



**Texas Education Agency (TEA)
Information Task Force (ITF)
November 9, 2021**

Zoom
10:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.

Meeting Minutes

Call Meeting to Order

Joel Garcia, ITF Chair

Joel Garcia called the ITF meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

Roll call of the ITF members was taken by Stephanie Sharp.

ITF Members Present:

David C. Taylor, Joel Garcia, David McKamie, Keitha Ivey, D'Lynne Johnson, Roshunda Roberts-Jackson, David Marx, Georgia Kalligeris, Linda Roska, John Newcom, Traci Pesina, Scott Lewis, Catherine Bray, Dana Braun

ITF Alternate Members Present:

Linda Raney, Debby Wilburn, Sandra Kratz, Kim Lyons, Tamara Kavanagh, Shawna Ohnesorge, Christine Barnes, Elisa Sanchez

TEA Staff Present:

Terri Hanson (ITS), Candice DeSantis (ITS), Connor Briggs (ITS), Beth Polo (ITS), Ed Linden (ITS), Kathy Adaky (ITS), Rhonda Williams (ITS), Scott Johnson (ITS), Wayne Curry (IT-Training), Leanne Simons (ITS), Jamie Muffoletto (ITS), Stephanie Sharp (ITS), Leticia Ollervidez (ITS), Alison Wright (ITS), Zane Wubbena (Monitoring Review & Support), Susan Bineham (Monitoring & Support)

Approve Meeting Minutes from August 31, 2021, ITF Meeting Action Item

Joel Garcia called for a motion to approve the meeting minutes from the August 31, 2021, ITF meeting.

Traci Pesina made a motion to approve the minutes.

Roshunda Roberts-Jackson seconded the motion.

Vote: Passed.

1. DC162 Code Table Updates

Action Item

At the January 14, 2020, Information Task Force (ITF) meeting, the proposal entitled HB 548 Special Education Language Acquisition (SELA) collection was presented and approved. The Special Education Program Division has determined that two code values in the TOOL-ASSESSMENT-CODE (DC162) table should not be reported. The codes Rubric (04) and Other (05) are considered informal assessments. During the SELA collection, local education agencies (LEAs) should only report formal rather than informal assessments.

TEA is proposing to remove codes Rubric (04) and Other (05) from the TOOL-ASSESSMENT-CODE (DC162) table. There are no rule or report impacts as a result of this change.

Presentation:

Stephanie Sharp presented the proposal which includes:

In the Texas Education Data Standards:

1. Modify TOOL-ASSESSMENT-CODE (DC162) table to remove codes:
 - a. Rubric (04)
 - b. Other (05)

ITF Discussion:

ITF Chair, Joel Garcia called for questions or comments. Hearing none, he requested a motion.

ITF Action:

David McKamie made a motion to approve the proposal.

D'Lynne Johnson seconded the motion.

Vote: Passed.

2. Dyslexia Data Collection Updates

Action Item

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) currently collects dyslexia related services information during the PEIMS Summer submission. During the PEIMS Fall submission, TEA collects data indicating if a student is identified as dyslexic under TEC 48.009.

During the PEIMS Summer submission, TEA collects the type of dyslexia or related services, if any, a student identified with dyslexia or related disorder under TEC 48.009 has received at any time during the school year. However, TEA does not collect an indicator to validate that each student identified as dyslexic has been reported with the services received.

Additionally, Local Education Agencies (LEAs) are required to screen students in kindergarten and first grade for dyslexia or related disorders. Currently, when an LEA does not screen a student, TEA cannot identify why the screening did not take place.

The division of special education has requested changes to what is collected for dyslexic students.

To support the changes requested, TEA proposes collecting DYSLEXIA-INDICATOR-CODE (E1530) data element by adding it as "optional" in the PEIMS Summer submission in the StudentExtension complex type. Second, update the data element definition for DYSLEXIA-

SERVICES-CODE (E1650) and changing it from "mandatory" to "conditionally mandatory" for the PEIMS Summer submission in the StudentProgramExtension complex type. TEA will also update the code "00" translation in the DYSLEXIA-SERVICES-CODE (C224) table.

