Texas Education Agency
Policy Committee on Public Education Information (PCPEI)
Tuesday, April 30, 2019

Wm. B. Travis Building, GoToMeeting and PDC 9
1701 N. Congress Avenue
10:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.

Meeting Minutes

Call to Order   **Andrew Kim**

Andrew Kim called the PCPEI meeting to order at 10:05 a.m.

Roll call of the PCPEI members attending the meeting was taken by Michele Elledge.

PCPEI Members Present:

John Allen (Frankston ISD)
Andrew Kim (Comal ISD)

PCPEI Members Present via GoToMeeting:

Patty Blue (Gustine ISD)	Suzanne Eiben (Palestine ISD)
Dr. Priscilla Canales (Weslaco ISD)	Jackie Janacek (College Station ISD)
Paul Clore (Gregory-Portland ISD)	Evelyn Jenkins (ESC 16)
Ray Cogburn (ESC 16)	Scott Lewis (LBB)
Carolyn Counce (TASB)	Cody Newcomb (Center Point ISD)
Dr. Priscilla Canales (Weslaco ISD)	Marcos Zorola (North East ISD)
Dr. Clark Ealy (College Station ISD)	

PCPEI Alternates Present via GoToMeeting:

Jennifer Carver (ESC 20 for Jeff Goldhorn)
Dawn Cummings (ESC 3 for Mary Beth Matula)
Suzanne Eiben (Palestine ISD for Jason Marshall)
Lynda Hoffpauir (ESC 5 for Danny Lovett)
Mary Morgan (ESC 11 for Clyde Steelman)
Nanette Power (Texarkana ISD for Paul Norton)

ITF Members Present via GoToMeeting:

David McKamie (ESC 12)

TEA Staff Present:

Candice DeSantis (ITS/BMD)	Leanne Simons (ITS/BMD)
Michele Elledge (ITS/BMD)	Heather Smalley (Performance Reporting)
Terri Hanson (ITS/BMD)	Jessica Snyder (Curriculum)
Patty O'Hara (Performance Reporting)	

TEA Staff Present via GoToMeeting:

Connor Briggs (ITS/BMD)	Ed Linden (ITS/BMD)
Jeanine Helms (ITS/BMD)	Melody Parish (ITS Deputy Commissioner)
Scott Johnson (ITS/BMD)	John Reese (ITS/BMD)

<u>**Approve Meeting Minutes from the January 30, 2019 PCPEI Meeting**</u>   **Action Item**

Andrew Kim asked if there were any corrections needed in the January 30, 2019 meeting minutes. Hearing none, he called for a motion to approve.
Clark Ealy made a motion to approve the January 30, 2019 PCPEI meeting minutes.
Paul Clore seconded the motion.
The motion passed unanimously.

**Information Task Force (ITF) Report to the
Policy Committee on Public Education Information (PCPEI)
For the April 9, 2019 ITF Meeting**

1. Dyslexia Risk Code Added for the 2019-2020 School Year   **Action Item**

TEA proposes to add the DYSLEXIA-RISK-CODE data element to the StudentExtension in order to comply with House Bill 1886 which requires that kindergarten and first grade students be screened for dyslexia and related disorders and also to comply with the reporting requirement of the Texas Education Agency (TEA) Strategic Plan Academic Excellence outcome measures.

Michele Elledge presented the Dyslexia Risk Code proposal to the ITF committee.

Due to the requirements to screen kindergarten (KG) and first grade students for dyslexia and related disorders and the associated outcome measures in the TEA Strategic Plan, TEA proposes to add a new data element DYSLEXIA-RISK-CODE. This new data element will provide a mechanism for local education agencies to report the outcome of dyslexia and related disorders screening.

Collection of this data element is proposed pending legislative mandate to collect this data and/or State Board of Education (SBOE) ruling to collect. If a bill is not signed into law mandating the collection of this data or the SBOE does not create a rule to collect the data, then for the 2019-2020 school year, DYSLEXIA-RISK-CODE will not be collected.

