



## **Policy Committee on Public Education Information Meeting Minutes**

**Tuesday November 5, 2013**

William B, Travis Building, Room **PDC7 & 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, Mark White, Mary Beth Matula, Bonnie Schwarze, Lisa Garcia

**Members Attending:** David McKamie (Information Task Force)

**Others Attending:** Melody Parrish, Bryce Templeton, Terri Hanson, Tessie Bryant, Candice DeSantis, Shannon Housson, Fernando Garcia, Jeanine Helms, Scott Johnson, Mark Stehouwer, Autumn Daves (Oklahoma State Department of Education) , Colleen Flory (Oklahoma State Department of Education), Nancy Smith (Oklahoma State Department of Education Consultant)

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

2. **July 23, 2013 PCPEI Meeting Minutes**

Mary Ann Whitaker introduced the minutes from the July 23, 2013 PCPEI meeting and asked if there was any discussion. Paul Clore made a motion to approve the July 23, 2013 PCPEI meeting minutes as presented. Mary Beth Matula seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously and the minutes from the July 23, 2013 PCPEI meeting were approved by the committee.

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

David McKamie, Information Task Force (ITF) Vice Chair, presented the ITF Report Oct 22, 2013 & Oct 31, 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 October 22, 2013 and October 31, 2013 ITF meetings**

**Part A: Summary of the ITF Business from the October 22, 2013 meeting**

**1. At Risk Indicator Code**

**Action Item**

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”. This 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 and the TSDS Texas Education 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”.

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.

**ITF Discussion**

Nancy Dunnam requested 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.

**ITF Recommendation**

The ITF Committee made a recommendation 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 with the 2014-2015 school year.

**PCPEI Discussion**

Mary Ann Whiteker asked if this would affect non-traditional High Schools. Bryce Templeton stated that since reporting a student under the age of 26 as at-risk was optional for the 2013-2014 school year, this change in reporting would change the way districts need to set up alternative education campuses.

**PCPEI Action**

**Motion:**

Paul Clore 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 with the 2014-2015 school year. Robert Muller seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

**Vote:**

The motion passed unanimously.

**2. Clarification on expelling students under 10 years of age Action Item**

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 in 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 2014-2015 PEIMS Data Standards to reinforce the rules related to expelling students who are under the age of 10.

TEA is proposing the following changes:

New Reporting Requirement for the PEIMS 425 Record Business Rules and Reporting Requirements:

**Except 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.**

Appendix E – Additional Information Related to Discipline - Question 9

**What is the minimum age that a student can be expelled?**

**Old answer**

*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, **must be expelled from their regular education setting** for a time period that is determined by the 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.*

**Students who are less than 10 years of age and commit an expellable offense must be expelled with placement to a DAEP.**

**New Answer**

Under TEC §37.007(a), (d), and (h), and §37.007(f) students who are at younger 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.

Under TEC §37.007(e), (student brings a firearm to school), students who are at younger 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.

Additionally, new edits will be added to further reinforce these requirements.

42588 <b>*NEW</b>	44425 -0062	<p>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".</p> <p>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.</p>	SW	3		X	X	X
----------------------	----------------	--	----	---	--	---	---	---

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".	SW	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**

The ITF Committee made a recommendation to modify the 2014-2015 PEIMS Data Standards to: 1. Add the new reporting requirement, 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.

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 10 years old.

**PCPEI Discussion**

Mary Ann Whiteker stated the need to clarify the ITF recommendation. Paul Clore stated that the grammar was incorrect for the re-worded new answer. Bryce re-wrote the new answer to read ‘student who are younger than 10 years of age’.

Robert Muller did not agree with the language ‘determined by the campus administrator’ and stated that his district uses a ‘district hearing officer’. Mary Ann Whiteker suggested using ‘superintendent or designee’. Robert also addressed that the issue that TEC 37.007(e) action was taken after the expulsion hearing. Bryce responded with the legal citation. Robert Muller suggested changing the wording. Bryce recommended removing ‘after the expulsion order was issued’ and adding the following language: ‘unless the expulsion term is reduced by the superintendent or designee’.

**PCPEI Action**

**Motion:**

Robert Muller made a motion to modify the 2014-2015 PEIMS Data Standards to: 1. Add the new reporting requirement, 2. Revise the “question 9 answer” in Appendix E with the revised wording, 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. Mary Beth Matula seconded the motion.

