


<p>Members: Nancy Dunnam, Chair David McKamie, Vice Chair Dianne Borreson Aaron Daitz Belinda Dyer Dara Fuller Adrian Garcia Stephanie Hazlewood Keitha Ivey John McCauley Debbie Largent Kim O'Leary Brenda Padalecki Tom Priem Linda Roska Janet Spurgin Peggy Sullivan</p>	 <p>Information Task Force (ITF) Meeting Minutes January 22, 2013</p> <p>10:00 AM to 2:00 PM William B. Travis Bldg. Via Webinar G-100, PDC 3</p>
<p>Members via Webinar: Alternates via Webinar: Others Attending:</p>	<p><i>Nancy Dunnam, Aaron Daitz, Dara Fuller, Adrian Garcia, Stephanie Hazlewood, Keitha Ivey, Brenda Padalecki, Linda Roska, Peggy Sullivan,</i></p> <p><i>Brenda Richmond, Cathleen Freeman, David Taylor, Beverly Meyer (attending for John McCauley)</i></p> <p><i>Melody Parrish, Bryce Templeton, Terri Hanson, Candice DeSantis, Cindy Laster, Tessie Bryant, Leanne Simons, Priscilla Flores, Nicole Schuessler, and Jeanine Helms</i></p>
<p>Call the Meeting to Order: Nancy Dunnam called the meeting to order at 10:01 a.m.</p>	
<p>Approval of the January 8, 2013 ITF Meeting Minutes</p> <p>Nancy Dunnam introduced the minutes from the January 8, 2013 ITF Meeting and asked for any needed corrections. Having no corrections offered, Nancy Dunnam called for a motion to accept the minutes as presented.</p> <p>Dara Fuller made a motion to approve the January 8, 2013 ITF Meeting Minutes as presented. Stephanie Hazlewood seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.</p>	<p>Action Item</p>
<p>Proposal to Add New Reason Restraint Code to Code Table C173 for 2013-2014 – Bryce Templeton/ Priscilla Flores</p> <p>The Texas Education Agency has determined that an additional Restraint Reason Code is needed to comply with legislative mandates of TEC 37.0021.</p> <p>Bryce Templeton and Priscilla Flores presented a proposal to add a new Restraint Reason Code to the C173 RESTRAINT-REASON-CODE PEIMS code table for the 2013-2014 school year. This code would allow TEA to capture all of the Restraint Reasons as required by statute. Bryce summarized the discussions from the prior meeting focusing on the issue around School Resource Officer (SRO) reporting requirements.</p> <p>Bryce stated that the law is clear regarding the need for a MOU relating to the use of SROs. However, if a school has requested police presence on a school campus or at a school activity, then any restraints performed by these SROs at these locations must be reported to TEA.</p>	<p>Action Item</p>

Priscilla Flores provided examples to clarify the misunderstandings regarding police presence on a school campus or at a school activity. 1. If a school district has its own police force (ISD police department), then these officers can have a continual police presence on campus and/or school activities. Restraints performed by school district police departments are reported to TEA. 2. If a school district or charter school has arranged for or requested police presence on campus and/or at school activities from a city, county, state, or federal law enforcement agency, then restraints performed by these law enforcement persons are reported to TEA. 3. If law enforcement personnel are on a school campus or at a school activity due to an emergency call (e.g. 911, 311) or have come to the school through their own initiative (e.g. serving a warrant, conducting an investigation) and should restrain a student, then these restraints are not reported to TEA.

Bryce Templeton discussed the revisions to the new Restraint Reason Code noting that the code focuses on restraints that are performed by law enforcement personnel providing a “police presence” on a school campus or at a school activity.

A school district shall report electronically to the agency, in accordance with standards provided by commissioner rule, information relating to the use of a restraint by school district police officer/School Resource Officer (SRO) performing law enforcement duties and/or providing a police presence on school property or at a school-sponsored or school-related activity.

ITF Discussion

The ITF committee discussed the following questions:

What is considered a planned police presence on campus?

Police presence is an ISD police department authorized by a school board or anytime a school has requested the police to spend significant time at their school other than 911 calls.

How is a police presence formed or created?

Police presence is created through the school board authorizing the creation of a school district police department or through an arrangement with a municipal, county, state, or federal to regularly be on campus or at school activities.

