


<p><b>Members:</b>  Nancy Dunnam, Chair  David McKamie, Vice Chair  Diane Borreson  Aaron Daitz  Belinda Dyer  Dara Fuller  Adrian Garcia  Keitha Ivey  Beverly Meyer  Debbie Largent  Kim O'Leary  Brenda Padalecki  Tom Priem  Linda Roska  Janet Spurgin  Patty Streat  Peggy Sullivan</p>	 <p><b>Texas Education Agency  Information Task Force (ITF)  Meeting Minutes  October 22, 2013</b></p> <p>10:00 AM to 12:00 PM  William B Travis Bldg.  Hosted in 3-102  Webinar Meeting</p>	
<p><b>Members attending:</b></p>	<p><i>Nancy Dunnam, David McKamie, Aaron Daitz, Belinda Dyer, Tom Priem, Adrian Garcia, Brenda Padalecki, Linda Roska, and Patty Streat</i></p>	
<p><b>Members attending via Webinar:</b></p>	<p><i>Dianne Borreson, Keitha Ivey, Debbie Largent, Kim O'Leary, and Peggy Sullivan</i></p>	
<p><b>Alternates attending via Webinar:</b></p>	<p><i>Judi Sparks and Brenda Richmond</i></p>	
<p><b>Others Attending:</b></p>	<p><i>Melody Parrish, Terri Hanson, Bryce Templeton, Candice DeSantis, Tessie Bryant, Fernando Garcia, Christina Matheny, Priscilla Flores, Scott Johnson, Mark Stehouwer, Nina Taylor, and Oklahoma Department of Education (Autumn Daves and Colleen Flory)</i></p>	
<p><b>Call the Meeting to Order:</b>  Nancy Dunnam called ITF meeting to order at 10:00 AM.</p>	<p><b>Nancy Dunnam, ITF Chair</b></p>	
<p><b>Approval of the July 16, 2013 ITF Meeting Minutes</b>  Nancy Dunnam introduced the minutes from the July 16, 2013 ITF Meeting and asked for any needed corrections. Having no corrections offered, Nancy Dunnam called for a motion to accept the minutes as presented.  Peggy Sullivan made a motion to approve the July 16, 2013 ITF Meeting Minutes as presented. Aaron Daitz seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.</p>	<p><b>Action Item</b></p>	
<p><b>ITF Committee Membership and Operating Procedures Reminder</b>  Terri Hanson introduced the Oklahoma Department of Education (DOE) as Texas Education Agency (TEA) guests attending the ITF meeting via webinar. She stated that the Oklahoma DOE is in the process of developing and implementing a data governance process and was invited to observe the TEA governance process in action starting with the first phase at an ITF meeting. The Oklahoma DOE will be invited to attend the Policy Committee on Public Education Information (PCPEI) committee meeting on November 5, 2013 to observe the second phase of the TEA governance process.  Bryce Templeton then reviewed the ITF committee membership rules and a few operating procedures with the ITF members. Bryce reminded the ITF that the only persons allowed to attend the ITF meetings are the ITF members that were appointed by the PCPEI committee, the alternate ITF members that are selected by the ITF member organization, the TEA staff that facilitate and support the ITF meeting process, and the</p>	<p><b>Discussion Item</b></p>	

