



# INDIANA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

## MINUTES

### DATA REPORTING COMMITTEE

October 13<sup>th</sup>, 2015

Indiana Government Center South  
Conference Room 4

302 W. Washington St., Indianapolis, IN 46204

The meeting of the Data Reporting Committee (“DRC”) convened at 9:00 AM.

Committee members Danielle Shockey, Steve Elliot, Dr. Tracy Lorey, John Elcesser, Lee Ann Kwiatkowski, Abby Taylor, Dan Scott, and Patricia Hackett were present. Committee Member Ted Zembala arrived late. Committee Member Paul Baltzell was not present. Staff members Ashley Cowger, Sarah Rossier, and John Snethen were present.

I. **Call to Order**

Ms. Shockey called the meeting to order at 9:00 AM.

II. **Attendance, Approval of Minutes, and Review of Agenda**

There were two sets of minutes to be approved at this meeting. The minutes from the September 1, 2015 and September 29, 2015 meetings were unanimously approved.

Before moving to the next agenda item, Ms. Shockey discussed the additional data collection requirement question that had been brought forth by Mr. Scott last meeting. Ms. Shockey concluded that this letter was sent to five or six specific charter schools seeking to address errors in their collections and that it was not the intent of the Department to have this letter sent out to additional schools.

III. **Continued Discussion of ME, SE & LM Collection**

Ms. Michelle Tubbs, the Director of Special Education came before the committee to discuss the streamlining of the ME, SE, and LM data collections. Ms. Tubbs proposed streamlining them in one or two parts and proposing to move the collection dates to the first of October and the first of November. These collections take into consideration special education, language minorities, and membership. Instead of having the schools submit in the last weeks of September and in October and December, it would allow time for the schools to submit all of their collections and do it more accurately because of the extra time. It will also give students more time for graduation requirements from the prior year since students have until September 30<sup>th</sup> of the next year. If all of the collections are put together, Ms. Tubbs said that it will allow for them to have a snap shot of their special education, language minority, and membership population as well as funding figures.

Phase two would combine the collections into a single collection that collects the data needed for all three collections. There were concerns about the schools losing funding if they did phase two instead of doing it at two different days and Ms. Tubbs concluded that the figures would be the same.

Ms. Pam Wright, the State Special Education Director came before the committee next to discuss special education funding. She is in favor of the two collection dates because they would recover the funds from October to December count in the February count. Ms. Kwiatkowski asked a question about when schools receive special education funding. Ms. Melissa Ambre from the finance area at the Department came before the committee to answer Ms. Kwiatkowski's question. Mr. Scott raised a concern about individual school corporations and how moving the date of the collection could affect the dollar amount that individual school corporations receive. Ms. Wright spoke to Mr. Scott's concern and said she could compute numbers for individual school corporations and that she would be able to get the data from Marion county at the district level to account for the mobility that happens with the special education population in between the October 1 date and the December 1 date. Ms. Kwiatkowski addressed another question about accountability when switching the dates for the special education population. Ms. Shockey noted that she will check into that and believes that it would be taken care of in February. Mr. Elcesser had a concern that the different reporting dates would add more burden to the schools and it goes against the goals of the group. Ms. Shockey verified that using the one date would allow for the elimination of redundancies based on one report and it would lessen the burden on schools. The combination of the reports would allow the schools to have less errors as well.

Ms. Tubbs readdressed the board and proposed moving forward to phase two to implement in September of 2017-2018 and the next year would be used for development. Mr. Scott gave his support for the overall plan, but said he would be concerned if each school corporation has the capability to report all three at the same time. For smaller schools that don't have the SIS systems, Ms. Tubbs proposed creating a template for those schools in excel format.

Ms. Kwiatkowski asked a question to Ms. Tubbs about the migrant population and funding. Her concern was if the schools receive funding in October or in February. Ms. Tubbs responded that in October it is merely used for informational purposes since the migrant population has not left yet. The funding will come in February.

Another question was addressed by a committee member about the membership for vouchers and membership for adult learners. Ms. Ambre stated that once the counts are complete, there is a two week window to complete the required information needed to distribute funds and the dates are set by the Governor's Office. The membership for vouchers are submitted on the same schedule as membership count, stated Ms. Ambre and proposed a possible need to delay payment to account for any errors that may arise since there are two payments. The other count Ms. Ambre described addresses the adult learners and that is paid monthly on a six month basis. In addition she said they do special education vouchers in December and by moving it to the October date, the

payment would be moved to the February date. Ms. Shockey addressed to the committee that the State Budget Agency has reached out and they will be involved as well.

Ms. Shockey concluded that this agenda item will be addressed at a further date and that for the time being the discussion was sufficient.

#### **IV. Continued Discussion of APR**

Ms. Tubbs came before the committee again to discuss APR and discussed the necessary requirements for the APR using version A and B from statute. The purpose of this discussion is to go through the statute and discuss requirements that can be removed. Ms. Tubbs went through versions A and B and proposed to remove certain requirements because they were either not relevant to the APR, not collected by the Department, or because of redundancy with another reporting requirement. Ms. Kwiatkowski was concerned about the links to additional information in the APR and Ms. Tubbs suggested that she could look into adding electronic links into the electronic PDFs files.

