



Texas Education Agency
Policy Committee on Public Education Information
Tuesday, October 28, 2014

Via GoToMeeting
William B. Travis Building, Room **PDC7**
1701 N. Congress Avenue, Austin, Texas 78701
10:00a.m. – 2:00 p.m.

Meeting Minutes

Members Attending: David Harris, David McKamie, Mark Eads, Dr. Patty Shafer, Brian Moersch, Gilbert Trevino, Judi Sparks, John Bass, Danny Lovett, Daniel Amador, Melody Parrish, Paul Clore, Dr. Clyde Steelman, Mary Beth Matula, Scott Lewis, Cody Carroll, Paul A. Norton, Berhl Robertson, Terry Driscoll

Others Attending: Terri Hanson, Bryce Templeton, Leanne Simons, Fernando Garcia, Amanda Callinan, Commissioner of Education Michael Williams

Call to Order: Mary Ann Whiteker called the meeting to order at 10:00 AM.

Mary Ann Whiteker began the meeting by welcoming the new PCPEI members to the committee and reviewed the purpose of the committee. Mary Ann emphasized the importance of considering data quality and whether the data collection is necessary. Mary Ann explained that the Information Task Force (ITF) was formed by the PCPEI, and that members of the ITF committee have technical expertise to work through the details of the data collection proposals then make recommendations to the PCPEI.

Commissioner of Education Michael Williams made a brief appearance and stated that he valued the expertise of the committee and thanked the members for their participation on the PCPEI.

Melody Parrish reviewed the ITF and PCPEI Charter emphasizing the importance of each committee member's participation. Terri Hanson discussed the data governance flow chart on the TSDS webpage emphasizing the three levels of review with the Information Task Force (ITF), PCPEI, and the TEA Data Governance Board for each PEIMS reporting change that is requested.

Melody explained that the overarching goal of TSDS is that we have one data collection system. Terri described how schools can opt-in to the TSDS Dashboards and how the Dashboard is a tool for administrators and teachers and they only have to pay for training and support. Terri explained how the data elements in PEIMS are mandated, and PCPEI decides how the data is collected not whether the data is collected. Terri explained that the Data Governance Board (DGB) has the final approval and that the Commissioner of Education can supersede and override decisions of the DGB. Melody explained that everything has been vetted through ITF before it goes before PCPEI. Melody identified the chair of the ITF committee as Nancy Dunnam and that everyone on the committee has a technical background and includes two student information system vendors (Skyward and TxEIS). Melody explained that PCPEI committee members may discuss items from the meeting at their districts and regions but they should qualify discussions by explaining that decisions are tentative and that nothing is final until the DGB votes. Melody then explained the PCPEI meeting is a closed meeting and that the meeting minutes are posted on the TSDS website once they are approved by the committee.

Mary Beth Matula asked who one should contact to recommend someone to serve on ITF. Melody Parrish stated that she could speak with Terri Hanson or her and they would consult with the PCPEI committee.

David McKamie stated that the ITF committee makes recommendations on how new data will be collected. Melody Parrish stated that the TEA PEIMS staff assists the committee in exploring all the options for collecting data. Melody explained that there is approximately 160 data collections and that PEIMS is only one of these 160. Melody gave the example of the Early Childhood Data System (ECDS) collection as one of the non-PEIMS collections that had recently been added to the TSDS. Mary Ann Whiteker emphasized the importance of the committee considering how data could be used incorrectly and how the data collections need to accurately reflect the school districts.

June 3, 2014 PCPEI Meeting Minutes

Mary Ann Whiteker introduced the minutes from the June 3, 2014 PCPEI meeting and asked the committee for any comments or corrections. Paul Clore motioned the approval of the minutes and Danny Lovett seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Information Task Force Report to the PCPEI

David McKamie, ITF Chair presented the ITF report to the PCPEI committee discussing each item of business and the recommendations from the report.

Part A. Summary of ITF Business from the September 23, 2014 Meeting

A-1. Economic Disadvantaged Code Reporting for the 2014-2015 School Year

Discussion Item

The Texas Education Agency has published special guidance for reporting the Economic Disadvantaged Code for the 2014-2015 school year in light of significant changes to the school lunch programs offered by the Texas Department of Agriculture.

ITF Discussion

Bryce Templeton introduced this item by reviewing the Community Eligibility Provision (CEP) school lunch program and the impact that this new program is having on schools determining and reporting the Economic Disadvantaged Code in the PEIMS submission process. CEP schools are not allowed to disburse and collect the official National School Lunch Program (NSLP) application forms. CEP schools only have access to the direct certification list provided to them by the Texas Department of Agriculture Child Nutrition Program and the use of a locally developed income survey form to determine the economic disadvantaged status of each student. All students who are matched to the direct certification list are eligible for a free lunch in the eyes of the Texas Department of Agriculture.

