuss a possible solution to code '3' and revise the data collection proposal with all of the requested changes. Nancy asked that this item be reviewed between the PEIMS staff and the program area and changes to be sent to the ITF committee members for an email vote.

ITF Recommendation

This item was tabled and items will be re-sent for an email vote.

TEA staff met with the Texas Department of Family and Protective Services and reached consensus on what data should be collected and then sent a revised proposal to the committee on July 17, 2013.

The revised proposal included the following provisions.

1. **The FOSTER-CARE-INDICATOR-CODE (E1528) indicates whether a student is in the conservatorship of the Department of Family and Protective Services (DFPS) currently, or for certain students that were previously in the conservatorship of DFPS.**

2. **The FOSTER-CARE-INDICATOR-CODE code table C196 contains the following codes:**

   0 - Student is not in the conservatorship of the Department of Family and Protective Services

   1 - Student is in the conservatorship of the Department of Family and Protective Services

   2 - Pre-kindergarten student was previously in the conservatorship of the Department of Family and Protective Services following an adversary hearing held as provided by Section 262.201, Family Code.

   3 - Grade 9-12 student was previously in the conservatorship of the Texas DFPS, or a child protective agency in another state (anytime since the age of 13 or was adopted from foster care since 2009), as reported to the school by the parent, for the purpose of college planning outreach, and information on financial assistance.

   (Code 3 is solely for the purposes of meeting statutory obligations to outreach and assist eligible students with college planning and accessing additional financial assistance.)

3. The business rules and reporting requirements are as follows:

   The Foster Care Indicator Code is reported in fall and summer and extended year submissions

(submissions 1, 3, and 4). The data is needed in submission 4 to comply with TEC 25.007 concerning the Agency's legislative requirement to facilitate access to credit recovery, high school completion, and dual credit programs.

Refer to the Student Attendance Accounting Handbook Pre-kindergarten section 7.2.6 for additional information and documentation concerning pre-kindergarten foster care student eligibility.

The following link http://www.tea.state.tx.us/FosterCareStudentSuccess provides additional information related to the foster care provisions, resources, and opportunities for LEAs.

Documentation required for a school to report a student as a Foster Care student is as follows:
For Foster Care Indicator Code 0, no documentation is required because the student is not in the conservatorship of the Texas DFPS when enrolling in the school.

For Foster Care Indicator Code 1, for students who are grade levels other than pre-kindergarten, the enrolling caregiver must provide a copy of the Texas DFPS Form 2085 or a court order that designates the student is in the conservatorship of the Department of Family and Protective Services.

For Foster Care Indicator Code 2, the student is enrolling in school for the purpose of participating as an eligible student in a pre-kindergarten program, and at least annually, the Texas DFPS and Child Protective Services mail verification letters of PK eligibility to the parents and caregivers of eligible children who in turn provide this verification documentation to the school at enrollment.

For Foster Care Indicator Code 3, use this code when during the school enrollment process the parent/guardian reports that the Grade 9-12 student was previously in the conservatorship of the Texas DFPS, or a child protective agency in another state (anytime since the age of 13 or was adopted from foster care since 2009), as reported to the school by the parent, for the purpose of college planning outreach, and information on financial assistance. (This code is solely for the purposes of college planning and accessing additional financial assistance.)

Districts are encouraged to input this data into local systems so that the data can be used by school personnel for transition assistance, service provision, academic support services, and postsecondary planning that are statutorily required for students in foster care.

Foster care status data should be handled with the utmost sensitivity, and in accordance with all FERPA guidelines.

Chart for determining Foster Care Indicator Code

Foster Care Indicator Code	Student Age	Student Grade level	Student Foster Care Status
0	Any	Any	Student is not in the conservatorship of the Department of Family and Protective Services
1	Any	Any	Student is currently in the conservatorship of the Department of Family and Protective Services
2	3 or 4 on September 1	PK	Pre-kindergarten student was previously in the conservatorship of the Department of Family and Protective Services following an adversary hearing held as provided by Section 262.201, Family Code.
3	Any	9-12	Grade 9-12 student was previously in the conservatorship of the Texas DFPS, or a child protective agency in another state (anytime since the age of 13 or was adopted from foster care since 2009), as reported to the school by the parent, for the purpose of college planning outreach, and information on financial assistance.