**Vote:**

The motion passed unanimously.

**3. 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 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 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 Code

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

Current Appendix E - Definition

43	<b><u>Truancy (failure to attend school) – Student with at least 3 unexcused absences – TEC § 25.094. Failure to Attend School</u></b> - (a) An individual commits an offense if the individual: <b>(1)</b> is required to attend school under Section 25.085; and <b>(2)</b> 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.
44	<b><u>Truancy (failure to attend school) – Student with 10 unexcused absences – TEC § 25.094. Failure to Attend School</u></b> - (a) An individual commits an offense if the individual: <b>(1)</b> is required to attend school under Section 25.085; and <b>(2)</b> 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, 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><u>Truancy (failure to attend school) – Student with at least 3 unexcused absences – TEC § 25.094. Failure to Attend School</u></b> - (a) An individual commits an offense if the individual: <b>(1) is 12 years of age or older and younger than 18 years of age;</b> <b>(2)</b> is required to attend school under Section 25.085; and <b>(3)</b> 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.
44	<b><u>Truancy (failure to attend school) – Student with 10 unexcused absences – TEC § 25.094. Failure to Attend School</u></b> - (a) An individual commits an offense if the individual: <b>(1) is 12 years of age or older and younger than 18 years of age; (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.</b>

**ITF Discussion**

Nancy Dunnam asked about if a student 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 get coded as truant for all 10 days. Priscilla stated that based on the law interpretation the student would only be considered truant for 5 days once the student turned 12 years old. Nancy stated she would like this specific topic brought back to the committee for the next ITF meeting on January 7, 2013 along with specific guidance on dealing with truancy situations where a student is turning age 6 and then turning age 12. 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, 2013. ITF recommended an additional example be added to the PEIMS Data Standards to illustrate this scenario.

**ITF Recommendation**

The ITF Committee made a recommendation 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.

**PCPEI Discussion**

Paul Clore stated that he was not comfortable with a PEIMS person being able to precisely determine if the student is at the right age at time of truancy. Bryce Templeton stated that a judge should be the check and balance for students who are under the age of 12 and have been filed on for Truancy. If a student is under the age of 12 and a district files truancy charges against the student, then the judge should dismiss the case. Paul Clore addressed his concern that minimizing the error factor by humans manually making the determination if the student was of age at time of truancy would eliminate the problem of students being filed on for Truancy when not appropriate. Terry Driscoll stated that this was not PEIMS issue but a Student Information System issue. Bryce also stated that many SIS have alerts when a student has accumulated a certain number of unexcused absences. Terry stated that currently, many SISs do not include the age of the students in the truancy management feature and that SISs will need to be modified. David McKamie added that would be a nice feature.

Mary Ann Whiteker asked if we were saying it is okay for the children under 10 to not come to school or would the parents get filed against. Bryce replied that there are separate citations to deal with truancy by filing against parents when a student under the age of 12 does not attend school as required. Mary Ann recommended that the SIS should not be updated, but should notify the district truant officer that the child is truant and file charges against the parent. Terry Driscoll agreed with Mary Ann.

Bryce Templeton wanted to ensure that the discussion was focusing on disciplinary-action-reason-codes 43 & 44. Mary Ann asked if we could still use Disciplinary Action Reason Code 42 (Parent Contributing) on all students under the age of 12 and Bryce stated that they could and that this part of the law had not changed.

Terry Driscoll suggested TEA add an example using Disciplinary Action Reason code 42 (Parent Contributing) when the student is under the age of 12. Bryce stated that an example could be included in the Data Standards.

### **PCPEI Action**

#### **Motion:**

Terry Driscoll 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. Paul Clore seconded that motion.

#### **Vote:**

The motion passed unanimously.

## **4. TSDS Student GPS Dashboards Assessment**

### **Action Item**

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.

- Pearson is adding Unique ID to STAAR and TELPAS files beginning with the April 2014 5<sup>th</sup> grade & 8<sup>th</sup> grade mathematics and reading administration (that is the first STAAR administration to report in 2014).
- *If the LEAs select the option for TEA to load the test results on their behalf*, TEA will convert the test result files to XML and load the data to the TSDS Operational Data Store (ODS).
- If the LEA does not select the option for TEA to load the test results on their behalf, the LEA will be responsible for converting the test results to XML and loading the data to the ODS.

### **ITF Discussion**

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.

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.

