



# INDIANA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

## MINUTES

### DATA REPORTING COMMITTEE

January 12, 2016

Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, Statehouse  
Conference Room 225  
200 W. Washington St., Indianapolis, IN 46204

The meeting of the Data Reporting Committee (“DRC”) convened at 9:15 AM.

Committee members Danielle Shockey, John Elcesser, Steve Elliot, Patricia Hackett, Dewand Neely, Abby Taylor, and Ted Zembala were present. Committee members Lee Ann Kwiatkowski, Dr. Tracy Lorey and Dan Scott were not present. Staff members Patrick McGrew, Cynthia Roach, Sarah Rossier, and Tim Schultz were present.

**I. Call to Order**

Ms. Shockey called the meeting to order at 9:15 AM.

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

Ms. Hackett requested the record reflect the funds associated with Special Education count days. Ms. Tubbs responded to Ms. Hackett’s request. Mr. Elcesser made a motion to approve the minutes, Ms. Hackett seconded. Ms. Shockey explained that the DRC would schedule monthly meetings which may be cancelled as needed.

**III. Review of Final Report Submitted**

Mr. Elcesser asked about the APR and why it was not included in the final report. Ms. Tubbs explained that the APR recommendation went before the SBOE but was not approved. The SBOE did not want to see the teacher-student ratio and classroom sizes removed off of the APR report. Ms. Tubbs explained that the DRC would work with Accountability to find a more accurate formula to show teacher-classroom size. The DRC must vote on this before the SBOE can approve it. SBOE discussion at the December meeting included questions on removing the classroom size portion, but there was no dissent regarding publication of the report. Ms. Tubbs indicated the DRC will need to revisit this recommendation and submit it again to the SBOE.

**IV. Progress Update from IDOE**

Ms. Shockey provided an update regarding the legislative session and deadlines for the final DRC report in 2016.

Ms. Shockey reviewed the structure for DRC meetings: a set monthly meeting which will only be utilized if there are enough agenda items. Ms. Hackett questioned if there would ever be one consolidated report, to which Mr. Moore responded that it is unlikely. Ms. Shockey consulted with Scott Reske, DOE, regarding requesting Sen. Pete Miller to present to the DRC. Mr. PJ McGrew, SBOE, reiterated that state agency response has been lacking. Ms. Taylor and Mr. Elcesser contributed.

Ms. Shockey consulted with Mr. Scott Reske, DOE, requesting Sen. Pete Miller to present to the DRC. Ms. Rossier shared 2016 Data Reporting Committee Meeting Dates that have a quorum of six or more members with the exception of February and March proposed meeting dates. Mr. Elcesser recommended meeting on Thursdays as to prevent conflict with legislative committee hearings. Ms. Shockey asked Ms. Rossier to send the confirmed and proposed dates to the DRC.

Ms. Tubbs explained that ISTA did not want to see classroom size removed from the APR. Ms. Shockey asked if this was about size or about ratio. Ms. Tubbs stated it was about average classroom size, looking at core teachers and full-time equivalency. This method inflated the classroom numbers. The goal is to work with Accountability to find a better equivalent that does not inflate the numbers. Ms. Shockey cautioned against adding another collection to make this work. Ms. Shockey asked the DRC if they would prefer to hear from Maggie Paino, Director of Accountability, on how she plans to fix it before they make any decisions. Ms. Taylor also expressed concern with Title I teachers in reference to the numbers. Ms. Tubbs stated that she has not yet met with Ms. Paino. Ms. Cynthia Roach, SBOE, contributed. Ms. Tubbs suggested re-wording the APR to say, "Average classroom size of core subjects – Math, Science, English and Social Studies" for accuracy. Ms. Shockey reviewed average size of class core subjects, with the second back-up option being to minimize the error. Ms. Tubbs suggested a re-wording and a clean-up of the formula. Ms. Shockey asked the DRC if they would prefer to give permission to IDOE to handle it or wait to hear from Ms. Paino. Ms. Tubbs reviewed that the DRC wanted this to be removed, while SBOE wanted it put back. The SBOE requested that the DRC vote on reinstating this in order to save money for the schools. Mr. Elcesser questioned if this would be contingent on a change of the definition. Ms. Hackett requested a hold on this. Ms. Shockey stated that as long as the measure is kept in the APR, it can at least be approved by the SBOE.