Ms. Cowger and Ms. Roach added that while Compass is helpful, there is a concern that non-educators do not know how to navigate it. The concern is that when the APR report card that is published in a newspaper, people understand that it is only a snapshot in time. However, with the creation of links on Compass, the question is how they will get people to understand that it may not be reported in real time. Ms. Tubbs added that once she approves a final data collection on Compass it cannot be changed. There was discussion by committee members about why the APR is necessary when in fact the data they are looking at is from last year. Ms. Shockey said that the purpose of the APR is to fulfill a federal reporting requirement and Indiana is required by statute to submit a minimum amount of requirements based on what the individual state has placed importance.

Ms. Tubbs continued with review of financial information, which the DRC talked about moving. The inter- and intra-district student mobility rates were discussed and agreed for it to be removed. The creation of a mobility report card was also discussed. Ms. Tubbs also reviewed the requirement for the number and percentage of the following within the school corporation added in 2016: teachers who are certified, teachers who teach the subject in which they are licensed, and teachers with national board certification, asking if this should be built into the website. Ms. Shockey stated her desire for a header for viewers to easily click on to find what they are looking for. Mr. Scott agreed, adding that topics could be broadly grouped together. Ms. Tubbs reminded the group of Ms. Taylor's previous concern about ease of comparison between data. Ms. Cowger explained that communication is convoluted for those not in school corporations. Ms. Shockey reiterated the need for clear headers.

Ms. Tubbs continued her review with students reading at a third grade level, which is currently reported. The number of students expelled collection had the number participating in recognized school programs during expulsion requirement removed, seeing as there is no way to know this data. The other breakouts will be included in the

March collection. Chronic absenteeism, with students missing more than 10% of school for any reason was discussed, was discussed without clear consensus. Ms. Tubbs explained that there are two different ways to collect, either the 10% or the truancy aspect, which would require 10 days. Mr. Scott stated that attendance is more of an individual student issue, not the overall attendance aspect, hence both should be removed. Ms. Tubbs reminded that a child who is ill would be included in this collection.

Next, Ms. Tubbs reviewed the student dropout requirement, questioning the reasons for dropping out requirement. Ms. Shockey explained that there are some groups who may wish to know this information to reduce dropout rates. Ms. Tubbs stated the RT and EM reports from schools include these exit codes, though there are only some that are relevant, such as working or pregnancy, disinterest in curriculum, failing. Mr. Scott opined that the dropout standalone is not as accurate as a mobility rate included with this; it should be broader. The consensus was that it be removed from the APR, yet potentially added elsewhere.

Ms. Shockey suggested moving the information from twelve into twenty-one. Ms. Kwiatkowski added that you post important data and then link to the applicable report. Ms. Tubbs clarified that twelve will be kept with nothing removed, and twenty-one will be kept with nothing removed, yet on the report they will be combined. Ms. Shockey added that the status of twelve is up in the air, with bullying information still being collected and available through public record. Mr. Elcesser contributed that schools will still collect this data, it will just be removed from the APR. Ms. Tubbs reminded the committee members of the cost of publicizing in a newspaper, on which the DRC had unanimous agreement that this is unnecessary. The publication date is in March. Even if still required to print in the papers, the reduction of requirements from the DRC will help reduce the cost.

Next, number twenty-two, the number of in-school suspensions, which Ms. Tubbs maintained was not necessary. Ms. Kwiatkowski stated that this is a hot topic right now with civil rights. Ms. Tubbs added that schools are not reporting this information accurately, seeing as it is only an in-school suspension if they are receiving instruction; even if they are in the building without instruction, it would not be an in-school suspension, thus it should be completely removed. Ms. Cowger suggested a discussion of definition with and Ms. Kwiatkowski discussed the importance of correct and accurate collection.

Ms. Tubbs continued with number twenty-three, the number of work permits, but DOE does not collect it and it is not currently on the APR, so it needs to be removed from statute. Next, number of students receiving an IB, which Ms. Tubbs stated would be placed under grad rates. Ms. Tubbs continued with the other indicators of performance as recommended requirement, which Ms. Shockey confirmed does not exist. Ms. Tubbs added that for 2016, statute requires all data points for all Marion County Schools in the APR. This includes attendance, graduation, enrollment, assessment, and other collections broken down by race, gender, and socioeconomic status for all schools in Marion County. Mr. Scott questioned the possibility of DOE posting this information on their website to relieve the schools versus the publication in newspapers. Mr. Scott also questioned the advanced placement requirement, which he saw as unfair to schools due

to the combination of AP/IB/dual-credit, etc. Ms. Shockey contributed that number eleven includes number eight. Members discussed and decided to remove number twenty-three under version A. Ms. Shockey and Ms. Kwiatkowski reasoned that number ten should be removed to not concentrate specifically on grade ten algebra. Mr. Scott requested a legal ruling on whether adult-learner schools would have to report APR, seeing as a lot of it does not apply to them. Ms. Shockey suggested looking at federal requirements. Ms. Roach explained that Title I requires grad rates to be included in adult-learner schools, and suggested grad enrollment rates be required.

