



INDIANA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

MINUTES

DATA REPORTING COMMITTEE

September 29th, 2015

Room 130

Indiana Government Center South

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, Dan Scott, and Patricia Hackett were present. Committee member Abby Taylor arrived late. Committee Members Paul Baltzell and Ted Zembala were not present. Staff members Ashley Cowger, Sarah Rossier, and Brian Murphy were present.

I. **Call to Order**

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

II. **Welcome and Review of Agenda and Minutes**

There were no minutes in need of approval at that time. Ms. Shockey stated that there will be two sets of minutes in need of approval at the next meeting. In addition, Ms. Shockey concluded that the goals of the meeting included further discussion about the Assist template and to have a continued discussion of the APR Report card.

Mr. Scott proposed adding a third agenda item that includes a report recently released by DOE dealing with charter schools and Title I. funding. He explained to the committee that there had not been previous discussion on this collection and he would like further explanation as to why charter schools are required to submit this data which is due today. Ms. Shockey stated should would consult Jeff Barber, Assistant Director of Grants Management at DOE regarding the issue.

III. **Presentation of the AdvancED Template for SIP**

Mr. Charlie Geier, Director of Early Learning and Intervention at the Department, led the discussion of the AdvancED Project with the end result being comprehensive School Improvement Plan (SIP) using the Assist template.

Mr. Geier explained to the Committee that the partnership formed with AdvancED has enabled DOE to work with schools and assist them with the submission of their school improvement plans (SIP). Mr. Geier discussed the two pilot programs, Pilot 1.0 and Pilot 2.0, which were created to streamline data collections from the school into one source in a concise and consistent matter, called the Assist platform. Their findings suggest that the Assist platform was helpful for schools to streamline their collections, but the participating schools would also like to have more robust measures included on the submission template.

Ms. Hackett asked how the state came to partner with AdvancED and inquired about the history of this process. Mr. Geier responded to her question by discussing how Indiana has modeled after other states who already use Assist in addition to the schools who have already worked with AdvancED. Dr. Lorey inquired about the customization of the Assist platform and Mr. Geier responded that Assist eliminates redundancies, accommodates to various plans that an individual school may have, and it meets the federal requirement. Ms. Kwiatkowski offered her insight on school reporting requirements and inquired about the timing of the process because schools will still have to continuously update reports.

Mr. Geier informed the committee of the various tools and diagnostics within Assist stressing the ability to customize individual plans. Mr. Geier reiterated that the Assist platform allows for data collections to be streamlined, reduces redundancy in reports in order to create consistency among the various schools submitting school improvement plans via Assist, and it ensures that the school improvement plans meet state and federal requirements. Ms. Shockey reiterated Mr. Geier's sentiments stating that Assist offers technical assistance and gives individualized support. Mr. Geier also assured the committee that Assist is data driven. Ms. Hackett expressed concern with the time frame that schools have to adjust to the new model. Ms. Kwiatkowski feels that there will be more pushback from principals as they are learning this process and if schools already have a method of submission, they would be duplicating the work by opting into the Assist platform. Ms. Shockey responded to the timing questions and stated the only requirement is the submission of the template itself. Ms. Taylor expressed concern about Assist being mandatory because their district already has difficulty getting the parents to actively participate and complete necessary materials. Following hearing concerns from Mr. Scott and Ms. Kwiatkowski regarding the endorsement of only one company, Ms. Shockey reiterated that its purpose is merely to serve as a unified template. Ms. Shockey stated per statute, the Committee is required to develop a unified template for submission. Ms. Shockey reiterated how important it is to have continuous school improvement and how Assist will help them make those adjustments.

The committee began to discuss how to view the changes through the catalogue. Committee members agreed that a catalogue to track the changes would be helpful and Mr. Geier added that he would research that question.

Amid more discussion concerning the necessary usage by each school, Ms. Kwiatkowski expressed the need for a legal opinion. Ms. Kwiatkowski noted it goes back to balance of local control. Mr. Murphy stated the Committee has the authority to make recommendations and the Committee can review the template and make policy decisions. Ms. Kirstie Andersen, Staff Attorney for DOE, debated Mr. Murphy's opinion. Ms. Shockey stated disagreement with Mr. Murphy's assertion.