<p>other TEA program area staff that are invited to present the ITF business items for data collections related to their department.</p> <p>Bryce also stated that only one vote can be counted for each business item for each member organization. The ITF members can vote on the action business items and if the ITF member alternate is attending with the ITF member, only the member can vote. The alternate for an ITF member is permitted to vote in the absence of the ITF member.</p> <p>ITF meetings are offered by webinar about half of the time to reduce the travel burden and to allow the ITF members the ability to attend the meetings remotely when they cannot travel to the TEA offices for a meeting.</p> <p>Bryce concluded this item by reminding the members that they are allowed to consult with staff from their organization regarding the business items are in process, but that once the ITF makes a recommendation to approve an item, they cannot share that information with anyone pending the outcome of the additional governance process steps. Until the items approved by the ITF are approved by the PCPEI and then by the TEA Data Governance Board and then published in the Data Standards publications, disclosure of these items is not permitted. A reporting requirement that is approved by the ITF is not an official requirement until the item has been successfully routed through the whole data governance process.</p> <p><b><u>ITF Discussion</u></b></p> <p>None.</p>	
<p><b>At Risk Indicator Code</b></p> <p>Candice DeSantis presented a proposal to the ITF committee to amend the definition of the At-Risk Indicator Code, PEIMS element E0919. During the 2013 legislative session, House Bill 5 was passed and Section 20 of the bill amends TEC 29.081 to revise the At-Risk definition to include “the students under the age of 26”. The revision increases the maximum age that a student can be reported as at-risk from 20 to 25 years old. TEA is proposing that for the 2014-2015 school year, the Legacy PEIMS Data Standards be amended such that the At-Risk Indicator Code (E0919) is updated to allow the expanded population to be reported. As a result of this change, TEA would also need to update two fatal edits, 1102A and 11070, to include “students under the age of 26”.</p> <p>For the current year, 2013-2014, TEA has downgraded edit 1102A to a special warning to allow the districts to report students that are under the age of 26 as at-risk.</p> <p><b><u>Discussion</u></b></p> <p>Nancy Dunnam requested that an update to the EDIT+ message board to notify the districts of the change the edit and to state something like “1102A that was downgraded to a special warning for the 2013-2014 school year”. Bryce Templeton and Candice DeSantis agreed to post this change to the EDIT+ message board. David McKamie asked if TEA knew why this change was made by the legislature to the At-Risk Indicator Code. Belinda Dyer responded that the districts are allowed funding for students up to age 25 and that this change brings the At-Risk definition into alignment with the funding eligibility range.</p> <p><b><u>ITF Recommendation</u></b></p> <p>Adrian Garcia made a motion to change the At-Risk Indicator Code definition to increase the maximum age limits for categorizing students as at-risk from 20 to 25 years old beginning in the 2014-2015 school year. Aaron Daitz seconded the motion.</p> <p>Motion passed unanimously.</p>	<p><b>Discussion Item</b></p>

Clarification on Expelling Students Under 10 Years of Age in Appendix E							Discussion Item		
<p>Candice DeSantis presented a proposal to the ITF committee to clarify the rules concerning the expulsion of students under the age of 10 years old. Candice illustrated that the TEC 37.007 (h) that with the exception of a student bringing a firearm to school, a student who is younger than 10 years of age may not be expelled from school. Specifically, this means that a student under the age of 10 years old may not be subjected to an expulsion hearing. TEA is proposing to modify the 2017-2015 PEIMS Data Standards to reinforce the rules related to expelling students who are under the age of 10.</p> <p>TEA is proposing the following changes:</p> <p><u>New Reporting Requirement for the PEIMS 425 Record Business Rules and Reporting Requirements:</u></p> <p><b>Excerpt for the reason of “bringing a firearm to school”, a student who is younger than 10 years of age may not be expelled for engaging in conduct described in TEC 37.007. Students who are less than 10 years of age and commit an otherwise expellable offense may be placed to a DAEP via a DAEP conference hearing in lieu of an expulsion hearing. Students under the age of 10 who bring a firearm to school must be expelled with placement to a DAEP.</b></p> <p><u>Appendix E – Additional Information Related to Discipline – Question 9</u></p> <p><b>What is the minimum age that a student can be expelled?</b></p> <p><b>Old Answer:</b></p> <p><i>Under TEC 37.007(a), (d), (e), and (h), students who are at least 10 years of age on the date that an offense is committed, <b>must be expelled from their regular education setting</b> for a time period that is determined by local Student Code of Conduct. The only exception is that TEC 37.007(e) requires that students who bring a firearm to school be expelled for a minimum of one year. The school administrator designated must first establish a reasonable belief that the act has been committed and then corroborate and/or document that belief with appropriate law enforcement officials.</i></p> <p><i>Students who are less than 10 years of age and commit an expellable offense must be expelled with placement to a DAEP.</i></p> <p><b>New Answer:</b></p> <p><i>Under TEC 37.007(a), (d), and (h), and (h), and 37.007(f) students who are younger than 10 years of age on the date that an offense is committed, and have committed a mandatory expellable offense other than bringing a firearm to school, must be placed in a DAEP for a period of time that is determined by the campus administrator.</i></p> <p><i>Under TEC 37.007(e),(student brings a firearm to school), students who are younger than 10 years of age on the date that an offense is committed, must be expelled and placed in a DAEP for a minimum term of one year, unless the expulsion term is reduced after the expulsion order was issued by the campus administrator.</i></p>									
42588 <b>*NEW</b>	44425 -0062	If a student's age as of DATE-OF-DISCIPLINARY-ACTION is less than 10 and DISCIPLINARY-ACTION-REASON-CODE is “12”, “14”, “16-19”, “29-32”, “36”, “37”, “46”, “47”, “48”, or “57, then there should be a 425 record where DISCIPLINARY-ACTION-CODE is “07”, “08”, “10”, “27”, “28”, “54”, “55”, or “57”.	S W	3		X	X	X	