### **ITF Recommendation**

The ITF Committee made a recommendation to approve an annual renewable option in the TSDS studentGPS™ Dashboards, to allow a LEA to “opt in” and allow TEA to load the LEA state assessment on behalf of the LEA to the TSDS studentGPS™ Dashboards.

### **PCPEI Discussion**

Mary Beth Matula asked if there was going to be a Service Fee for TEA loading the Assessment data. Terri Hanson answered there would not be a service fee; this is a free service for schools that opt in. Terry Driscoll asked if this would include prior year data. Terri answered that the

data load service would not include prior year data because of the Unique ID being absent from the prior year data. Terri also stated this service would begin in April 2014. Robert Muller asked why TEA would load this data. Terri Hanson replied that TEA would provide this service to load the data or the LEA would load this data locally. Terri further stated that many districts did not have the expertise or resources to load the data on their own. Mary Ann Whiteker asked if the TEA would receive the Assessment data before or at same time as the LEA from Pearson. Terri stated that the TEA would receive the data at the same time; however, it would take some time to get the data file coded to load the data into the dashboards. Mary Beth Matula asked if this would be for 2014 on, or could the LEA work with SIS vendor to get data prior to 2014. Terri stated that the service would begin in 2014 and that going forward the LEA could work with their SIS vendor to get Unique ID in their data to load prior year data, but for now the TEA will only load starting with 2014.

Terri Hanson also stated that this service would be only for the STAAR or State Assessment data.

### **PCPEI Action**

#### **Motion:**

Mary Beth Matula made a motion to approve an annual renewable option in the TSDS studentGPS™ Dashboards, to allow a LEA to “opt in” and allow TEA to load the LEA state assessment on behalf of the LEA to the TSDS studentGPS™ Dashboards. Paul Clore seconded the motion.

#### **Vote:**

The motion passed unanimously.

## **5. Historical Data in the TSDS Dashboard**

### **Action Item**

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 begin appearing in the second year of a LEA’s participation in the TSDS Dashboards. As LEAs move into 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 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 a 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 see 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 setting assigned to the student. Bryce further stated that only campus administrators should know the discipline history of a student as 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.
- **Student – Course Transcript**  
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 access to only the course transcript data for the students enrolled on their campus.

Brenda Richmond asked for a 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™ Dashboards. 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.

- **Student - State Assessments**  
ITF discussed generally 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.

### **ITF Recommendation**

The ITF Committee made a recommendation to approve displaying the historical data for Staff-Teacher Attendance, Student-Attendance, Student-Course Transcript, and Student-State Assessment in the TSDS studentGPS™ Dashboards.

Note: The ITF committee did not approve to display historical data of Student-Discipline.

**PCPEI Discussion**

Mary Ann Whiteker stated she did not like the fact historical Teacher Attendance Rate would be viewable after the school year of employment. Terri Hanson responded that this historical data was not obtainable through the HR system at most districts. She also stated that this type of information would be beneficial to identify classrooms where performance is low and determine if this was because of low attendance by the teacher. Mary Ann stated that she had a problem with this type of information being presented in a historical format because of the nature of the data. Terri stated that this information could or could not be loaded to the Dashboards and if the LEA didn't want this data in their system they do not have to load it.

Paul Clore asked if this was aggregated data. Scott Johnson replied, yes, the historical attendance data are counts of days present and days absent by calendar year.

Paul Clore did not support an individual teacher's information being accessible through a public web interface. Terri Hanson replied that access into the Dashboards was subject to the security roles at the district and is not accessible to the public. Mary Ann asked if the Legislature could access this information. Terri stated that in order for this information to be accessed, the individual accessing the data would need the appropriate access as authorized by the school district. This data cannot be accessed by ESCs, TEA, or any other state government staff. Paul Clore asked about Public Information Requests. Terri stated that the district owns this information and that the individual would need to request the information through the school district. The school district would be able to deny access to confidential information. Terri reiterated the fact that access a LEA can opt to not load certain data components into the Dashboard.

David McKamie stated that principals in Region 12 were excited to have this feature after one principal noticed a teacher had been off either Friday or Monday every other week. Terri added that this could be an early warning indicator for principals to see which teachers were not in the classroom.

Mary Ann Whiteker stated that this kind of data could be interpreted incorrectly because the teacher may actually be out of the classroom for training and that a teacher is given their days off by law to be taken at their convenience.

