

## EMIS Advisory Council Agenda

<b>DATE</b>	February 1, 2021; 1:00PM-3:00PM via Microsoft Teams
-------------	---

<b>COUNCIL MEMBERS</b>	<b>Kristine Blind</b>	<b>John Kellogg</b>	<b>Amber Myers</b>	<b>Sean Taylor</b>
	<b>Elizabeth Davis</b>	<b>Robert Kornack</b>	<b>Kim Rhoads</b>	<b>Jenny Wall</b>
	<b>David Ehle</b>	<b>Renae Lyons</b>	<b>Ben Richards</b>	<b>Tiffany White</b>
	<b>Beth Fletcher</b>	<b>Lisa McCullough</b>	<b>Erik Roush</b>	
	<b>Kirsten Hill</b>	<b>Tim Meister</b>	<b>Penny Rucker</b>	
	<b>Tammy Hrosch</b>	<b>Tim Miller</b>	<b>Elena Sanders</b>	
	<b>Carla Isaac</b>	<b>Marianne Mottley</b>	<b>Diane Smith</b>	

<b>Agenda Item</b>		<b>Presenters</b>	<b>Approx . Start Time</b>
1	Welcome/Roll Call <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New members: Sean Taylor (EMIS/Student Services Supervisor from NWOCA) and State Board Member Tim Miller</li> </ul>	Marianne Mottley	1:00
2	Approval of October 2020 Meeting Minutes	Marianne Mottley	1:05
3	Overview of SB89	Erica Weaston	1:10
4	COVID-19 EMIS Reporting	Shaun Yoder/ Heather Boughton	1:30
5	Recommendations from Secure Data Center Workgroup	Marianne Mottley/ Letitia Linville	2:10
6	Update from SLDS Grant Workgroup	David Ehle	2:40
7	Update from CTE Workgroup	David Ehle	2:50
8	Adjournment  Next meeting date/time options: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thursday, April 29 from 1:00-3:00pm</li> <li>• Thursday, May 6 from 10:00am-12:00pm</li> <li>• Tuesday, May 18 from 10:00am-12:00pm</li> </ul> <i>Please let <a href="#">Taylor Beougher</a> know your availability by February 8.</i>	Marianne Mottley	3:00

## Meeting Minutes

### Welcome/ Roll Call

- The meeting was called to order by Marianne Mottley at 1:01pm.
- The Council welcomed two new members: Sean Taylor - EMIS/Student Services Supervisor from NWOCA and State Board Member Tim Miller.
- The first order of business was roll call. All members were present except for Diane Smith.

### Approval October 2020 Minutes

- The next agenda item was to review and approve the meeting minutes from the October 7, 2020 meeting.
- Elizabeth Davis made a motion to approve the meeting minutes with Ben Richards providing the second. All present workgroup members voted in favor of the approval. These meeting minutes are to be posted on the EMIS Advisory Council webpage.

### Overview of Senate Bill 89

- Senate Bill 89 requires ODE to create a process by which users of EMIS can review and provide public comment on new or updated EMIS Guidelines.
- EMIS changes for the upcoming school year must be posted on the web this spring for 30 days for public comment, the agency then has 30 days to respond to comments, then 30 days of public review before considered “final”.
- Timeline:
  - April 1 – April 30\*: Changes posted for public comment
    - \*EMIS changes that do not impact early EMIS reporting may be posted for public comment after April 1. Those changes would follow the 90-day process, based on date posted.
  - May 1 – May 31: ODE responds to public comments
  - June 1 – June 30: EMIS guidelines out for “final review”
  - July 1: FY22 EMIS changes go into effect; FY22 EMIS Manual posted; FY22 EMIS Collections open
- Types of Changes
  - Tier 1 Changes - Examples of EMIS changes **included** in public comment process and **are** subject to spring deadline include:
    - New or updated data element, reporting option, reporting instruction that changes what districts are required to report (substantive)
    - Change in which organization type is required to report existing data
  - Tier 2 Changes (Legislative) - Examples of EMIS changes **included** in public comment process but **not** subject to spring deadline include:
    - Newly enacted state or federal law
    - New or updated federal rule
    - Rule or resolution adopted by the state board of education
    - \*It is important to note that the mandated 90-day timeline conflicts with any legislation requiring an EMIS change effective 90 days after signing. This is especially difficult for complex legislation, like HB410, that require legal or business office input before any work can start.
      - Emergency legislation that is effective immediately after signing will lag even more.