#### **V. Introduction of Idea for the ME/SE/LM**

Ms. Tubbs then covered ME/SE/LM. Ms. Tubbs explained that she wants to start with the STN as opposed to the school number in the collection. Ms. Tubbs explained that the duplicate fields were removed but fields they felt were necessary remained: school number, the school corporation, the location (if they are special Ed in a school without a state ID number). Essentially, these are collected in three separate ways, so the recommendation is that all of these be combined into one collection. Ms. Tubbs explained that the "count of legal residence" field may be unnecessary, so could be removed. Additionally, the "membership" field must be considered because PK is necessary for Special Ed, yet is not included at present. For the ADM, a new code of "0" will be added for Special Ed or language minority reasons, yet will not receive money for

these students under Membership. Field Twelve, the “Primary Exceptionality” is from the Special Ed report, where the code “00” will be added so that students who are not Special Ed will not receive Special Ed funding. Field Fourteen, the LRE Code will also now include a “00” code for non-Special Ed students. Fields Fifteen and Sixteen also added a code “00” for those students that are not language minorities. Ms. Tubbs explained that DOE does not expect to see data for students that have English as their first language. Field Seventeen, Country of Origin, will be consolidated, with the code addition “000”, for those students who were born in the US or US territories, as opposed to the current two sections for this. “Instructional Program” will have an additional code of “0” as well. Nothing needs to be added to the Title Program. Ms. Tubbs stated that she is waiting on one last piece from Charlie Geier, Director of Early Learning and Intervention at the Department, she requested removing the high-ability for the LM.

Ms. Tubbs detailed that there was previously three collections with thirty-one fields, but it is now narrowed to one collection with between twenty-two and twenty fields. Additionally, this will only be collected twice a year, eliminating three reporting periods. Non-public schools would only have seventeen fields, with the possibility of becoming only fifteen fields, collected twice a year. The non-publics can have the following removed: ADM type, membership ADM type (instructional days/minutes, full day kindergarten), no LRE or Special Ed placement code, no Environment. Members discussed. Ms. Roach, Mr. Elcesser and Mr. Moore discussed the requirements for an arch-diocese. The DRC also discussed different Special Ed accommodations with contributions from Ms. Roach.

Ms. Shockey asked why this would not have to go to the SBOE. Mr. Moore explained because this is a subset of the collection. Ms. Tubbs explained that this is the fruits of the DRC’s labor. Mr. Elcesser asked if the Board approved going to the single count date. Mr. Moore and Ms. Tubbs replied yes, if this goes through statute. Ms. Tubbs explained that the DRC did not specify October 1<sup>st</sup> in the statute, but the intent is the first school day in October.

Ms. Tubbs detailed the idea to build an excel template for the non-publics. Mr. Elcesser said it sounds over-simplistic but taking the reduction of reports back to the constituents shows real progress. Mr. Elliot reiterated.

## **VI. C Collections**

Ms. Tubbs explained the process of C collections and what the report entails. In December, DOE asks the district the status of work for employees; if the status is a classroom teacher, if an educator and oversight of a classroom, tied to the classroom report.

Ms. Shockey stated the accuracy of the C collection drives educator evaluation and ties the student test results to the teacher.

Ms. Tubbs stated the C collections are very burdensome and cumbersome. They take an exuberant amount of time to report in the district. Ms. Shockey asked how many touches are on the C Collection in the district. Ms. Tubbs replied twice.

Ms. Tubbs stated she spoke at the UNITE group in December, which is comprised of PowerSchool, Harmony, Skyward, Infinite Campus, Chalk; data input field across the state, including representatives of the non-public schools. The group did not respond favorably to splitting the collections. However, they did like the idea of making an employee report, taking the SPN and collecting more data on staff personnel data to reduce the C collection. May consider adding years of service to the SPN. Ms. Tubbs asked why it is necessary to collect the salary. Mr. Elcesser stated non-pubs are a whole different issue. Ms. Tubbs added non-pubs are not required to publish salaries. TERF is already collecting salaries, so is it necessary to collect again in the C collection. Mr. Zembala added that anyone who reports wages must report every calendar year to the State Board of Accounts. Ms. Tubbs discussed first year teachers, contract days and contract salaries, supplemental salary, salary paid by Title 1 and prior year employment in a district in the collection. Ms. Tubbs questioned why the data is needed. Ms. Shockey defined two parts to the question: is all the data necessary? If it is needed, can it be moved to the SPN report? Ms. Tubbs met with Chris Deaton, Peggy Wild and Jenny Berry. Full time equivalency must be reported to the federal government. Ms. Tubbs concluded for the CC, Course Completion, we need to know dual credit from that, however there is a separate dual credit report required, so Ms. Tubbs recommends eliminating one of those. Chris Deaton needs CTE data for DWD. DWD needs the final grade, which is the only piece of data DWD is not concurrently collecting with DOE. Mr. Elliot added most of the external data from trade providers is needed for CTE. Ms. Tubbs said some pieces of data are overlapping, so she recommended consolidating the data into one collection. Mr. Moore explained one group is collecting the data.

