



**Texas Education Agency
Policy Committee on Public Education Information
Tuesday, May 17, 2016**

Wm. B. Travis Building, G-100, PDC7
1701 N. Congress Avenue
10:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.

Meeting Minutes

Call to Order **Mary Ann Whiteker (Chair)**

Mary Ann Whiteker called the PCPEI meeting to order at 10:05 AM.
Roll call of the PCPEI members attending the meeting was taken.

PCPEI Members Present

Brian Gottardy	Danny Lovett
Dr. Patty Shaffer	Dawn Cummings for Mary Beth Matula
Janet Spurgin	Scott Lewis

PCPEI Members Present via GoToMeeting

Mary Ann Whiteker	Paul Clore
Jeff Goldhorn for Ronny Beard	Cody Carroll
Paul A. Norton	Terry Driscoll for Behrl Robertson
Dr. Clyde Steelman	Dr. Gilbert Trevino
Pablo Martinez for Bernadette Cardenas	

ITF Member Present:

David McKamie

TEA Staff Present

Commissioner Mike Morath	Melody Parrish
Terri Hanson	Bryce Templeton
Leanne Simmons	Scott Johnson
Shannon Housson	Jamie Crowe
Didi Garcia	Ed Linden
John Reese	Kristen Reynolds
Melissa Lemons	

Approve Minutes from the February 2, 2016 PCPEI Meeting Action Item

Mary Ann Whiteker introduced the PCPEI meeting minutes from the February 2, 2016 PCPEI meeting and asked the committee members for any comments or corrections. No changes were requested. Mary Ann called for a motion to accept the meeting minutes as presented.

Paul Clore motioned to approve and Dr. Patty Shaffer seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

ITF Report to PCPEI Committee

Presentation of recommendations from the March 12, 2016 and March 26, 2016 ITF Meetings

Presented by David McKamie, Information Task Force Vice Chair

David McKamie presented and summarized each of the following ITF business items and recommendations for the PCPEI members.

Part A: April 12, 2016 ITF Meeting

1. Discussion on Sharing PEIMS Data with Other TSDS Systems Action Item

There are TSDS data elements that are reported in one or more of the PEIMS submissions that need to be displayed in the studentGPS® Dashboard Application or used by the Early Childhood Data System (ECDS) or promoted for other TSDS collections. When other collections need to display this data, should the data come from the operational data store (ODS) or from the PEIMS Data Mart (PDM)?

Example: Foundation High School Program Participation Code (E1541) – Indicates whether a student is currently enrolled in (pursuing) the Foundation High School Program

Terri Hanson (TEA) presented two options to the committee.

Option #1 ODS: If the data is promoted from the ODS to the Dashboard Data Mart (DDM) or Core Data Mart (CDM), the data would not have been validated in the PEIMS Application. Mainly, the full battery of business validations used in the PEIMS data collections would not have been applied. When the data is loaded into the ODS, basic validations are performed. Code values are validated, however, most of the business validations will not be applied.

Option #2 PDM: If the data is promoted from the PDM to the DDM/CDM, the data would have been more extensively validated, however, the data showing in the other systems, would be dependent on the PEIMS Coordinator having promoted and validated the data.

ITF Discussion

Initially, there was concern over PEIMS data being extracted and sent often enough under Option 1. An additional concern was voiced over data not being the same between PEIMS and other applications that use PEIMS data. Terri Hanson (TEA) stated that additional business edits would be included into the other data marts that use the PEIMS data under Option 1.

In order to gain perspective, ITF Chair, Nancy Dunnam requested that school district members speak up on this matter as it affects them more directly. Several district members spoke up and prefer Option 1 since it is more real time and is not dependent on finalized PEIMS data even though additional business edits are not performed. It was also stated that Option 1 data (ODS) would not be problematic as this data can be loaded nightly and therefore they would not have to wait for finalized PEIMS data. Another aspect of Option 1 is that, since the data would be real time, it should reinforce correctness at the local district system level.

ITF Action

The ITF committee made a recommendation to use the data from the ODS when the data is also reported to the PEIMS Data Mart for a PEIMS collection (Option 1 (ODS)).

PCPEI Discussion

Mary Ann Whiteker stated that the data being entered is without immediate access and by the time it is available it is prior year. The purpose of the dashboard should be to see data in real-time and therefore, agreed with ITF regarding Option 1. Paul Clore supported her statement.

PCPEI Action

Motion: Paul Clore made a motion to approve the ITF recommendation to use the data from the ODS when the data is also reported to the PEIMS Data Mart for a PEIMS collection (Option 1 (ODS)).

Vote: The motion passed unanimously.

2. 2016-2017 FSHP implementation in the studentGPS® Dashboards Discussion Item

Scott Johnson presented this item to the ITF committee and stated that Texas Education Agency is ready to include the Foundation High School Program (FHSP) participation data, that is currently collected in submission 3, into the studentGPS® Dashboards.

As a result of House Bill 5 being passed in the 83rd legislative session, the Texas Education Agency is required to collect participation data on students that are pursuing the Foundation High School Program (FHSP) graduation plan.

The US Department of Education awarded the Texas Education Agency (TEA) another federal Statewide Longitudinal Data System (SLDS) grant in September 2015. The primary focus of this grant is the delivery of relevant and actionable data back to educators so they can continually improve student performance, while reducing the burden on schools to submit this data.

