



**Data Reporting Committee**  
**Updates and Final Recommendations for**  
**Consideration by the Indiana State Board of Education**  
**November 2016**



## Data Reporting Committee

### Membership Roster

#### Indiana Department of Education

Danielle Shockey

Chairperson

#### Indiana Association of Public School Superintendents

Tracy Lorey

#### Indiana Non-Public Education Association

John Elcesser

#### Indiana Office of Technology

Bob Clark

#### Member Representing State Government, Appointed by the Governor

Steve Elliot

#### Charter School Representative

Dan Scott

#### Indiana School Boards Association

Patricia Hackett

#### Teacher, Appointed by Indiana State Superintendent Glenda Ritz

Abby Taylor

#### Indiana State Board of Education

Lee Ann Kwiatkowski

#### Indiana Association of School Business Officials

Ted Zembala



## **FINAL REPORT & RECOMMENDATIONS FOR STATE BOARD REVIEW**

### **Data Reporting Committee**

#### **I. Data Reporting Committee Directive.**

The committee on school data reporting was established to review all regulations or forms required or proposed by any state agency that seek to require a school to report data to a state agency or to the public (source: IC 20-19-3.5).

#### **II. Data Reporting Committee Meetings**

The Data Reporting Committee (“DRC”) met six times between January and October 2016. Each meeting of the Committee was approximately two and a half hours to discuss and take action on multiple data reporting topics. The agendas and materials for each of the meetings can be found [here](#) on the Indiana State Board of Education (“SBOE”) website.

#### **III. Summary and Resubmission of Previous Data Reporting Committee Recommendations to the Indiana State Board of Education.**

Beginning in June 2015, SBOE staff worked to establish the membership for the DRC and began to identify what information and qualified data is collected by Indiana Department of Education (“IDOE”) and other state agencies, including the SBOE, from schools and school corporations. Qualified data collections are those collections that are required by schools but that are not specifically authorized by statute. In July, the DRC met for the first time to begin review of data collections. The DRC met again in August, twice in September, October, and November. During this timeframe the DRC worked to determine how to streamline, pare down, or eliminate data collections that schools and school corporations send to various administrative agencies.

During SBOE business meetings in September and December 2015, the SBOE considered recommendations from the Data Reporting Committee. Some of the recommendations that were approved by the SBOE required legislative action, while other recommendations could be incorporated via internal agency streamlining reporting structures. Below is a summary of the previously submitted recommendations that the SBOE approved in 2015. As some of the recommendations required legislative action, which did not occur during the previous session, the DRC resubmits the recommendations for SBOE approval in order to give the legislature another opportunity to consider the proposed changes.



#### **IV. DRC Updates Regarding 2015 Recommendations that were implemented.**

##### **A. DRC Update # 1: Consolidate Discipline Collection (ES Collection).**

**Purpose of Discipline Collection (ES Collection):** For the 2014-2015 school year, schools had to report their arrest and bullying data separate from their expulsion and suspension data. Furthermore, the gang and restraint/seclusion data are a new requirement. The purpose of this data collection is to gather student suspension, expulsion, and arrest data including whether the incident involved bullying, gang related activity, or firearms. IC 20-34-6 requires the IDOE to submit arrest data to the Legislative Council and the Criminal Justice Institute annually by August 1 of each year. IC 20-34-6 requires the IDOE to post bullying data online annually. IC 20-26-18 requires the IDOE to submit gang related data to the Governor and the Indiana General Assembly. IC 20-20-40-13 requires the IDOE to include Restraint and Seclusion instances on each school's Annual Performance Report (APR). IC 20-20-8-8- requires the IDOE to include suspension and expulsion data on the APR.

**ES Collection Report 2015 Recommendation:** The DRC, in conjunction with the IDOE, recommended changing the Discipline Collection for 2015-2016 school year to include the arrest, bullying, gang, and restraint/seclusion data into a single collection. The IDOE also recommended adding additional type codes for theft, sexual misconduct, technology misuse, and non-deadly weapons to make the data more meaningful than using the type of "other." The SBOE approved this recommendation during a 2015 business meeting, and no additional SBOE action is necessary at this time.

