



**Texas Education Agency (TEA)
Information Task Force (ITF)
August 9, 2021**

Zoom
2:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.

Meeting Minutes

Call Meeting to Order

Joel Garcia , ITF Chair

Joel Garcia called the ITF meeting to order at 2:00 p.m.

Roll call of the ITF members was taken by Jamie Muffoletto.

ITF Members Present:

Joel Garcia, David C. Taylor, David McKamie, Keitha Ivey, D'Lynne Johnson, Catherine Bray, Roshunda Roberts-Jackson, David Marx, Linda Roska, John Newcom, Traci Pesina, Joe Herrera

ITF Alternate Members Present:

Sarah Cagle, Linda Raney, Elisa Sanchez, Brent Lacy, Debby Wilburn, Sandra Kratz, Kim Lyons, Justin Jons, Christine Barnes, Nina Taylor, Tamara Kavanagh, Shawna Ohnesorge, Yolanda Vargas

TEA Staff Present:

Melody Parrish (ITS), Terri Hanson (ITS), Leanne Simons (ITS), Jamie Muffoletto (ITS), Scott Johnson (ITS), Rhonda Williams (ITS), Stephanie Sharp (ITS), Jeanine Helms (ITS), Candice DeSantis (ITS), Connor Briggs (ITS), Ed Linden (ITS), John Reese (ITS), Kathy Adaky (ITS), David Butler (IT-Training) Deborah DeBerry (IT-Training), Wayne Curry (IT-Training).

1. 2021-2022 General Education Homebound Indicator Action Item

The General Education Homebound (GEH) program provides instructional services to eligible students who are at home or in a hospital setting. Students served through GEH have a medical condition or extended illness that prevents attendance in school for at least four weeks, as documented by a physician licensed to practice in the United States.

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) Student Attendance Accounting Handbook (SAAH) outlines the documentation requirements for a student to be served through the GEH

program either in-person or remote by a Local Education Agency (LEA). Currently, there is not an indicator reported through the Texas Student Data System to indicate if a student was served by an LEA in the GEH program during the school year. As outlined in the SAAH, the instruction delivered through the GEH Program can be done in-person or remotely.

TEA is proposing the addition of one new data element GENERAL-EDUCATION-HOMEBOUND-INDICATOR (E17XX) added to the PEIMS Summer submission to indicate if a student was served at any time in the GEH program during the current school year.

Presentation:

Jamie Muffoletto presented the proposal which includes:

1. Add one new data element GENERAL-EDUCATION-HOMEBOUND-INDICATOR (E17XX) and update data element reporting requirements in the StudentExtension complex type to be reported in the PEIMS Summer submission.
2. Update existing TSDS reports to reflect the changes in this proposal.
3. Add and update associated data validation rules to reflect the changes in this proposal.

ITF Discussion:

ITF Chair, Joel Garcia called for questions or comments. David McKamie asked if this indicator is only for special education students or for every student. Jamie Muffoletto responded the indicator is for every student participating in the general education homebound program.

Keitha Ivey asked why districts need to report this indicator. Terri Hanson replied that a To The Administrator Addressed (TAA) letter will be sent this week to explain more about the general education homebound indicator. David Marx added that with the increase in COVID cases, an LEA may need to provide GEH instructional services to additional students. TEA would need a method to track which students participate in the general education homebound program during the school year.

David Marx stated that TEA will use this indicator to compare the number of students in general education homebound in prior years to the number of students reported in 2021-2022. Keitha asked how TEA will compare the number of students participating in general education homebound during the 2021-2022 school to prior years since there was no indicator in the past. David Marx stated that there is not a way to compare the new indicator being collected to prior years since it was not previously collected. David Marx also said the TAA should provide additional information about general education homebound and the funding mechanism for the program.

Joel Garcia asked when an LEA should use this new indicator. David Marx stated this indicator may be used in situations where a student has a life-threatening disease or hospitalization. Depending on the note provided by a doctor, a student with COVID may be eligible for general education homebound.

Joel asked if the general education homebound indicator should be used for more than 20 days of remote conference instruction. David Marx clarified the general education homebound program is different from remote conferencing and this indicator is for students

participating in the general education homebound program. Joel asked what illnesses can qualify for GEH. David Marx replied the illnesses will depend on the note provided by the doctor.