		For reasons other than “bringing a gun to school”, if a student is less than 10 years old on the date a mandatory expellable incident occurred then they cannot legally be expelled and will generally be assigned to a DAEP in lieu of an expulsion assignment.							
42589 <b>*NEW</b>	44425 -0062	If a student's age as of DATE-OF-DISCIPLINARY-ACTION is less than 10 and DISCIPLINARY-ACTION-REASON-CODE is “11”, then there should be a 425 record where DISCIPLINARY-ACTION-CODE is “03”, “04”, “52”, or “53”.	S W	3		X	X	X	
		If a student, who is less than 10 years old, brings a firearm to school, they must be expelled with placement to a DAEP.							

**ITF Discussion**

Nancy Dunnam asked how TEA was planning to deal with this issue for the current 2013-2014 school year. Bryce Templeton stated that with a recommendation from the ITF committee, question 9 in Appendix E could be updated in the 2013-2014 PEIMS Data Standards to reflect the revision presented above and that would be the only changes made to the PEIMS Data Standards for the current school year.

**ITF Recommendation**

Peggy Sullivan made a motion to modify the 2014-2015 PEIMS Data Standards to: 1. Add the new reporting requirement and 2. Revise the “question 9 answer” in Appendix E, and 3. Add two new edits to notify schools when an expulsion of a student under the age of 10 years old has been reported, to reinforce the rules for not expelling students who are under the age of 10. Tom Priem seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

The committee also made a recommendation that TEA update Appendix E for the 2013-2014 school year to reflect the revised answer to the question regarding the expulsion of students under the age of ten years old.

**Clarification of Minimum Age for Truancy Disciplinary Action Reason Codes 43 and 44 on PEIMS Code Table**

**Action Item**

Candice DeSantis presented a proposal to the ITF committee to modify Disciplinary Action Reason Codes 43 and 44 in the PEIMS code table C165 – Disciplinary Action Reason Code and the explanations for the same in Appendix E.

**PEIMS Code Table C165 – Disciplinary Action Reason Code (Current)**

43	Truancy (failure to attend school) – Student with at least 3 unexcused absences – TEC 25.094
44	Truancy (failure to attend school) – Student with 10 unexcused absences – TEC 25.094

In a recent legislative session, Texas Education Code 25.094 was revised to establish a minimum age for which a school could specifically file truancy charges against a student.

TEC 25.094 was amended to specify that students under the age of 12 cannot be charged as being truant. Prior to a student turning age 12, truancy issues with a student must be handled by filing truancy charges against a parent or guardian of the student.