Terry Driscoll stated that the Dashboard data was only for LEAs, not the TEA or ESCs, and that Lubbock ISD uses the staff data to monitor classroom performance.

David McKamie stated that the ITF committee voted against the historical Student-Discipline data because of students needing to have a clean start in a new school year or new campus.

Paul Clore stated that he felt approving this proposal would be moving too quickly.

Robert Muller asked if it were legal for teachers to view student historical discipline data. Melody Parrish answered that after talking to the TEA legal team this was a local decision.

Melody also stated that if this option to allow historical data for the 5 categories was approved, there was not an option to turn it off at a later date, but that could be added as an enhancement to the system in the future.

Terry Driscoll asked if transcripts would have historical data. Scott Johnson stated that this particular category was different in the fact that you can load prior year transcript data for the transcript portion. Terry asked if they would be able to load local assessment data and Scott replied no.

Mary Ann Whitaker called for a motion based the PCPEI discussions.

**PCPEI Action**

**Motion:**

Terry Driscoll made a motion to approve displaying the historical data for Student-Course Transcript and Student-State Assessment in the TSDS studentGPS™ Dashboards Paul Clore seconded the motion.

Note: The PCPEI committee did not approve to display historical data of Staff Teacher – Attendance, Student – Attendance and Student-Discipline.

**Vote:**

The motion passed unanimously.

**6. TSDS Incident Management System (TIMS) Overview**

**Action Item**

Terri Hanson presented a proposal to the ITF committee to discuss the TSDS Incident Management System (TIMS). TEA is seeking approval to access the LEA's TSDS data, with permission of the LEA, during the processing of a customer support incident.

- All TSDS support requests must be made through the TSDS Incident Management System (TIMS)
- Incidents may include questions, problem reports or requests for enhancements/suggestions
- An incident may be opened by any TSDS user, a logon to TIMS is not required

Terri presented the different levels of support that the TIMS will include:

Level 1 – LEA Stewards - Focal Point for User Support Routing and Basic Troubleshooting of Application.

Level 2 – ESC Champions and MSDF Technical Coaches - 1st Escalation Point for Data Anomalies and Use.

Level 3 – TEA TSDS Support Desk - 2nd 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 stated that TIMS would include a Data Use Agreement between the LEAs and TEA.

- FERPA gives students 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 for 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 date 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 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.

ITF suggested that the TEAL approval process be modified to allow the Superintendent to approve a 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 Johnson 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.

### **ITF Recommendation**

The ITF Committee made a recommendation to approve TEA to access a LEA's TSDS data during the processing of a customer support incident, with permission of the LEA granted at the time the incident ticket is submitted.

---

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.

### **PCPEI Discussion**

Terry Driscoll asked if there were any way to verify that a TEA person or ESC person had tried to view any other data they did not have approval to view. Terri Hanson replied that there is a database log. Terry asked if the district could get to that log. Melody Parrish replied that she did not know that answer. Terry asked if this would be something the Legislature could ask to see and Melody replied no. Terry wanted clarification that TEA would not access this data and Terri replied that the TEA would not access this data.

Mary Ann Whiteker asked if this would all be going through TEAL and Terri responded yes.

David McKamie stated that ITF made a recommendation for superintendents to approve a person to give TEA or ESCs authority to view data for a particular instance. Terri Hanson stated that this was an item to take back to the TEA developers for a one time approval. Paul Clore stated that this was already a function of TEAL. Paul also

stated that the smaller LEAs may have to hire a person to just do this approval. Terri stated that those type of districts could work with their ESC to do the approval when TEA requests to view the data.

**PCPEI Action**

**Motion:**

Robert Muller made a motion to approve TEA to access a LEA's TSDS data during the processing of a customer support incident, with permission of the LEA granted at the time the incident ticket is submitted. Paul Clore seconded the motion

**Vote:**

The motion passed unanimously.

**Part B: Summary of the ITF Business from the October 31, 2013 meeting****1. District and Campus Performance Indicator Proposal for Legacy PEIMS system      Action Item**

Bryce Templeton and Fernando Garcia presented a data collection proposal to the ITF committee to collect new school district/charter school and campus performance data as required by HB5 from the 83<sup>rd</sup> legislative session. Schools would evaluate themselves and then assign and report a performance rating of exemplary, recognized, acceptable, or unacceptable for the district/charter school and each campus, based on locally-determined criteria certain programs and/or categories. The criteria for rating the district/charter school and each campus must to be developed by local committee.