If legislation passes and/or the SBOE makes a ruling, the following changes are proposed:

1. Add a new data element, DYSLEXIA-RISK-CODE (E####) to the PEIMS Summer Submission.
2. Add guidance related to DYSLEXIA-RISK-CODE in the Texas Education Data Standards (TEDS) Section 2.
3. Add a new code table, DYSLEXIA-RISK-CODE (C2xx).
4. Analyze TSDS reports for the addition of DYSLEXIA-RISK-CODE.
5. Add data validation rules to support the collection of DYSLEXIA-RISK-CODE.

ITF Discussion:

Nancy Dunnam expressed concern that all new items for the 2019-2020 school year (19-20) are supposed to be finalized by March.

Michele Elledge noted the goal to have all significant changes published by the March publication of TEDS, but that we do publish a TEDS Addendum by July 1. Since this is a legislative session year, we anticipate there may be some things that have to be added for that Addendum, but we try to keep those changes to a minimum. This indicator will not be added for 19-20 if the legislation does not pass or the SBOE does not pass a rule requiring the collection of this data.

Dara Fuller asked how TEA will communicate to vendors if this gets added at the last minute. Michele Elledge replied that an email notification will be provided to vendors. Terri Hanson added that TEA will communicate as soon as possible. We recognize that July 1 is late to be communicating this information, so we will email and post all changes on TEDS website.

Nancy Dunnam requested it be noted that ITF does recognize that this is out of the desired timelines for making changes and adding new data collection(s). Due to changes in personnel, TEA needs to be reminded of the preferred timelines for data reporting changes.

Keitha Ivey asked for clarification regarding if dyslexia screening is new for the districts. Jessica Snyder answered no; it is not new. HB 1886 passed in the last legislative session and the screening went into place in the 2018-2019 school year (18-19). The results of the screening will be reported beginning in 19-20.

Dara Fuller asked about dyslexic kids that are already coded as dyslexic. Is it necessary to go back to look at previous screening? Jessica Snyder responded that the new dyslexia risk code would be used to report students screened in the year in which they are screened. This applies for KG and 1st grade in 19-20 and

applies to reporting the screening of students, not those being served for dyslexia and related disorders (which is a different indicator).

Jessica also noted that just because a student is identified as at-risk for dyslexia does not mean they will be identified as dyslexic later.

Peggy Sullivan asked about why the dyslexia risk indicator would be put on the Early Reading Indicator report. Michele Elledge replied that TEA will analyze to see if it will be added to this report and further analysis may show that it is not appropriate to add the DYSLEXIA-RISK-CODE to the Early Reading Indicator report. Peggy stated that, although they are similar age groups, there are different people looking at these two areas within her district and she does not think dyslexia screening is appropriate for the early reading indicator report.

Dara Fuller described a scenario where a student was screened for dyslexia in 18-19 when in KG, but not in 19-20 as a 1st grader. Would they be coded as 03 (not screened) or one of the other codes (i.e. 01- Screened and determined to be not at risk for dyslexia or related disorders or 02 Screened and determined to be at risk for dyslexia or related disorders) based upon prior year screening? Jessica Snyder responded that it is a requirement for all students to be screened in both KG and 1st grade. In 19-20, the LEA should report the Dyslexia Risk Code for the students who were screened in 19-20 (or if the student was not screened, then code 03).

Peggy Sullivan asked that even if a student was screened in KG, are they still required to be screened again in 1st grade? Jessica replied yes; the requirement is that students are screened in both grades. Sometimes, signs of dyslexia or related disorders do not present in KG and the student needs to be screened again in 1st grade.

Nancy Dunnam pointed out that the proposal guidance on page 11 indicates "at any time during the school year" and requested some clarification of that statement. She suggested adding information to the element definition to clarify when the screening was done. Terri Hanson confirmed that this is for screening for any time within 19-20. The questions before were about being screened in KG. Jessica Snyder stated that statute requires end of school year screening for KG students. Michele Elledge responded that the definition can be refined to clarify the timing.

Keitha Ivey asked when it will be determined one way or the other if the collection of DYSLEXIA-RISK-CODE is going into TEDS for 19-20. Michele responded that TEA will know by the end of the legislative session and/or SBOE meeting. Jessica Snyder and Shelly Ramos stated that the SBOE will take this up for first reading in June and second reading in September. Based on this schedule, if there is not a legislative mandate and the SBOE writes a rule to collect this data, the change would not be implemented until the 2020-2021 school year. Terri Hanson added that this proposal is presented in anticipation of supporting legislation being passed during the current session. The change will be published in 19-20 TEDS if the bill passes and we are waiting on Governor's signature.