Bryce further explained that the E-Rate program provides technology discounts of different amounts for schools based on the percentage of eligible free and reduced price lunch students. As a result of the current Economic Disadvantaged reporting instructions, the CEP schools would be negatively impacted because TEA has required that the students on the direct certification lists be coded as Other Economic Disadvantaged per the Economic Disadvantaged Code table. Students who are coded as Other Economic Disadvantaged are not currently included in the e-Rate computations because of the E-Rate program rules enforced by the Universal Services Administration Company (USAC) that currently exclude the students on Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) benefits as eligible students for the E-Rate student count. As a result, the E-Rate discount for the CEP schools will decline to zero percent if a data reporting policy change is not enacted.

Bryce stated that TEA is forming a work group to consider the economic disadvantaged coding guidelines for the 2015-2016 school year and if any additional changes are needed.

Meanwhile for the 2014-2015 school year, all schools, CEP participants and other NSLP participants are being instructed to report all students matched to the direct certification list as Economic Disadvantaged

Code 01 – Eligible for a Free Lunch. This reporting guidance change does not change the total number of economically disadvantaged reported by a school district; only the distribution over the three economic disadvantaged types is changed.

Nancy Dunnam asked how the information would be disseminated. Bryce stated that the guidance was published on the TEA PEIMS webpage and had also been emailed to the ESCs and the PEIMS software vendors with an attached request to share with their customers. Bryce illustrated the guidance document from the TEA website.

Aaron Daitz stated that there are over 100 CEP campuses in Houston ISD and he wanted clarification on the correct way to code CEP. Bryce stated that Houston would code all students from any campus matched on the direct certification list as 01- Eligible for a Free Lunch. The CEP campus students not matched to the direct certification list would be surveyed with a local income survey form and determined to be either 00 - Not Economically Disadvantaged or 99- Other Economically Disadvantaged.

Peggy Sullivan mentioned that there has been misinformation passed around the schools on when to report the specific Economic Disadvantaged Codes. Bryce stated that the guidance provided by TEA should eliminate this confusion if read and applied by all schools.

Excerpt from the reporting guidance document:

Regardless of the kind of NSLP offered by a Texas public school, students who are determined to be eligible for a free lunch by virtue of being on a direct certification list as provided by the Texas Department of Agriculture should be coded with Economic Disadvantaged Code 01 – “Eligible For Free Meals Under The National School Lunch And Child Nutrition Program”. For the 2014–2015 school year Economic Disadvantaged Code 01 should be interpreted to mean “Student is eligible for free lunch based on an approved NSLP application or direct certification under the NSLP”. Students who are found on a direct certification list are categorically eligible for a free lunch under the NSLP.

Regardless of the kind of NSLP offered by a Texas public school, students who are reported as Economic Disadvantaged Code 02 – “Eligible For Reduced–price Meals Under The National School Lunch And Child Nutrition Program” must be determined as eligible with an approved NSLP application. No exceptions exist for this rule.

Any other student who is determined to be economically disadvantaged through a means other than an official NSLP application or direct certification under the NSLP should be coded Economic Disadvantaged Code 99 – “Other Economic Disadvantage”. This would include Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) students, Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) students, and any other student who may be determined to be economically disadvantaged through the use of locally developed income survey forms. Examples include, but are not limited to, Pre-Kindergarten eligibility applications related to economic disadvantage status, migrant students, runaway students, and homeless students.

Schools that do not offer the NSLP to enrolled students must code all students as either 00 –“Not identified As Economically Disadvantaged” or 99 – “Other Economic Disadvantage” based on the results of a locally developed income survey form.

ITF Recommendation

PCPEI Discussion

David McKamie explained that economically disadvantaged students enrolled at a CEP school are 01s (Free Lunch) or 99s (Other Economic Disadvantaged). David commented that getting parents to return the locally developed income survey form has been an issue in some districts. David commented that Region 12 has one CEP district and four Provision 2 districts and that there is a huge interest in CEP and getting rid of the stigma of certain students receiving a free lunch. Bryce Templeton reinforced that because of the rules enforced by the eRate administrator for the federal government that are excluding Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) from the eRate counts and how the agency does not

want schools to be negatively impacted with a reduced E-Rate because of the economic disadvantaged reporting guidelines.