Mr. Scott suggested that at some point, the DRC make a recommendation, knowing it may not come to fruition, and then the lawyers can determine who has jurisdiction. Ms. Taylor questioned if this was the only template. Ms. Shockey stated that this is the current template in use by DOE. Mr. Scott questioned how this is paid for. Mr. Geier confirmed that the first two pilots were paid for by a 4% set aside. Ms. Shockey stated that this year it is being funded by turnaround money. The money was not taken from somewhere else, it was new money provided to the DOE to promote turnaround. This

will apply for two years, when DOE will seek continued funding. Mr. Scott questioned if there is language that requires a certain amount be attributed to this tool. Ms. Shockey stated that the title is turnaround schools, and there is no additional language. Ms. Shockey also explained that they have been meeting with Senator Kenley, who has a great deal of say in the budget, and he is in favor of a unified template. Mr. Scott expressed frustration over the lengthy process to find data. Ms. Shockey explained that DOE is able to connect schools with similar goals and analyze statewide trends thanks in part to the Strategic Planning Committee of the SBOE. Ms. Kwiatkowski inquired if schools will be required to add formative data to this. Ms. Shockey responded that it is an option if schools choose to. The template costs a million dollars a year, and if a school buys on its own, \$700. Mr. Geier reiterated that the template can be used to link schools together. Mr. Scott questioned if this is a finished product. Ms. Shockey contributed that 125 schools have used it, so it is a finished product, but it can be customized more. Mr. Geier stated that it is finished, and schools will have access in mid-October. The submission date was moved back to March 1, 2016, with training, occurring on a testing platform, taking place in the fall. After training, students will be able to get in with their access codes. Mr. Scott expressed concern over the double reporting of this year. Ms. Shockey explained that the prior deadline was September 15, yet most schools submitted in the spring, and the 300 schools that have already submitted are being asked to put the data into the template by March 1. Ms. Kwiatkowski mentioned that there are likely more schools who have this data already, even if it wasn't submitted. Ms. Shockey detailed that it is expected that schools have the data now, they just have until March 1 to enter the information into the template, which will then be continuous. Ms. Kwiatkowski suggested giving schools more time, making it due March 1 for next September, expressing concern for adding a new requirement with little time. Ms. Shockey explained that schools are required to submit annually, and schools have been given more time than the alternative. Mr. Scott inquired how many schools DOE evaluates. Mr. Geier explained that many states have their own customized versions, and a popular version is I-Star, which comes with many components. Ms. Shockey stated that DOE met with Kentucky a few years ago to discuss methods, and received a sole-source approval from the Department of Administration for Indiana to use this tool. Mr. Scott asked what percentage of schools are using a platform similar to Assist. Mr. Geier replied around 30 schools use a similar platform other than Assist. Mr. Scott expressed concern with the excessive usernames and passwords, questioning if this will acquire another set of usernames and passwords. Mr. Geier responded that DOE can consolidate into one. Mr. Scott then asked if DOE had looked at any single-sign on technology. Ms. Tubbs responded that it has been looked into. Mr. Elliot contributed that this is an important issue. Ms. Shockey explained that DOE is working with IOT on this, and will follow their lead.

Ms. Shockey reiterated that the point of this board is reduction of submissions and redundancies. Ms. Kwiatkowski questioned how this would be a reduction of submission, seeing as there would still be a submission, just to a different location. Mr. Geier explained the ease of the process online, with all goals in one section. Ms. Shockey clarified that the reduction would be primarily in the work component. Ms. Hackett questioned if this had truly been user friendly in the past. Mr. Geier explained that this

will come with time and practice with this technology. Dr. Lorey suggested continued communication on this issue to provide clarity. Mr. Scott brought up a concern on whether AdvancED could troubleshoot for all of the schools. Mr. Geier clarified that the state of Michigan has had a statewide rule for ten years, and the Indiana contract has built-in support included in the contract. Dr. Lorey explained that each state has its own AdvancED office, but the AdvancED office will be the best place to contact for technical support, not the state office. Mr. Scott expressed concern about users' confusion over whether to call AdvancED for user issues or DOE, suggesting a publicized chain of command for questions and a link or icon for help on the site. Mr. Elliot contributed with a suggestion for concise and specific information on this link instead of users having to pick and choose who to call. Mr. Geier stated this does not currently exist, and Mr. Scott explained that the general help icon that exists now directs to the main help center, where emails and phone numbers are listed to direct users.