Keitha Ivey asked when the legislative session ends. Terri replied May 24th. (After meeting it was determined that the legislative session is scheduled to end on May 27th.) Nancy Dunnam asked about the cutoff date for this this item and Terri Hanson responded that we will know by June 1.

Brenda Padalecki asked for verification that this indicator is separate from other at-risk reporting. Michele Elledge confirmed that this indicator is only related to at-risk for dyslexia, not at-risk for dropping out.

With no other questions, Nancy Dunnam asked that the ITF make a motion, with a request that the motion include the June 1 cutoff date.

ITF Action:

Dara Fuller made a motion to accept the proposal as presented to be added to the data standards if we have a deadline of June 1.

Peggy Sullivan seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

PCPEI Discussion:

David McKamie presented a summary of the Dyslexia Risk Indicator ITF Proposal, highlighting the main points and pointing out the following from the proposal, discussion, and ITF's recommendation:

- Dyslexia screening is required by law.

- The fourth paragraph of the proposal (under Overview) states that the collection of this data element is presented in anticipation of supporting legislation passing during the session and getting the governor's signature.

- At-risk for dyslexia is not related to other at-risk reporting.

- ITF expressed concerned with how late this is coming in, but recognize this is a legislative session year, so this is one of the purposes of the July 1 Addendum.

Andrew Kim asked about the communication to districts regarding the requirement to do these assessments. Jessica Snyder from Curriculum responded that the screening requirements are already in place, the addition of the dyslexia risk code is for the reporting of the results. Our ability to identify and serve these students is a focus of the last two legislative sessions.

Terri Hanson added that the last legislative session included the screening requirement, and the proposed legislation is for the reporting of the data collected from the screening. Terri continued that TEA usually does not propose changes before legislation passes, but this dyslexia risk data has been designated to use for one of TEA's performance measures, and TEA anticipates the legislation passing. If the bill passes, then TEA will communicate the changes in the TEDS Addendum. Terri added that TEA will try to do some earlier communication about this change before the addendum so that people will know. The screening for dyslexia is already occurring.

Jessica stated that as a result of HB 1886, which requires the screening of kindergarten and first grade students, the dyslexia handbook was updated. There will be further updates to the dyslexia handbook if the reporting requirement is legislatively mandated. The collection of the dyslexia risk code will reinforce that screening should be occurring.

Jackie Janacek asked if this data going to be reported with ECDS or with the regular PEIMS submission in the summer. Terri Hanson responded that this proposal is for the data to be collected in the PEIMS Summer submission.

PCPEI Action:

> **Motion:**
>
> Paul Clore made a motion to approve the recommendation made by ITF to accept this proposal.
>
> Clark Ealy seconded the motion.
>
> **Vote:** The motion passed unanimously.

2. Dual Credit Reporting Revisions for the 2019-2020 School Year   **Action Item**

TEA proposes that the COURSE-SEQUENCE-CODE (C135) code table be updated to include additional codes for the exclusive purpose of reporting dual-credit courses. The addition of dual-credit codes will allow LEAs to report dual-credit courses more accurately.

Michele Elledge presented the Dual Credit Reporting proposal to the ITF committee.

1. Add codes to the COURSE-SEQUENCE-CODE (C135) code table to be used exclusively for reporting dual credit courses.

2. Update guidance in TEDS Section 2.4 pertaining to the new codes added for COURSE-SEQUENCE-CODE (E0948).

3. Update business data validation rule 43415-0036 and add 3 new business data validation rules.

ITF Discussion:

Nancy Dunnam expressed concern with going from single-digit to 2 digits. Terri Hanson explained that the data element, E0948 COURSE-SEQUENCE-CODE in TEDS is already defined as a 2-digit data element. Candice DeSantis displayed the data element for course sequence code from TEDS. Peggy Sullivan indicated that it should be ok since this is a non-numeric value and code A is an existing code. Jay Young with TCC agreed that the new codes should not be a problem.