Mary Ann Whitaker asked what the effect would be on state compensatory money, and Terri Hanson replied that Belinda Dyer said it has no effect.

Bryce Templeton commented that the Compensatory Education funding formula is explained in the April 6, 2014 “To the Administrator Addressed” letter. CEP schools will have their compensatory education funding computed using a 1.6 multiplier against the number of students matched off of the direct certification list. David McKamie commented that Region 12 is watching its schools for excessive reporting of “Other Economic Disadvantaged”.

John Bass asked why a district should choose CEP. Bryce Templeton commented that districts can combine campuses in order to reach the threshold percentage.

PCPEI Action

None

A-2. School Board Information Request PEIMS Reporting for 2014-2015 Discussion Item

The Texas Education Agency has published special guidance for determining the cost for School Board Information Requests. It is not required that a school district follow this particular guidance.

ITF Discussion

At the last ITF meeting, when the PEIMS reporting requirements for the School Board Information Request were presented, there were concerns regarding how schools would calculate the costs to fulfill these information requests. The PEIMS staff obtained permission from the TEA legal office to offer the Texas Attorney General’s Public Information Request Cost Recovery Guidelines to the public schools for determining this information.

Amanda Callinan explained the Attorney General’s costing guidance, posted on PEIMS data standards webpage, can be used to cost school board data requests. Amanda reiterated that districts do not have to use this particular guidance since the legislation has no costing requirements.

Reference

Texas Administrative Code

TITLE 1 ADMINISTRATION

PART 3 OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

CHAPTER 70 COST OF COPIES OF PUBLIC INFORMATION

RULE §70.3 Charges for Providing Copies of Public Information

ITF Recommendation

None

PCPEI Discussion

David McKamie explained that last year the data was collected in Survey Monkey and that this year the data is being collected in PEIMS on the 010 record. David explained that TEA has provided guidelines for determining costs and that the guidelines include examples such as a copy costing 10¢ and a diskette costing \$1.

A member asked about the purpose of the data collection, and Bryce Templeton explained that the legislation does not state a purpose in collecting the data. David McKamie commented that his

assumption is that there are board members who make excessive requests. Danny Lovett commented that there may be isolated instances. Daniel Amador verified that this collection is not for charters. David Harris asked if the data could be reported back to the school board. Melody Parrish explained that districts do not have to report the data back to the school board. Mary Ann Whiteker commented that the data collection falls under open records requests. John Bass gave the example of one member reporting what another member's requests cost the district.

PCPEI Action

None

A-3. 2014-2015 Discipline Data Edits for the Legacy and TSDS PEIMS Systems Discussion Item

TEA has determined that the PEIMS summer data collection is not adequately controlling for data quality related to the Truancy Discipline Action Reason Codes 42-45. The TEA PEIMS staff have discovered that schools are reporting data implying that students were removed with the Official Length of Disciplinary Assignment and the Actual Length of Disciplinary Assignment fields being reporting with values greater than zero.

ITF Discussion

Bryce Templeton introduced this item by stating that the truancy data is collected on the PEIMS 425 Disciplinary Action Data record, but there are not any classroom removal actions allowed for the truancy reasons. The only two actions allowed are that truancy charges were filed and the result was either a fine assessed or no fine assessed.

The TEA PEIMS staff have discovered that schools are reporting data implying that students were removed with the Official Length of Disciplinary Assignment and the Actual Length of Disciplinary Assignment fields being reporting with values greater than zero. To remedy this situation, TEA will add a new fatal discipline validation edit for the 2014-2015 school year that requires these fields to be reported with a value of Zero (0).

The following discipline data (truancy) edit logic will be added to the legacy and TSDS PEIMS systems to ensure better data quality.

When truancy is reported (discipline action reason codes 42-45), the official length of disciplinary assignment, actual length of disciplinary assignment, and the disciplinary length difference reason codes must be '00' since schools do not remove students to a disciplinary setting in cases of truancy.

ITF Recommendation

None

PCPEI Discussion

Mark Eads stated that San Marcos ISD has nine students from New Mexico receiving court-ordered services at the Texas Hill Country Clinic. Bryce Templeton recommended Mark consult Section 25.003 -Tuition For Children From Other States of the Texas Education Code and have the school district legal counsel consider if these students are subject to compensation being provided to the school district by the institution responsible for the maintenance of these persons.

PCPEI Action

None

A-4. 2015-2016 Texas Student Data System PEIMS Data Approval Forms – SAF to SOA Action Item

The texts and titles of the old LEA and ESC SAF (Superintendent Approval Form) and PAL (Principal Approval Letter) forms are being updated. The titles are being updated to match the name currently used in the headers of both documents: Statement of Approval (SOA) in the TSDS PEIMS system.