Third, add the new data element, DYSLEXIA-SCREENING-EXCEPTION-REASON (EXXXX), as "optional" in the PEIMS Summer submission and add the corresponding code table DYSLEXIA-SCREENING-EXCEPTION-REASON-CODE (CXXX), to the StudentExtension complex type. Finally, update reports, and implement new rules to reflect the changes in this proposal.

Presentation:

Leticia Ollervidez presented the proposal which includes:

In the Texas Education Data Standards:

1. Updates to the sub-complex TX-DyslexiaServices collected in StudentProgramExtension during the PEIMS Summer submission.
 - a. Revise the data element definition for DYSLEXIA-SERVICES-CODE (E1650).
 - b. Change the sub-complex from "mandatory" to "optional."
 - c. Change the data element DYSLEXIA-SERVICES-CODE (E1650) from "mandatory" to "conditionally mandatory" and update the Data Element Reporting requirements.
2. Update the code translation for "00" in the DYSLEXIA-SERVICES-CODE (C224) table.
3. Updates to the complex type StudentExtension.
 - a. Add data element as "optional" and update the Data Element Reporting requirements for DYSLEXIA-INDICATOR-CODE (E1530) in the PEIMS Summer submission).
 - b. Add new data element as "optional" and add Data Element Reporting requirements for DYSLEXIA-SCREENING-EXCEPTION-REASON (EXXXX) reported in the PEIMS Summer submission.
 - c. Add new code table DYSLEXIA-SCREENING-EXCEPTION-REASON-CODE (CXXX) with 12 codes.
4. Update existing TSDS reports to reflect the changes in this proposal.
5. Add new data validation rules based on changes in this proposal.

ITF Discussion:

Traci Pesina asked if, for PK and KG screening, the new data element is to be used in Submission 3. Leticia Ollervidez introduced Zane Wubbena from the Monitoring Review & Support division, who confirmed this data is reported in Submission 3 and will allow TEA to determine what prevented a child from receiving services. Last year, Zane added that over 800 local education agencies (LEAs) provided data on students who were not screened. This request resulted from analysis conducted by the Monitoring Review & Support team to identify specific reasons a child was not screened for services to determine compliance. Joel Garcia asked how TEA plans to use this data. Zane replied that this data is used to provide additional information to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) on students not screened.

Keitha Ivey asked for the number of students reported and the primary reason for not screening these students. Zane clarified that approximately 800 LEAs, not students, reported data indicating students were not screened. The primary reason for not screening was a

student left before the screening could occur, withdrew during or enrolled after the screening window. Zane added that there were also many reports of students with admission, review, and dismissal (ARD) decisions already undergoing Special Education testing, which includes Dyslexia screening.

Traci Pesina asked how the Monitoring Review and Support Division would communicate this information to LEAs. Zane stated that a TAA is being drafted and will be released.

ITF Chair, Joel Garcia called for additional questions or comments. Hearing none, he requested a motion.

ITF Action:

Traci Pesina made a motion to approve the proposal.

Roshunda Roberts-Jackson seconded the motion.

Vote: Passed.

3. Child Find Collection Updates

Action Item

During the January 19, 2021, ITF meeting, the committee passed a proposal titled “2021-2022 Child Find Collection”, which outlined the new Child Find collection requirements.

SPPI-11 refers to the timely evaluation of students, ages 3-21, for special education services under Part B of IDEA. SPPI-12 refers to children who are referred from Part C of IDEA prior to age 3, found eligible for Part B of IDEA, and have an individualized education plan (IEP) developed and implemented by their third birthday to receive early childhood special education (ECSE) services from a local education agency (LEA).