TEA is proposing that the truancy codes in the PEIMS code table C165 and in Appendix E be modified for the 2014-2015 school year as follows:

**Current PEIMS Code Table C165 – Disciplinary Action Reason Codes**

43	Truancy (failure to attend school) – Student with at least 3 unexcused absences – TEC 25.094
45	Truancy (failure to attend school) – Student with 10 unexcused absences – TEC 25.094

**Current Appendix E – Definition**

43	<b>Truancy (failure to attend school) – Student with at least 3 unexcused absences – TEC 25.094. Failure to Attend School –</b> (a) An individual commits an offense if the individual: (1) is required to attend school under Section 25.085; and (2) fails to attend school on 10 or more days or parts of days within a six-month period in the same school year or on three or more days or parts of days within a four-week period.
45	<b>Truancy (failure to attend school) – Student with 10 unexcused absences – TEC 25.094. Failure to Attend School –</b> (a) An individual commits an offense if the individual: (1) is required to attend school under Section 25.085; and (2) fails to attend school on 10 or more days or parts of days within a six-month period in the same school year or on three or more days or parts of days within a four-week period.

TEA is proposing that for the 2014-2015 school year that the following changes be made to the truancy codes in PEIMS Code Table C165 and in Appendix E.

**2014-2015 PEIMS Code Table C165 – Disciplinary Action Reason Code**

43	Truancy (failure to attend school) – Student <b>is at least 12 years old</b> with at least 3 unexcused absences – TEC 25.094
44	Truancy (failure to attend school) – Student <b>is at least 12 years old</b> with 10 unexcused absences – TEC 25.094

**2014-2015 Appendix E – Definitions**

43	<b>Truancy (failure to attend school) – Student with at least 3 unexcused absences – TEC 25.094. Failure to Attend School –</b> (a) An individual commits an offense if the individual: (1) <b>is 12 years of age or older and younger than 18 years of age</b> ; (2) is required to attend school under Section 25.085; and (3) fails to attend school on 10 or more days or parts of days within a six-month period in the same school year on three or more days or parts of days within a four-week period.
44	<b>Truancy (failure to attend school) – Student with 10 unexcused absences – TEC 25.094. Failure to Attend School –</b> (a) An individual commits an offense if the individual: (1) <b>is 12 years of age or older and younger than 18 years of age</b> ; (2) is required to attend school under Section 25.085; and (3) fails to attend school on 10 or more days or parts of days within a six-month period in the same school year or on three or more days or parts of days within a four-week period.

<p><b><u>ITF Discussion</u></b></p> <p>Nancy Dunnam asked about if a student is truant for 5 days at age 11 on DATE-OF-DISCIPLINARY-ACTION and is truant for 5 additional days but is now age 12 on the DATE-OF-DISCIPLINARY-ACTION, does the student coded as truant for all 10 days. Priscilla Flores stated that based on the legal interpretation, the student would only be considered truant for 5 days. Nancy Dunnam requested that she would like this specific topic brought back to the committee for the next ITF meeting on January 7, 2014 along with specific guidance on dealing with truancy situations where a student is turning 6 years old as well as when a student is turning 12 years old. Bryce Templeton and Priscilla Flores stated that they would bring this information back to the committee to review at the next ITF meeting on January 7, 2014. ITF recommended an additional example be added to the PEIMS Data Standards to illustrate this scenario.</p> <p><b><u>ITF Recommendation</u></b></p> <p>Tom Priem made a motion to modify the 2014-2015 PEIMS Data Standards to revise the Disciplinary Action Reason Codes 43 and 44 to specify the codes do not apply to students under the age of 12 or over the age of 18, and to include the same exemptions in the expanded definitions of the Disciplinary Action Reason Codes 43 and 44 in Appendix E. Aaron Daitz seconded the motion.</p> <p>Motion passed unanimously.</p>	
<p><b>TSDS Student GPS Dashboards State Assessment</b></p> <p>Terri Hanson presented a proposal to the ITF committee to discuss the loading of state assessment data to the TSDS studentGPS™ Dashboards. TEA is seeking approval for an option to allow TEA to load state assessments on behalf of the LEAs. This would be an optional service for LEAs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pearson is adding Unique ID to STAAR and TELPAS files beginning with the April 2014 5<sup>th</sup> grade &amp; 8<sup>th</sup> grade mathematics and reading administration (that is the first STAAR administration to report in 2014).</li> <li>• <i>If the LEAs select the option for TEA to load the test results on their behalf, TEA will convert the test results files to XML and load the data to the TSDS Operational Data Store (ODS).</i></li> <li>• If the LEA does not select the option for TEA to load the test results on their behalf, the LEA will be responsible for concerting the test results to XML and loading the data to the ODS.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>ITF Discussion</u></b></p> <p>Adrian Garcia asked if the LEAs could “opt out” of this service instead of “opting in” if they wanted to load their own assessment data. Terri Hanson stated that each LEA desiring TEA to load their assessment data for them to the TSDS studentGPS™ Dashboards would have to “opt in” to ensure that TEA had their permission to load the data for them. The “opt in” approval is a yearly option with a new approval required each new school year.</p> <p>David McKamie asked what the benefit was for the LEAs that choose to exercise this option. Terri Hanson stated that any LEA that did not “opt in” to this service would be responsible for converting their assessment data to the XML format and loading the data to the ODS.</p> <p><b><u>ITF Recommendation</u></b></p> <p>Aaron Daitz made a motion to approve an annual renewable option in the TSDS studentGPS™ Dashboards, to allow an LEA to “opt in” and allow TEA to load the LEA state assessment on behalf of the LEA to the TSDS studentGPS™ Dashboards. Brenda Padalecki seconded the motion.</p> <p>The motion passed unanimously.</p>	<p><b>Action Item</b></p>