Mr. Elliot inquired about the data collected for non-CTE courses. Ms. Tubbs explained it is collected for course completion. Ms. Tubbs referenced correspondence from Mr. Deaton, DWD, who cited pathway courses. Mr. Elliot said the DRC needs to streamline the data then figure out how to share the data across agencies.

Mr. Elcesser said in regard to refining the C collection it is a win, but his contention continues to be that data should not be collected if it is not used for nonpublic schools. Course completion data will change with the new assessment system. Mr. Elliot said every three to four years data typically needs to be revisited for the purpose of its collection. Ms. Tubbs asked why grades and course completion are being collected if it is not being connected to accountability. If the data is not collected from the nonpublic schools it will skew the data. It needs to be made clear to the public that it does not include nonpublic schools. Mr. Moore said in regard to course completion there are questions around cohorts. Mr. Elcesser said the cohort would not be tracking course completion, however. Mr. Elliot stated it is important to understand the goal of the future employer and look at the pipeline, ensuring that students are being placed in courses to build those skills. Student placement in CTE courses is an important factor. Mr. Elliot recognized the need to identify those students. Ms. Shockey said there is a need to look

at the trends and the gaps. Mr. Elcesser suggested weighing the potential for the data usage compared to the amount of work required to collect the data.

Ms. Taylor asked how many students are served in nonpublic schools. Mr. Elcesser said it is approximately ten percent of students. Ms. Tubbs said nonpublic schools do not use course completion. Jenny Berry and Peggy Wild think they use CTE. Highly qualified teachers can move over to the SPN. Ms. Hackett asked is there anything collected in the C collections that the purpose is unknown for the collection. Ms. Tubbs restated the salary collection.

Sen. Pete Miller joined the meeting. (10:56AM)

Ms. Shockey asked Sen. Miller what is anticipated as the final result of the DRC. The committee reviewed the statute and wondered about the spirit versus the language. Sen. P. Miller stated: catalogue the elements, who needs the information, how is it used.

Ms. Shockey explained Ms. Tubbs' role in the DOE and the forty-two collections. The challenge is reaching someone in the other state agencies and receiving a response. Sen. P. Miller recommended sending the agencies the catalogue and requesting their review and response. Ms. Shockey said regarding the outside agencies, group them in three categories: needed collections, not needed, duplicated collections.

Ms. Shockey thanked Sen. P. Miller for joining the committee. (11:06 AM)

Ms. Tubbs continued to consider if the HQT could be moved to another collection. If a teacher moves from one district to another, and all of the data is collected through the SPN, how can the data be preserved from one district to another? Ms. Taylor explained that there needs to be a way to change the codes to include multiple areas to be marked in the HQT. Ms. Tubbs considered adding more data to the SPN. Ms. Shockey said further study needs to be made on these data points.

Ms. Shockey asked if SBOE could be ready to present an update in February on the other state agencies who collect data.

Ms. Shockey moved to support the inclusion of the average class size line back into the APR report. Mr. Elliot seconded. The motion passed. Ms. Shockey concluded, stating that this measure may be attached to legislation and subsequently presented to the SBOE for further action.

The next meeting is dependent upon the next legislative action. Ms. Shockey stated there will be further communication about the next meeting. Ms. Rossier stated she will work on this.

## **VII. Next Steps and Adjournment**

Ms. Shockey moved to adjourn. Ms. Hackett made a motion, Mr. Zembala seconded. The meeting adjourned at 11:22 AM.