ITF Discussion

Melanie Ulrich presented the Legacy PEIMS Superintendent Approval Form (SAF) and TSDS Statement Of Approval (SOA) data approval forms. Melanie emphasized that the SOA form would be consistent across all organizations. Melanie described how the principal and the superintendent forms would be the same in the TSDS system whereas in the Legacy PEIMS EDIT+ system, they are different forms. The new SOA form will allow for electronic signatures.

The texts and titles of the old LEA and ESC SAF (Superintendent Approval Form) and PAL (Principal Approval Letter) forms are being updated to accurately reflect the approver's responsibilities.

There will be 3 versions of the SOA: principal, superintendent, and executive director, just as there are now, with small adjustments to the wording in each version appropriate for each organization type.

Nancy Dunnam stated there should be an emphasis in the form on responsibility. Terri Hanson said that the signature would be for the "PEIMS data approver" and that the signature is based on the person's role. Melanie then clarified this would be for 2014-2015 and beyond even though the proposal reads for 2015-2016.

ITF Recommendation

Brenda Padalecki made a motion to approve the use of the new Statement of Approval form for the TSDS system. Tom Priem seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

PCPEI Discussion

David McKamie stated that the SAF is the superintendent approval and always has been. Bryce Templeton commented that the Principal Statement of Accuracy is optional. Terri Hanson explained that the change to the form is for TSDS only.

Terri Hanson stated that we are discussing a change for TSDS only. David McKamie commented that the application is in TEAL and that approvers are designated. Bryce Templeton commented that the early adopters will see the forms.

Melody Parrish commented that there are about 70 districts that are early adopters and that these districts are currently parallel processing in Legacy PEIMS and TSDS PEIMS. Melody explained that the two data collections will be compared for quality assurance purposes. Melody explained that the forms will remain the same in legacy and will be new in TSDS. Melody explained that in the 2015-2016 school year the early adopters plus 600 other districts will process data in TSDS PEIMS only and in the 2016-2017 school year every district in the state will use TSDS PEIMS. Melody explained that Legacy PEIMS is on TEASE and TSDS PEIMS is on TEAL. Mark Eads commented that TEAL crashes about twice a week. Melody explained that TEA is working on TEAL to eliminate the problems that are making TEAL go down frequently. Melody went on to explain that TEAL was built for 40,000 users and that we will have about 400,000 users as the schools migrate to TSDS. Melody stated that the Agency has funding to improve TEAL and that there will be a new release next year.

Terri Hanson explained that where districts are in the adoption process is posted on the website and that if a district is not where they want to be in the rollout to let her know. David McKamie commented that the new system translates well and it is very similar technically. Melody Parrish commented that the vast majority of PEIMS software vendors have completed the necessary work and that the schools should find it easy to use the TSDS system.

PCPEI Action

Daniel Amador motioned to adopt the new Statement of Approval forms to replace the old Superintendent Approval Form and Principal Approval Letter. John Bass and Clyde Steelman seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

A-5. TSDS Incident Management System (TIMS) for Third Party Support Vendors Action Item

With TEA approving third party support vendors to become TSDS certified for Level 2 support, schools choosing to contract with these vendors may need to allow these vendors access to their data in the TSDS system during a TSDS support incident.

ITF Discussion

From the beginning of the Texas Student Data System (TSDS) project, the Texas Education Agency has maintained the position that the data loaded to the Operational Data Store (ODS) belongs to the school that loaded the data, and that the TEA staff do not have the ability to look at this data.

In recent ITF and Policy Committee on Public Education Information (PCPEI) meetings, TEA presented the option for a support requestor to allow Level 2 and above (Level 3 and Level 4) support staff to see the data from the above mentioned sources with specific approval of the person submitting a support ticket. This provision was approved with the condition that the ability of the support person to not see the data was the default setting. This measure was approved by ITF and PCPEI in order to allow the data owner to decide if the support staff should be able to see the data relevant to the support request.

With TEA now allowing third party vendors to provide Level 2 support, the escalation screen needs to be modified to state that the support staff at the ESC, Certified Vendor, or TEA may access the data.

Melanie Ulrich presented the escalation screen modification that is needed to include certified vendors.

ITF members asked who these vendors would be. Terri Hanson stated that if an SIS vendor or any other company went through the required TSDS training and achieved the required certification that they would be permitted to provide the TSDS support for school districts.