Michele Elledge explained that reporting issues occur when students take a dual credit course over two semesters. In these situations, college credit hours are overreported. This is one of the issues that TEA is trying to address with the additional course sequence codes. Keitha Ivey asked if the goal is to eliminate the extra credit hours that students are receiving, will the number of credits will go away? Or will there be additional information to report? Michele Elledge replied that the data would still be reported but with different course sequence codes. Keitha asked if the number of credit hours is being overreported to TEA. Patty O'Hara responded that both overreporting of and under reporting is happening.

Keitha asked if information that has already been reported to TEA that is not valid is going away. Patty replied these new course sequence codes will provide a way for LEAs to accurately report what credit is received; there is no additional reporting. LEAs will no longer be required to submit college credit hours for dual credit courses for the beginning semesters when the student has not completed the course. With the new course sequence codes, college credit hours will only be reported when the student finishes the college course.

Jay Young asked how this proposal for new course sequence codes will impact current data reporting. Patty responded that the new course sequence codes will allow for more accurate reporting of 0 college credit hours for non-final semester courses. Welding is an example of four semesters courses that have been previously underreported. The new reporting should allow schools to receive accurate credit for dual credit coursework.

Terri Hanson reminded everyone of rule 43415-0036 that was too restrictive and was the rule causing overreporting. Candice DeSantis stated that 43415-0036 forced the reporting of college credit hours, which was causing some to be overreported.

Jay Young asked if 43415-0036 is being modified for 18-19. Candice confirmed that the rule is being modified to no longer force college credit hours to be reported, which should help some with the overreporting.

Jay asked about reporting of non-terminal semesters, such as course sequence code D1 and D3. Candice replied that a new rule is being added as a warning that encourages reporting 0 college credit hours for the non-terminal semesters. Peggy Sullivan asked why is this rule a warning and not a special warning? Terri responded that we can change this to a special warning.

Adrian Garcia asked for clarification for reporting a two-semester course. Patty replied with an example of Calculus; course sequence code D1 would be used for the first semester and D2 would be used for the second semester. Adrian asked about when the student gets credit for D1 and D3 course sequence codes. Patty responded that it varies by course. This approach is accommodating giving credit for everything else. This is to accommodate both situations – two semesters in high school and two college course credits and the other way around. This approach allows reporting of college credits as they are earned.

Patty further explained that the approach attempts to make the reporting as flexible as possible to report the college credits as they are earned. Some courses take a whole year in high school that are only a semester in

college. Other college courses are completed in a single high school semester. We wanted to provide the ability to report what is actually happening.

Dara Fuller pointed out that 18-19 data will be skewed. Patty acknowledged that the data may still be skewed in 18-19.

Keitha Ivey asked how this data is used as part of accountability. Patty replied that it is part of the distinctions and College, Career, and Military Readiness (CCMR).

With no other questions, Nancy Dunnam called for a motion.

ITF Action:

Adrian Garcia made a motion to accept the proposal as presented.

Peggy Sullivan seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

PCPEI Discussion:

David McKamie presented a summary of the proposal and presented the ITF discussion contents and recommendation. He then opened the floor for questions or comments.

Terri Hanson introduced Patty O'Hara and Heather Smalley from Performance Reporting for any questions the committee may have about this proposal.

Andrew Kim commented that the College, Career and Military Readiness (CCMR) distinctions are using this data, so accuracy is important. He asked if the overreporting of college credit hours has caused any differences in these distinctions. Patty O'Hara replied that Performance Reporting has not analyzed the data this way to know for sure, but that they would rather LEAs overreport than underreport this data.

Andrew Kim asked if the reporting of this data has any impact on military readiness. Patty O'Hara responded that this reporting is not related to military readiness. John Allen added that the reporting of this data impacts Domain 1.

PCPEI Action:

Motion:

John Allen made a motion to approve the recommendation made by ITF to accept this proposal.

Paul Clore seconded the motion.

Vote:

The motion passed unanimously.

3. Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery (ASVAB) Revisions for the 2019-2020 School Year Action Item

Since not all LEAs serve grades 10-12, TEA proposes to modify the ARMED-SERVICES-VOC-APT-BATTERY-INDICATOR-CODE (E1625) data element to be optional instead of mandatory. This would allow LEAs that do not serve grades 10-12 to not submit data regarding the ASVAB. Business validation rules will be used to control which LEAs should report the ARMED-SERVICES-VOC-APT-BATTERY-INDICATOR-CODE (E1625).

Michele Elledge presented the Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery (ASVAB) Revisions proposal to the ITF committee.

1. Update ARMED-SERVICES-VOC-APT-BATTERY-INDICATOR-CODE (E1625) data element to be optional in the LocalEducationAgencyExtension complex type.

2. Update guidance related to ARMED-SERVICES-VOC-APT-BATTERY-INDICATOR-CODE (E1625) data element in the Texas Education Data Standards (TEDS) Section 2.1.

3. Update business data validation rule 10010-000E and add a new business data validation rule to support the collection of the ARMED-SERVICES-VOC-APT-BATTERY-INDICATOR-CODE.

ITF Discussion:

There were no questions regarding this proposal.

ITF Action:

Peggy Sullivan made a motion to approve the proposal as presented.

Brenda Padalecki seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

PCPEI Discussion:

David McKamie presented the proposal and ITF recommendation.

There were no questions or comments regarding this proposal. Andrew Kim called for a motion.

PCPEI Action:

Motion:

Nanette Power made a motion to approve the recommendation made by ITF to accept this proposal.

Paul Clore seconded the motion.

Vote:

The motion passed unanimously.

4. Early Childhood Data System (ECDS) Revisions for the 2019-2020 School Year - Supplemental Discussion Item

TEA will update the Early Childhood Data System (ECDS) Collection with updated Prekindergarten submission due dates, and the use of TSDS element SEX (E1325) instead of PEIMS element SEX-CODE (E0004) for student data.

Michele Elledge presented the discussion item which included the following:

1. Update the Prekindergarten submission due dates

    a. Prekindergarten submission due date change from July 16, 2020 to June 18, 2020

    b. Business Partner Directory (BPD) Org number application deadline change from June 26, 2020 to May 28, 2020

2. Update the existing ECDS collection of student data to use TSDS element SEX (E1325) instead of PEIMS element SEX-CODE (E0004)

3. Other corrections and clarifications to the January 15, 2019 proposal

ITF Discussion:

Terri Hanson explained that the date change is coming from Howard Morrison and the program area for ECDS. Ed Linden added that Howard wanted to alleviate overlap with the PEIMS Summer submission and alleviate the burden of submitting both at the same time. Another advantage would be the Program area receiving the information earlier.

Dara Fuller indicated that she likes the date change. July is a difficult time to submit data as people are unavailable to answer questions.

Terri Hanson pointed out the technical changes and clarifications described at the end of the document.

Candice DeSantis reminded the group that these changes are for 19-20, when ECDS will not be dependent upon PEIMS data any longer. All ECDS data will come through TSDS. Terri Hanson added that these ECDS changes for 19-20 were originally presented in the January ITF meeting. We recognized the need to correct what was presented in January. Vendors will be notified prior to the July TEDS Addendum.

ITF Action:

Discussion item therefore no action was necessary.

PCPEI Discussion:

David McKamie presented the discussion item and ITF discussion content.

Andrew Kim asked for verification that the due dates presented on page 7 of the proposal are moving to an earlier time in the year. Terri Hanson confirmed that the due dates are moving earlier, adding that the program area asked to move the dates up based on feedback from LEAs wanting to report sooner and at a time that does not conflict with PEIMS Summer submission due dates.

Andrew Kim asked if there is another due date for ECDS PK data later in the year. Terri Hanson replied that there is not another collection of that year's PK data, as the next collection of PK data is for the next school year.

Andrew Kim remarked that there is pending legislation that will impact prekindergarten program funding.

Terri Hanson replied that the ECDS collection is data for the early childhood program. This collection is used to identify PK students in the ECDS submission, along with their assessments, but that LEAs will use the PEIMS Summer submission to identify PK students for funding purposes. The ECDS collection is mainly assessment data.