The data element EVALUATION-DELAY-REASON (E1718) is used to indicate the reason for either evaluation or eligibility delays. However, it has been determined that while SPPI-11 requires only the initial evaluation compliance criteria be met, SPPI-12 requires both initial evaluation and eligibility determination compliance requirements be met by the 3rd birthday. As a result, there is a need to separate evaluation and eligibility delay reasons to ensure accurate reporting.

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) proposes changing the name of a sub-complex in the StudentChildFindAssociationExtension from TX-EvaluationDelay to TX-DelayReason. In addition, the data element definition for EVALUATION-DELAY-REASON (E1718) will be revised, and the data element will be changed from "conditionally mandatory" to "optional."

TEA will also be adding a new data element, ELIGIBILITY-DELAY-REASON (E17XX). Lastly, the code table EVALUATION-DELAY-REASON-CODE (DC164) will be updated to DELAY-REASON-CODE. Rules and reports will be added, changed, or removed as a result of this change.

Presentation:

Stephanie Sharp presented the proposal which includes:

In the Texas Education Data Standards:

1. Revise StudentChildFindAssociationExtension complex type:
 - a. TX-EvaluationDelay sub-complex type:

- i. Add new data element, ELIGIBILITY-DELAY-REASON (E17XX).
 - ii. Rename sub-complex type to TX-DelayReason.
 - iii. Add Data Element Reporting Requirements for new data element.
- b. EVALUATION-DELAY-REASON (E1718) data element:
 - i. Update the data element definition and remove Special Instructions.
 - ii. Change the data element from “conditionally mandatory” to “optional”.
 - iii. Update Data Element Reporting Requirements for this data element.
- 2. Revise the EVALUATION-DELAY-REASON-CODE (DC164) code table:
 - a. Rename the code table to DELAY-REASON-CODE.
 - b. Add additional guidance to the code table.
- 3. Update the data element definition for PARENTAL-CONSENT-DATE (E1714).
- 4. Revise existing TSDS reports to reflect the changes in this proposal.
 - a. CHF0-100-001
 - b. CHF0-100-002
 - c. CHF0-100-003
 - d. CHF0-100-004
- 5. Add and update data validation rules to reflect the changes in this proposal.

ITF Discussion:

Traci Pesina asked if the Evaluation Delay and Eligibility Delay data were currently captured through one data element for reporting purposes. Zane Wubbena confirmed that LEAs reported Evaluation Delay and Eligibility Delay together in the legacy system. He added that further analysis determined that the federal reporting requirement was based on the evaluation delay but did not capture the eligibility delay. Zane went on to say that LEAs reported the evaluation delay reason rather than the eligibility delay reason since there was only one data element. With many of the students also out of compliance for the eligibility reason. For example, an ARD meeting would not occur, and students were not placed into special education in a timely manner. Therefore, the Monitoring Review and Support Division needs to separate Eligibility Delay Reason from Evaluation Delay Reason.

Additionally, the division is currently developing guidance documents for the Child Find program area related to measurement requirements. This information will be communicated through a TAA letter sent at a later date.

ITF Chair, Joel Garcia called for additional questions or comments. Hearing none, he requested a motion.

ITF Action:

Dana Braun made a motion to approve the proposal.

D'Lynne Johnson seconded the motion.

Vote: Passed.

4. ODS 3.x Upgrade - Finance

Action Item

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) is upgrading the Texas Student Data System (TSDS) Operational Data Store (ODS) to Ed-Fi version 3.x. This will be a phased upgrade with pilot 1 beginning in the 2021-2022 school year. The upgrade will be completed in the 2023-2024 school year. The updated standards will include data elements already legislatively approved

for collection in addition to data elements that must be collected to align with the new Ed-Fi 3.x version.

The Ed-Fi Data Standards is the set of rules for collecting, managing, and organizing educational data that allows multiple systems to share their information in a seamless, actionable way.

This document presents the data in the Finance Extension Domain of the Ed-Fi Data Standards reported to TSDS.

The majority of the data elements are already being reported to TSDS using Complex Types in Interchange files. Some new data elements are needed to support and align fully with the Ed-Fi standard.

