EMIS Advisory Council:
Reports and Impact Workgroup Meeting Agenda and Minutes

Location	Ohio Department of Education 25 South Front Street, Columbus, Ohio 43215 Conference Room B-004

Date	Tuesday, April 23, 2019; 1:00pm-3:00pm

Facilitator(s)	**Marianne Mottley **** **Aaron Rausch****

Attendees	**Sheri Ballman**	Carrie Herringshaw**	Tim Meister**	**Penny Rucker****	Todd Yohey**	**Lisa McCullough****
	Teri Belt	**Carla Isaac****	**Yvonne Morton**	**Karen Wilson**	Stephanie Rouse	Cheryl Geisler

Bold names indicate who was present.
** Indicates the work group member is also on the EMIS Advisory Council

Agenda Items	Approx. Start Time
Welcome/Roll Call	1:00
Vote on Approval of February Meeting Minutes	1:10
Financial Data and Funding Reports Recommendations	1:15
Secure Data Center Reports Recommendations	1:45
Break	2:15
Accountability Resources and Report Card Webpage Recommendations	2:25
Adjournment	3:00

Welcome/ Roll Call

- The meeting was called to order by Marianne Mottley at 1:03 PM.
- The first order of business was roll call. All members were present except for Carrie Herringshaw, Tim Meister, Todd Yohey, Stephanie Rouse, and Cheryl Geisler.

Vote on Approval of February Meeting Minutes

- The next agenda item was to review and approve the meeting minutes from the February 27th meeting. Sheri Ballman made a motion to approve the meeting minutes with Teri Belt 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.

Prioritization Process Explanation

- Before reviewing and revising the list of challenges and opportunities for improvement, Marianne Mottley gave an overview of the prioritization process that would be used in order for the EMIS Advisory Council to learn and understand what items were most important to the workgroup.
- Today, the workgroup reviewed and revised each of the challenges/ opportunities for improvement on the list. Blank line items were created in order to gather new items to add to the list. Subsequently, each present workgroup member had the opportunity to individually rank their top two most important challenges/ opportunities for improvement, as well as seven additional items for a total of no more than nine.
- Results below show scores for each of the recommendations prioritized by seven non-ODE workgroup members. Top two items were scored with more weight (x3) as priority challenges/ opportunities for improvement.

Financial Data and Funding Reports

There are a lot of reports available to members of the field who are trying to understand their payments. This can be good, but it also creates challenges. It's good because users have different ways to view their payment data depending on the audience with whom they will be sharing the information. Some reports provide high level summary data while other reports provide more detail.

Seven non-ODE workgroup members prioritized the following list:

Challenges	Short-Term Opportunity for Improvement	Long-Term Opportunity for Improvement	Total:
1. Data are not stored in one single place and it's often hard to understand because of its complexity.	Create an all-in-one funding report for reconciliation that provides more transparency regarding how numbers are calculated for SFPR.		**14**
2. Lack of understanding what files correlate with payments. Treasurers cannot reconcile payments to students funded.	Create a snapshot report when data is pulled from payments to help Treasurers with reconciliation.	Create a tool to show all the data reported for each single payment so that treasurers can reconcile each payment quickly and easily.	**14**
3. Reports are too complex when trying to share and explain with district administration and board members.	Simply the SFPR report.	Add short videos to explain the various pieces of the funding formula (i.e. excess costs tuition payments, etc.).	**5**

* Blank boxes are for additional recommendations.
* Short-term is defined as being able to be completed in this calendar year, while long-term is defined by taking longer than this calendar year to implement.
* Top 2 and Top 3 items were scored with more weight (x3) as priority challenges/opportunities. The total in the right column reflects scores for all non-ODE workgroup members.

#	Challenges	Short-Term Opportunity for Improvement	Long-Term Opportunity for Improvement	Total
4.	No reports exist with data about benefits/health insurance.		Create a new funding report which contains data about benefits/health insurance.	**1**
5.	Many school personnel don't understand the codes reported in EMIS today impact the funding they receive tomorrow to support all students.	Create more awareness and communication to all district personnel on the role that EMIS data plays in supporting teachers in their services to students.	Generate report card resource documents specifically to help "non-EMIS" personnel better understand the relationship between EMIS reporting and funding they receive to support students.	**7**
6.	Because so many districts are on the guarantee, we need a way to explain what it means and why budget reconciliation still is needed.	Create resources/ videos explaining what it means to be on the guarantee and why it happens. Also create a resource to explain the effects of the guarantee on the budget.		**0**
7.				
8.				
9.				
10.				