Nancy Dunnam stated that vendors have no accountability and that if their support is not timely or correct, then the ESCs would be blamed for district data issues because TEA runs analyses and associates districts with a particular ESC. Terri Hanson explained this is a wording change on the TIMS screen, not a policy change that the ITF is considering. The policy to allow certified vendors to provide TSDS support to school districts has already been decided at the upper management level of TEA.

ITF Recommendation

Nancy Dunnam called for a vote on this item. Having some members voting against this item, a Roll Call Vote was applied with the following results: 5 votes for, 5 votes against, and 6 abstain votes. Nancy Dunnam stated the topic would be sent to the PCPEI for their consideration.

Nancy Dunnam – Against

David McKamie – Against

Adrian Garcia – Against

Keitha Ivey – Abstain

Brenda Padalecki – Abstain

Tom Priem – Abstain

Scott Lewis – Abstain

Judi Sparks - Against

Linda Roska – Abstain

Belinda Dyer – Abstain
Dianne Borreson – For
Aaron Daitz – For
Sandra Kratz – For
Kim O’Leary – For
Patty Streat – For
Dara Fuller – Against

PCPEI Discussion

David McKamie summarized this action item and stated that the ITF vote did not really reflect the action item that TEA brought to the committee for review. But, the ITF members were concerned with the fact that 3rd party vendors would be allowed to support schools at the risk of schools being given unsound guidance and the ESCs associated with the schools being reflected on negatively.

Melody Parrish explained that since 3rd party software vendors are required to be certified for Level 2 support, schools that contract with them may need to allow them to access their data for support reasons. Melody clarified that TEA does not pull data and that districts push data in the TSDS. Melody went on to explain the customer support process and that Level 1 support is available at the district level, Level 2 support is at the ESC level, and that Level 3 support is at the TEA. Terri Hanson explained that the users control what data TEA sees during a support activity. David McKamie commented that there is a new twist in that ESCs used to be the sole providers and now that vendors can be certified as well. Leanne explained TEAL roles and that ESCs still have the final sign off on a schools PEIMS data even if the training and support is from a 3rd party vendor. Patty Shafer commented that she has concerns about giving vendors responsibility when the ESCs are accountable. Melody Parrish explained that depending on the size of the district, the role of software vendors in support vary, but regardless the ESC always has to sign off on a schools data submission.

Daniel Amador asked to clarify what the PCPEI was voting on related to this action item. Melody Parrish clarified that the vote is on a change to the data approval forms and not the district - vendor relationship.

Danny Lovett commented that the ESCs can never completely verify the accuracy of the data anyway and that we need to move forward to a vote. John Bass asked for assurance that this decision would not leave the ESC liable for an outside vendor. TEA staff stated that regardless of an ESC approving an LEA data collection, the responsibility of the accuracy of the data will rest with the school superintendent.

Bryce Templeton commented that most ESC PEIMS coordinators have a certain data review routine and they run certain reports and compare this year’s data with last year’s data and that is all an ESC can do. David McKamie commented that he is concerned about accountability, and Patty Shafer commented that she does not want to be held accountable for vendor actions.

Terry Driscoll asked why a small detail like this is something that has to go through PCPEI. Terri Hanson explained that her team has been vetting decisions through PCPEI since the beginning of the project.

PCPEI Action

John Bass motioned to approve the changes outlined in the Statement of Approval forms for the TSDS that that these forms replace the former Superintendent Approval Form and Principal Approval Letter used in the EDIT+ system. Shelia Straughan seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

A-6. 2014-2015 TSDS PEIMS Report PDM2-100-012 (Formerly EDIT+PRF3D017) – Mid-Year Financial Accountability Rating Indicators Action Item

TEA is proposing to eliminate Percent of Operating Expenditures for Instruction from TSDS Report PDM2-100-012 but not the EDIT+ PRF3D017.

ITF Discussion

Bryce Templeton presented the Report PDM2-100-012 report and explained the report had been reviewed as part of the TSDS application development and it has been determined that TEA no longer needs the Percent of Operating Expenditures for Instruction column.

Belinda Dyer explained the field was left over from the old 65% spending requirement.

David McKamie explained that the data element may be relevant to schools even if it is not required and that accountants may appreciate having the report available to calculate the administrative cost ratio.

ITF Recommendation

David McKamie made a motion to leave the report intact as is and not delete the Percent of Operating Expenditures for Instruction column from the report. Judi Sparks seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

PCPEI Discussion

PCPEI members discussed the pros and cons of removing the Percent of Operating Expenditure for Instruction data column and were in agreement to leave the data on the report for those schools that have been accustomed to seeing and using this information for local financial analysis purposes.