This grant will span over the next 4 years and will enable TEA to make more effective use of the TSDS data by extending graduation plan data to the studentGPS® Dashboards. Starting in the 2016-2017 school year, the TEA will implement the Foundation High School Program (FHSP) into the studentGPS® Dashboards based upon the data currently collected under House Bill 5 and TEC 28.025.

This proposal will outline the student, campus and LEA level changes that would need to occur in order to fully implement the FHSP data into the studentGPS® Dashboards.

Scott Johnson presented the details of this item to the ITF committee and provided an overview of the proposed changes to be made to the studentGPS® Dashboards that will make use of the PEIMS elements currently collected in submission 3. Scott Johnson also provided a high level overview of the grant that was awarded to the TEA. Scott stated that the inclusion of the FHSP data will be driven off of the FHSP Participant Code with a value of 1 (participating) being the trigger that includes the student FHSP participation in the Distinguished Level of Achievement (DLA) and the Endorsements.

Scott Johnson provided mocked up screen shots of the proposed changes to the studentGPS® Dashboards screens that will display the FHSP data collected from PEIMS. These screen shots depicted the student, campus and district level information that will be displayed on the studentGPS® Dashboards.

Linda Roska (TEA) had a question on how the calculation of 'pursuing' and 'not pursuing' an endorsement was to be calculated. Scott Johnson said this information was to be data driven from the student level and then rolled up to the campus and district level. If the Endorsement is reported with a positive participation code, the data would be included. If a student is reported with a positive response (1 - Pursuing), then the student would be included. If a student is reported with a negative response (0 – Not Pursuing), then the student would not be included. Dennis Telas had a question about this data for current 11th and 12th graders and how to report for graduates in the next Fall PEIMS collection.

Bryce Templeton (TEA) stated the 2016-2017 school year will be the 3rd year of the FHSP implementation. This will include all freshman, sophomores and juniors in high school. The 12th grade students will be fully represented in the 2017-2018 school year. The FHSP Participation Code E1541 will be the trigger (*Indicates whether a student is currently enrolled in (pursuing) the Foundation High School Program*) for including the FHSP data in the dashboards.

Texas Education Agency Action:

Scott Johnson stated that the addition of the FHSP data should be fully implemented into the studentGPS® Dashboards in the late fall time-frame of the 2016-2017 school year.

PCPEI Discussion

There were no questions or comments regarding the information presented.

3. PID Error Rate Suspension for 2015-2016 school year Discussion Item

TEA is planning to suspend the PID error rate for the 2015-2016 school year due to Texas public schools using different PEIMS systems. The TSDS PEIMS school PID error rate is calculated differently than the PEIMS EDIT+ school's PID error rate.

Terri Hanson presented this item to the ITF committee. In regards to the PID Error Rate, Terri Hanson stated that the PID Error Rate is currently only used as a line item on the Texas Accountability Performance Report (TAPR). Terri Hanson said that the TEA has decided to suspend the PID Error Rate for the 2015-2016 school year and reinstated in the 2016-2017 school year, TEA would like to use a new Data Quality Rate that will be determined at a later date. Terri continued by describing that in the EDIT+ system, the PID Error Rate is calculated at the point that the PEIMS data file is approved by the school district or charter school. This is after the school has had the opportunity to clean up any data that is problematic for that particular district; thus achieving a low PID Error Rate. If any of the student data that is corrected impacts another school district, then that district is able to clean up the data prior to their acceptance of the PEIMS EDIT+ data file and achieve a low PID Error Rate as well. This practice does not result in an accurate measure of data quality and the errors between two or more schools are still floating around the UID system and are potentially not attributed to any school. The TSDS system is currently computing the PID error rate for all schools at a particular point in time, after the close of a collection.

Nancy Dunnam stated that there is difficulty and confusion over the current PID Error reports within PEIMS due to all schools not following standard procedures for properly identifying the legal name of a student. Nancy Dunnam said a new Data Quality report with different measures would be more meaningful.

Terri Hanson stated that a new Data Quality indicator could be created to indicate, for example, how many times a district has retired a Unique ID. This might identify the instances where a school did not follow standard procedures for determining a student's legal name. Terri stated that the ITS-SEDS Division would convene a working group within TEA to come up with recommendations to present to the ITF committee.

Nancy Dunnam asked if the same guidelines needed to be followed for PID Error Rate for the upcoming PEIMS submission 3 (summer collection). Dennis Telas asked if there would be written guidelines to follow concerning PID Error Rate suspension for the summer Collection.

Texas Education Agency Action:

Terri Hanson stated that the Texas Education Data Standards (TEDS) would be updated to reflect that the PID Error Rate is being suspended for the 2015-2016 school year.

PCPEI Discussion

There were no questions or comments regarding the information presented.