Keitha asked what the new indicator will be used for by TEA. David Marx said that the new indicator will be used by TEA to determine which students were provided general education homebound instruction during the school year.

Elisa Sanchez asked if the LEA needs to report how long a student received general education homebound instruction. Joe Herrera replied that the LEA will not need to report how long the student received general education homebound instruction. Joe added that to qualify for general education homebound instruction, a student is expected to not attend school for four weeks during the school year based on a note provided by a doctor. The requirement for remote conferencing is different from general education homebound and additional information can be found in the student attendance accounting handbook.

Terri clarified that TEA is only collecting a general education homebound indicator, not the length of time a student is provided instruction in the general education homebound program. David McKamie asked if a student could be coded with a general education homebound indicator and also be special education homebound. David Marx replied that a student could be coded both.

Joel Garcia asked for additional questions. Hearing none, he requested a motion.

ITF Action:

Roshunda Roberts-Jackson made a motion to approve the proposal.

David C. Taylor seconded the motion.

Vote: Passed.

2. New ADA-ELIGIBILITY-CODE

Action Item

Per information released by the Texas Education Agency (TEA) on August 5, 2021, a local education agency (LEA) has the authority to provide full-time remote instruction to a student. The student would not be eligible for funding under Average Daily Attendance (ADA), but may be eligible for certain Foundation School Program (FSP) allotment funding.

Currently, the State Compensatory Education (SCE) Allotment is generated by economically disadvantaged students eligible for the FSP. For the 2021-2022 school year only, TEA will include additional students who are economically disadvantaged for SCE purposes and will flow SCE funding based on economically disadvantaged students from the following two categories:

1. Total enrolled students (ADA codes 1, 2, 3, 6 and 7); and
2. Total students enrolled, not in membership due to virtual learning.

Additionally, an LEA will be required to report a census block group for economically disadvantaged students enrolled, not in membership due to virtual learning.

The Teacher Incentive Allotment (TIA) currently uses student counts eligible for FSP. For the 2021-2022 school year only, TEA will calculate TIA funding using total enrolled eligible students at the campus and total students enrolled, not in membership due to virtual learning.

TEA is proposing to add new code “9” to code table ADA-ELIGIBILITY-CODE (C059) for use by a local education agency when a student is enrolled, not in membership due to virtual learning. Guidance will be updated in the Texas Education Data Standards (TEDS) to facilitate the reporting of a STUDENT-CENSUS-BLOCK-GROUP (E1648) for any students coded with the new code “9”. Reports and rules will be updated to include the new information.

Presentation:

Jamie Muffoletto presented the proposal which includes:

1. Add new code “9” Enrolled, Not In Membership Due to Virtual Learning to the ADA-ELIGIBILITY-CODE (C059) table.
2. Update the Data Element Reporting Requirements for STUDENT-CENSUS-BLOCK-GROUP (E1648) in the StudentExtension complex type.
3. Update existing TSDS reports to reflect the changes in this proposal.
4. Add, update, and remove associated data validation rules to reflect the changes in this proposal.

ITF Discussion:

ITF Chair, Joel Garcia called for questions or comments. Traci Pesina asked if there will be additional attendance codes for remote conferencing or should the LEA change the ADA code each time a student moves in and out of virtual learning. David Marx replied that TEA is not adding any additional attendance codes. An LEA can use local codes if needed but will only report to TEA the number of days present or absent for an eligible or ineligible student.

John Newcom asked if the new ADA code is only use for economically disadvantaged students. Jamie clarified that both economically disadvantaged, and non-economically disadvantaged students should be reported with the new ADA code. If the student is reported with the ADA-ELIGIBILITY-CODE “9” and is economically disadvantaged, the LEA would also report the data element STUDENT-CENSUS-BLOCK-GROUP.

David C. Taylor asked if there is a limited number of days a student can be coded as an ADA-ELIGIBILITY-CODE “9”. Jamie replied that there is no limit on the number of days a student can be coded with an ADA-ELIGIBILITY-CODE “9”.