- Tier 3 Changes – Examples of EMIS changes **not included** in public comment process and **not** subject to spring deadline include:
  - EMIS reports
  - Report explanations and other supplemental docs
  - Data checks
  - Non-substantive updates in EMIS Manual (such as grammar/ technical errors)
  - Answers to EMIS questions
  - Clarify to the implementation of EMIS guidelines
  - Training of EMIS users and related materials
  - EMIS internal processing work
- Section (F)(1) of SB 89 states, “*Uniform guidance for career-technical planning districts and information technology centers established under section 3301.075 of the Revised Code regarding the education management information system and EMIS guidelines for career-technical planning districts;*”
  - Clarification is needed to the introduction of the EMIS Manual that the CTPD is a consortium of entities that already report to EMIS and are subject to the EMIS Guidelines.
- External Communication Plan
  - The Department plans to share the implementation plan with the following stakeholder groups:
    - EMIS Advisory Council
    - EMIS Change Committee and SIS vendors
    - EMIS trainings
    - EMIS Newsflash
      - Will also include notification to Superintendents when items are available for comment
    - Professional organizations
  - Council members also felt that it was important to include the following entities/groups:
    - OEDSA
    - OASBO
    - OAEP
    - Ohio 8
    - CORAS
    - BASA
    - OSBA
    - OESCA

### COVID-19 EMIS Reporting

- Why are we collecting new information?
  - The Department encourages districts to use data-informed approaches to ensure that students receive high-quality instruction and services. Similarly, state-level data can play an important role in understanding equity issues and developing supports for districts, educators and students. At both the local and state level, the coronavirus pandemic has highlighted the critical need to look at Opportunity to Learn data to help us understand and address the digital divide, as well as data on students’ remote learning experiences.
- At a high level, the Department will begin collecting information on two categories of data significant to students’ Opportunity to Learn during the pandemic and beyond:

- Connectivity and Hardware Access: Access remains among the most significant needs for Ohio’s students as they engage in remote and hybrid learning. By collecting information on access through EMIS, the Department will improve the completeness and accuracy of the state level data for this element.
- Education Delivery Models: During the 2020-2021 school year, students are learning through a variety of education delivery models (e.g., 5-Day In-Person, Fully Remote, Hybrid). For this element the only student level reporting will be for students who do something different from the rest of the district/school.
- The Department’s goal in collecting this information is to support districts, schools, and students. Data reported through EMIS will be used to:
  - Inform the use of state resources;
  - Inform the state’s support, guidance, and policies;
  - Encourage knowledge-sharing across districts and schools;
  - Create tools and resources to support instruction; and
  - Learn more about how the unique educational landscape in 2020-2021 affects students and educators, both short- and long-term.
  - These data will not be used for accountability purposes, as a factor in foundation payments, or to evaluate individual districts, schools, educators, or students.
- The pandemic is the catalyst for this new data collection. That said, aspects of remote and online learning are likely to become a permanent part of K-12 education and many jobs. The importance of understanding connectivity and technology access, as well as the role of remote or blended learning opportunities, will remain. Thus, the Department intends for this data collection to carry on in future years so that local and state leaders have the information they need to understand and address the “digital divide.”
- Discussion and Feedback from Council:
  - Although the Department has been looking at ways to eliminate reporting elements and being deliberate about additional reporting requirements, one Council member felt that these new reporting requirements do not align with the overarching goal of the Council to reduce reporting.
    - *“It feels like we have only increased reporting over the last two years. What moves are we making to reach the goal of reducing reporting?”*
    - *“How many data elements were there two years ago versus now?”*
  - Several Council members asked what the goal of the data was and what research questions were trying to be answered. A few Council members expressed their concern that the wrong variables were being used, and that the variables being used can not be correlated to high-quality instruction and services.
    - *“It is a stretch to claim that we have a better understanding of high-quality instruction and services from the data points of internet connectivity and hardware access. From a state policy and investment perspective Ohio needs to move to internet as a utility and not chase this issue as a school only need. It is a much bigger equity issue.”*
    - *“To better understand the impact of COVID-19 on Ohio’s students, maybe don’t look at internet connectivity but look at things like social-emotional well-being.”*
  - Several Council members felt that these new reporting requirements would bombard and add additional stress/burden to district staff who are already facing challenges due to the impacts of COVID-19.

- One Council member explained that as a result of this additional stress, these data will not be a priority of superintendents since they are not attached to funding or accountability.
- *“The accuracy and integrity of this data will be in question.”*
- Others emphasized the importance of other collections (i.e. Pandemic-Electronic Benefit Transfer – P-EBT) which is also time-consuming and very important to districts in order to feed their students.
- Multiple Council members felt that collecting student level data was unnecessary and would actually lead to lower quality data being reported as they have the ability to report “unknown” as an ‘out’.
  - *“Why do we need to know that John Doe got a hotspot? Why is it not enough to just know how many hotspots were handed out?”*

**Recommendations from Secure Data Center (SDC) Workgroup**

- In early 2020, the agency identified funds to be used to update and modernize its SDC.
- The SDC workgroup was created to advise agency staff and outside contractors as they do the work.
- The SDC workgroup met three times. The first meeting was spent on brainstorming where members identified challenges and opportunities for improvement, features that work well and should be kept, and features that are not needed and can be eliminated. The second and third meetings were held for members to refine the list and set priorities for the work. Department staff held two demonstrations showing the capabilities of the new SDC tool. Members identified 45 challenges or opportunities for improvement across seven buckets:
  - Challenges with Resources/Training
  - Challenges with Functionality
  - Challenges with Timing of Reports
  - Challenges with Users of the System
  - Missing Resources/Trainings
  - Missing Functionality
  - Missing Reports
- Challenge to Resources/Training = The resource exists, but is confusing or not intuitive in the current tool vs. Missing Resources/Training = A resource or a training that does not exist
- Challenge with Functionality = The functionality exists, but is confusing or doesn’t work “well” vs. Missing Functionality = The functionality does not exist
- Workgroup members were asked to vote on #1 Top Priority for ODE staff to address. Three points were given for each person’s top priority.
- Members also were asked to vote on four next highest priorities for staff to address. One point was given for items 2 through 5 on each person’s list.
- No items are “unimportant” and all will be taken to the development team.
- The top five priorities approved by the workgroup are listed below:

Priority Number	Bucket	Challenge	Points
1	Missing Reports	JVSD and CTPD reports	14 points – 4 workgroup members ranked this items as their #1 priority and 6 members voted this in their Top 5.
2	Timing of Reports	The timing of the reports is challenging. It would be nice to see reports earlier	13 Points – 3 workgroup members ranked this item as their #1 priority and 7 members voted this in their Top 5.

		in the year (e.g. in the first or second reporting windows) when there is plenty of time to check and double check data.	
<b>3 (Tie)</b>	Missing Resources and Trainings	More formal training for all users on how to use the SDC and the reports.	11 Points – 2 workgroup members ranked this item as their #1 priority and 7 members voted this in their Top 5.
<b>4 (Tie)</b>	Missing Functionality	Ability to switch between schools without going back to the beginning of the report.	11 Points – 1 workgroup member ranked this item as his or her #1 priority and 9 members voted this in their Top 5.
<b>5</b>	Missing Resources and Trainings	A reports list to describe what is in each report to make it easy to see if a report exists that contains the data needed.	10 Points – 2 workgroup members ranked this item as their #1 priority and 6 members voted this in their Top 5.

- Other priorities receiving votes were as follows:

Bucket	Challenge	Points
<b>Missing Functionality</b>	Shifting to having student names.	9
<b>Missing Functionality</b>	A time stamp to show when the report was last updated (which EMIS submission is included).	9
<b>Challenge with Resources or Training</b>	The platform is not intuitive. Users don't know the aggregate reports are drillable unless trained.	6
<b>Missing Functionality</b>	Ability to see all/multiple subgroups at once.	6
<b>Challenge with Functionality</b>	Hard to unfilter or aggregate once a report has been disaggregated into subgroups.	5
<b>Timing of Reports</b>	The timing of this tool versus ODDEX is an issue. Users wish the SDC was populated earlier to be able to use it in tandem with ODDEX.	5
<b>Missing Resources or Training</b>	Add links to the EMIS manual to help personnel understand which data elements are used in the calculations.	5
<b>Missing Functionality</b>	Archived Local Report Card (pretty) reports from prior years.	5
<b>Missing Functionality</b>	A way to make all files into PDF style pretty reports.	4
<b>Missing Functionality</b>	Ability to quickly filter aggregated data into one or more disaggregation's and then quickly unfilter it back to the original numbers.	3
<b>Missing Reports</b>	Reports to show Ed. Choice, Peterson and Autism Scholarship students.	3
<b>Missing Reports</b>	A report showing why someone is not in a calculation.	2
<b>Missing Reports</b>	Webxam and credential reports.	2
<b>Various</b>	Ten Items received a single vote each (6, 9, 13, 22, 23, 35, 36, 38, 42, 44)	1
<b>Various</b>	17 Items received no votes	0

(2, 7, 8, 12, 14, 16, 25, 26, 27, 29, 30, 32, 34, 39, 41, 43, 45)
---

- Renae Lyons made a motion with Carla Isaac providing the second to include these recommendations in their next annual report for the spring of 2021. All members voted in favor of adding the recommendations to the report.

#### **Update from Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems (SLDS) Grant Workgroup**

- The workgroup met for a second time on December 10th to discuss the connection between graduation requirements, planning, and EMIS data to inform progress towards graduation reports.
- The workgroup walked through a flowchart of how the Student Claiming Module might work and discussed upcoming focus groups for more detailed co-design and feedback.
- Lastly, the workgroup completed a round-robin exercise to make sure all (EMIS, counselors, administrators) can provide input.

#### **Update from Career Technical Education (CTE) Workgroup**

- The workgroup met for a third time on January 26th.
- In general, the workgroup has focused on reports for CTE.
- At the most recent meeting, the workgroup completed a final review of report guidelines and report roadmap.
- Each member was given an opportunity to suggest additional topics that the workgroup should address, but the consensus was that the work is done for the currently convened workgroup.
- These recommendations will be discussed further in an upcoming Council meeting and up for possible adoption and approval.

#### **Next Steps/Adjournment**

- The Council was asked to send their availability to [Taylor Beougher](#) for the following proposed dates/times for the next meeting this spring:
  - Thursday, April 29 from 1:00-3:00pm
  - Thursday, May 6 from 10:00am-12:00pm
  - Tuesday, May 18 from 10:00am-12:00pm
- Ben Richards made a motion to adjourn the meeting with Kim Rhoads providing the second.
- The vote was unanimous in favor of adjournment. The meeting adjourned at 2:51p.m.