Part B: April 26, 2016 ITF Meeting

1. Student Language Code Data Element for the 2017-2018 School Year Action Item

The United States Department of Education (USDE) EdFacts reporting requires that, for a student who is LEP, the Native Language be submitted as defined by the following:

- a. The language normally used by a child or youth; or
- b. The language normally used by the parents of the child or youth

Currently, and for many years, TEA has only collected the Home Language Code (E0895). The Home Language Code indicates the language spoken in the student's home, as determined by the student's home language survey. As a result, the state reporting includes students who are limited English proficient, but their associated language is English. In order to be in compliance with USDE requirements, the Texas Education Agency (TEA) needs to be able to know and report the non-English language for each LEP student. Therefore TEA is proposing that a new data element to be known as the Student Language Code be added to the PEIMS data collection system for the 2017-2018 school year.

The Student Language Code would be added to the Student Extension Complex Type and would be an optional data element. However, the Student Language Code would be required for each enrolled student reported through the fall submission. Only students who are leavers would not be reported with this data. TEA would add the Student language Code to the TSDS PEIMS Report PDM1-120-012 and also add validations to ensure the highest possible and reasonable data quality.

ITF Discussion

Nancy Dunnam asked for clarity regarding the authority for the Texas Education Agency to collect this information. Melissa Lemons (TEA) stated that federal legislation which requires the collection of the student and home language. Melissa Lemons referenced Texas Administrative Code 89.1215 which states that the Texas Education Agency (TEA) should collect the home language and the student language on the Home Language Survey. Bryce Templeton (TEA) addressed this question in more detail by stating that the United States Department of Education EdFacts Submission System requires the collection of this information. By virtue of receiving federal education funding, the TEA is obligated to comply with the data reporting requirements. Additionally, the TEA has been recently contacted by the USDE regarding the deficiency of reporting in this area. The state of Texas has been reporting numerous LEP students with a home language of English and this data does not support the purpose of the English Language Learners (ELL) program by serving students who cannot adequately speak English.

ITF member, Dennis Telas, inquired if the Student Language collection would be retroactive or if it would be required going forward. Bryce Templeton initially said that this collection will be required going forward in the 2017-2018 school year for all currently enrolled students. Dennis Telas verified that schools would be required to report both the Student Language and the Home Language. Bryce confirmed this fact. Dennis Telas then asked if the Home Language Code and the Student Language Code would need to be entered for students for previous years. Bryce Templeton confirmed that districts would need to populate the Student Language Code for all enrolled students effective with the 2017-2018 school year otherwise a data load error would occur.

ITF member, Peggy Sullivan, referred to the validation rule impacts located in the presentation (page 8), wanting to know if the combination of the Home Language of English and the Student Language of not English should generate a warning. Bryce Templeton stated that TEA had not planned on a warning for this data combination due to the anticipated number of needless errors this would generate for a school. Peggy Sullivan and Dennis Telas ran reports during the meeting to see how many students this would impact. Peggy Sullivan indicated that there would be more than 10,000 records meeting this data combination for Dallas ISD and Dennis Telas indicated that there would be 5,000 records for Round Rock ISD. The ITF committee members and TEA staff concurred that this was too many errors and that these would be needless errors for a school to review since one of the languages on the Home Language Survey is not English.

Peggy Sullivan asked if it was possible for TEA to locate the Student Language Code to be next to the Home Language Code in the XSD. Terri Hanson stated that TEA would look into this, but that the TEA policy has been to add new elements at the bottom of a complex to minimize changes to the XSDs.

ITF members representing the larger school districts discussed the amount of work there would be for schools to enter the Student Language Code for all enrolled students. Bryce Templeton polled the committee starting with the Skyward and the TCC representatives and then each district member present to get feedback on the level of effort needed to implement this data collection.

- Nancy Smith, Skyward, stated that adding this field should not be an issue and that the software can be modified to create a utility to update the field for the schools with the current value of the Home Language Code.
- Judi Sparks, TCC, stated that once the field is added, it can be defaulted and a utility run as needed to update the field. Judi Sparks also stated that schools will still need to validate the data for the students.
- Peggy Sullivan, Dallas ISD, stated that the Home Language and Student Language is something that they already store in the student management system, so the level of effort is minimal for Dallas ISD.
- Dianne Borreson, Hays CISD stated that this data reporting change would impact approximately 117 students out of 2900 LEP students and that this would not be a huge burden for the school district to report this data. Dianne suggested that districts should look at students that are identified as LEP and have a Home Language Code of English.
- Debbie Largent, Lewisville ISD, stated that the campus staff would likely have to go back to all Home Language Survey forms to input the correct data.
- Pablo Martinez/Nancy Cintron, Houston ISD stated that this will be more difficult for Houston due to the size of the district and the number of students enrolled in English Language Learner programs but that HISD should be able to programmatically populate the field with a default value for each student.
- Brenda Padelecki, Northeast ISD, stated that the district could populate the Student Language Code with the existing Home Language Code and then correct the instances that were identified as problematic through the data validation rules.

- Keitha Ivey, Amarillo ISD, stated that she was not sure how the district would populate the data, but that it would be a lot of work initially.
- Dennis Telas, Round Rock ISD, stated that the district could populate the new Student Language Code with the current Home Language Code to give the campus staff the majority of the data needed. This would likely result in some cleanup of the data after the PEIMS validations were run against the data.

Terri Hanson stated that the districts should verify each student's language code and that defaulting the Student Language to the Home Language code as was suggested, would make the implementation as painless as possible.