**2016 Update:** During the course of 2016, IDOE has begun to successfully implemented this recommendation.



## **B. DRC Update # 2: Student Residence Report (SR Collection).**

**Purpose of Student Residence Report (SR Collection):** Indiana Code 20-24-7-2 requires charter school organizers to submit certain data that was previously necessary in order to determine the corporation of legal settlement of each student enrolled at a new charter school during its first year of operation. The corporation of legal settlement was used to determine the first year state tuition support funding for new charter schools. The SR Collection was used to collect this data from charter school organizers. However, in 2015 the General Assembly changed the manner in which this tuition support is calculated. Going forward, the state tuition support formula for new charter schools is no longer dependent upon the corporation of legal settlement of its students.

**2015 DRC recommendation regarding SR Collection Report** Since information regarding the corporation of legal settlement is no longer necessary for use in the state tuition support formula, the DRC, in conjunction with the IDOE, recommended elimination of the SR Data Collection in 2015. The recommendation was adopted by the legislature.

**2016 Update:** IC 20-24-7-2 was amended to remove IC 20-24-7-2(a)(1)-(5) so that charter school organizers no longer have to submit the following data elements:

1. The number of students enrolled in the charter school.
2. The name and address of each student.
3. The name of the school corporation in which the student has legal settlement.
4. The name of the school corporation, if any, that the student attended during the immediately preceding school year.
5. The grade level in which the student will enroll in the charter school.



## V. DRC 2016 Recommendations previously submitted to the Board.

### A. DRC Recommendation # 1: Membership (ME), Special Education (SE), English Learner and Immigrant (LM), Special Education for Vouchers (SV), and Membership for Vouchers (MV) Reports.

**Purpose of the Membership (ME), Special Education (SE), English Learner and Immigrant (LM), Special Education for Vouchers (SV), and Membership for Vouchers (MV) Reports:** The purpose of the Membership (ME) collection is to obtain the Average Daily Membership (ADM) from each school. The ME includes count of Choice voucher students (MV) and Adult Learner Charter schools (MA). The ADM is used in the calculation of state tuition support funding for public, charter and choice voucher schools. The purpose of the Special Education (SE) collection is to obtain data on students that are receiving Special Education services. The data obtained through the SE collection are used for state tuition special education funding and for federal and state reporting and monitoring. The purpose of the English Learners and Immigrant Students (LM) collection is to obtain student information on English learners and immigrant students in order to provide a count of limited English proficient students to calculate funding for the Federal Title III program and the State Non-English Speaking Program. Furthermore, the data from the LM collection is used for providing a count of students for the Title III Significant Immigrant Influx Grant.

**2015 DRC recommendation regarding membership (ME), Special Education (SE), English Learner and Immigrant (LM), Special Education for Vouchers (SV), and Membership for Vouchers (MV) Reports:** The DRC, in conjunction with the IDOE, recommended the combination of the ME, SE, LM, SV, MV, and MA reports in 2015. Although the SBOE agreed with the recommendation, the recommendation was not adopted by the legislature. Thus, the DRC resubmits this recommendation to the SBOE for approval and legislative consideration. Specifically, the DRC recommends combining all data collection into two count dates—a single collection count for Period 1 (the first business day in October) and a single collection count for Period 2 (the first Monday in February).

**2016 DRC Recommendation:** In order to consolidate these items, the DRC again recommends that the legislature amend Indiana Code 20-43-4-2 to provide that the fall ADM count day is the first Wednesday in October. Additionally, the DRC recommends that the legislature amend 20-43-7-1(a) to provide that the amount of special education is based on the count of eligible pupils enrolled in special education programs on the fall and spring ADM counts per IC 20-43-4-3. IC 20-43-4-9 also needs to be amended to allow the IDOE to make adjustments in the same manner tuition support is adjusted. Further, the SBOE would also need to amend 511 IAC 1-3-1(h), which establishes the fall and spring counts for tuition support and special education. When the legislature reviewed this recommendation during the last session, concerns were raised that pushing back the student counts to October would create issues in regards to collective bargaining negotiations. However, IDOE staff has confirmed that the estimated student enrollment data is made available prior to October. Therefore, adjusting the count date to October should not create any issues for purposes of collective bargaining.