House Bill 5 from the 2013 regular legislative session added TEC 39.0545 that requires:

1. districts and charter schools (LEAs) to evaluate their district/charter and each of their campuses and assign a performance rating for their community and student engagement, and compliance for the following factors: **fine arts, wellness and physical education, community and parental involvement, 21<sup>st</sup> Century Workforce Development program, the second language acquisition program, the digital learning environment, dropout prevention strategies, educational programs for gifted and talented students.**
2. LEAs must rate themselves and each campus and assign a performance rating overall for the collective group of categories/factors identified in number 1.
3. LEAs must rate themselves and each of their campuses and assign a performance rating regarding compliance with statutory reporting and policy requirements

School districts and charter schools are required to assign a performance rating of exemplary, recognized, acceptable, or unacceptable to the district and each campus, based on locally-determined criteria for each of the above mentioned programs and/or categories. The criteria for rating the district and each campus are to be developed by local committee.

TEA is seeking approval to collect the following data based on the requirements derived from House Bill 5 Section 46 (TEC 39.0545) and Section 60 TEC 39.363) beginning with the 2013-2014 school year in Submission 3 (Summer Submission).

The legislation requires that the performance ratings be submitted to the TEA by August 8, 2014 and made available publicly by the districts. Note: This date will be made flexible in order to work within the PEIMS summer submission timelines. Given the PEIMS submission deadlines, TEA would still be able to post the data on the TEA public website as required by October 1, 2014.

The data collection for this new requirement will need to begin with the Summer PEIMS Collection of the 2013-2014 school year on the 010 District Organization record and the 020 Campus Organization record.

This new data reporting requirement will be effected by adding a new code table:

- PERFORMANCE-RATING-CODE (C198)
  - 00 Not Applicable
  - 01 Exemplary
  - 02 Recognized
  - 03 Acceptable
  - 04 Unacceptable
- 10 new data elements:
  - 1) FINE-ARTS-CATEGORY-CODE (E1531)
  - 2) WELLNESS-AND-PHYSICAL-ED-CATEGORY-CODE (E1532)
  - 3) COMMUNITY-AND-PARENTAL-INVOLVEMENT-CATEGORY-CODE (E1533)
  - 4) 21ST-CENTURY-WORKFORCE-DEVEL-PGM-CATEGORY-CODE (E1534)
  - 5) SECOND-LANG-ACQUISITION-PGM-CATEGORY-CODE (E1535)
  - 6) DIGITAL-LEARNING-ENVIRONMENT-CATEGORY-CODE (E1536)
  - 7) DROPOUT-PREVENTION-STRATEGIES-CATEGORY-CODE (E1537)

- 8) EDUCATIONAL-PGM-FOR-GT-STUDENTS-CATEGORY-CODE (E1538)
- 9) OVERALL-RATING-CATEGORY-CODE (E1539)
- 10) STATUTORY-REPORTING-AND-POLICY-COMPLIANCE-CODE (E1540)

These new data elements would capture the information needed for the TEA to publish the performance ratings assigned by districts, charters and their campuses by the October 1, 2014 deadline as required in HB5 Section 60 - TEC 39.363.

Fernando Garcia illustrated to ITF the proposal that would add the 10 new data elements listed above to the 010 District record and the 020 Campus record. Each new data was discussed and it was illustrated that each data element would be reported with a value from the new PEIMS code table C198 as listed above.

Shannon Housson stated that since this proposal had been finalized, that TEA upper management was discussing the possibility of not collecting the data for the STATUTORY-REPORTING-AND-POLICY-COMPLIANCE-CODE (E1540) with code table C198 and possibly using PEIMS code table C088 (Yes/No) to collect the information for this data element.

Fernando Garcia and Bryce Templeton continued the presentation by presenting the edits (data validations) that would be implemented for the 2013-2014 school year to ensure the data quality of this new information.

The edits for this information would require that this information be reported in submission 3 and not be allowed in submissions 1, 2, or 4.

The edits for this information would warn a district/charter school if data elements E1531 – E1538 were all reported as “00” – Not Applicable for a district/charter or campus.

The edits would not allow a district/charter or campus to report data elements E1539 – E1540 with a value of “00” – Not Applicable. Note: IF TEA upper management decides that the E1540 data element should be reported with PEIMS code table C088, then E1540 would be removed from the criteria of this edit.