Bryce Templeton stated that from the comments by each district and vendor, if the system's implemented the method described by Terri Hanson, then the PEIMS validations would identify the bare minimum data that must be updated; a student who is reported as LEP, First Year Monitored, or Second Year Monitored cannot be reported with both the Home Language Code and Student Language Code as English. Bryce also stated that it would likely take most of a public school cycle, 15 years – EE-12, to truly get all of the data as clean as it should be. If schools begin storing and reporting the Student Language Code and Home Language Code starting in 2017-2018 for students that are new to the district, then with each passing year, the data will become cleaner and more accurate.

Nancy Dunnam stated that it would be necessary for the Texas Education Agency to provide guidance regarding the implementation of this collection; especially for smaller school districts. Terri Hanson advised that she would speak with Susie Coultriss regarding guidance. Bryce Templeton stated that Susie Coultriss has a frequent TETN session (monthly or quarterly) regarding the Bilingual/ESL program and that she would possibly accommodate the PEIMS staff to present and discuss the reporting with this group. The attendees include ESC program coordinators and some district program coordinators.

Peggy Sullivan stated that if this item is approved and published as early notice for the 2017-2018 school year, then the vendors and districts have a year before implementation and should be able to meet this reporting requirement. Keitha Ivey stated that this may not be enough time for vendors to implement this change. Bryce Templeton stated that there will be vendor training this summer, and assuming that these changes are approved through the governance cycle, TEA PEIMS staff will advise them of these changes and strongly suggest that the vendors implement the ability to store this information in the student management systems as soon as possible. The ability to extract the data to the fall submission can come later and in time for the 2017-2018 school year.

ITF Recommendation

ITF made a recommendation to add the Student Language Code to the fall submission and to the Student Extension effective with the 2017-2018 school year with TEA publishing early notice of this change in the 2016-2017 TSDS TEDS Addendum and to inform and train the PEIMS software vendors as soon as possible to prepare them for the need to immediately add the element to the student management systems.

PCPEI Discussion

David McKamie presented the proposal to the PCPEI members and then asked Texas Education Agency (TEA) for input. Bryce Templeton stated that there were 16,000 students being pulled in aggregations that may be incorrectly identified as LEP for the 2014-2015 school year. With the addition of a new data validation rule for the current school year (2015-2016) the number has dropped significantly to approximately 5500 students. The new rule is notifying schools when the Home Language Code is English and the student is reported as LEP. Terri Hanson clarified that this proposal is retroactive because each district will be required to store a Student Language Code for any enrolled student that does not have a Student Language Code identified in the student information system. Every student will need to be reported in the 2017-2018 school year based on their Home Language Survey for both the existing Home Language Code and the new Student Language Code.

Mary Ann Whiteker asked why the survey is necessary if the focus is on the student language and not the home language. Bryce stated that the Texas Administrative Code Bilingual/ESL program rules require that schools collect both the Home Language and Student Language codes. Further, the USDE requires the states to be able to provide a non-English language for each LEP student. For some LEP students, the Student Language is not always a non-English language. If the student's home language or student language is not English then the school is required to test the student for limited English proficiency. Mary Ann then wanted to confirm that there are no new questions being added to the Home Language Survey. Bryce stated that there are no new questions added. The existing E0985 – Home Language data element has been in place for many years but there is not an element in place to report on question 2 (student language) therefore the quality of data is not up to the needed standards to complete the required federal data reporting.

Mary Ann Whiteker then asked about the student language that would be entered in this new element. Bryce responded that the student language that would be entered for the element would be the answer to question 2 on the Home Language Survey. Mary Ann then asked about when the student moves from Spanish to English as their student language. Bryce confirmed that the Home Language Survey does not change for the district for that student. Terri Hanson reaffirmed that the Home Language Survey is not re-administered for the student.

Mary Ann clarified that her concern is the data entered for one purpose is often used for another purpose and does not reflect accurate information. She went on to inquire how the old data will be used. Bryce stated the students reported are those that are currently identified as LEP. If the LEP flag is set to "no" they will not be reported to the United States Department of Education (USDE). Mary Ann then gave an example of a student who is identified as LEP but is not in a program. They would continue to be reported as LEP though the student may eventually become proficient in English. Bryce stated that LPAC can exit the student from LEP which would then change the student's LEP flag to "no". The student would no longer be reported to USDE as LEP.

Mary Ann asked if TEA could go back to the SBOE and request that the rule be changed. Melody Parrish commented that the current proposal reflects correct data that is required in order to be in compliance. She then suggested that Bryce and Terri go back and discuss the concerns presented.

Mary Ann commented that she did not understand why this was being requested now. She feels that reports will not match as they will have conflicting information. Bryce stated that

reporting students identified as LEP and noting the answer to question 2 will allow TEA to know that the LEP student spoke a language other than English. Mary Ann wanted to know if TEA is reporting the parent or student. Bryce explained that TEA is reporting on the student and not the parent. The district can test the student if either the home language or student language is not English on the Home Language Survey.

Terry Driscoll stated his concern that the new data requirement is a burden on districts that are reporting properly in order to catch districts that are not. Bryce stated that when this new element is in place, all LEP students will be required to have at least one non-English language between the Student Language Code and the Home Language Code. There will be nothing for TEA to catch going forward unless a district misreports the student or home language and the puts the student into a special language program.