### **IC 20-43-4-2 Version b**

#### **Determination of ADM; adjustments; estimates**

*Note: This version of section effective 1-1-2017. See also preceding version of this section, effective until 1-1-2017.*

(a) A school corporation's ADM is the number of eligible pupils enrolled in:

- (1) the school corporation; or
- (2) a transferee corporation;

on the days fixed in **September October** and in February by the state board for a count of students under section 3 of this chapter and as subsequently adjusted not later than the date specified under the rules adopted by the state board. The state board may adjust the school's count of eligible pupils if the state board determines that the count is unrepresentative of the school corporation's enrollment. In addition, a school corporation may petition the state board to make an adjusted count of students enrolled in the school corporation if the corporation has reason to believe that the count is unrepresentative of the school corporation's enrollment.

\*\*\*

### **IC 20-43-7-1**

#### **Special education grants; counts; additional grant distributions; grant reductions**

(a) In addition to the amount a school corporation is entitled to receive in basic tuition support, each school corporation is entitled to receive a grant for special education programs for the state fiscal year. Subject to subsections (b) and (c), the amount of the special education grant is based on the count of eligible pupils enrolled in special education programs **on the date of the fall ADM, established pursuant to IC 20-43-4-2, December 1** of the preceding state fiscal year in:

- (1) the school corporation; or
- (2) a transferee corporation.

\*\*\*

### **IC 20-43-4-3**

#### **Fixing day to determine ADM**

(a) Subject to subsection (b), the state board shall make an ADM count of the eligible pupils enrolled in each school corporation two (2) times each school year, with one (1) count date occurring in each of the following periods:

- (1) The fall count of ADM shall be made on a day during **September October** fixed by the state board.
- (2) The spring count of ADM shall be made on a day during February fixed by the state board.

\*\*\*



### 511 IAC 1-3-1(h)

#### Definitions

(h) "Average daily membership" or "ADM" means the number of pupils with legal settlement in the school corporation enrolled in the school corporation or in a transferee corporation on the **first business day in October** ~~second Friday following Labor Day~~. Kindergarten pupils attending half-time or more shall be counted as one-half ( $\frac{1}{2}$ ). Beginning in the 2004-2005 school year, the ADM shall be adjusted on December 1 of that same year. The board shall monitor changes that occur after the ADM count, in the number of students enrolled in programs for children with disabilities, and shall, on December 1 of that same year and, beginning in the 2004-2005 school year, on April 1 of the following calendar year, make an adjusted count of students enrolled in programs for children with disabilities.





## **B. DRC Recommendation # 2: Annual School Performance Report (APR).**

**Purpose of the Annual School Performance Report:** IC 20-20-8-8 requires schools to compile a large amount of data—the report contains 24 separate categories of data—and publish the same in a report called the Annual School Performance Report (APR). Schools must publish a copy of the APR in a newspaper of general circulation. In addition, the IDOE is required to make each school corporation's APR available on the IDOE's Internet web site and schools must make the APR available on a prominent page of the school's website.

**2015 DRC recommendation regarding Annual School Performance Report:** The DRC, in conjunction with the IDOE, recommended a number of revisions to IC 20-20-8-8 to simplify the reporting process. Although the SBOE agreed with the need for revision to the statute, the SBOE sent the recommendation back to the DRC to address a number of issues. The IDOE has reviewed this data reporting statute and has determined that there are limited options to streamline the data requirements without legislative changes. Therefore, the DRC resubmits the recommendation to the SBOE that the statute be amended by the legislature during the next session.

### **2016 DRC Recommendation:**

- **Average Class Size—IC 20-20-8-8(a)(5):** The DRC previously recommended changes to the APR statute and presented those recommendations to the SBOE on December 2, 2015. The SBOE raised concerns over the recommendations to remove the “average class size” requirement in IC 20-20-8-8(a)(5) and moved to return the issue back to the DRC for further review. As discussed at the August 16, 2016, and the October 13, 2016, DRC meetings, IDOE staff explained that the data collected under this provision is of limited use and it is difficult to confirm the accuracy of the data. The DRC resubmits its recommendation to remove this data collection requirement.

#### **IC 20-20-8-8**

##### **Report information**

(a) The report must include the following information:

\*\*\*

~~(5) Average class size.~~

\*\*\*

- **Remove requirement for newspaper publication.** The DRC recommends removal of the requirement, contained in IC 20-20-8-3, that the school's APR be published in a local newspaper of general circulation. Publication is expensive and the report is largely unusable in that format. Publication of a school's APR would be done on the department's website (Compass) and on each school's website.