PCPEI Action

Gilbert Trevino motioned to leave TSDS report PDM2-100-012 as is and not the changes recommended by the Information task Force. Patty Shafer seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

A-7. 2014-2015 TSDS PEIMS Reports – Elimination of the Turnaround Reports Action Item

The EDIT+ turnaround reports were originally created for audit purposes to allow TEA to prove data and for LEAs to know that their data was not altered as it moved from one EDIT+ database to another. In TSDS, the data within PEIMS will remain in a single database for all of the EDIT+ functions, validations and reports, thus eliminating the need the previous audit trail design for the data.

ITF Discussion

Fernando Garcia presented the turnaround reports proposal. He explained that the Turnaround reports were initially developed to audit the movement of data from one EDIT+ database to another. Since the TSDS architecture consists of just one single database, the need for re-verification has been eliminated. He noted that there were a total of 19 reports that could be eliminated. Nancy Dunnam asked if we intend on eliminating the reports entirely. Terri Hanson stated that the reports will be entirely deleted. It was also stated that reports that cannot be run until all district data has been submitted, such as the Presumed Under-reported Leavers report, would still be run and then displayed after the submission or resubmission window was closed.

ITF Recommendation

Adrian Garcia made a motion to approve the deletion of the Turnaround Reports from the TSDS PEIMS system. Brenda Padalecki seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

PCPEI Discussion

None

PCPEI Action

Danny Lovett motioned to approve the elimination of the EDIT+ Turnaround Reports in the TSDS PEIMS system and David Harris seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

A-8. 2014-2015 PEIMS Discipline Data Complex Adjustment **Action Item**

In order to successfully collect and load the discipline data through the TSDS PEIMS system, the Behavior Location Code must be moved from the DisciplineIncidentExtension Complex Type to the StudentDisciplineIncidentAssociation Complex Type.

ITF Discussion

Fernando Garcia presented the discipline data complex type and explained that the Behavior Location Code must be moved from one complex to another in order for the discipline data to correctly load to the TSDS PEIMS system. Fernando stated that the data element E1083 - BEHAVIOR-LOCATION-CODE must be moved from the DisciplineIncidentExtension Complex Type to the StudentDisciplineIncidentAssociation Extension Complex Type. Both of these complex types are in the Disciplinary Interchange.

Nancy Dunnam verified that this is a permanent change and not just for 2014-2015. TEA staff verified this fact.

ITF Recommendation

Peggy Sullivan made a motion to approve the movement of the Behavior Location Code from the DisciplineIncidentExtension Complex Type to the StudentDisciplineIncidentAssociation Extension Complex Type. Tom Priem seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

PCPEI Discussion

None

PCPEI Action

Patty Shafer motioned to approve the movement of the Behavior Location Code from the DisciplineIncidentExtension Complex Type to the StudentDisciplineIncidentAssociation Complex Type and Mark Eads seconded.

A-9. TSDS Early Childhood Data System (ECDS) Reporting Requirement changes **Action Item**

TEA has determined that it will not be necessary for the ECDS collection to collect data element E0170 NUMBER-STUDENTS-IN-CLASS for the 2012-2013, 2013-2014, or 2014-2015 collections for Pre-K or Kindergarten data.

AND

In order to streamline the PK School Type selection process for the users, the customer has requested the following changes to Code Table DC152 PK-SCHOOL-TYPE for the 2014-2015 school year.

ITF Discussion

Fernando Garcia presented two TSDS-ECDS reporting requirement changes:

1. With E1558 STUDENT-INSTRUCTION and related code table DC153 being previously approved by the committee, it is no longer necessary to collect E0170 NUMBER-STUDENTS-IN-CLASS in *any* of the ECDS collection years. Fernando also made note of the fact that though this data element is not needed for ECDS, it will not be eliminated from TSDS, as this data element is still being used for staff responsibility reporting.

2. In order to streamline the PK school type selection process for the end users, the customer requested changes for 2014-2015 to Code Table DC152 PK-SCHOOL-TYPE. The proposal was to eliminate 4 of the entries: Private for profit, Family day Home Child Care Program, Non-Profits, and Faith Based.

Nancy Dunnam suggested that unless these changes were specific only to 2014-2015, that they should be approved for 2014-2015 and subsequent years.