5. Organization Data from AskTED Revisions for the 2019-2020 School Year - Supplemental Discussion Item

TEA will remove the collection of the EducationOrgIdentificationCode subcomplex type from the LocalEducationAgencyExtension Complex Type and the SchoolExtension Complex Type and make associated data validation rule updates.

Michele Elledge presented the discussion item which included the following:

1. Remove the collection of the Complex Type EducationOrgIdentificationCode from the LocalEducationAgencyExtension Complex Type.

2. Remove the collection of the EDUCATION-ORG-ID (E1463) from the LocalEducationAgencyExtension Complex Type.

3. Remove the collection of the Complex Type EducationOrgIdentificationCode from the SchoolExtension Complex Type.

4. Remove the collection of the EDUCATION-ORG-ID (E1463) from the SchoolExtension Complex Type.

ITF Discussion:

Nancy Dunnam opened the floor to questions, and there were none.

ITF Action:

Discussion item therefore no action was necessary.

PCPEI Discussion:

David McKamie presented the discussion item and ITF content. He added that ITF considers this item as a behind-the-scenes cleanup effort.

There were no questions or comments regarding this item.

6. InterchangeStudentTranscriptExtension: Adding Subject Area and Course Description data elements – Supplemental   **Discussion Item**

Michele Elledge presented the discussion item:

Move the E1186 SUBJECT-AREA and E1187 COURSE-DESCRIPTION from the CourseCode sub-complex type to the CourseTranscriptExtension complex type in the InterchangeStudentTranscriptExtension. The reporting of both data elements is optional.

ITF Discussion:

Dara Fuller asked when this change will be communicated to vendors. Terri replied that it will be communicated to the vendors very soon.

ITF Action:

Discussion item therefore no action was necessary.

PCPEI Discussion:

David McKamie presented the discussion item and ITF discussion content.

Terri Hanson added that these are technical adjustments and that vendors are impacted by these types of structural changes. Now that PCPEI has been made aware, TEA can move forward and communicate to vendors quickly about these changes.

There were no questions or comments regarding this item.

7. Residential Facility Tracker Revisions for the 2019-2020 School Year – Supplemental Discussion Item

TEA will be updating XML names for RESIDENTIAL-FACILITY-ID (E1627) and DISTRICT-ID (E0212), as well as adding reference complex types to the ResidentialFacilityExtension complex type.

Michele Elledge presented the discussion item which included the following:

1. On the ResidentialFacilityExtension complex type make the following changes:
    *   Change the XML name for RESIDENTIAL-FACILITY-ID (E1627) from TX-ResidentialFacilityId to StateOrganizationId.
    *   Add the Reference Complex Type LocalEducationAgencyReference.
    *   Add the Reference Complex Type EducationOrgIdentity.
    *   Change the XML name for DISTRICT-ID (E0212) from EducationalOrgIdentity to StateOrganizationId
2. On the data element RESIDENTIAL-FACILITY-ID (E1627) change the XML name from TX-ResidentialFacilityId to StateOrganizationId.
3. On the StudentResidentialFacilityAssociationExtension complex type, change the XML name for RESIDENTIAL-FACILITY-ID (E1627) from TX-ResidentialFacilityId to StateOrganizationId.
4. On rule 10025-0001, change the business meaning XML name from TX-ResidentialFacilityId to StateOrganizationId.
5. On rule 40115-0002, change the business meaning XML name from TX-ResidentialFacilityId to StateOrganizationId.

ITF Discussion:

Dara Fuller asked if TEA will be updating the XML schema on the TSDS website and notifying the vendors.

Terri Hanson replied that TEA will be updating the XML schemas on the TSDS website, as well as sending notifications to the TSDS ESC coordinators and vendors when the new schemas are available.

Nancy Dunnam opened the floor, and there were no further questions.

ITF Action:

Discussion item therefore no action was necessary.

PCPEI Discussion:

David McKamie presented the discussion item and ITF discussion content.

There were no questions or comments regarding this item.

Open Forum

Andrew Kim opened the floor for discussion items.

Terri Hanson introduced Michele Elledge and Heather Smalley to present follow up on material from the January PCPEI meeting regarding campus enrollment types. Based upon questions and feedback from the January PCPEI meeting, TEA has revised definitions and added additional organization data about the new campus enrollment type codes.