### IC 20-20-8-3

#### **Publication of report; Internet publication**

(a) Not earlier than March 15 or later than March 31 of each year, the governing body of a school corporation shall publish an annual performance report of the school corporation, in compliance with the procedures identified in section 7 of this chapter. ~~The report must be published one (1) time annually under IC 5-3-1.~~

(b) The department shall make each school corporation's report available on the department's Internet web site. The annual performance report published on the Internet for a school corporation, including a charter school, must include any additional information submitted by the school corporation under section 6(3)(A) of this chapter. The governing body of a school corporation shall make the school corporation's report available on a prominent page of a school corporation's Internet web site.

(c) The governing body of a school corporation shall provide a copy of the report to a person who requests a copy. The governing body may not charge a fee for providing the copy.

- **Allow Schools to rely on other State Agencies to Report Financial Data:** The DRC recommended to make numerous changes to the required reported data in order to reduce redundancy because some of the data reported in the APR is also collected by the IDOE or by other governmental agencies. For example, much of the financial data required in the APR is available on the websites of the DLGF and the Office of Management and Budget's "Dollars to Classroom" website. The APR website for each school could simply be a hyperlink to the information maintained by the respective agency. If the Board approves this recommendation, staff from IDOE and SBOE will work with other agencies to identify redundant data reporting under this statute, and then present the proposed legislative language to the Board for final review.
- **Create a Unified Version of IC 20-20-8-8:** Currently, there are two versions of the APR statute, Version A and Version B. The Committee recommends repealing the multiple versions of the statute and adopting a unified version of IC 20-20-8-8. This version could also incorporate the revised reporting requirements recommended above. If the Board approves this recommendation, staff from IDOE and SBOE will draft a proposed version of the combined statute, and then present the proposed legislative language to the Board for final review.
- **Every Student Succeeds Act:** As data reporting requirements will be modified pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act, the DRC has determined it is unwise to recommend further changes to IC 20-20-8-8 at this time.



## **VI. DRC 2016 Recommendations that were not previously submitted to the Board.**

Staff from the IDOE and SBOE have worked to determine what, exactly, schools are reporting to state agencies. Beginning in January 2016, IDOE and SBOE staff began requesting representatives from each state agency that collects data from schools or districts attend a DRC monthly meeting to publically discuss 1) what data or information the agency collects from schools or school corporations 2) how the agency could streamline their collections with other state agencies to provide data reporting relief to schools and school corporations and 3) their recommendations for continuing or eliminating collections. By requesting that representatives from non-IDOE agencies be in attendance at the DRC meetings beginning in January 2016, SBOE and IDOE staff were hopeful that there would be more intentional collaboration and cooperation from non-IDOE state agencies to complete the work of the DRC. Although representatives from numerous agencies were initially invited to attend a DRC meeting, it was determined that positive results could be obtained by IDOE and SBOE staff working directly with other State agencies between meetings. IDOE and SBOE staff then updated the DRC regarding any progress regarding the streamlining data collection.

### **A. DRC Recommendation # 3: Streamlining Financial Reporting Requirements— Department of Local Government Finance.**

**Department of Local Government Finance Reporting:** Staff from the IDOE and the SBOE engaged in multiple meetings with representatives from the Department of Local Government Finance (“DLGF”) and members of the IDOE’s financial team to review financial data reporting requirements for schools. It was determined that the DLGF was requesting data from schools that the IDOE also collected.

**2016 DRC Recommendation regarding Department of Local Government Finance Data Reporting:** After it was determined that both the DLGF and IDOE were collecting, at least in part, the same financial data from schools, the parties began to explore the possibility of entering into a Memorandum of Understanding to share data between the agencies. Therefore, the DRC, in conjunction with the IDOE and the DLGF, recommend to the SBOE that the IDOE and DLGF enter into a Memorandum of Understanding that will allow the agencies to share school financial data. It is believed that this recommendation will result in the streamlining of financial data reporting for schools without the need for legislative action.

This recommendation does not require legislative action at this time.