ITF Recommendation

Judi Sparks made a motion to approve the deletion of data element E0170 - Number of Students in Class from the ECDS data collection and to eliminate the Private for profit, Family day Home Child Care Program, Non-Profits, and Faith Based PK School Types from the DC152 PK-School-Type code table for the ECDS reporting. Tom Priem seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

PCPEI Discussion

None

PCPEI Action

Paul Clore motioned to approve the removal of the Number-Of-Students-In-Class data field from the ECDS data collection and the deletion of the codes for Private for profit, Family day Home Child Care Program, Non-Profits, and Faith Based from the TSDS Code Table DC152 PK-SCHOOL-TYPE. John Bass seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

A-10. Data Governance Process for the Texas Records Exchange System Discussion Item

ITF Discussion

Terri Hanson presented on the data governance for the Texas Records Exchange (TReX) system. Terri stated that since the inception of the TReX system, the data governance process has not regularly reviewed the data elements that are added to the TReX Data Standards. Typically when the PEIMS system has elements added, the TEA PEIMS staff, in conjunction with other TEA program areas, have determined whether or not the data elements should be added to the TReX system. Occasionally, there are elements added that are not in the PEIMS system and these items have not been through the data governance process. The ITF committee members were in favor of reviewing the proposed changes to the TReX system. Melody Parrish stated that districts could make suggestions about the addition of certain data because they are in the field using this data to enroll students in school.

In January, TEA staff will present the TReX Data Standards to the ITF committee to establish a baseline for all future changes to the TReX system.

ITF Recommendation

None

PCPEI Discussion

David McKamie stated that House Bill 5 had direct impacts on the TReX data system. The question raised to the ITF committee was whether changes to TReX should be presented to and approved by the three governing committees - ITF, PCPEI, and DGB.

Melody Parrish commented that there has been interest from school districts and that districts want more information. Melody commented that TEA would like to make TReX a more useful

tool. Ultimately, the goal is to possibly move the TReX system to the TSDS system and allow districts and charter schools to share information that already exists in the TSDS system

Terri Hanson stated that she had met with the DGB and that they were in agreement that data governance process should have visibility to any TReX changes. Terri also mentioned that there were several changes to TReX currently in play, so that the baseline would be ready and presented to the ITF committee in January.

PCPEI Action

None

Part B. Summary of ITF Business from the October 14, 2014 Meeting

B-1. New Excess Contact Hours Validations for the Legacy and TSDS PEIMS Systems

Discussion Item

The Texas Education Agency has determined that some schools are under and/or over-reporting special education attendance excess contact hours. New validations will be applied to the 2014-2015 Summer collections for the PEIMS Legacy system. The TSDS system will mimic these changes for the early adopter testers during the 2014-2015 school year.

ITF Discussion

Bryce Templeton presented this item and stated that some campuses are under and/or over-reporting special education attendance excess contact hours. The overstatement of excess contact hours financially penalizes a school and that the understatement of excess contact hours results in an overpayment of special education funding from the Texas Education Agency Foundation School Program.

Bryce stated that two new validations will be applied to the 2014-2015 Summer collections for both the PEIMS Legacy and TSDS PEIMS systems:

1) Edit Rule 40533/42405-0028 prevents some over-reporting by limiting the maximum number of Excess Hours that can be reported. Bryce explained that the limit is based upon the mathematical maximum of 5.75 hours for each day present in an instructional setting.

2) Edit Rule 40534/42405-0029 prevents some under reporting by limiting the minimum number of Excess Hours that can be reported when we can be sure a student has received special education instruction and V6 career and technical education instruction on the same day. Bryce explained that if special education eligible days plus V6 CTE eligible days is greater than the number of days taught, TEA can be sure a student has received both on at least one day in the six week reporting period and that excess contact hours must be reported as greater than zero (0).

Bryce stated that the PEIMS software vendors would be notified of these changes and asked to review and check their excess contact hour algorithms. TEA believes that these actions will resolve most, if not all, of the excess contact hour reporting problems. As TEA moves forward with the TSDS PEIMS system rollout, there may be additional edits to check the excess contact hours starting in the 2016-2017 school year.

Nancy Dunnam confirmed there were no questions and reminded the members that this was a discussion item only.

ITF Recommendation

None

PCPEI Discussion

Bryce Templeton commented that some vendors were inadvertently reducing their customers special education funding and sometimes causing schools to over claim special education funds from the state. David McKamie mentioned that the problem is sometimes triggered by

SIS schedule systems. Bryce commented that TEA will communicate with all the SIS vendors to review their excess contact hour calculation algorithms.

PCPEI Action

None

B-2. PEIMS Code Table C165 Disciplinary Action Reason Code Action Item

The Texas Legislature modified the Texas Penal Code in the 2013 Legislative Session to exclude Switchblade Knives from the definition of a Prohibited Weapon in Penal Code 46.05. This change will have an impact on schools for the 2014-2015 school year reporting disciplinary incidents that involve switchblade knives.