Heather Smalley presented information about the expanded campus enrollment types:

>   **Open Enrollment Charter School** – A charter school that prioritizes enrollment on the basis of geographic and residency considerations and may consider whether a student has documented history of a criminal offense, a juvenile court adjudication, or discipline problems under Subchapter A, Chapter 37. If an open-enrollment charter school specializing in performing arts, consideration may also be given to whether the student demonstrates artistic ability.

>   **Selective Enrollment School (Criteria-Based)** – A school that uses some sort of selective criteria (e.g., student grades, audition, interview, portfolio) for enrollment determinations. Enrollment in these schools may or may not be based on the student's home address.

>   **Selective Enrollment School (Special Program-Based)** – A school that uses some sort of selective criteria for enrollment based on whether the student meets the requirements of a specific program (e.g., stand-alone prekindergarten, stand-alone special education programs, stand-alone bilingual programs). Enrollment in these schools may or may not be based on the student's home address.

>   **Zoned School (no transfers accepted)** – A school in which enrollment is based on the student's home address and transfers are not accepted.

>   **Zoned School (transfers accepted)** – A school in which enrollment is based on the student's home address but transfers of students from other schools or districts are accepted, including the children of district employees. The school may accept inter- and/or intra-district transfers.

>   **Combined Enrollment Type School**¬ – A school in which enrollment is based on two or more of the five enrollment types listed above (e.g., a school which houses both a selective enrollment program and a zoned school on the same campus).

>   **Special Assignment School** – A school in which students are ordered to attend by a juvenile court, juvenile board, or any other governmental entity (e.g., residential treatment facility, Texas Juvenile Justice Department, juvenile justice alternative education program, disciplinary alternative education program). Enrollment in these schools may or may not be based on the student's home address. This school may be operated by an open enrollment charter school or an independent school district. This enrollment type may not be included in the Combined Enrollment Type School.

Heather continued by saying that TEA is anticipating additional feedback and is open to making additional changes in future years.

Terri Hanson stated that TEA plans to publish these updated definitions in the July 1 Addendum of 2019-2020 TEDS unless this meeting leads to additional changes. In order for LEAs to know how to code their data for Fall, this list needs to be finalized. Further changes would have to be made in 2020-2021.

John Allen asked about how to code an open enrollment charter that gives weighted priority enrollment to the the sibling of an existing student. Heather responded that, unless the charter is using additional criteria to determine enrollment of the sibling, the charter would be coded as an open enrollment charter school.

Heather added that the first place Performance Reporting anticipates using this data is for defining comparison groups for purposes of awarding distinction designations. Performance Reporting has to get some of the data to know how to best use it. The expectation is for there to be many campuses that are the combined enrollment type.

John Allen stated that if a distinction designation is dependent upon the campus comparison group, this will probably skew some specialty schools and may result in a fairer comparison group for awarding distinction designations.

Heather replied that campus enrollment type will not be used for comparison groups initially, but that Performance Reporting will use the reported information to see how it would impact campus comparison groups if it was used.

Andrew Kim presented a scenario of a charter that is criteria-based and open enrollment, such as a "school within a school". Heather replied that in this scenario the charter school should select combined enrollment type.

Andrew asked how the selection of campus enrollment type will be monitored. Heather responded that districts will determine the campus enrollment types based on the definition and what is best choice for each campus.

Heather further stated that if a school has students who apply from other LEAs or if the school is screening students or the students have to apply, then this is a selective enrollment school. Otherwise, the school would be a zoned school, transfers accepted.

John Allen stated that even within LEAs, there are differences across campuses and many different variables at play related to the enrollment of students. Heather agreed that it was very challenging to narrow down all of the things being done on campuses into these enrollment types.

Andrew asked if the data will be shared to help campuses determine how other campuses will be identified in their group. Heather responded that the data will be shared. Performance Reporting may need to clarify and expand the enrollment type choices, but the data needs to be gathered first to learn more. Terri Hanson added that previously this campus enrollment type data was not a mandatory collection like PEIMS, so TEA had some data but not data on all campuses. One motivation to move it to PEIMS was so that more data would be available to define the comparison groups. Heather continued by saying that Performance Reporting is considering further analysis tools that would help a campus compare themselves to other campuses with the same campus enrollment type.