Secure Data Center Reports

Dashboard Reports are designed to show each report card measure and component. Data displayed follow the accountability rules and each report displays preliminary percentages and grades based on data reported in EMIS. The reports for analysis follow both the report card accountability rules and also are used for diagnostic purposes and may show data broken down differently.

Seven non-ODE workgroup members prioritized the following list:

	Challenges	Short-Term Opportunity for Improvement	Long-Term Opportunity for Improvement	Total:
11.	Lack of training for other staff and administrators makes the process more challenging because they don't understand reports.	Leverage the education stakeholder groups (BASA, OSBA, OASBO, etc.) to offer EMIS/funding/report card sessions at their conferences/annual meetings and also reach out directly to districts and ESCs to offer training to people who are new to those key positions.		**5**
12.	SDC is difficult to navigate and not user friendly.	Develop the capability in the SDC to switch from one building to another on same report without having to start over in running the report.	Add links to the relevant EMIS manual sections in the form of pop-up windows to help SDC users see information about the calculation/EMIS data elements as they are reviewing their grades.	**9**

* Blank boxes are for additional recommendations.
* Short-term is defined as being able to be completed in this calendar year, while long-term is defined by taking longer than this calendar year to implement.
* Top 2 and Top 3 items were scored with more weight (x3) as priority challenges/opportunities. The total in the right column reflects scores for all non-ODE workgroup members.

	Challenges	Short-Term Opportunity	Long-Term Opportunity for Improvement	Total:
13.	Lack of understanding about report card measures.	Create more training through short webinars that explain a specific report card element.		4
14.	No reports exist to help districts see data about at-risk students and mental health/social-emotional learning.	Create a new report which contains data about at-risk students and mental health/SEL.		1
15.	For SDC reports to be more useful to districts, they need to be more student centered.		Recommend a law change to allow ODE to collect names in addition to SSIDs so they can be added to the reports.	9
16.	Many reports allow users to disaggregate only by a single subgroup	Make reports drillable to multiple subgroups.		1
17.				
18.				
19.				
20.				

Accountability Resources and Report Card Webpage

Seven non-ODE workgroup members prioritized the following list:

	Challenges	Short-Term Opportunity for Improvement	Long-Term Opportunity for Improvement	Total:
21.	The six-line description on the report card landing page is too long and needs to be refined.	Refine the report card landing page language to include a more "personal" message geared to parents.	Add a "human element" to the report cards by creating a video that welcomes readers to the page and explains the purpose of the report cards.	2
22.	The value-added report card measure is difficult to explain.	Develop a simple resource (something that does not focus on the technical calculations) for districts to use to explain the value-added measure.		1
23.	The report card is not simple and easy to read like it is intended to be.	Review each page of the report card website to simplify the language so that parents can better understand what is being measured or reported	Create "voice over" options to explain what each measure of the report card means.	7
24.	The letter grades are not a true picture of districts' and schools' performance.	ODE will facilitate a discussion with stakeholders to find ways to make the report card tell a story.	Work with stakeholders to help readers know about the good things schools are doing with their students	6
25.	A member of the EMIS Advisory Council should be added to the State Board of Education's	(NOTE: The original "combined committee" disbanded after issuing its report in late 2018).	If a new work group or combined committee is created in the future, include a representative from	4

* Blank boxes are for additional recommendations.
* Short-term is defined as being able to be completed in this calendar year, while long-term is defined by taking longer than this calendar year to implement.
* Top 2 and Top 3 items were scored with more weight (x3) as priority challenges/opportunities. The total in the right column reflects scores for all non-ODE workgroup members.

		the EMIS Advisory Council on that new group's membership.	
"combined" report card/accountability committee so that a data person can contribute to the discussions.			
26.			
27.			
28.			
29.			
30.			

Wrap Up/ Next Steps:

- These results will be taken to the full EMIS Advisory Council meeting on April 30th for review and discussion and later voted on in June to then be taken to the State Superintendent for consideration.
- Marianne Mottley asked for one workgroup volunteer who was also on the Council to present these recommendations alongside her and Aaron Rausch at the April 30th meeting. Penny Rucker volunteered.
- The meeting adjourned at 2:50 PM.

* Blank boxes are for additional recommendations.
* Short-term is defined as being able to be completed in this calendar year, while long-term is defined by taking longer than this calendar year to implement.
* Top 2 and Top 3 items were scored with more weight (x3) as priority challenges/opportunities. The total in the right column reflects scores for all non-ODE workgroup members.