ITF Discussion

Bryce Templeton introduced Priscilla Flores as the agency school discipline program expert.

Fernando Garcia presented this item and explained that House Bill 1862 revised the definition of a prohibited weapon in the Texas Penal Code to now exclude switchblade knives. Fernando reviewed the necessary revisions to Appendix E of the Texas Education Data Standards and the Legacy PEIMS Data Standards and read the following proposed addition to the appendix:

New Question # 23. With the definition of a Prohibited Weapon being revised in HB 1862, how do I report a disciplinary incident involving a switchblade knife?

House Bill 1862 revised the definition of a prohibited weapon in TEC 46.05 to exclude switchblade knives. As a result, Disciplinary Action Reason Code '14': (Used, Exhibited, Or Possessed A Prohibited Weapon Under Penal Code §46.05 – TEC §37.007(a)(1)(D)) can no longer be used to describe a disciplinary incident involving a switchblade knife.

As a result of this change, there are several options for reporting incidents involving switchblade knives:

- 1) Disciplinary Action Reason Code '50', which falls under local policy - Used, Exhibited, Or Possessed A Non-illegal Knife As Defined By Student Code Of Conduct and as Allowed Under TEC37.007.
- 2) Disciplinary Action Reason Code '12' - Used, Exhibited, Or Possessed An Illegal Knife TEC §37.007(a) (1) (B) (Illegal knife blade longer than 5.5 inches).
- 3) Disciplinary Action Reason Code '21' - Violation Of Student Code Of Conduct Not Included Under TEC §§37.002(b), 37.006, or 37.007 (does not include student code of conduct violations covered in reason codes 33 and 34).

Fernando stated that there would be no additional data validations or code changes.

Bryce Templeton commented that it's possible that students may have already been expelled for having a switchblade knife this school year, but it's probable that the knife exceeded 5.5 inches. Bryce stated that after notification by TEA in Early November, schools can no longer knowingly expel students for having a switchblade knife. Priscilla Flores confirmed that districts can no longer code a switchblade knife as a prohibited weapon. Bryce explained that any knife on school campus can be an illegal knife if locally defined as such in the student code of conduct.

ITF Recommendation

Adrian Garcia motioned to accept the changes related to the documentation related the legality of switchblade knives and David McKamie seconded.

PCPEI Discussion

John Bass questioned the impetus for the decision to remove switchblade knives from the list of prohibited weapons. Bryce Templeton mentioned the knife lobby appeared to be behind this

legislative action. David McKamie mentioned that under Disciplinary Action Reason Code 50 – non-illegal knife defined as illegal by the local code of conduct, districts can expel based on local policy. Mary Ann Whiteker stated that every district would potentially have to revise their student code of conduct, and Bryce stated that over-reporting for Disciplinary Action Reason Code 14 – Prohibited Weapon, could put districts on the persistently dangerous school list. John Bass commented that changing districts’ codes of conduct mid-way through the year is not wise and that maybe this revision could be implemented next year. Mary Ann Whiteker expressed concerns regarding what districts would do if a district has already expelled a student during the current school year. David McKamie commented that it is a change in the penal code and that the change needs to be enacted as soon as possible.

PCPEI Action

Mark Eads motioned for the approval of the changes related to the documentation related the legality of switchblade knives and Danny Lovett seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Other Business

ITF Member Replacement for Aaron Daitz, Houston ISD Action Item

Mark White, Houston ISD, recommended Cathleen Freeman to be the new ITF member for Houston ISD and presented her resume to the PCPEI. Mary Ann Whiteker asked if anyone had any questions regarding Cathleen’s resume. There were no questions.

Mark Eads motioned for Cathleen Freeman’s approval as the Houston ISD ITF member and Gilbert Trevino seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Bryce Templeton stated that ITF member Tom Preim has left Skyward employment and that TEA has not been given information on a nomination for his replacement. Terri Hanson stated that the PCPEI may have to conduct an email vote for Tom’s replacement upon receipt of the nomination by TEA from Skyward.

Melody Parrish attempted to show the committee a check-off sheet in TSDS, but the wireless internet connection was non-responsive. TEA will try to re-present this information at the next PCPEI meeting.

Melody then thanked everyone for attended and stated that their participation in the committee helps TEA make the right decisions for the public schools of Texas.

Upcoming PCPEI Meetings

February 3, 2015

June 2, 2015

Adjournment:

The PCPEI meeting ended at 12:45 PM.