Financial data will continue to be reported in the same manner (aggregation) as it is currently being reported in TSDS, meaning that data will be summarized to the TEA reporting level account.

Presentation:

Jamie Muffoletto presented the proposal which includes:

The following changes are proposed:

1. Transition from collecting finance and budget data with the current TSDS Interchanges and Complex Types to using Ed-Fi Domains.
 - a. Finance Extension Domain
 - b. Education Organization Extension Domain
2. Transition from using code tables to using descriptor tables.
 - a. Add Fund descriptor table based upon code table FUND-CODE (C145).
 - b. Add Function descriptor table based upon code table FUNCTION-CODE (C146).
 - c. Add Object descriptor table based upon code table OBJECT-CODE (C159).
 - d. Add ProgramIntent descriptor table based upon code table PROGRAM-INTENT-CODE (C147).
 - e. Add PayrollActivity descriptor table based upon code table PAYROLL-ACTIVITY-CODE (C018).
 - f. Add SSAType descriptor table based upon code table SHARED-SVCS-ARRANGEMENT-TYPE-CODE (C049).

The following entities are referenced in the Finance Extension Domain:

1. EducationOrganization
2. Staff

ITF Discussion:

Kim Lyons requested Jamie Muffoletto clarify that existing code tables have additional reporting guidance and others do not. Jamie explained that the PayrollActivity descriptor table would only include the descriptor values and not the additional information that is currently listed. The Data Element Reporting Requirements section will include additional information about descriptor values instead of the descriptor table.

ITF Chair, Joel Garcia called for additional questions or comments. Hearing none, he requested a motion.

ITF Action:

Traci Pesina made a motion to approve the proposal.

D'Lynne Johnson seconded the motion.

Vote: Passed.

5. ODS 3.x Upgrade - Assessment**Action Item**

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) is upgrading the Texas Student Data System (TSDS) Operational Data Store (ODS) to Ed-Fi version 3.x. This will be a phased upgrade with pilot 1 beginning in the 2021-2022 school year. The upgrade will be completed in the 2023-2024 school year. The updated standards will include data elements already legislatively approved for collection in addition to data elements that must be collected to align with the new Ed-Fi 3.x version.

The Ed-Fi Data Standards is the set of rules for collecting, managing, and organizing educational data that allows multiple systems to share their information in a seamless, actionable way.

This document presents the data in the Assessment Extension Domain of the Ed-Fi Data Standards reported to TSDS.

The majority of the data elements are already being reported to TSDS using Complex Types in Interchange files. Some new data elements are needed to support and align fully with the Ed-Fi standard.

Presentation:

Jamie Muffoletto presented the proposal which includes:

The following changes are proposed:

1. Transition from collecting student assessment data with the current TSDS Interchanges and Complex Types to using Ed-Fi Domains.
 - a. Assessment Extension Domain
 - i. New Data Elements
2. Transition from using code tables to using descriptor tables.
 - a. Add AssessmentName (TX) descriptor table based upon code table ASSESSMENT-TITLE-CODE (DC154).
 - b. Add ReportAssessmentType (TX) descriptor table based upon code table REPORT-ASSESSMENT-TYPE-CODE (DC123).
 - c. Add AcademicSubject descriptor table based upon code table ACADEMIC-SUBJECT-TYPE (DC002).
 - d. Add AssessedGradeLevel descriptor table based upon code table GRADE-LEVEL-TYPE (DC063).
 - e. Add AssessmentCategory descriptor table based upon code table ASSESSMENT-CATEGORY-TYPE (DC011).
 - f. Add AssessmentIdentificationSystem descriptor table based upon code table ASSESSMENT-IDENTIFICATION-SYSTEM-TYPE (DC012).
 - g. Add AssessmentReportingMethod descriptor table based upon code table ASSESSMENT-REPORTING-METHOD-TYPE (DC014).
 - h. Add new ResultDatatypeType descriptor table.