Keitha Ivey asked if an LEA could change the student’s ADA-ELIGIBILITY-CODE to “9” for the 14 day quarantine if a student tested positive for COVID-19 and was not participating in remote conferencing, and then change it back to the original ADA-ELIGIBILITY-CODE when the student returns. Terri Hanson clarified that the new ADA-ELIGIBILITY-CODE “9” is for LEAs that are providing virtual learning to students using local funding. The new ADA-ELIGIBILITY-CODE “9” is not for students who are temporarily at home due to a quarantine. David Marx confirmed that the new ADA-ELIGIBILITY-CODE “9” is for students who are not generating state funds. The new code will allow an LEA to earn state funding allotments that are based on enrollment counts

Traci Pesina wanted to clarify that students who are participating in remote conferencing are not coded using an ADA-ELIGIBILITY-CODE “9”. Joe Herrera confirmed that the new code is not for students that are participating in remote conferencing.

Traci asked if an LEA does offer remote conferencing, will there be an additional indicator reported for these students. Joe confirmed that there is no additional coding for the students participating in remote conferencing. A student should be reported using the ADA-ELIGIBILITY-CODE based on the number of instructional hours provided.

Kim Lyons asked if the student receiving services under remote conferencing should be marked absent. Joe replied that remote conferencing is based on specific parameters set in the student attendance accounting handbook. The attendance for a student is based on a student being “virtually present” at the official attendance time. Kim also asked if for the days that a student is participating in remote conferencing, should the LEA report synchronous or asynchronous attendance for the student. Joe clarified that there is not a special code for remote conferencing that should be reported to TEA.

Christine Barnes asked if an LEA would need to report attendance for ADA-ELIGIBILITY-CODE “9” students. Terri clarified there should be no absences reported since these students are considered not in membership. Justin Jons added that an LEA would still need to track attendance locally for these students for the 90% rule.

Roshunda Roberts-Jackson stated that in Houston ISD there is a teacher shortage and asked if the teachers or substitutes for remote conferencing need to be certified teachers. David Marx replied that generally a teacher or substitute would need to be certified. Roshunda asked if her district should use the new ADA-ELIGIBILITY-CODE “9” for a virtual learning environment funded through ESSER funds. David Marx recommended that Roshunda review the [Remote Instruction](#) document provided by TEA and if there are additional questions David can answer after the meeting.

Kim asked for clarification on course completion when reporting remote conferencing students since LEAs are still required to enforce the 90% rule. Terri Hanson said the LEAs should still be able to report course completion since TEA does not collect ADA codes in the PEIMS Summer submission. TEA will make sure there are no edits that would stop course completion from being reported in for the PEIMS Summer submission.

John Newcom asked if there is an indicator for students participating in remote conferencing to be reported in PEIMS, or should the LEA retain documentation in case of an audit. Terri replied there will be no indicator in PEIMS for students that are provided instruction through remote conferencing. David Marx added that from an audit standpoint, documentation showing a student qualified for instruction through remote conferencing should be retained by the LEA.

Catherine Bray asked since LEAs will not be taking attendance for students coded with an ADA-ELIGIBILITY-CODE “9”, should an LEA presume the student had 100% attendance. David Marx replied that the FAQ provided by TEA lists the allotments that an LEA may receive for students coded with an ADA-ELIGIBILITY-CODE “9”. The allotments that an LEA may receive are based on student enrollment.

Joel Garcia asked for additional questions. Hearing none, he requested a motion.

ITF Action:

Traci Pesina made a motion to approve the proposal.

Keitha Ivey seconded the motion.

Vote: Passed.

Other Business

Discussion Item

Terri Hanson told the committee that the next ITF meeting will be on August 31, 2021. The meeting on September 14, 2021 was originally scheduled to be in-person and virtual, but will be virtual only.

Terri also reminded the committee that it was important to not share the link to the ITF meeting or request that anyone other than ITF members or their alternates join the meetings.

Adjournment

ITF Chair, Joel Garcia called for additional questions or comments. Hearing none, he requested a motion to adjourn.

David C. Taylor made a motion to adjourn.

Roshunda Roberts-Jackson seconded the motion.

Vote: Passed.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:46 p.m.