## Historical Data in the TSDS Dashboards

Terri Hanson presented a proposal to the ITF committee to discuss displaying historical student and staff data in the TSDS studentGPS™ Dashboards. TEA is seeking approval to display historical data for both students and staff in the TSDS studentGPS™ Dashboards.

The historical data could be appearing in the second year of an LEA's participation in the TSDS Dashboards. As LEAs move in to the second year of using the Dashboards, there are several metrics that reflect historical data. TEA needs approval to display the historical data for students and staff from prior years.

Each of the following categories of data must be considered:

- Staff – Teacher Attendance
- Student – Attendance
- Student – Discipline
- Student – Course Transcript
- Student – State Assessments

Terri Hanson presented screenshots of the dashboards and what the historical data would look like to the districts staff members viewing the data. The screenshots consisted of Staff-Teacher Attendance, Student-Attendance, Student-Discipline, Student-Course Transcript, and Student-State Assessments.

### **ITF Discussion**

- Staff – Teacher Attendance

ITF asked how many years of historical data would be available for viewing. Terri Hanson stated that the “dashboards” displays the current year and then four years of historical data.

ITF was concerned about the confidentiality of teacher or staff attendance data related to the Family Medical Leave Act (FMLA). It was stated that this information is only visible to the campus principal and that these persons already had the right to this information.

ITF asked if the historical data would show the attendance of staff by day. Terri Hanson stated that the current year attendance data is shown by calendar format (by day) and that the historical data only shows the total days present at work and total days absent from work. ITF members were concerned that this attendance data for staff would be misleading because the data reveals that a staff person was off campus, but does not disclose the reason why a staff person was off campus.

- Student – Attendance

ITF members were concerned about who would be able to see the historical attendance data for a particular student. Terri Hanson stated that the current teacher(s) at a campus would be able to see the current and historical attendance data of student enrolled in their classes. ITF had additional concerns about a teacher seeing prior year attendance and Terri Hanson stated that a student's attendance was part of the metrics that current teachers of students are allowed to view.

- Student – Discipline

ITF members questioned the legality of teachers seeing historical discipline data for their students. Bryce Templeton stated that currently, a teacher makes a disciplinary referral to the campus administrator and then they may or may not know the disposition of that disciplinary referral. If the student does not return to the teacher's class, the teacher is generally involved in the continued instruction of the student in terms of creating assignments for the student in the disciplinary