## **ITF Discussion**

Aaron Daitz asked if this data collection was going to be for summer only. Bryce Templeton responded that this data collection would be for submission 3 only. Aaron asked about year round schools as they are in school through August. Bryce responded that there were approximately 5 weeks after the last due date for year round schools and that TEA would be able to meet the publication deadline of October 1.

Peggy Sullivan asked if this was a new TEA data collection or has this data been collected previously. Bryce stated that this was a completely new data collection.

Beverly Meyer asked why TEA decided PEIMS was selected as the means to collect this data. Bryce stated that TEA upper management determined that because of the high level of data quality for information collected through PEIMS that this would be the best option. Beverly asked if this was going to be an annual collection or if this was a onetime collection. Bryce responded that this was an annual collection for submission 3.

David McKamie posed a question regarding a districts timeframe to collect this data, would it be at the end of the school year, was this flexible, will the performance code change throughout the school year or can they change? Shannon Housson responded that senior management’s directive was that the information reported is a local decision and this would be our basic response to questions. TEA is not allowed to give any guidance on how the districts go about assigning these performance measures.

David asked if there were anything to determine when a district assigns the performance measure or does the law not specify. Shannon stated that it would be a local decision. +

Debbie Largent asked if the districts have been notified. Shannon responded that TEA has not notified schools of this change. TEA has been receiving calls regarding HB 5, and callers have been told that the bill was being analyzed. Brenda Richmond stated that the administration at Hay CISD was aware of the changes and how would the districts be notified. Bryce stated that once the proposal is approved at the Data Governance Board notifications would be sent to the superintendents.



David asked a question about any data checking for districts that have a campus marked as unacceptable in a particular data element but have that same data element marked as exemplary at a district level. Bryce stated that TEA would not be validating the data at this level; at least not in the first year of collection. It is up to a local committee to determine the criteria developed and then the LEA to assign the ratings for the district/charter and the campuses. David stated that there were no edits to police the data and Bryce responded that the reporting wide open based upon the district/charter determinations for reporting. Shannon Housson stated that there is currently a discussion regarding data element E1540 and that TEA upper management is working with the Legislature to determine if this data element should be a yes/no type of response instead of using code table C198.

David McKamie asked if code 00 – Not applicable would be used for other collections not collecting this data. Bryce responded that in collection 1, 2, & 4 these performance indicator data elements would need required to be blank.

Aaron Daitz asked if a campus were to report N/A for all categories such as PK campuses that report all N/A, would the edits check for this scenario. Bryce stated that the edits would warn a campus if all of the individual performance indicators were reported as 00 – Not Applicable.

David McKamie asked if there would be a check between the 010 and 020 records where there were 020 records that were reported with 00 – Not Applicable and the 010 records did not match. Bryce stated that there would not be a data check on this situation as this was local decision.

David made a statement regarding ESCs giving guidance to their districts and Bryce responded that if TEA cannot give guidance then the ESCs should not give guidance either. Shannon stated that he and Shelly Ramos would be developing a commissioner's rule where the guidance for district/charters and campuses would be covered in the rule.

Peggy Sullivan asked if it would be possible to extend the school name element to 50 characters to match what is in the TSDS system. Bryce stated that it would not be a possibility with legacy system given the restraints on available space for the remaining few years the Legacy system must operate.

### **ITF Recommendation**

The ITF Committee made a recommendation to approve the new data collection for school districts and charter schools to assign and report a performance rating of exemplary, recognized, acceptable, or unacceptable to the district and each campus, based on locally-determined criteria for the proposed new data elements E1531 – E1540 with the understanding that the criteria for rating the district/charter school and their respective campuses would be developed by a local committee.

### **PCPEI Discussion**

Mary Ann Whiteker asked if this data would be reported on the same web page as

- (1) The letter performance rating assigned to each school district and campus under Section 39.054 and each distinction designation awarded to a school district or campus under Subchapter G;
- (2) The performance rating assigned to a school district and each campus in the district by the district under Section 39.0545; and
- (3) The financial accountability rating assigned to each school district and open-enrollment charter school under Section 39.082.

Shannon Housson stated that TEC 39.363 lists all three criteria. The planning hasn't gotten that far but from a logistic stand point this information should all be put in one place. Mary Ann stated that, that was good because that was the intent and there is a developing working group to assist districts and campuses to determine criteria for the different ratings. Bryce Templeton asked if this information would be available to the LEAs. Mary Ann replied that the group would be meeting shortly so the LEAs would have the opportunity to use this information if they choose. Melody Parrish asked which groups would be involved. Mary Ann replied that TASA and TASB would have representatives present.