## **B. DRC Recommendation # 4: Streamlining Financial Reporting Requirements— Annual School Finance Report (AFR).**

**Purpose of the Annual School Financial Report:** Indiana Code 5-3-1-3 states that “[n]ot earlier than August 1 or later than August 15 of each year, the secretary of each school corporation in Indiana shall publish” an annual financial reports (AFR) in accordance with the general requirements for publication (this requirement is reaffirmed in IC 5-3-1-3(f) as well). Further, IC 5-3-1-3(g) requires schools to submit their AFRs to the IDOE, which must, in turn, make the AFRs available for public inspection upon request.

Furthermore, a separate statute, IC 5-11-1-4, requires that schools to submit a different AFR to the state examiner’s office (State Board of Accounts) via the collection systems of Gateway. These reports, as submitted by the governmental units, are made available via Gateway to the public soon after the deadline for submission (60 days after year end). See <https://gateway.ifionline.org/public/aboutGateway.aspx>. While some of the data contained in the different AFRs overlaps, the data requirements are not an exact match.

**2016 DRC Recommendation regarding Annual School Financial Report:** The DRC recommends to the SBOE that IC 5-3-1-3 and IC 5-11-1-4 be amended so that schools only need to submit one AFR to the state examiner (with all pertinent information required by the separate statutes), without the need to publish a separate document and submit that document to IDOE. The AFR submitted to the state examiner’s office would be uploaded to the State’s Gateway system, which will ensure that the data is available to the public and other State agencies that need the data. If the Board approves this recommendation, staff from IDOE and SBOE will draft proposed statutory language that incorporates the recommendation, and then present the proposed legislative language to the Board for final review.



### **C. DRC Recommendation # 5: Streamlining Data Reporting Requirements between Schools and the Department of Health.**

**Department of Health Reporting Requirements:** Representatives from the IDOE as well as the State Department of Health (“DOH”) have attended multiple DRC meetings, as well as staff meetings, and provided detailed summaries regarding the data reporting requirements that schools have regarding health data. During these meetings several issues have been identified under the current data reporting systems. Under the current system schools are responsible for monitoring the immunization status of students and entering student immunization records into the IDOE database, as well as the DOH immunization database, known as CHIRP.

The meetings between the respective parties have highlighted some of the challenges with CHIRP including the inconvenience of system time-outs, the inability for records to automatically follow students as they move to school rosters, the inconsistency of hierarchal updates from school nurses, and the technical training required for nurses to insert immunization information. The main dilemma for school nurses is that the law requires the same immunization data be to be maintained in two separate, incompatible systems. Additionally, there are concerns that maintaining CHIRP is difficult due to limitations placed on school staff by the Family Educational Rights and Privacy (FERPA) laws.

In light of the technical challenges, weighed against the need for the data in question, IDOE, SBOE, and DOH staff has been working with the Indiana Office of Technology to create a solution that allows the data entered into the IDOE’s database to transfer into CHIRP. The data collected by IDOE is FERPA compliant, and with a few small changes should satisfy CHIRP’s data requirements. This process is ongoing.

**2016 DRC Recommendation regarding Department of Health Collections:** As the solution to this data reporting issue is still being determined, it is not possible to provide a specific recommendation to the SBOE. However, the DRC requests that the SBOE approve the continued cooperation amongst the interested parties and potential solution to this data reporting issue, and if such a solution is identified, approve the implementation of such a solution.

This recommendation does not require legislative action at this time.



#### **D. DRC Recommendation # 6: Streamlining “C” Data Reporting Requirements.**

**“C” Collection Requirements:** Data reporting, commonly referred to as “C” collections, consists of the Certified Employee report (CE), the Certified Personnel report (CP), and the Course Completion report (CC). A representative from the IDOE has presented at multiple DRC meetings. During the course of these presentations, the IDOE representative explained that IDOE has been granted permission to share data with the Indiana Public Retirement System (INPRS). Through this proposed data sharing process, IDOE will be able to eliminate some of the “C” collection requirements that are currently imposed on schools by collecting information directly from INPRS. This will be an ongoing process.

**2016 DRC Recommendation regarding “C” Collections:** As the solution to streamlining “C” collections is still being finalized, at least in part, it is not possible to provide a specific recommendation to the SBOE. However, the DRC requests that the SBOE approve the use of data sharing between the IDOE and INPRS.

This recommendation does not require legislative action at this time.