Education Management Information System (EMIS) Advisory Council

October 23, 2018   1:00-3:00pm

Roll Call:

The meeting was called to order by Beth Fletcher at 1:04 PM

The first order of business was to call the roll.

Attendees: Elizabeth Davis, Carrie Herringshaw, Tammy Hrosch, John Kellogg, Renae Lyons, Lisa McCullough, Tim Meister, Amber Myers, Kim Rhoads, Penny Rucker, Ryan Shively, Diane Smith, Todd Yohey, David Ehle, Beth Fletcher, Karl Koenig, Marianne Mottley, Aaron Rausch, Carla Isaac, Jenny Wall
Absent: Julie Sellers, Emily Passias

EMIS Advisory Council Bylaws:

The next order of business was to review the bylaws.

Vote on all bylaws:

Todd Yohey made a motion to approve the bylaws with John Kellogg providing the second.

All present board members voted in favor of approval.

3301-17 Ohio Administrative Code:

The next order of business was to review Ohio Administrative Code 3301-17, which is up for its five-year rule review. Beth Fletcher asked the members to review all code and provide feedback by November 15th via email to Beth.

She said the feedback will be combined and presented at the next EMIS Advisory Council meeting for discussion.

All council members reviewed and approved the proposed changes in the Ohio Administrative Code 3301-17.

EMIS System Components Presentation/Discussion:

The next order of business was a presentation by David Ehle on an Introduction to EMIS. David's presentation centered on five main pieces of the EMIS system:

1. EMIS manual and data requirements
2. District Software
3. EMIS Data Collector
4. Department Data processing
5. Reports and Impact

After the presentation, Beth Fletcher explained that the council would form up to workgroups to provide recommendations for improvements using the five domains that David reviewed.

The members were asked to take 10-15 minutes to review the five domains, and come up with strengths and ideas for improvement for each. The comments were as follows:

EMIS Manual and Data Requirements:

- Improved readability to the EMIS manual documents similar to the report explanations; right now it's too much of a technical document. It should look like the report that will be generated for the data collector to help the user see how the data should look.
- Would like a change log on the report explanations.
- Please think before making data requirement changes due to mid-year legislative changes.
- There is no consistency among the collection names and different forms of communication use different terms compared to what they are called in the manual. Ex: "Autumn Collection", old vs new terminology needs to be reviewed.
- Have the manual updated before a collection opens and don't make reporting changes in the middle of the year. Wait and make changes in the next school year. Aaron Rausch points out that legislation changes are going to occur, and ODE does continue to express our concerns of timing and implementation.
- One council member found that manual updates are very easy to see and be made of aware of.
- Another member commented that communications is much better than it has been in the past.

District Software:

- One member likes that the State does not dictate what software districts use. However, one challenge is that not all software complies with EMIS and creates issues with reporting.
- One member said a lot of software are national products, so to get Ohio changes into the software is more difficult than when its supported in Ohio.
- The same comments apply to the HR/payroll and fiscal software. Some changes are easier to make than others – depending on whether the system is Ohio-based or national-based.

EMIS Data Collector:

- Council members said the immediate processing is awesome.
- The Data Collector is very trainable; has so much in it; the biggest challenge in training is the process of the software to the DC. The system is very user friendly, and easy to process, but once the report is in preview, there are no error checks. There are no bells or whistles to alert a user to an error.
- One member questioned the amount of work it takes to check the accuracy of data before its submitted. Is this a good system if it takes so much work to 'get it right'? How do we know this is a good system when this is all we've used?
- The Data Collector is great but getting that info out to the people of the district where they can understand it is difficult.

- A lot needs to be done to train all the people across the district to look at their reports and know what they are looking at.
- We should have building level sign offs by principals to ensure that data is accurate.
- One member asked why can't we have reports ready to go instantly.
- Another suggested updating the Data Collector to include email notifications (David said these are coming).
- Another council member suggested that it would be helpful to let districts create their own "customizable" reports from the DC for whatever they want to check and to also give users a canned report based on preset parameters.
- The council would also like a way to separate archived and received files.

Department Data Processing:

- it would be nice to have a "known issues" notification area. David said they are working on designing that now. It will be in the data collector.
- There needs to be a process where there is a longer time to review data before they are final so they don't have to file an appeal. Receiving reports has improved tremendously but receiving reports in the final hour sends people into a panic.
- Have a more timely/routine issuance of reports that come from accountability reports (i.e. assessment pathways/prep for success/gen issues reports). Knowing these are coming will help ensure the data are checked for accuracy.
- Gen issues reports need to be created for some elements. It is ODE's endeavor to get all these reports automated. ODE must have defined business rules to be able to automate things.
- Can FTE for CTE payments being pulled automatically for payments versus just having a snapshot? David indicated ODE is working on some things to get the snapshot of when payment is pulled.

Reports and Impact:

- More connectivity between the SFPR report
- One council member asked if public record request comes in asking ODE for data on district how is that handled? David Ehle explained that because of student privacy laws, no raw student data can be disseminated, but aggregated data may be sent. Raw staff data is public record/public data**.**

Next Steps:

The council members were asked to go back and talk to others in their districts/communities the gather additional feedback on the five pieces of EMIS. The council should send additional feedback to Beth Fletcher by November 30.

The members also should send their preference for a workgroup assignment as well as sending names of others they'd like to have participate in a workgroup.

The members were asked to review availability for next meeting date and send their preference to Beth by November 15th.

Final Wrap Up:

One of the council members asked whether ODE finds the reporting requirements cumbersome and whether the office is adequately staffed?

Another member made a comment that ODE should use this as an opportunity to streamline the reporting.

Another member asked for a review of staff numbers to see the number of ODE staff worked in the EMIS department 10 years ago, 7 years ago, 5 years ago? This piggybacked on the idea that one of the recommendations might be to hire more staff for ODE?

A final comment was to ask a private sector person to conduct an internal audit to see how EMIS works? Beth indicated ODE did have an external consultant review EMIS, but not a business.

Tim Meister made a motion to adjourn with Tammy Hrosch providing the second. The vote was unanimous in favor of adjournment. The meeting adjourned at 2:58 PM