Mary Ann asked what would occur if the districts decided to not fill in the information. Bryce stated that the districts would receive a fatal; the data is a mandatory field. Terry inquired about the option to identify the districts that did it incorrectly and have them fix their data. Terri stated that the districts may not have incorrect data – the issue is the unknown. Dawn Cummings reiterated that the issue is not necessarily “wrong data” but instead is the fact that TEA does not know what the answer is to question 2. Brian Gottardy stated that it is important to know what the student’s language was when they were enrolled. The new data element will allow for this information be captured and stored in record.

Mary Ann said that many school districts will have a monumental undertaking due to their size. Terry added that the students to look at will be those that have English on their reporting. Bryce Templeton stated that currently, there are less than 6000 students that will be affected statewide. This is a relatively low number of students when averaged across all of the school districts.

Didi Garcia was called to the meeting to respond to committee questions. She began by stating the history of the proposal. She stated that TEA is required to report LEP to the USDE and in the 2014-2015 school year over 16,000 students were reported as LEP with the home language of English. The USDE questioned why this was but without having the answer to question 2 there was no way of accurately responding. Didi represented Susie Coultriss’ recommendation that both question 1 and 2 be reported so that we know how to respond and report accurate data in the future.

Bryce requested that Didi explain how this will reporting be retroactive. Didi stated that TEA is not requesting a new Home Language Survey be completed but that the responses on the original Home Language Survey be reported. This information will already be in the student’s file.

Bryce said that early notice will be given to vendors and directed the PCPEI members to the vendor responses during the March 26, 2016 ITF meeting minutes which had confirmations from two vendors on what they could do to assist with this addition. Melody Parrish then added that if vendors are provide a script to copy the home language to the student language that most schools will have very little data cleanup to do in the fall of 2017-2018. The districts could then review the small amount that will need review. Additionally, if the vendors will add this field to the 2016-2017 release of their SIS system, then schools can begin adding this data for new students and cleaning up the current data. Terri Hanson explained that if you go by the letter of the law, each district should go back and review all Home Language Surveys but the suggestion posed will assist and the data will become cleaner.

David McKamie stated some districts may have underreported students because they were not using both questions so this addition will assist those districts.

Mary Ann requested that TEA make sure that vendors are aware of this and will assist districts with this change. Bryce stated that vendor training is in July and that TEA will urge the PEIMS software vendors to add this new data element to their systems as soon as possible.

PCPEI Action

Motion:

Danny Lovett made a motion to approve the ITF recommendation to add the Student Language Code to the fall submission and to the Student Extension effective with the 2017-2018 school year with TEA publishing early notice of this change in the 2016-2017 TSDS TEDS Addendum and to inform and train the PEIMS software vendors as soon as possible to prepare them for the need to immediately add the element to the student management systems. Jeff Goldhorn seconded the motion.

Vote: The motion was passed unanimously.

2. Staff Data Reporting Adjustments 2016-2017

Action Item

Bryce Templeton began by discussing the background of the proposal and how the staff data is used in the Texas Academic Performance Report (TAPR). Bryce illustrated the following staff data calculations that are included as part of the TAPR.

Professional Staff:

The full-time equivalent (FTE) count of teachers, professional support staff, campus administrators, and, on the district profile, central office administrators. Staff are grouped according to roles as reported in PEIMS. Each type of professional staff is shown as a percentage of the total staff FTE.

Auxiliary Staff (District Profile only):

The count of full-time equivalent (FTE) staff reported in PEIMS employment and payroll records who are not reported in the PEIMS 090 Staff - Responsibilities record. The auxiliary staff are expressed as a percentage of total staff. For auxiliary staff, the FTE is the value of the percent of day worked.

Average Actual Salaries (regular duties only):

For each of the four categories, the total salary for that category is divided by the total FTE count for that category. Only payment for regular duties is included in the total salary; supplemental payments for extra duties (e.g., coaching, band and orchestra assignments, and club sponsorships) are not included. See Appendix A for lists of the PEIMS role IDs included in each category.

Teachers.

Teachers, special duty teachers, and substitute teachers. Substitute teachers are people who are either temporarily hired to replace a teacher who has quit, died, or been terminated or hired permanently on an as-needed basis.

Campus Administration.

Principals, assistant principals, and other administrators reported with a specific school ID.

Central Administration.

Superintendents, presidents, chief executive officers, chief administrative officers, business managers, athletic directors, and other administrators reported with a central office ID and not a specific school ID.

Professional Support.

Therapists, nurses, librarians, counselors, and other campus professional personnel. An employee who works half time and a reported actual salary of \$30,000 has a full-time equivalent salary of \$60,000. All average salaries are expressed in full-time equivalent form by dividing the sum of the actual salaries earned by the total FTE count.

Average Teacher Salary by Years of Experience (regular duties only):

Total pay for all teachers in each category divided by the total teacher FTE count for that category. The total actual salary amount is pay for regular duties only and does not include supplemental pay. For teachers who also have non-teaching roles, only the portion of time and pay dedicated to classroom responsibilities is factored into the average teacher salary calculation.

