Texas Education Agency
Zoom Meeting
1:30 PM to 3:30 PM

Texas Education Agency
Policy Committee on Public Education Information (PCPEI)
Meeting Minutes
July 13, 2020

Call the Meeting to Order   Andrew Kim, PCPEI Chair

Andrew Kim, PCPEI Chair called the meeting to order at: 1:31 p.m.

Roll call of the PCPEI members attending was taken by Leticia Ollervidez.

PCPEI Members Present via Zoom: Susan Austin, Charlotte Baker, Patti Blue, Jennifer Carver, Carolyn Counce, Damon Jackson, Evelyn Jenkins, Andrew Kim, Scott Lewis, Danny Lovett, Mary Beth Matula, David McKamie, Mary Morgan, Amanda Manca, Marcos Zorola

TEA Staff Present via Zoom: Jeanine Helms, Jamie Muffoletto, Leticia Ollervidez, Leanne Simons, Melody Parrish, Terri Hanson

2020-2021 Attendance Reporting Changes   Action Item

Jamie Muffoletto presented the 2020-2021 Attendance Reporting Changes ITF Proposal.

After, March 19, 2020 and the temporary closure of schools which turned into a permanent closure, TEA needed a new framework for schools that addressed instruction and funding. On June 23, 2020, the commissioner introduced two new instructional methods, remote synchronous and remote asynchronous for the 2020-2021 school year.

TEA proposes to add 30 new data elements to the Texas Education Data Standards (TEDS) and two new data elements to the Texas Records Exchange (TREx) in order to report Remote Synchronous instruction and remote Asynchronous instruction days present. All new TEDS data elements would be reported in the PEIMS Summer Submission (Submission 3) and in the PEIMS Extended Year Submission (Submission 4) if the Local Education Agency (LEA) is participating in the Additional Days School Year (ADSY) program.

The proposal includes the following:

Data Collection Requirement Changes:
1. Add new data element RS-TOTAL-ELIGIBLE-DAYS-PRESENT (E16XX) to the BasicReportingPeriodAttendanceExtension.

2. Add 14 new Remote Synchronous data elements to the SpecialProgramsReportingPeriodAttendanceExtension.
    a. RS-BILINGUAL/ESL-FUNDING-CODE (E16XX)
    b. RS-TOTAL-ELIG-BILINGUAL/ESL-DAYS-PRESENT (E16XX)
    c. RS-TOTAL-ELIG-RESIDENTIAL-FACILITY-DAYS-PRESENT (E16XX)
    d. RS-TOTAL-ELIG-PREG-REL-SVCS-DAYS-PRESENT (E16XX)
    e. RS-TOTAL-ELIG-SP-ED-MAINSTREAM-DAYS-PRESENT (E16XX)
    f. RS-ELIGIBLE-DAYS-PRESENT-IN-INSTR-SETTING (E16XX)
    g. RS-INSTRUCTIONAL-SETTING-CODE (E16XX)
    h. RS-EXCESS-HOURS-IN-INSTRUCTIONAL-SETTING (E16XX)
    i. RS-ELIGIBLE-DAYS-PRESENT-V1 (E16XX)
    j. RS-ELIGIBLE-DAYS-PRESENT-V2 (E16XX)
    k. RS-ELIGIBLE-DAYS-PRESENT-V3 (E16XX)
    l. RS-ELIGIBLE-DAYS-PRESENT-V4 (E16XX)
    m. RS-ELIGIBLE-DAYS-PRESENT-V5 (E16XX)
    n. RS-ELIGIBLE-DAYS-PRESENT-V6 (E16XX)

3. Add new data element RA-TOTAL-ELIGIBLE-DAYS-PRESENT (E16XX) to the BasicReportingPeriodAttendanceExtension.

4. Add 14 new Remote Asynchronous data elements to the SpecialProgramsReportingPeriodAttendance Extension.
    a. RA-BILINGUAL/ESL-FUNDING-CODE (E16XX)
    b. RA-TOTAL-ELIG-BILINGUAL/ESL-DAYS-PRESENT (E16XX)
    c. RA-TOTAL-ELIG-RESIDENTIAL-FACILITY-DAYS-PRESENT (E16XX)
    d. RA-TOTAL-ELIG-PREG-REL-SVCS-DAYS-PRESENT (E16XX)
    e. RA-TOTAL-ELIG-SP-ED-MAINSTREAM-DAYS-PRESENT (E16XX)
    f. RA-ELIGIBLE-DAYS-PRESENT-IN-INSTR-SETTING (E16XX)
    g. RA-INSTRUCTIONAL-SETTING-CODE (E16XX)
    h. RA-EXCESS-HOURS-IN-INSTRUCTIONAL-SETTING (E16XX)
    i. RA-ELIGIBLE-DAYS-PRESENT-V1 (E16XX)
    j. RA-ELIGIBLE-DAYS-PRESENT-V2 (E16XX)
    k. RA-ELIGIBLE-DAYS-PRESENT-V3 (E16XX)
    l. RA-ELIGIBLE-DAYS-PRESENT-V4 (E16XX)
    m. RA-ELIGIBLE-DAYS-PRESENT-V5 (E16XX)
    n. RA-ELIGIBLE-DAYS-PRESENT-V6 (E16XX)