When is an arrest not reported?

An arrest restraint would not be reported when the arresting officer was not on campus or at a school activity for the purpose of providing a police presence as arranged for by the school.

What is the ultimate goal of the legislative mandate?

To collect all restraints that are performed by law enforcement personnel who are on campus or at school activities who are present to provide a police presence as requested by the school.

ITF Recommendation

The committee recommended that more verbiage be added to the Data Standards along with 3 examples (2 police examples and 1 non-police example) to clarify what is considered a police presence on campus.

ITF members requested that the definition for the Restraint reason code be expanded to include restraints performed by law enforcement personnel.

Dara Fuller requested that “Codes 01-07” be added to the 435 STUDENT RESTRAINT REPORTING FLOWCHART under “Was Student Restrained for C173 Reason? (Codes “01-

<p>07").</p> <p>Aaron Daitz requested that on Code Table C173 Codes "01-07" be designated as only used for Special Education students.</p> <p>Peggy Sullivan requested that on Code Table C173, Code "08" be designated as for All Students.</p> <p>Peggy Sullivan made a motion to approve the Proposal to Add New Reason Restraint Code to Code Table C173 for 2013-2014 including the above recommendations. Dara Fuller seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.</p>	
<p>Add District of RDSPD Service to TEDS - Terri Hanson</p> <p>Terri Hanson presented to the committee the need to add the DISTRICT-OF-RDSPD-SERVICE data element to the Texas Education Data Standards. At the previous ITF meeting, the addition of the DISTRICT-OF-RDSPD-SERVICE was approved for the Legacy PEIMS data system. This new data element must be added to the Texas Education Data Standards as well.</p> <p>Terri Hanson presented to the committee the complex types to which this data element would be added: StudentSpecialEdProgramAssociationExtension Complex Type StudentSpecialProgramsReportingPeriodAttendanceExtension Complex Type.</p> <p><u>ITF Discussion</u> None.</p> <p><u>ITF Recommendation</u> None.</p>	<p>Discussion Item</p>
<p>Automated Process of Dashboard Access for LEA users through TEAL – Melody Parish/Terri Hanson</p> <p>Melody Parrish presented to the committee the Automated Process of Dashboard Access for LEA Users through TEAL. This would involve Extracting 10 Data Elements (First Name, Last Name, Day of Birth, Month of Birth, Year of Birth, Email address, Unique ID Number, Gender, Organization Code, and Campus Number) from the HR Data in the Dashboard Data Mart for Security Access Approvals. Melody explained the current process for Limited Production Release users and addressed concerns of the number of users and extensive manual process that would be encountered by the Early Adopter schools during the 2013-2014 school year. Melody estimates that there will be 50,000 Early Adopter users and using the current manual processes, it would be impossible to provide timely service to set up this number of users. As an example, Melody stated that Austin ISD would likely have to approve 11,000 users and would be receiving and processing 11,000 emails; too much for the available staff.</p> <p>TEA could automate this process. Districts would need to send via FTP nightly staff files, with the required information, to TEA to process access requests in an automated environment in order to grant security access to staff wanting to use the studentGPS Dashboards.</p> <p>TEA legal staff have endorsed this concept, but TEA needs the ITF and PCPEI committees to approve this item since the districts would be giving TEA systems access to data from the studentGPS Dashboards.</p> <p><u>ITF Discussion</u></p>	