Average Years' Experience of Teachers:

The average number of completed years of professional experience, regardless of district. Weighted (1 for a full-time teacher, .75 for a three-quarter-time teacher, and .5 for a half-time teacher) averages are calculated by multiplying each teacher's FTE coefficient by his or her years of experience. These amounts are summed for all teachers and divided by the sum of all teachers' FTE coefficients.

Average Years' Experience of Teachers with District:

The average number of years employed in the district whether or not there has been any interruption in service. Weighted averages are calculated by multiplying each teacher's FTE coefficient by his or her years of experience in the district. These amounts are summed for all teachers and divided by the sum of all teachers coefficients.

As Texas public schools have begun to use contracted professional staff more and more, many schools are no longer able to completely and accurately report the professional staff that are serving the Texas public school students enrolled in a campus and sometimes entire local education agencies (LEAs).

Bryce Templeton described two different issues that needed to be addressed.

1. Missing Superintendent Data

The Agency has seen a large number of Texas public schools that fail to report a staff person in the role of school superintendent; PEIMS Role ID 02, in recent years. For example, based on the mandated Superintendent's Salary Report that is annually published on the TEA website, the number of LEAs with missing superintendent data for the 2014-2015 school year is 41 LEAs consisting of both traditional independent school districts and open enrollment charter schools.

Missing Superintendent Statistics (from Fall PEIMS submissions)

School Year	Number of Superintendents not Reported in Fall Submission
2014-2015	41
2013-2014	39
2012-2013	51
2011-2012	66

Bryce Templeton stated that on any given day, there is someone who is in charge of a public school serving as the superintendent. For the Fall Snapshot data submission, the person serving as the superintendent may be employed as the superintendent, may be serving as an interim superintendent, or may be also serving in another role. Currently the PEIMS data systems require that someone in each public school district be designated as the superintendent for the purpose of approving the district data collection. If someone can always be identified as the superintendent for the purpose of approving a PEIMS data collection, then it is also reasonable to expect that someone can be reported as ROLE ID 027 – Superintendent on the last Friday in October for the PEIMS Fall Submission.

TEA will apply a new validation rule for the 2016-2017 school year that requires at least one staff person be reported with PEIMS Role ID 027- Superintendent for the fall submission.

2. Missing Professional Staff Data

As schools begin to contract out for professional school staff more and more, the professional staff FTEs are greatly diminished in some LEAs due to the fact that these persons are not “employees” of the LEA. Some charter schools completely contract out the operation of their school to a contract management company and the non-instructional professional staff cannot be reported.

To allow schools that contract out classroom teachers and be able to provide data for the school in the Student Assessment Data Portal (Classroom Link Data), TEA added a STAFF-TYPE-CODE data element for the 2010-2011 school year. The code table for the Staff Type Code consists of the following codes:

PEIMS code table C181 – Staff Type Code (Current)

Code	Translation
1	School District or Charter School Employee
2	Contracted Instructional Staff Serving As a Classroom Teacher

Proposed PEIMS Data Reporting Solution: 2016-2017 school year

PEIMS code table C181 – Staff Type Code (Proposed)

Code	Translation
1	School District or Charter School Employee
2 (deleted)	Contracted Instructional Staff Serving As a Classroom Teacher
3 (add)	Contracted Professional Staff (Instructional and Non-Instructional) (Staff with a Role ID from PEIMS code table C021 – Role ID)

The addition of this new Staff Type Code will allow a school that contracts out for any of the professional roles listed in PEIMS code table C021 to report all of the professional staff serving the students of a school and be included in the FTE counts for that school's TAPR.

Additionally, TEA would implement data validation rules to ensure that data for each school includes at least one superintendent (see above), one classroom teacher, and one campus administrator in each fall submission. Other validation rules will be added for other staff roles. Bryce Templeton explained that currently there is a direct correlation between an employee and payroll. Adding a STAFF-TYPE-CODE that allows all professional staff to be reported would not cause a public school to look deficient in their professional staff data reporting. The professional contracted would not have to be reported with a payroll record.

ITF Discussion

There was discussion amongst the ITF members regarding the instances where the interim superintendent might also be an assistant superintendent, a principal, etc. Bryce Templeton stated that for interim superintendents, this may require that their professional duties (staff responsibility data) be split between the superintendent role and the other role the staff person is serving.

Dennis Telas inquired about the custodial staff. Bryce Templeton stated that contracted custodial staff would not be reported with the staff data. Custodial staff that are on the district payroll would be reported with the staff data, but would not be reported with the Staff Responsibility data.

Nancy Dunnam confirmed that the code is meant for teachers and professional staff only. Nancy stated that the code table translation needed some more information to clearly communicate the intent of the code. The ITF committee suggested the following explanatory language to be appended to the new Staff Type Code for Contracted Professional Staff: Staff with a Role ID from PEIMS code table C021 – Role ID instead of Instructional and Non-Instructional.

ITF Action

ITF made a recommendation to approve the deletion of Staff Type Code 2 – Contracted Classroom Teacher and the addition of a new code 3- Contracted Professional Staff (Staff with a Role ID from PEIMS code table C021 – Role ID), as well as the addition of validations that require the basic professional staff that exist at each public school to be reported.

PCPEI Discussion

Mary Ann asked what would happen if two districts hire curriculum staff and each has the staff half of the time but one district issues the contract. David McKamie stated that both districts would show use of that person. The percent of staff full-time equivalent (FTE) would indicate the percentage the staff member is at each district and would show correctly on the TAPR report. Bryce verified David's assessment.