Priscilla Canales stated that most districts in the Rio Grande Valley consider themselves open enrollment and take transfers. She asked what campus enrollment type would be used for these public school system campuses. Heather responded that most public school campuses will used "Zoned School (transfers accepted)" if there is not any application process before the transfers are accepted.

Andrew Kim asked what campus enrollment type an Early College High School (ECHS) would be. Heather replied that the campus would be Selective Enrollment School (Criteria-Based) if it used grades, test scores, and interviews as a basis for enrollment. Heather gave another example of Pathways in Technology Early College High Schools (PTECHs), which are housed on campuses that are also zoned schools; these would be "Combined Enrollment Type".

Andrew Kim asked what campus enrollment type would be used for a fine arts academy. Heather answered that if the school has an audition or another other criteria-based process for enrollment, then the campus would be Selective Enrollment School (Criteria-Based). Andrew then stated that if campus enrollment type is used for campus comparison groups, an ECHS and a Fine Arts school could end up in the same comparison group; Heather agreed.

Suzanne Eiben requested that the question about transfers be repeated. Heather replied that the campus enrollment type for a campus that accepts transfers depends on whether the students are screened before they can transfer. When there is any kind of pre-transfer acceptance process, the campus enrollment type would be Selective Enrollment School (Criteria-Based). Otherwise it would be a Zoned school (transfers accepted). She continued by saying that most campuses have some kind of basic discipline check before a student can transfer, but those basic checks are not the type of selective criteria being referred to here.

Nanette Power suggested providing a checklist to assist in determining campus enrollment type. Her LEA has eight (8) elementary schools and one houses the bilingual program, so it's a basic elementary but has district assigned bilingual students. Other elementary schools may have a district assigned special needs program. A checklist could assist in determining how to choose the correct campus enrollment type for these campuses. Heather replied that Performance Reporting will be providing additional guidance such as a checklist and FAQs.

Terri Hanson asked Nanette if she was suggesting that TEA collect that data about the special programs being offered at campuses. Nanette replied yes, she was suggesting collecting that data to get a better feel for what

the campus actually provides, allowing for for better comparison to similar schools. Terri thanked Nanette for her good suggestion and explained that TEA would not be able to do this for 2019-2020 but would consider collecting more granular data for more accurate comparison groups in the future.

Andrew Kim agreed that this more detailed data would be helpful, particularly if distinctions are based on these comparisons. Heather added that once TEA has this first round of more thorough data from everyone, analysis can be done into these designations to figure out how detailed the data needs to be in order to link truly comparable campuses. Andrew stated that their LEA does local analysis sometimes for comparison groups, and the challenge can be getting a large enough sample size. Andrew concluded by saying this is an important topic to consider again for future improvements.

Terri Hanson explained that this proposal was already approved in the January 2019 meeting, so these code table changes are refinements and not an action item for PCPEI.

Upcoming PCPEI Meeting Schedule

Terri Hanson stated that this is the last scheduled meeting for 2018-2019 school year, and that Michele Elledge will make the 2019-2020 meeting schedule available as soon as it is finalized. She continued by saying that usually PCPEI has three (3) meetings in a school year, one in October, January, and May. TEA will try to have most content for the school year ready for the October meeting, and the schedule will indicate that meeting will be in person here at TEA.

Terri Hanson reminded everyone that since the legislature is currently in session, there are items around the school finance bill that may require changes for in the 2019-2020 school year. We are typically finished with the data governance process by this point in the school year and TEA tries very hard not to have any changes this late in the school year. There is the possibility of a need to call an emergency meeting for items that have to be collected in 2019-2020 based on legislation that passes.

Andrew Kim responded that having advance notice of the schedule is very helpful for PCPEI member planning purposes.

Terri Hanson replied that TEA's goal is to have the final 2019-2020 meeting schedule by available by June 1, 2019.

Adjournment

Andrew Kim called for a motion to adjourn the meeting.

Nanette Power made a motion to adjourn the PCPEI meeting.

Patty Blue seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Meeting ended at 11:04 a.m. on April 30, 2019.