The ITF committee members voted to approve this data collection proposal for the Foster Care Indicator Code with the following results and comments:

ITF Member	Vote	Comments
Kim O'Leary	For	None
Dianne Borreson	For	None
Tom Priem	For	None
Beverly Meyer	For	I am voting Yes for both items, but concur with the statements made by Nancy and David.
Keitha Ivey	For	I like Nancy's statement. Also, I think regions should be given a heads up so districts can amend their enrollment packets.
Adrian Garcia	For	I also agree with Nancy and David that the timing will definitely impact the data quality.
Patty Streat	For	From a district's perspective I have already questioned the appropriate people in our district in order to find out who will collect this data and how it gets coded in our SIS. It would have been nice to have some time to plan and train our staff and yes our registration packets are already assembled and ready to go, so this will have to be an additional questionnaire I suppose.

I'm not really sure how we will go about finding these students that may have been adopted since 2009 since we don't have them flagged in any way. We will do our best and as always we find a way to collect the data because it's what the state requires, but I agree with David and Nancy as to the validity and quality of the data we are collecting in such a short period of time. |
Nancy Dunnam	Abstain	Since these items are being presented to the ITF without adhering to the required implementation timelines, the ITF cannot vote to "recommend" the implementation of changes for the 2013-2014 school year, giving programmers and districts one month to implement the requirements. However, if the state is going to implement the changes by August 2013, I support the proposed guidelines. I too agree with David's comments.
Debbie Largent	For	I agree with David and Nancy and here's my vote.
Brenda Padalecki	For	I agree with Nancy and David's statements 100%.
Aaron Daitz	For	I also agree with David. My only concern is if we delay collecting the data until the Summer submission, does this still comply with the Legislature? Did the Legislature specify when the data has to be collected or anytime during the 2013-14 school year would be sufficient?
Peggy Sullivan	For	From a district perspective --- I did manage to find out who our foster liaison is! Yay me! Foster data: We are going to look into the possibility of DFPS giving us the data to enter. Military: we will have to incorporate it into our enrollment packets, which, by the way, have already been assembled. And if DFPS can't provide the foster data to us, we will include it in our enrollment packets, too. Dyslexia: Already collected.

I agree with what David and Nancy had to say. |
| Dara Fuller | For | I agree with what David and Nancy had to say. |
| David McKamie | For | Nancy I like your statement. As my personal preference I would even add to it the statement that the validity and quality of the data collected and reported in the Fall submission under this |

		timeline may suffer and be suspect due to the short lead time. I do think your statement gives me a way to somewhat represent what would be the majority opinion of most districts and superintendents if they were polled on these requirements/timelines. Yet, still as a committee perform a much needed roll in giving input and supporting TEA who has the difficult task of making this happen. I also think this statement helps pass up to PCPEI our concerns about the timelines. So, I think I can say Yes in regards that I support TEAs method and effort to come up with a very quick solution on something they have been ordered to do. At the same time I am prefacing it with concerns on bypassing implementation guidelines, concerns on data quality, concerns on vendor response, and concerns on hardships placed on district/campus staff to get training, obtain understanding, collect the data, and report it on such a quick turnaround.

13 ITF members voted "For" the Foster Care Indicator Code and 1 member abstained from the vote. Comments are included with each member's vote.

PCPEI Discussion

Melody Parrish stated this was going to be a soft launch for the 13-14 school year. Mary Ann Whitaker asked for clarification for code 3. It was stated that if the student was 13 and were in foster care but no longer then the student would be coded as 3; however, if the student is 16 and currently in foster care they would be coded as a 1. It was also stated that TREx will be updated as parents may not provide the information. Kelly Kravitz gave addition purpose to code 3. The foster care students need guidance when filling out the FAFSA as being foster care may make the student eligible for free tuition at a public Texas college.   Mary Beth Matula asked if the student needed to be 13 while in foster care to be eligible for benefits and they answer was yes. Mary Ann mentioned that age 13 needed to be stressed. Mary Beth also asked if the student was 10 in foster care and no longer then code 3 and the answer was no.

PCPEI Action

Motion: Robert Muller made a motion to approve the foster care indicator code proposal as presented for the 2013-2014 school year. The motion was seconded by Mark White.

Vote: The motion passed unanimously.

3. Addition of the Military Connect Student Indicator Code for Legacy PEIMS   **Action Item**

Candice DeSantis presented a proposal to the ITF committee, as stated in SB 525, to begin collecting military connected student data. The data collection for this new requirement will be effected by adding a new data element.

The Military Connected Student Code (E1529) indicates whether a student, enrolled in a school district or open-enrollment charter school, is a dependent of a member of the United States military service in the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard on active duty, the Texas National Guard, or a reserve force of the United States military. This new data element will capture the information needed for both the Pre-Kindergarten military eligibility requirement as well as the latest requirement for collecting the military connected status of all students.