Mary Ann then asked regarding a specific scenario where there is a county-wide alternative high school that contacts their staff. All districts use the campus but only one district pays the contacted staff. Would the reporting change for this? Bryce stated that the reporting would not change. If the district is the one that employs the contacted staff then they would be required to report the staff. If a district was using the staff part of the time then the reporting would be for the FTE amount used (ex. 50% FTE).

PCPEI Action

Motion:

Danny Lovett made a motion to approve the ITF recommendation to approve the deletion of Staff Type Code 2 – Contracted Classroom Teacher and the addition of a new code 3- Contracted Professional Staff (Staff with a Role ID from PEIMS code table C021 – Role ID), as well as the addition of validations that require the basic professional staff that exist at each public school to be reported. Paul Clore seconded the motion.

Vote:

The motion was passed unanimously.

3. Early Childhood Data System (ECDS) Reporting Adjustments 2016-2017 - Action Item

Ed Linden (TEA) presented this item to the ITF committee and reviewed the legal authority for collecting the Early Childhood data.

Legislation excerpt:

House Bill (HB) 4 was passed by the 84th Texas Legislature, 2015, and signed into law by Governor Abbott on May 28, 2015. HB 4 establishes additional state support for high-quality prekindergarten programs including authorization for a grant program and expansion of early childhood education reporting requirements for all Texas public schools. Grant applications are expected to be posted in spring 2016 and funding made available in summer 2016 for use by districts in implementing high-quality prekindergarten programs in the 2016-2017 school year. Additional funding will be made available in fall 2016 to support 2016-2017 implementation. In preparation for awarding high-quality prekindergarten grants, TEA must complete the following tasks:

- Review and update the 2008 Prekindergarten Guidelines
- Identify model family engagement strategies
- Establish a list of commissioner approved prekindergarten assessment instruments
- Determine high-quality prekindergarten teacher qualification requirements
- Develop additional prekindergarten professional development opportunities
- Adopt commissioner's rules for the implementation of the high-quality grant program established in HB 4

HB 4 also adds certain new prekindergarten reporting requirements for all public school districts and open-enrollment charter schools. In addition to implementation of the high-quality grant program, the statewide data collection required by HB 4 will begin in the 2016-2017 school year.

Proposed 2016-2017 changes for ECDS – Public Pre-K collection (PK-SCHOOL-TYPE):

A discussion was held with the newly formed Early Learning Advisory Committee (ELAC), on April 13, 2016, that resulted in a decision to ensure that all LEAs and charter schools that offer a Pre-K program, in addition to participating Private Pre-Ks, to provide a PK-SCHOOL-TYPE code value required by HB 4. The current 2016-2017 PK-SCHOOL-TYPE code of '09-None' would limit the amount of Pre-K data collected that displays the progress of ECDS Pre-K students on State, ESC, LEA, and Campus level reports. This resulted in the following changes regarding the PK-SCHOOL-TYPE code value table:

- Public Pre-K programs and charter schools that are submitting demographic and special programs data in the 2016-2017 school year required by HB 4, must provide a participating PK-SCHOOL-TYPE code from the C209 table for PEIMS submission 3.
- Participating Private Pre-K programs will also need to provide a participating PK-SCHOOL-TYPE code from the DC152 table through the TSDS collection for the 2016-2017 school year.
- The '09-None' value will be removed from the C209 and DC152 PK-SCHOOL-TYPE tables which will prevent Public and Private Pre-K programs from being excluded on all relevant Pre-K ECDS State, ESC, LEA, and Campus level reports.
- Business Validation logic rule 1: If service ID=010010000, then LEA must provide a valid PK-SCHOOL-TYPE value from code table C209

Code Table ID	Name	XML Name	Date Issued	Date Updated
C209	PK-SCHOOL-TYPE	PKSchoolType	3/1/2016	
Code	Translation			
01	Non-Public Pre-K Head Start			
02	Public Pre-K			
05	Non-Public Pre-K Licensed Child Care			
07	Public Pre-K Head Start			
08	Public Pre-K Licensed Child Care			
09	None			
99	Other			

Code Table ID	Name	XML Name	Date Issued	Date Updated
DC152	PK-SCHOOL-TYPE	PKSchoolType	3/3/2014	8/31/2015
Code	Translation			
09	None			
99	Other			
08	Public Pre-K Licensed Child Care			
07	Public Pre-K Head Start			
05	Non-Public Pre-K Licensed Child Care			
01	Non-Public Pre-K Head Start			
02	Public Pre-K			

ITF Discussion

None

ITF Action

ITF made a recommendation to approve the deletion of the 09-None code from PEIMS code tables C209 and DC152.

PCPEI Discussion

There were no questions or comments regarding the information presented.

PCPEI Action

Motion: Dr. Patty Shaffer made a motion to approve the ITF recommendation to approve the deletion of the 09-None code from PEIMS code tables C209 and DC152. Paul Norton seconded the motion.

Vote: The motion was passed unanimously.

4. Collecting Data for the High Quality PK Program Family Engagement Plan 2016-2017 **Action Item**

Ed Linden began by reviewing the legislation that requires the collection of the High Quality PK Program data.