The following entities are referenced in the Assessment Domain:

1. Education Organization
2. Program
3. Section
4. Student

ITF Discussion:

Kim Lyons asked if the new GradeLevel descriptor table will include additional data reporting requirements to explain the definitions for any new values. Jamie Muffoletto clarified that TEA would be adjusting descriptor tables only to contain the descriptors reported to TEA. Leanne Simons added that TEA is only publishing the data standards required for state reporting. Currently, there is a request that local education agencies (LEAs) could have the ability to use the landing zone for other purposes. Leanne confirmed that TEA is still working through this concept.

Kim asked if there was a separate Ed-Fi data standard document. Leanne replied that Ed-Fi also publishes a data standard document. The Texas Education Data Standards (TEDS) will only contain the data elements and descriptor tables related to Texas state reporting.

John Newcom stated that assessment vendors report assessment information in TSDS and asked whether they will still report assessment data or do LEAs need to report assessment data through their student information system. Scott Johnson answered that ECDS assessment vendors will still be reporting the data.

ITF Chair, Joel Garcia called for additional questions or comments. Hearing none, he requested a motion.

ITF Action:

Dana Braun made a motion to approve the proposal.

D'Lynne Johnson seconded the motion.

Vote: Passed.

6. ODS 3.x Upgrade – Student Cohort Action Item

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) is upgrading the Texas Student Data System (TSDS) Operational Data Store (ODS) to Ed-Fi version 3.x. This will be a phased upgrade with pilot 1 beginning in the 2021-2022 school year. The upgrade will be completed in the 2023-2024 school year. The updated standards will include data elements already legislatively approved for collection in addition to data elements that must be collected to align with the new Ed-Fi 3.x version.

The Ed-Fi Data Standards is the set of rules for collecting, managing, and organizing educational data that allows multiple systems to share their information in a seamless, actionable way.

This document presents the data in the Student Cohort Domain of the Ed-Fi Data Standards reported to TSDS.

The majority of the data elements are already being reported to TSDS using Complex Types in Interchange files. Some new data elements are needed to support and align fully with the Ed-Fi standard.

Presentation:

Jamie Muffoletto presented the proposal which includes:

The following changes are proposed:

1. Transition from collecting Student Cohort data with the current TSDS Interchange and Complex Types to using Ed-Fi Domains.
 - a. Student Cohort Domain
 - i. New Data Element
2. Transition from using code tables to using descriptor tables.
 - a. Add CohortType descriptor table.

The following entities are referenced in the Student Cohort Domain:

1. EducationOrganization
2. Intervention
3. Program
4. Section
5. Staff
6. StaffSectionAssociation
7. Student
8. StudentInterventionAssociation
9. StudentSectionAssociation

ITF Discussion:

ITF Chair, Joel Garcia called for questions or comments. Hearing none, he requested a motion.

ITF Action:

D'Lynne Johnson made a motion to approve the proposal.

Traci Pesina seconded the motion.

Vote: Passed.

7. Sunset of C900 Reports

Discussion Item

During a reports advisory group meeting, the Texas Education Agency (TEA) was informed that there is no longer a need to develop two reports related to the Edit+ C900/P900 reports:

- LEA - Organization Lookup data report
- Campus - Organization Lookup data report

The Texas Student Data System (TSDS) obtains organizational data directly from AskTED, therefore LEAs no longer require an organizational data report to be developed for use in the TSDS.

TEA is proposing to sunset two reports related to the Edit+ C900/P900 (Organization Lookup) reports and not have these reports developed for TSDS. Users are able to retrieve organizational data in AskTED. There is no rule impact as a result of this change.

Presentation:

Stephanie Sharp presented the proposal which includes:
In the Texas Education Data Standards:

1. Sunset Edit+ C900/P900 (Organization Lookup) reports.
 - a. PDM0-900-900 – LEA
 - b. PDM0-900-901 - Campus

ITF Discussion:

Traci Pesina asked if the sunset reports were initially requested to be developed but did not get developed. Stephanie Sharp confirmed that the reports were requested but never developed. TSDS obtains the organization data directly from AskTED. To validate organization data, LEAs do not need to use the C900/P900 Organization Lookup report.