The data collection proposal deletes current PK-MILITARY-INDICATOR-CODE from the 110 Student Enrollment record and adds a new data element, MILITARY-CONNECTED-STUDENT-CODE, to the PEIMS 102 Student Data.

A new code table, MILITARY-CONNECTED-STUDENT-CODE, is added to capture the Military Connected status of each student. The codes are as follows:
0 - Not a military-connected student

1 - Student is a dependent of a member of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard on Active Duty

2 - Student is a dependent of a member of the Texas National Guard (Army, Air Guard, or State Guard)

3 - Student is a dependent of a member of a reserve force in the United States military (Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard)

4 - Pre-kindergarten student is the child/dependent of a uniformed service member who is "Missing in Action" (MIA)

5 - Pre-kindergarten student is a dependent of an active duty uniformed member of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, or activated/mobilized uniformed member of the Texas National Guard (Army, Air Guard, or State Guard) who was injured or killed while serving on active duty.

The Military Connected Student data would be collected in submissions 1 and 3 only.

ITF Discussion

ITF asked if the Missing in Action code could be groups with codes 1, 2, and 3. Bryce Templeton stated that he would contact the program area for an answer. If the Missing in Action code represents persons who are still considered to on active duty, then TEA would delete it from the code table. Nancy Dunnam asked if this data would be collected upon enrollment. Bryce stated that this data would be collected upon enrollment and would be reported at the end of the year with the student's last status. Nancy also recommended the Submissions be included in the Business Requirements as they currently state the 102 Student Data record is required for submissions 1, 3, & 4 and the new data element is only required for submissions 1 & 3.

ITF Recommendation

The ITF Committee made a recommendation to approve the proposal to add MILITARY-CONNECTED-STUDENT-CODE to the 102 Student Data record as presented with recommendations.

TEA agreed to send out a revised document with the requested changes for the committee to review and approve by email vote with the Military Connected Student action item.

The ITF committee members voted to approve this data collection proposal for the Military Connected Student Code with the following results and comments:

ITF Member	Vote	Comments
Kim O'Leary	For	None
Dianne Borreson	For	None
Tom Priem	For	None
Beverly Meyer	For	I am voting Yes for both items, but concur with the statements made by Nancy and David.
Keitha Ivey	For	I like Nancy's statement. Also, I think regions should be given a heads up so districts can amend their enrollment packets.
Adrian Garcia	For	I also agree with Nancy and David that the timing will definitely impact the data quality.
Patty Streat	For	From a district's perspective I have already questioned the appropriate people in our district in order to find out who will collect this data and how it gets coded in our SIS. It would have been nice to have some time to plan and train our staff and yes our registration packets are already assembled and ready to go, so this will have to be an additional questionnaire I suppose. I'm not really sure how we will go about finding these students that may have been adopted since 2009 since we don't have them flagged in any way. We will do our best and as always we find a way to collect the data because it's what the state requires, but I agree with David and Nancy as to the validity and quality of the data we are collecting in such a short period of time.
Nancy Dunnam	Abstain	Since these items are being presented to the ITF without adhering to the required implementation timelines, the ITF cannot vote to "recommend" the implementation of changes for the 2013-2014 school year, giving programmers and districts one month to implement the requirements. However, if the state is going to implement the changes by August 2013, I support the proposed guidelines. I too agree with David's comments.
Debbie Largent	For	I agree with David and Nancy and here's my vote.
Brenda Padalecki	For	I agree with Nancy and David's statements 100%.
Aaron Daitz	For	I also agree with David. My only concern is if we delay collecting the data until the Summer submission, does this still comply with the Legislature? Did the Legislature specify when the data has to be collected or anytime during the 2013-14 school year would be sufficient?
Peggy Sullivan	For	From a district perspective --- I did manage to find out who our foster liaison is! Yay me! Foster data: We are going to look into the possibility of DFPS giving us the data to enter. Military: we will have to incorporate it into our enrollment packets, which, by the way, have already been assembled. And if DFPS can't provide the foster data to us, we will include it in our enrollment packets, too. Dyslexia: Already collected. I agree with what David and Nancy had to say.
Dara Fuller	For	I agree with what David and Nancy had to say.
David McKamie	For	Nancy I like your statement. As my personal preference I would even add to it the statement that the validity and quality of the data collected and reported in the Fall submission under this timeline may suffer and be suspect due to the short lead time. I do think your statement gives me a way to somewhat represent what would be the majority opinion of most districts and

		superintendents if they were polled on these requirements/timelines. Yet, still as a committee perform a much needed roll in giving input and supporting TEA who has the difficult task of making this happen. I also think this statement helps pass up to PCPEI our concerns about the timelines. So, I think I can say Yes in regards that I support TEAs method and effort to come up with a very quick solution on something they have been ordered to do. At the same time I am prefacing it with concerns on bypassing implementation guidelines, concerns on data quality, concerns on vendor response, and concerns on hardships placed on district/campus staff to get training, obtain understanding, collect the data, and report it on such a quick turnaround.