IV. **Continued Discussion of APR**

Ms. Michelle Tubbs, Data Collections Manager for DOE, led the continued discussion of the APR.

Ms. Shockey began the conversation by inquiring about federal requirements for what needs to be included in the APR. The State of Indiana has expanded these requirements. Ms. Tubbs stated that the handout had been updated with waiver information. Ms. Tubbs explained that she had created a rough draft of the requirements from Indiana Code that had been discussed at the previous meeting. Ms. Tubbs also provided a handout that included the removal of requirements that had been discussed at the previous meeting. Ms. Tubbs suggested that the DRC redo the order of the requirements in terms of importance. Ms. Tubbs recommended that A-F grades be listed first, and Indiana Code states that these only go to the school and not the corporation. Ms. Tubbs suggested that the recommendations should be: A-F grades, student enrollment, graduation rate, attendance rate. Ms. Tubbs stated that testing should be next, but it is the committee's decision how to format this section. Mr. Scott questioned if this information needed to be in one form. Ms. Tubbs reminded the DRC of their previous decisions that the legislative recommendation would be to have this data published entirely online and not in the newspaper, and that the data would all be located in one form. Ms. Tubbs explained that she had talked to app development to discuss adding links to Compass that would direct users to expenditure reports and other information. Ms. Tubbs also discussed the ability to compare various schools and districts. Ms. Shockey suggested that Ms. Tubbs reformat the handout to list everything and show what was stricken for the legislative report. Ms. Tubbs highlighted the law requires the reporting of number of students expelled, which the DRC agreed was necessary, including the number participating in recognized education programs during expulsion. Ms. Tubbs stated that there is no way to know which students are participating in other programs during expulsion, so she recommends that the DRC vote to remove this portion. Ms. Tubbs further reminded the DRC that they had discussed test score reporting, which have never been reported. Ms. Tubbs stated that the percentage of passing students is reported, however. Ms. Tubbs requested DRC input on the requirement that the number of students expelled or suspended be reported on race, grade, gender, free and reduced lunch status, and eligibility for special education. Ms. Tubbs stated that if all of this information is provided, the report will be at least five

pages. For example, the race requirement would need seven race codes for every grade level, in addition to two lines for gender and one for the rest. Ms. Taylor questioned if this had been removed at the last meeting, due to the lack of students fitting the requirement. Ms. Tubbs stated that this would likely only be applied to suspension. Mr. Scott interjected with his previous point, stating that hyperlinks would be helpful for specific information, such as a graduation rate breakdown. Ms. Tubbs reminded the DRC that there had been previous discussion of a mobility report card. Mr. Elliot questioned if this information was reported to the state. Ms. Tubbs explained that it is reported to the state, and posted on Compass for parents to access. Mr. Elliot again questioned why this information needs to be reported in the various categories. Ms. Shockey responded that the federal requirement basics require a state report card to contain the most recent information available on student achievement, accountability, and teacher quality, in addition to an SEA that receives ESEA flexibility must report on college and career readiness and accumulation rates. Member asked who would use information on, for example, a suspended student who is on a free lunch program. Ms. Tubbs responded that school districts use this, and Ms. Shockey contributed that the hyperlinks could be utilized by parents who also would want this data. Ms. Tubbs stated that she would love to see the DRC recommend that a lot of these be taken out of code. Mr. Scott contributed that this data has become less useful because it was too much, stating that federally it is only required to collect suspension and expulsion number, and the other data, like race and gender, can be found elsewhere. Ms. Taylor questioned if parents actually review suspension and expulsion rates to make their school decision, and if this information needs to be included on the report card. Ms. Kwiatkowski stated that specialized groups and stakeholders, such as civil rights organizations, may review that data to provide support. Ms. Taylor reiterated that this data is available elsewhere on Compass, and the report card should be prioritized to the most important things. Ms. Shockey proposed discussion on what specifically on the list provided should be included on the report card. Members discussed the benefits of a consolidated report card. Mr. Scott suggested that ideally the DRC could request about \$100,000 from the legislature to create a report tool to look for APR and simply filter the report to review certain components. Ms. Shockey questioned if there were websites that already provide this service, and Mr. Elliot mentioned Great Schools, which may not provide the comparison aspect. Mr. Scott replied that it is unlikely that these offer the amount of detail he suggested. Ms. Kwiatkowski contributed that she liked the comparison component. Ms. Tubbs mentioned that DOE has someone new to the position that would like to see the APR web based. Mr. Scott suggested that the DRC recommend to the state legislature to set aside funds to make this service possible. Ms. Shockey recommended waiting to see the field's reaction to the reduced APR, and then potentially adding this component to the second recommendation. Mr. Elliot contributed that this service could also include a function to compare those who have graduated from the schools. Ms. Tubbs reminded the DRC that the percentage of students in school flex programs requirement, which is relatively new, is for the schools that are in A to offer students an hour less to the day. Ms. Shockey questioned why that was included. Ms. Tubbs explained that it is in the Indiana Code, Section 6. Ms. Shockey responded that if it needs a definition or explanation, it should not be on the report card. Ms. Hackett said that this is not clear, even to schools who qualify. Ms. Kwiatkowski contributed that this only applies to high schools, and it gives students flexibility. The