5. Update existing PEIMS reports and/or add new PEIMS reports to reflect the changes in this proposal.

6. Add, update, and remove associated data validation rules to reflect the changes in this proposal.

Texas Records Exchange Requirement Changes:

1.   Add new data element RS-TOTAL-DAYS-PRESENT (TE136) to the TREx data standards.
2.   Add new data element RA-TOTAL-DAYS-PRESENT (TE137) to the TREx data standards.

ITF Discussion:

Nancy Dunnam asked if Jamie could first discuss definitions of the two new methods, Remote Synchronous and Remote Asynchronous which were provided in the TEA FAQ.

Jamie presented a slide with the definitions.

Nancy Dunnam called for other comments or questions.

Traci Pesina requested clarification regarding students changing from one method of instruction to another within the same grading period, or if it needs to be one choice for the entire period. Traci mentioned a grid that was released on July 7, 2020. The note on the attendance method comparison stated: "A student could change between each of the attendance methods below by day depending upon the school's planned instructional methods". David Marx and Terri Hanson clarified that it is possible for students to change from one method of instruction to another within the same grading period under certain circumstances. Jamie noted that on page 13 of the FAQ provided by TEA, this question is addressed.

David added that for the first three weeks of school, TEA is going to provide a level of flexibility for students.
David also said he would review the grid to confirm the intent of the note and make changes if needed.

John Newcom from Skyward requested clarification on reporting attendance event indicators for the new remote instruction methods. Terri responded that we did not add any new attendance event indicators and LEAs should use the existing indicators for remote synchronous and remote asynchronous.

John also asked about the domain of values for TREx and the maximum value of 180. Is that giving the district more than 180 days to report, or they can only report up to 180? Terri clarified that LEAs should report the allowable domain of values on the existing total-days-present element for TREx. TEA can review this maximum value if LEAs are finding they need to report more days.

John asked if remote asynchronous attendance is compatible with the new Additional Days school year program. Terri replied that this question will be added to the HB 3 Additional Days School Year FAQ when it is released on 7/9/2020, and that yes, it is compatible.

Kathy Bray stated that when attendance is submitted in the SIS, it is for a point in time and period. With remote asynchronous, we would still want to maintain the 90/10 engagement rule but if the definition of engagement is over three or four periods, how can we roll that up in the SIS to one place where it is pulled for attendance? David replied that for the remote asynchronous instructional plan, there may be a case where a student is completing most of their work at any point in the day, for example, from 5 p.m. to 10 p.m. The teacher may be reviewing the work one or two days later, determining the level of daily engagement and then marking the student present or absent for asynchronous instruction at that time. The time of day that the work is completed may vary. In order to be marked present for asynchronous attendance, a student must be engaged. Terri added, there is still a master schedule with courses and periods. In a secondary setting, marking a student remote

asynchronous present in each of those periods may be delayed a few days as the teacher reviews the course work completed.

Nancy asked to clarify the guidance that states a student cannot work ahead in the remote asynchronous environment. Per the guidance, engagement is required on a daily basis and attendance is funded based on this. David confirmed that a student wouldn't be able to do the work for the week on Monday and then allow the district to receive credit for funding Tuesday through Friday. Another example David provided is that the student cannot do their work on Saturday and receive credit for engagement/funding Monday through Friday for that work. Nancy added that teachers should monitor attendance on a daily basis. Nancy also said it would be beneficial to give some of these examples that have come up in this meeting in the guidance. Terri agreed and stated we will include some examples in the training for ESCs and Vendors as well.

ITF Chair, Nancy Dunnam called for additional questions or comments. Hearing none, she requested a motion.

ITF Action:

Motion Made By: Dianne Borreson
Seconded: Jennifer Carver
Vote: Passed

PCPEI Discussion:

David McKamie presented the ITF Report to PCPEI for the topic **2020-2021 Attendance Reporting Changes**.