Legislation excerpt:

House Bill (HB) 4 was passed by the 84th Texas Legislature, 2015, and signed into law by Governor Abbott on May 28, 2015. HB 4 establishes additional state support for high-quality prekindergarten programs including authorization for a grant program and expansion of early childhood education reporting requirements for all Texas public schools. Grant applications are expected to be posted in spring 2016 and funding made available in summer 2016 for use by districts in implementing high-quality prekindergarten programs in the 2016-2017 school year. Additional funding will be made available in fall 2016 to support 2016-2017 implementation.

In preparation for awarding high-quality prekindergarten grants, TEA must complete the following tasks:

- Review and update the 2008 Prekindergarten Guidelines
- Identify model family engagement strategies
- Establish a list of commissioner approved prekindergarten assessment instruments
- Determine high-quality prekindergarten teacher qualification requirements
- Develop additional prekindergarten professional development opportunities
- Adopt commissioner's rules for the implementation of the high-quality grant program established in HB 4

HB 4 also adds certain new pre-kindergarten reporting requirements for all public school districts and open-enrollment charter schools. In addition to implementation of the high-quality grant program, the statewide data collection required by HB 4 will begin in the 2016-2017 school year.

Ed Linden summarized the recommendation of the Early Learning Advisory Committee (ELAC) to add a data element to capture the Family Engagement Plan website link in order to be in compliance with the Family Engagement Plan requirements.

Proposed 2016-2017 changes for ECDS – Public Pre-K collection:

In order to collect the data needed for the High Quality Pre-K Program for the 2016-2017 School Year required by House Bill 4, the following requirements must be implemented in the PEIMS submission 3 collection:

1. Related to the requirement of a school district developing and implementing a Family Engagement Plan to assist the district in achieving and maintaining high levels of family involvement and positive family attitudes toward education, the Texas Education Agency

will add a new data element (FAMILY-ENGAGEMENT-PLAN-LINK) to the LocalEducationAgencyExtension complex type starting with the 2016-2017 school year.

2. Business Validation logic rule: If High Quality Pre-K Program = 1 then LEA must provide (FAMILY-ENGAGEMENT-PLAN-LINK) information for PEIMS Submission 3.

ITF Discussion

ITF members inquired as to whether districts had been notified regarding grants for the High Quality PK program. Ed Linden stated that this process is still underway but when the information is available it will be posted to TEA's website.

ITF Chair, Nancy Dunnam, inquired as to how long the FAMILY-ENGAGEMENT-PLAN-LINK would need to be available. Terri Hanson (TEA) responded that as long as the district is using the funds for the program that the link would need to be active.

ITF Action

ITF made a recommendation to approve the addition of the FAMILY-ENGAGEMENT-PLAN-LINK data element to the LocalEducationAgencyExtension complex type for the 2016-2017 school year and for submission 3.

PCPEI Discussion

Mary Ann requested insight as to why the URL link option was selected. Terri Hanson stated that during the Early Learning Advisory Committee (ELAC) meeting the members suggested this as an efficient way to capture the data. Terry Driscoll asked how long the link would need to be active. Bryce responded that as long as the district is using the funds from the High Quality PK Grant were active, the link would need to remain active. Mary Ann asked why the link is being reported through PEIMS as this is not typical for grant information. Bryce stated that reporting it through PEIMS would be more expedient than the grant management process. The reporting of the link eliminates the need to submit a lengthy document to the TEA Grants Division. Brian Gottardy asked if the link option had been successful previously. John Reese responded that with HB 2804 the link idea was introduced and has not yet been reported so there is no data verifying success.

PCPEI Action

Motion:

Paul Clore made a motion to approve the ITF recommendation to approve the addition of the FAMILY-ENGAGEMENT-PLAN-LINK data element to the LocalEducationAgencyExtension complex type for the 2016-2017 school year and for submission 3.

Vote: The motion was passed unanimously.

Open Forum

In the February 2, 2016 meeting it was requested that Domain 4 – Post-Secondary Licensures be brought back to the table for additional discussion. Bryce began by stating that Commissioner Morath is currently guiding the Agency on HB 2804 and the data elements proposed and needed for Domain 4. At this time reporting on licensures stops at graduation. The suggestion of reviewing licensures is still under advisement but no solution has been solidified regarding reporting beyond graduation.

Mary Ann questioned whether it would be possible to show that the student is on a “path” to completion. She cited that there are some CTE courses where the student cannot test until they are 18. There is also an LVN program where there is one exam that is not administered until August, at which point, the student has already graduated.

Melody Parrish confirmed that Mary Ann is wanting an “on-track” option so that the district can receive credit for the student. Mary Ann confirmed this is her concern.

Jeff Goldhorn also inquired about the process to be accepted as a member to PCPEI. Melody Parrish stated that a verbal acceptance has already been made by the Commissioner but a formal letter will need to be sent. Melody asked that Bryce add Jeff to the PCPEI mailing list.

Next PCPEI meetings

Dates suggested were July 12, July 19, August 2, and August 9. After discussion July 12 and 19 were not possible and August 9 was the CCRS meeting. August 2, 2016 was accepted as the next PCPEI meeting date.

Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 12:22 PM.