Other Business**Discussion Item****Texas Records Exchange (TREx) CAREER-TECH-ED-INDICATOR(TC03)**

Jamie Muffoletto presented an “other business” proposal about Career and Technical Education (CTE) indicators in the Texas Records Exchange (TREx) application.

Background:

Currently, the Texas Education Agency (TEA) auto-calculates one CTE indicator per program of study based on courses taken, completed, and passed by a student. During the ITF meeting on January 19, 2021, the committee approved a proposal to update the CAREER-TECH-ED-INDICATOR (TE041) and corresponding code table TC03 to reflect the new CTE codes for a Local Education Agency (LEA) to transfer a student’s auto-calculated code to the receiving LEA beginning in the 2021-2022 school year.

Details:

On August 1, 2021, the TREx Data Standards were updated to include the new CTE codes so an LEA could transmit the auto-calculated CTE code through TREx. However, TEA determined that the TREx Data Standards did not have a data element to send the necessary program of study information.

Jamie asked committee members for their opinion related to CTE Indicators and the need to update TREx to transmit the code with the associated program of study.

Kim Lyons stated that an LEA might use the CTE indicator for purposes other than PEIMS, like CCMR, to populate the indicator into their Student Information System (SIS) for a new student. Joel Garcia added that the counselor might need the information. Traci Pesina agreed there might be a need for some for local tracking purposes.

Jamie asked the committee when TREx information is transmitted, which includes course completion, would there be a need for the CTE indicator.

Joel asked if only one CTE indicator could be transmitted in TREx. Jamie stated that in TREx, an LEA could only send one CTE indicator. TEA is trying to determine if the indicator

with the program of study needs to be transmitted. Jamie met with the CTE program area and determined that it is possible to send CTE indicators for seven or more programs of study.

Joel requested clarification if this indicator is for sequential courses or if the CTE indicator should only be reported for a student taking classes affiliated with a program of study. Candice DeSantis stated that TEA calculates the CTE indicator based on course completion data for the current and prior years. Additionally, TEA was told by the CTE department that even when a student moves to a new LEA, the new LEA would not receive any funding for that program of study.

Traci Pesina requested additional time to discuss this with her CTE department before providing any feedback. Jamie agreed and asked the committee to take the information back to their CTE departments and counselors to give feedback on what they would need.

Georgia Kalligeris added if a student has up to seven (7) indicators based on a program of study by school year, transmitting the data in TREx could get very messy. Jamie confirmed that is a possibility, and TEA is still working with the CTE department to determine the best way to transfer this data if required. Georgia added that the reports from TSDS and the data provided have shown up to five (5) records for one student. The amount of data could grow each year which might cause issues with transmitting the indicator in TREx.

Kim Lyons asked if there is any guidance related to the program of study and how TEA calculates that value. Candice stated that the guidance is in the report requirements and the TSDS reports to show the calculation information.

Terri Hanson provided the link to the [Technical Resources in TWEDS](#) and a note from the page that clarifies how the program of study is related to the calculation of values for the CTE indicator.

Upcoming ITF Meetings

ITF Chair Joel Garcia asked TEA if the upcoming ITF meetings would continue to be held virtually. Jamie Muffoletto confirmed that the meetings would continue to be held virtually.

Leanne Simons asked for feedback on a proposed change to the ITF meeting from January 11, 2022, to January 25, 2022. Members did not see any issues with changing the date of the meeting. Leanne stated that she would provide the committee members with additional information if the meeting is rescheduled.

Adjournment

ITF Chair, Joel Garcia called for additional questions or comments. Hearing none, he requested a motion to adjourn.

D'Lynne Johnson made a motion to adjourn.

David C. Taylor seconded the motion.

Vote: Passed.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:28 a.m.