Melody stated that a link to this support information could be included in the Data Standards and the LEAs could use that information or determine their own criteria when determining the ratings.

Mary Ann stated that these parameters for the categories would broaden the scope not narrow the scope.

Bryce Templeton asked when this information would be available and Mary Ann replied January at the latest.

Shannon Housson added that data element STATUTORY-REPORTING-AND-POLICY-COMPLIANCE-CODE E1540 was under review and may be modified to a yes/no.

**Note: After the PCPEI meeting the STATUTORY-REPORTING-AND-POLICY-COMPLIANCE-CODE data element was changed to be yes or no response and not use the Ratings code table.**

### **PCPEI Action**

#### **Motion:**

Paul Clore made a motion to approve the new data collection for school districts and charter schools, in the 2013-2014 school year, to assign and report a performance rating of exemplary, recognized, acceptable, or unacceptable to the district and each campus, based on locally-determined criteria for the proposed new data elements E1531 – E1540 with the understanding that the criteria for rating the district/charter school and their respective campuses would be developed by a local committee. Robert Muller seconded the motion.

#### **Vote:**

The motion passed unanimously.

**Note: After the PCPEI meeting the STATUTORY-REPORTING-AND-POLICY-COMPLIANCE-CODE data element was changed to be yes or no response and not use the Ratings code table.**

## **2. District and Campus Performance Indicator Proposal for TSDS PEIMS system Action Item**

Tessie Bryant and Fernando Garcia presented a proposal to the ITF committee to approve the addition of the Performance Indicator data elements approved for the PEIMS Legacy system to the Texas Student Data System (TSDS) Texas Education Data Standards for the 2013-2014 school year. The definitions of each data element and the use of the new code table would be identical to the Legacy system proposal.

TEA is seeking approval to add the following data elements to the TSDS Texas Education Data Standards to the LocalEducationAgencyExtension Complex Type and the SchoolExtension Complex Type:

- 1) TX-FineArtsCategory (E1531)
- 2) TX-WellnessAndPECategory (E1532)
- 3) TX-CommunityAndParentalInvolvementCategory (E1533)
- 4) TX-21stCenturyWorkforceDevelPgmCategory (E1534)
- 5) TX-SecondLanguageAcquistionPgmCategory (E1535)
- 6) TX-DigitalLearningEnvironmentCategory (E1536)
- 7) TX-DropoutPreventionStrategiesCategory (E1537)
- 8) TX-EducationalPgmGTStudentsCategory (E1538)
- 9) TX-OverallRatingCategory (E1539)
- 10) TX-StatutoryReportingAndPolicyCompliance (E1540)

Add code table

- C198 – PERFORMANCE-RATING-CODE - TX-PerformanceRatingIndicatorType
  - 00 Not Applicable
  - 01 Exemplary
  - 02 Recognized
  - 03 Acceptable
  - 04 Unacceptable

### **ITF Discussion**

Brenda Richmond asked how the early adopters would be notified of these changes. Tessie Bryant responded that once the proposal reached its final approval there would be a vendor webinar to discuss the changes related to this data collection.

Debbie Largent asked if this data collection would always be in the summer collection and Bryce responded that this information would always be collected in the summer collection because there is not enough time with the time constraint of posting the information by October 1 to collect the data in the extended year collection.

### **ITF Recommendation**

The ITF Committee made a recommendation to approve a new data collection for school districts and charter schools to assign and report a performance rating of exemplary, recognized, acceptable, or unacceptable to the district and each campus, based on locally-determined criteria for each of the above mentioned programs and/or categories.

### **PCPEI Discussion**

None.

#### **PCPEI Action**

##### **Motion:**

Terry Driscoll made a motion to approve a new data collection for school districts and charter schools to assign and report a performance rating of exemplary, recognized, acceptable, or unacceptable to the district and each campus, based on locally-determined criteria for each of the above mentioned programs and/or categories. Robert Muller seconded the motion.

##### **Vote:**

The motion passed unanimously.

#### **4. Next PCPEI Meeting**

The next PCPEI meeting:

**February 4, 2014 10 a.m. – 2 p.m. TEA - PDC7**

#### **5. Adjournment:** Mary Ann Whitaker adjourned the PCPEI Meeting at 1:08pm.