<p>setting assigned to the student. Bryce further stated that only campus administrators should know the discipline history of a student s they are allowed to know this information when considering a current disciplinary issue. ITF members were concerned that displaying the discipline history of a student might taint the ability of a student to have a fresh start when being instructed by a new teacher. Other ITF members were concerned that a teacher should know if a student was a safety threat because of past disciplinary incidents. TEC Chapter 37 has provisions to prevent certain students from being returned to a teacher’s class who are believed to be a safety threat to the teachers and others in the class.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Student – Course Transcript</li> </ul> <p>ITF discussed generally the benefits of the Course Transcript data for historical purposes of the TSDS studentGPS™ Dashboards. It was restated that teachers would only be able to see the course transcript history of students that were currently in their classes and that the campus principal would have success to only the course transcript data for the students enrolled on their campus.</p> <p>Brenda Richmond asked for clarification of the historical data in terms of correcting the course transcript data. Scott Johnson stated that the course transcript data is the only historical data that can be corrected in the TSDS studentGPS™. All of the other historical categories of data are sourced from locations that cannot be changed after they are available for loading into the TSDS studentGPS™ Dashboards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Student – State Assessments</li> </ul> <p>ITF discussed the benefits of the Student State Assessments data for historical purposes of the TSDS studentGPS™ Dashboards. It was restated that teachers would only be able to see the assessment history of students that were currently in their classes and that the campus principal would have access to only assessment data for the students enrolled on the campus.</p> <p><b><u>ITF Recommendation</u></b></p> <p>Adrian Garcia made a motion to approve displaying the historical data for Staff-Teacher Attendance, Student-Attendance, Student-Course Transcript, and Student-State Assessment in the TSDS studentGPS™ Dashboards. Aaron DAITZ seconded the motion.</p> <p>Motion passed unanimously.</p>	
<p><b>TSDS Incident Management System (TIMS) Overview</b></p> <p>Terri Hanson presented a proposal to the ITF committee to discuss the TSDS Incident Management System (TIMS). TEA is seeking approval to access the LEAs TSDS data, with permission of the LEA, during the processing of a customer support incident.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All TSDS support requests must be made through the TSDS Incident Management System (TIMS)</li> <li>• Incidents may include questions, problem reports or requests for enhancements/suggestions</li> <li>• An incident may be opened by any TSDS user, a logon to TIMS is not required</li> </ul> <p>Terri presented the different levels of support that the TIMS will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Level 1 – LEA Stewards – Focal Point for User Support Routing and basic Troubleshooting of Application</li> <li>• Level 2 – ESC Champions and MSDF Technical Coaches – 1<sup>st</sup> Escalation Point for Data Anomalies and Use</li> </ul>	<p><b>Action Item</b></p>



- Level 3 – TEA TSDS Support Desk – 2<sup>nd</sup> Escalation Point for Data Anomalies, Application Issues and Use, Resolution of Escalation Path (Application/Systems), and Focal Point for Coordination of Escalation
- Level 4 – TSDS Component Owners – Code Fix, Systems Issues, and Application Maintenance

Terri also stated that this data was required to be FERPA compliant.

Terri then said that TIMS would include a Data use Agreement between LEAs and TEA.

- FERPA gives student access to their education records, an opportunity to seek to have the records amended, and some control over the disclosure of information from the records.
- LEAs have blanket agreements with their ESCs to disclose personally identifiable information (PII) from student education records in accordance with Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA)
- Technical Coaches, TEA analysts nor Component Support analysts have no blanket agreement to view LEA data until an incident is officially escalated.
- Any LEA incident escalated requires the Level 1 (LEA) support analysts to agree to the Data Use Agreement on an incident-by-incident basis
- Level 2 Technical Coaches, Level 3 Support Analysts, and Level 4 Support Analysts can only access data within the EDW for the sole purpose of support the studentGPS™ Dashboards and PEIMS submissions
- Once the incident ticket is closed, the access agreement is terminated
- Support analysts must adhere to specific data use rules
- When the Level 1 (LEA) staff escalates an incident, this confirmation window will appear. The Level 1 staff must confirm in order for escalation to proceed. When the user clicks “Escalate to Level 2” the confirmation is written to the incident record.
- When TSDS Support Analysts work an escalated ticket they must confirm adherence to the TEA TSDS Data Use Agreement and identify the TSDS subsystems that were accessed. The Analyst clicks “Log Data Access” and the confirmation is written to the incident record.
- Data will be used for the sole purpose of resolving the reported incident and no attempt will be made to identify specific individuals.
- If the identity of any student should be discovered inadvertently, then
  - No use will be made of this information, nor will it be shared with anyone else
  - The identifying information will be safeguarded or destroyed
- Only the person identified in the data agreement as the Support Analyst will have access to the contents of the data files, including derived data files
- The Support Analyst must respond promptly and in writing to inquiries from the LEA regarding compliance with this agreement or the expected data of resolution of the incident
- The Support Analyst must destroy all electronic and paper files when the incident is closed

