INDIANA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

MINUTES

DATA REPORTING COMMITTEE

June 9, 2016

Indiana Government Center South

Conference Room 12

302 West Washington St., Indianapolis, IN 46204

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

Committee Chair Danielle Shockey and Committee members John Elcesser, Dr. Tracy Lorey, Dan Scott, and Ted Zembala were present. Committee members Patricia Hackett and Bob Clarke were present by conference call. Committee members Steve Elliot, Lee Ann Kwiatkowski, Abby Taylor were not present. Bob Clark, Chief Operating Officer of IOT, will serve as the IOT designee on behalf of Dewand Neely. Staff members Brian Murphy, Sarah Rossier, Tim Schultz, and Ashalyn Hardy 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

Mr. Murphy took attendance. Ms. Shockey made a motion to amend the agenda to include the staff homework assignment from the May meeting. Ms. Shockey made a motion to approve the minutes. Ms. Patricia Hackett seconded the motion. The committee unanimously approved the minutes.

III. SB500 Advocates

Dr. Brian Smith, Executive Director for the Indiana School Boards Association, joined the committee to present on SB500. Dr. Smith informed the committee of the following:

- SIF uses a zone integration server, compares the fields and connects them. If the software is SIF compliant, it connects those pieces together. Part of the genesis of the bill was to identify how many people in the schools are working on data entry and what is the cost of that staff.

- Part of the responsibility of DRC is to streamline the collection process, one way to do that is to be SIF compliant. There are some states who are doing it and it is working well. The DOE was looking at this in the past. The DRC must now approve any new data to be collected. There is a starting point, which can be expanded and modified. The goal is to streamline the collection process. It would allow the state to put the big picture together rather than analyzing individual districts. Original questions were how do unburden the school districts with the data collection process.

Dr. Lorey added that SIF is not just transportation, it talks to the library, cafeteria, etc.

Dr. Smith stated this would streamline the process. He said there are a number of privacy issues with collecting data, which will have to be addressed. Another issue he mentioned is that there has been no standardization. The technology is available and it can be done.

Dr. Lorey said it would be very advantageous for school districts if their data bases could talk to the data bases at the DOE, instead of constant reporting. It is about process, time, and dollars spent, she said. For smaller districts, it is pulling someone away from their daily responsibilities in order to do data reporting. If the data bases could communicate with one another it would streamline the process so much more.

Mr. Elcesser said the committee is dealing with content and process, and much of the conversation to date has been about content, not process. Dr. Smith recommended bringing in experts to speak to what components the state is meeting these requirements, and where are the missing pieces.

Mr. Elcesser asked what other states are doing this.

Mr. Scott recommended the committee build a strategic plan to make the systems compliant, identify next steps, and also the timeline.

Dr. Smith agreed it would be advantageous to build a plan.

Dr. Lorey asked why there can't be one database for the state. She added that it is about local control, yet allowing SIF.

Ms. Shockey said that was the goal for Indiana Network of Knowledge.

Mr. Zembala said some of these recommendations are cost prohibitive to districts, especially for smaller districts. He asked how this transition would work and how it would impact state agencies who are collecting the data.

Dr. Smith said those are all questions that should be asked to the appropriate people.

Mr. Zembala added how would data input and collection be handled with new software. Dr. Smith responded that it would be cloud based. Ms. Shockey added she was thinking about student data and instructional data.

Dr. Smith said the storage part will be huge.

Ms. Shockey said she will give some thought to the strategic planning approach, and reach out to IOT.

IV. **Finance**
Melissa Ambre, DOE, presented on the accounting structure of data collection. She spoke about the following:

Form 9
High level data is posted on the DOE website. It is a cash basis, for federal purposes. DOE receives about 410 Form 9's each month, ELAs provide the information to the DOE. A data

dump is provided to SBA every six months.   It is also used for maintenance of effort. The IGA uses actual data throughout the legislative session from Form 9 data.

Annual Financial Report
The annual financial report is published in August by school districts annually. DOE provides a template. Every school is required to file it, it must be published in the newspaper, sent to DOE, and kept on file. Rarely does DOE receive requests to review the reports. In the past two years, there has been about only one request to review a report. Revenue, expense, tax rates, levies, a lot of the data is from DOE.

Ms. Ambre explained there are two distinct pieces, DLGF collects the information, but DOE collects from the Form 9, which is what they need to use.

Ms. Shockey asked does the APR pull from this report. Ms. Ambre said the APR is collected differently, some from expenditure, some from Form 9.

Ms. Shockey asked for a follow-up report from Ms. Ambre following her meeting with DLGF and SBA.

V. **Update on DRC Spreadsheet**
Tim Schultz stated that he is continuing to work on additions to the spreadsheet.

VI. **Update on CHIRP**
Bob Clarke, IOT, stated that he is working with Greenfield Technology Director.
Mr. Moore said there is a way to match up STN. If there is a unique identifier, they can be matched.

Dr. Lorey said her school district used CareDox and it sits within student data management system. It is free health technology for K-12 public schools. Dr. Lorey encouraged Mr. Clarke to look into it. The nurses will no longer have to go into specialized fields and duplicate their efforts. It can communicate to parents via email. Mr. Moore said the problem is once the data is in CHIRP, there is personally identifiable information that can be seen by the user. Mr. Clarke said he will work with Jolene. Ms. Shockey said ISDH is doing a pilot program as well. Mr. Clarke said PowerSchools is another system that schools are using.

Ms. Shockey said now the committee can analyze the process, regarding CHIRP, and SIP compliance. Mr. Scott said the data sharing process can be complex.

VII. **Next Steps and Adjournment**
Mr. Moore said there are two updates with INPRS and the C Collection. Ms. Tubbs will be working with the data coordinators and provide an update at the July meeting.

Dr. Lorey said she is not in favor of collecting additional data if it is not being used. She added a graduate report is already conducted. Ms. Hackett said that would be contrary to SB500. Mr. Scott said ultimately he believes the committee should eliminate it. Dr. Lorey said there would be gratitude in the elimination of the C Collection.

Mr. Zembala brought up SB327. Ms. Shockey asked who owns the transparency website. Dr. Lorey said possibly gateway; it has to be published to the state and all employment contracts must be published. Ms. Shockey requested Mr. Moore to look into SB327. Dr. Lorey said there will be a lot of time and effort spent to redact information.

Mr. Scott asked if the committee can take action at the July meeting to eliminate data collections for the upcoming school year.

Ms. Shockey summarized next steps for the July meeting. Mr. Elcesser moved to adjourn. Dr. Lorey seconded. The committee adjourned at 10:30 AM.