Ms. Shockey stated a list of recommended strikes, numbers: Version A ten, thirteen, twenty-two, twenty-three, twenty-four, and Version B five, Version E seven, Version H seven, ten, fourteen, section of language in seventeen, all of eighteen and nineteen, part of twenty and all of twenty-three. Mr. Scott questioned if anyone had heard back about the career and technical education piece. This was tabled. Ms. Shockey called for a motion to recommend the list to be stricken. Ms. Hackett made the motion, Mr. Scott seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

#### **V. Discussion of Layouts and Recommendations for Consolidations/Deletions of other Agency Collected Data**

Ms. Cowger stated that headway is being made with non-DOE collections, and the Department of Homeland Security had just reached out during the meeting. Included in the handout are the Indiana State Police, which provided a specific recommendation, and the Department of Workforce Development (DWD), which collects CTE information, primarily dual credit. DWD did not provide a specific recommendation, but Ms. Cowger mentioned an opportunity to streamline between DWD and DOE. The two departments will be meeting to provide a more specific recommendation. DWD collects more federal requirements than DOE. There will be more recommendations coming in the future. Ms. Cowger suggested the DRC include the State Police recommendation in the next round sent to the State Board of Education. Ms. Shockey stated she sent the State Police Recommendation to the Cathy Danyluk, Director of Student Services and Maggie Paino, Director of Accountability at DOE. Mr. Moore provided a report of the primary findings. Mr. Moore also explained the reporting of missing children data. Mr. Scott questioned if this would mean that anyone could use an ability code of “missing” without having any paperwork. Ms. Kwiatkowski contributed that schools are becoming savvier and are now reporting directly to a clearing house. Members discussed the various codes available and the consequences of each. Ms. Cowger offered to get more information about the clearing house process, including a clearer definition of “missing”. Ms. Roach contributed that there is a process before reporting a student missing. Mr. Scott requested input from the State Board of Education and the State Police before making any decision. Ms. Shockey also questioned how this is helpful for the State Police. Ms. Cowger will follow up and provide an update before the next meeting. Ms. Cowger detailed which agencies they had reached out to, including FSSA, DWD, State Police, Homeland Security, Health and CHE. There is not a master list of agencies. Ms. Shockey agreed that a file of which agencies collect what and their process etc. would be helpful to the legislature as well. Ms. Cowger mentioned that there are over 200 reports, though the definition of a report is hazy.

## **VI. Discussion of Layouts and Recommendations for Consolidations/Deletions of other Agency Collected Data**

Ms. Tubbs does not recommend any changes to the AD Report at this time. Schools are really struggling with how to identify students who have parents or guardians on any branch of active duty. Ms. Tubbs opined that the legislature will not remove it now, but perhaps the issue can be revisited in the future, schools would love if this was removed. Ms. Kwiatkowski stated she doesn't know why this is collected. Ms. Cowger suggested it is there in order to offer resources. Ms. Tubbs contributed that there is a website for this. Members hypothesized why this is a requirement. Ms. Tubbs detailed ways in which the schools are attempting to collect this information, such as parent-teacher conferences, and problematized them. Ms. Shockey requested the legal team look into this, and perhaps find out the author.

Ms. Tubbs stated that the following have no changes: AltEd, Attendance for both real time and enrollment, dual credit, educator evaluations, educator results, special education evaluation, and mobility submitters. Ms. Tubbs questioned whether the dual credit could be combined with the CC. Ms. Tubbs was unaware if frequency of enrollment mobility collection is stated statutorily. Members contributed that this is required five days after any kinds of movement occur. Members had already made recommendations to discipline, and it has been approved by the State Board of Education and posted, ready to collect for next year. Ms. Tubbs suggested removing the post-graduate data from the grad collection. The C collections will be tackled at a later date. Ms. Tubbs stated that this is needed more often, perhaps monthly. Pupil enrollment is currently used for title funding, formative assessment, and compass numbers. There are nonpublic schools that have not yet reported a mobility file, so DOE doesn't know where students are attending school. Ms. Tubbs reiterated that this should be collected monthly, because this data is posted on Compass. Mr. Scott questioned if this is used to validate a transfer to a nonpublic school. Ms. Tubbs stated that the mobility piece is not as important as the enrollment piece. Ms. Tubbs explained that students could be in records of more than one school, which is problematic, especially for assessments. Members discussed.

Ms. Shockey requested a pause due to time, suggesting that there is homework on the data layouts, and if there are any recommendations that members feel they would like to enact that have not been discussed or oppose any changes that have been recommended. Members will take their binders home. Ms. Shockey suggested looking at data layouts that are particularly important to members. Ms. Tubbs stated that most layouts she does not have recommendations for, so it would be helpful to have recommendations from members. Dual Credit is only open in the summer-should it be open longer? The next meeting will involve the C Collections. Ms. Tubbs stated there will be an all-day C Conference on October 27, 2015, hoping to get information from schools. Ms. Tubbs suggested that the C Collection discussions be tabled until after this conference. Members agreed.

The meeting adjourned at 11:00AM.