**ITF Discussion**

Does the superintendent of a school need to approve the TIMS Support person granting access to the data? – Yes

Terri Hanson asked the ITF whether there should be a one-time annual agreement or a per incident approval granting access to the data for the purposes of resolving a ticket in

<p>the TIMS. ITF discussed the issue in terms of which roles are permitted to authorize access to data for the purposes of resolving an incident.</p> <p>ITF suggested that the TEAL approval process be modified to allow the Superintendent to approve an LEA designee (TIMS Support) to approve TEA or an ESC, to view data on a case by case basis. The ITF committee also requested that ESCs be included on the TIMS approval to access LEA TSDS data during processing of a Customer Service Incident. Terri Hanson stated that the TIMS Support role is not currently in the system as of yet. Brenda Richmond asked about which role is identified as the TIMS Support role. Scott John restated that the TIMS Support role is not the TSDS system as of yet. Melody Parrish stated that the data stewards are generally going to be in the TIMS Support role.</p> <p>ITF Recommendation</p> <p>Aaron Daitz made a motion to approve TEA and the ESC to access a LEAs TSDS data during the processing of a customer support incident, with permission of the LEA granted at the time the incident ticket is submitted. Patty Streat seconded the motion.</p> <p>The motion passed unanimously.</p> <hr/> <p>ITF also provided TEA with an action item to figure out how to allow superintendents to make a one-time approval, for their TIMS Support person, to have the authority to grant TEA and ESCs access to the TSDS data for the purposes of resolving a TSDS incident. ITF requested that an email vote occur on this action item.</p>	
<p><b>Other Business:</b></p> <p>David McKamie brought back a discussion regarding code table C166 – Disciplinary-Length-Difference-Reason-Code. David stated that he is receiving phone calls from districts regarding the terminology “modified” in the codes and the districts taking that verbiage to mean “reduce or extend a disciplinary assignment”. He stated that in a previous meeting it was recommended that the word “modified” be changed to “reduced”; however, this recommendation was voted against by the PCPEI committee. Priscilla stated that TEC 37.009(j) says “If, during the term of a placement or expulsion ordered under this section, a student engages in additional conduct for which placement in a disciplinary alternative education program or expulsion is required or permitted, additional proceedings may be conducted under this section regarding that conduct and the principal or board, as appropriate, may enter an additional order as a result of those proceedings”.</p> <p>She said this meant if a student misbehaved in a disciplinary setting that an additional incident report should be submitted. Nancy Dunnam asked if this could be added to the Data Standards. It was agreed that this could be added to the Data Standards as well as Appendix E in the questions/answers portion. Nancy asked if this discussion could be presented at the next ITF committee meeting on January 7, 2014.</p> <p>Nancy Dunnam also requested that, TEA include in the PEIMS Data Standards documents a statement that “districts are to handle the Unique ID with the same level of security and sensitivity as they do for the Social Security Numbers”.</p>	<p><b>Discussion Item</b></p>
<p><b>Upcoming ITF Meetings</b></p> <p>The next ITF meetings are scheduled as follows:</p> <p><b>Meeting Date</b></p> <p>January 7, 2014</p> <p>January 21, 2014</p> <p>Aaron Daitz made a motion to adjourn the meeting and Tom Priem seconded the motion.</p> <p>The meeting adjourned at 12:40 p.m.</p>	<p><b>Discussion Item</b></p>