district must also be an A district to be eligible. Ms. Shockey recommended that this be removed from the report card. Ms. Shockey requested that Ms. Tubbs provide a list of all things removed so that the DRC can come to an agreement for the legislative recommendation. Ms. Taylor questioned what Version A7B is. Ms. Tubbs responded that it is for scholastic aptitude test (SAT) scores for all students taking the test, test scores for students taking Academic Honors. Ms. Tubbs included percentage of students taking the test on the handout. Ms. Kwiatkowski mentioned that the average is provided, and requested that it still be included. Members recommended that only the average be included in the links on Compass. Ms. Tubbs questioned if the discipline portion should be removed, and accessibly in links. Ms. Kwiatkowski and Mr. Scott contributed that there may be pushback, as this is a touchy subject. Ms. Shockey stated that there is not a recommendation to remove, but it would be made accessible through a link on Compass. Ms. Tubbs requested that the consolidation of the three collections, be discussed at the next meeting, and Melissa Ambre and Pam Wright could attend to discuss special education and finance. Ms. Shockey reminded the DRC that the outside recommendations, which Ms. Ashley Cowger of the SBOE is working on, still need to be discussed. Ms. Shockey stated that the DRC needs to decide what it is recommending rather quickly, and questioned how to proceed. Ms. Tubbs questioned if anyone had looked at all 42 of the collections. Ms. Kwiatkowski expressed concern that she did not have enough knowledge to make an informed decision on some of the 42. Mr. Elcesser stated that some of his concerns for streamlining were for the nonpublic school specific, and some of the collections are not applicable and a waste of time and resources. Ms. Tubbs and Ms. Shockey explained the CE process, and the CC is collected, yet not applicable to nonpublic schools. Ms. Tubbs explained that she only has recommendations left for the C collections, and potentially the AD requirement, which collects data for students who have a parent or guardian in active duty, which schools are struggling with. Mr. Elcesser requested that members receive information in advance to prepare for meetings. Ms. Kwiatkowski also requested a list of stricken requirements. Ms. Tubbs committed to sending this information earlier. Mr. Scott requested a short list of collections that cannot be perfected so that members can agree or disagree with keeping the requirements unchanged at the beginning of meetings. Ms. Shockey requested the addition of an extra column for this.

Ms. Shockey informed the DRC that several charter schools contacted DOE about Title I funding, and a subsequent investigation showed that there were data errors in the PE collection. Ms. Andersen contributed, in addition, DOE contacted a few other charters, providing them with the option to resubmit in the case that their data was also incorrect. The schools had to respond by September 29, 2015. Mr. Scott contributed that he had heard confusion about this, and requested an extension and a letter of clarification to all charter schools. Ms. Shockey responded that only ten had received individual letters, and all were invited to a face-to-face meeting to go over data, so sending something to everyone would not make sense. Ms. Shockey concluded stating the issue does not affect the DRC. Therefore, the meeting was adjourned.