13 ITF members voted "For" the Military Connected Student Code and 1 member abstained from the vote. Comments are included with each member's vote.

PCPEI Discussion

Robert Muller asked which code is used if more than one code applies to the student. Bryce Templeton stated that the active duty option would apply because of the Military Impact clause. Robert asked for more clarification when more than on code applies to a student. It was stated that code 4 sounded a bit redundant to code 1 because of the 'or' statement and that it needed to be clarified. Bryce stated that he clarified the meaning with school finance. Mary Ann asked Bryce to get clarification on multiple military codes applying to students and Bryce stated he would get clarification.

PCPEI Action

Motion: Robert Muller made a motion to approve the Military Connected proposal as presented for the 2013-2014 school year. The motion was seconded by Terry Driskoll

Vote: The motion passed unanimously.

4. Addition of the Dyslexia, Foster Care, and Military Connected Student Code for TSDS TEDS

Action Item

Tessie Bryant presented a proposal to add the DYSLEXIA-INDICATOR-CODE, FOSTER-CARE-INDICATOR-CODE, and MILITARY-CONNECTED-STUDENT-CODE to the StudentExtension Complex Type in the TSDS Texas Education Data Standards. Tessie illustrated the following changes to the Texas Education Data Standards:

This proposal is to modify the TX-StudentCharacteristics Complex Type as follows:

- **Delete the following data elements:**
    - E1038 PK-MILITARY-INDICATOR-CODE
    - E1041 PK-FOSTER-CARE-INDICATOR-CODE
- **Add the following data elements :**
    - E1528 FOSTER-CARE-INDICATOR-CODE
    - E1529 MILITARY-CONNECTED-STUDENT-CODE
    - E1530 DYSLEXIA-INDICATOR-CODE

ITF Discussion

None.

ITF Recommendation

The ITF Committee made a recommendation to approve the modification of the StudentExtension Complex Type as presented with updates as documented in Legacy Data Standards data collection proposals for the Military Connected Student Code and the Foster Care Indicator Code.

PCPEI Discussion

None.

PCPEI Action

Motion: Paul Clore made a motion to approve the modification of the StudentExtensionComplex Type as presented with updates as documented in Legacy Data Standards data collection proposals for the Military Connected Student Code and the Foster Care Indicator Code. The motion was seconded by Robert Muller

Vote: The motion passed unanimously.

4. **Changes to TSDS Texas Education Data Standards**   **Discussion Item**

Tessie Bryant presented modifications that were made to the Texas Education Data Standards. It was determined during review and testing of the TSDS system that the data standards documentation did not reflect how to report certain data elements. The following elements have been documented in the

In further review and testing of student data for the PEIMS Summer Collection, the documentation did not reflect how to report the following data elements.

Student Special Ed Program Data
We had discussed how to collect in our prior discussions, but the documentation was not updated.
- E0794 SPECIAL-ED-INDICATOR
- E0041 PRIMARY-DISABILITY-CODE
- E0882 MULTIPLY-DISABLED-INDICATOR-CODE

Student Attendance Data
The following data elements have been added to the BasicReportingPeriodAttendanceExtension Complex Type because it affected the LEA's funding.
- E1079 PRIMARY-PK-FUNDING-SOURCE
- E1080 SECONDARY-PK-FUNDING-SOURCE
- E1078 PK-PROGRAM-TYPE-CODE

ITF Discussion
None.

PCPEI Discussion

None.

4. **Next PCPEI Meeting**

The next PCPEI meetings. The November 5 will be a webinar meeting due to Election Day.

Committee	Meeting Date	Meeting Time	Meeting Location
PCPEI	October 1, 2013	10 a.m. – 2 p.m.	TEA - TBD
PCPEI	November 5, 2013	10 a.m. – 2 p.m.	TEA - Webinar
PCPEI	February 4, 2014	10 a.m. – 2 p.m.	TEA - TBD
PCPEI	June 3, 2014	10 a.m. – 2 p.m.	TEA - TBD

5. **Adjournment**

Mary Ann Whitaker adjourned the PCPEI Meeting at 11:12pm.