<p>The committee had the following questions and concerns:</p> <p>Nancy Dunnam - Districts should have the option to control this process manually, even if a district is a studentGPS Dashboard participant. Melody Parrish stated that districts who do not send the data being requested would continue to approve staff needing access to the studentGPS Dashboards manually.</p> <p>Nancy Dunnam – would only those participating districts have to provide nightly extracts? Does the district have the option to choose dashboards? Nancy was concerned about TEA being able to access the district’s information and would they lose their local control.</p> <p>Adrian Garcia – definitely wants an automated process.</p> <p>Dara Fuller – for small districts with staff less than 100 employees, will the superintendent have access to delete a user’s access? Yes</p> <p>Brenda Richmond – stated that Hays Consolidated ISD use “roles” to exclude access to certain staff.</p> <p>Dara Fuller - If superintendent deletes access, will the teacher have access the next day? No.</p> <p>What impact will this proposed process have on other TEAL processes and applications? No impact.</p> <p><u>ITF Recommendation</u></p> <p>Terri Hanson will follow-up with Double Line Partners (DLP) so all concerns and questions can be addressed. Bryce Templeton will send out the list of Data Elements that will be extracted for automated process of Dashboards along with any additional information that is needed for the committee to make a decision. ITF will consider this item via an email vote.</p>	
<p>PEIMS Data Reports Revisions for the Texas Student Data System –</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Leanne Simons</p> <p>Continuing from the January 8, 2013 ITF meeting: The PEIMS EDIT+ reports have been evaluated for migration to the TSDS system. Many of the reports will be consolidated and have parameters to allow the users to retrieve the same information in the future as they do today. Some of the reports are being presented to the ITF committee for deletion.</p> <p><u>ITF Discussion</u></p> <p>Dara Fuller made the following recommendations:</p> <p><i>Recommendation 2:</i> Use PRF7D011 as the template for the Student Disciplinary Action Roster. It will have the Campus ID of Disciplinary Responsibility and Gender fields added to it, and will have the option to run it by Campus of Enrollment or All Campuses. Student Disciplinary Action Rosters PRF7D011, PRF7D013, PRF7D023, PRF7D025, PRF7D026, PRF7D027, and PRF7D028 will be deleted. Dara wanted to confirm that the ability to have a parameter to pull one or more action codes from the report still exists. Leanne Simons confirmed that the functionality of the reports will not change.</p> <p><i>Recommendation 7:</i> Create report template to be used for both reports below with a parameter option for Grades PK-6, Grades 7-8, Grades 9-12, and All Grades. Add Campus as a column on the report for reports PRF4D011 and PRF4D012. Dara would like to make sure the report will still have the column for “may exceed state cap”. Leanne Simons confirmed that the reports will still display the same information as individual reports.</p>	<p>Action Item</p>

<p><i>Recommendation 8:</i> Create a report template to be used for the three reports PRF5D001, PRF5D018 and PRF5D019 with a parameter option for At Risk Students, Economically Disadvantaged Students and All Students. Remove the Special Education section at the bottom of the All Students report and create another parameter call Special Education Students to be used with the template. Provide the option to run against enrollment or membership data. Dara wanted to confirm that the category will still be displayed if the role parameter is chosen. Leanne Simons stated the reports will display the same information as individual reports.</p> <p><i>Recommendation 16:</i> Create a report template to be used for both reports, PRF5D022 and PRF5D041, with a parameter option for Students Not Enrolled on PEIMS October Snapshot Date and Students Not Enrolled on PEIMS School-Start Window. Dara wanted to confirm that the reports will still display the economically disadvantaged data. Leanne Simons confirmed that the reports will display the same information as individual reports.</p> <p>Dara also recommended that report PRF7D051 be available for the fall. TEA will take this request to the developers for feasibility and consideration.</p> <p>Aaron Daitz asked if the system would provide for a custom report builder. Leanne Simons stated that the system would not have custom report builder functionality due to the limited resources that are available.</p> <p>Adrian Garcia asked if the Flexible Attendance reports would be expanded to the campus level. TEA staff stated that all student reports would have a campus parameter to allow this information.</p> <p>Terri Hanson reminded the committee that these report changes would not be automatically retroactive to the Legacy EDIT+ system and would be available to the Early Adopters using the TSDS system in the 2013-2014 school year.</p> <p><u>ITF Recommendation</u></p> <p>Dara Fuller made a motion to approve PEIMS Data Reports revisions for the Texas Student Data System. Aaron Daitz seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.</p>	
<p>Other Business:</p> <p>None.</p>	<p>Action Item</p>
<p>Upcoming ITF Meetings</p> <p>The next ITF meetings are scheduled as follows:</p> <p>April 9, 2013 (TEA Meeting)</p> <p>May 14, 2013 (Webinar Meeting)</p> <p>Peggy Sullivan made a motion to adjourn the meeting.</p> <p>Dara Fuller seconded the motion.</p> <p>The meeting adjourned at 11:50am.</p>	<p>Discussion Item</p>