Andrew Kim called for questions.

Alex Arroyo requested clarification for when a student is working ahead in remote asynchronous. David McKamie stated that students cannot work ahead. David Marx agreed with David McKamie's statement. If a student in remote asynchronous works ahead, the work done cannot count towards attendance funding for the student except on the day the student engages.

Susan Austin asked how many days after the day of instruction a teacher can enter the attendance for remote asynchronous. Justin Jons responded it will be determined by the local policy. TEA has not placed limits on when remote asynchronous attendance needs to be posted. All remote asynchronous days' present must be supported by evidence of engagement for the day. Andrew stated that many districts are looking at 24 hours to update attendance for remote asynchronous but would like to know how TEA will define it. According to Justin, as long as an LEA has documentation to support the change from an absent code to remote asynchronous present, TEA will allow the coding. Andrew went on to say that districts need to find an efficient way to report attendance to TEA. There needs to be an automated process, so teachers do not have to individually track students. Justin added that an LEA needs to find what works best for them.

Terri Hanson stated that if a student is doing a combination of remote synchronous and remote asynchronous for one day, the LEA must code the student under one method only. David Marx went on to speak about remote asynchronous instruction. He stated that remote synchronous instruction

does not mean a student is online for four hours straight. The student can be online for a specific period of time and then do individual work offline.

PCPEI Chair, Andrew Kim called for additional questions or comments. Hearing none, he requested a motion.

PCPEI Action:

Vote: Passed

Next PCPEI Meeting: The next PCPEI meeting will be held on September 29, 2020. Andrew asked if there are any other items that may come before the September meeting. Terri stated that TEA is looking at new crisis codes and new attribution codes, but there has been no decision made.

PCPEI Chair, Andrew Kim called for additional comments. Hearing none, he requested a motion to adjourn.

Motion Made By: Damon Jackson

Meeting adjourned at 2:04 p.m.

Texas Education Agency (TEA)
Policy Committee on Public Education Information (PCPEI)
Email Vote August 6, 2020

2020-2021 New Student Attribution Code   Action Item

Since 1997, PEIMS has included the collection of student level attribution codes to determine individual student enrollment circumstances. On July 17, 2020, the Texas Education Agency (TEA) provided guidance that would allow eligible open-enrollment charter schools to enroll students outside their approved attendance/geographic boundary for the 2020-2021 school year. Eligible open-enrollment charter schools who enroll a student outside their approved attendance/geographic boundary will be required to submit a waiver to TEA and submit an attribution code for the students in PEIMS that informs the agency as to whether the student resides within or outside of the charter's approved attendance/geographic boundaries.

For the 2020-2021 school year, TEA is proposing the addition of one new code and the revision of the translation of a current code in code table STUDENT-ATTRIBUTION-CODE (C161).

Presentation:

Jamie Muffoletto presented the proposal which includes:

1. Update STUDENT-ATTRIBUTION-CODE (C161) code table:
   a. Revise translation of code 01 to Open Enrollment Charter School: Within Attendance/Geographic Boundaries
   b. Add new code 31 – Open Enrollment Charter School: Outside Attendance/Geographic Boundaries

2. PEIMS Collection Reports Impact

3. Add and revise data validations rules to support reporting of student attribution codes for charter schools.

ITF Discussion:

ITF Chair, Nancy Dunnam called for questions or comments.

David McKamie asked if the addition of a new attribution code would affect the census block reporting as students would be reported with a census block group number that was not within the geographic boundary of the charter school.

Jamie explained that the census block is reported for each student who is economically disadvantaged and clarified how this will be reported. If the child was identified as economic

disadvantaged, and accepted into an Open-enrollment Charter school, a census block group number outside of the geographic boundary would be reported for that student.

David McKamie also asked if this is due to COVID or was in the works already.

Jamie responded that that the new attribution code is based on COVID. Information related to the new attribution code is also included in the 2020-2021 Enrollment and Attendance FAQ.

ITF Chair, Nancy Dunham called for additional questions or comments. Hearing none, she requested a motion.

ITF Action:

Kim O'Leary made a motion to approve the proposal.
Brenda Padalecki seconded the motion.
Vote: Passed

PCPEI Email Discussion:
On August 6, 2020, Jamie Muffoletto from TEA emailed all members of PCPEI for comments and vote on this item. The deadline for comments and voting was Tuesday, August 11, 2020.

PCPEI Action:
No negative votes were received.
Motion passed.