EMIS ADVISORY COUNCIL

Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems (SLDS) Grant Workgroup Agenda

Location	ODE CR_1st_102

Date	December 1, 2022; 1:00-3:00pm

Facilitators	**David Ehle****	**Marianne Mottley****		

Attendees				
	Alex Ahlers	Stephanie Heidenreich	Dara LaForest	**Cathy Spellman**
	Crystal Aker	Lee Herman	Carrie Long	**Amy Szymanski**
	Kim Atwell	Kirsten Hill	Karen Meister	**Bill Wagner**
	Greg Cosimi	**Suzette Jackson**	Helen Mills	Alice Weygandt
	Bryan Drost	Brian Jettinghoff	**Amber Myers**	**Teresa Williams**
	Sue Hall	Heather Keating	Ben Richards**	**Graham Wood**
	Jamie Hamilton	**Kylea Kimmerly**	Ryan Shively	

** Indicates the workgroup member is also on the EMIS Advisory Council.

Agenda Items	Facilitator	Approx. Start Time
Welcome/Roll Call/Agenda Review	David Ehle	1:00
Approval of May 2022 Meeting Minutes	David Ehle	1:10
Early Warning System- flags and/or formulas discussion	David Ehle & Amy Szymanski	1:15
Round Robin- EWS feature requests	David Ehle	1:35
Review of Progress Towards Graduation module	David Ehle, Teresa Williams & Graham Wood	2:05
EWS- need to collect additional EMIS data?	David Ehle	2:40
Next Steps/Adjournment	David Ehle	2:55

Meeting Minutes

Welcome Roll Call
- The meeting was called to order by David Ehle at 1:04 p.m.
- The first order of business was roll call. All members were present except for Kim Atwell, Greg Cosimi, Stephanie Heidenreich, Lee Herman, Kirsten Hill, Brian Jettinghoff, Heather Keating,

Dara LaForest, Carrie Long, Karen Meister, Helen Mills, Ben Richards, Ryan Shively, and Alice Weygandt.

Approval of March 2022 Meeting Minutes
- Amber Myers moved to approve the minutes from the May 25, 2022, meeting. Kylea Kimmerly provided the second. The minutes were approved without objection.

Early Warning System (EWS) - Flags and/or Formulas Discussion
- At its foundation, the ODDEX EWS will focus on ABC.
  - Attendance (10% absent for a particulate time period)
  - Behavior (1 or more days of suspension or expulsion)
  - Course grades (failed 1 or more credit-bearing courses)
- The above criteria are binary (applies to a student or not). Some warning system models use more in-depth data. The data used in the system will grow over time. The eventual goal is to create a machine learning model that uses as much data as possible to identify at-risk students. There are options between the ABC flags and the machine learning model. ABCs are still relevant as they identify at risk students. This is the first step/"check engine light", but eventually we want to dig deeper into why these students are at risk which is why additional data points would be helpful.
- The workgroup was asked, "*should we do more now, or only flags now and then machine learning model later?*" The workgroup reviewed possible data to use now, and also discussed the pros and cons of a simple, general indication of possible issues (ABC) versus a more complex approach that distinguishes levels of risk (Low, Medium, High, Ultra) using more data.
  - Attendance – flag if student missed 10% or more OR min/max
  - Behavior – flag if student was suspended for one or more days versus points of how many days they've been suspended and combine across areas
  - Courses – flag students if one or more credit courses failed versus 25 points per course failed, perhaps additional points for courses with a D
  - Other Data to Generate Points:
    - IEP status, EL status, foster status, state test scores, number of schools attended, number of years retained
  - Workgroup members mentioned how there is already a lot of focus on attendance in the districts because of HB 410. Most districts already have ABC information, so levels of risk approach would be most useful to streamline process and priority.
  - Workgroup members felt that peformance on state tests is a huge indicator, as well as looking at end of course exams and state tests together.
  - In terms of the behavior component, something to think about is the fact that EMIS only includes in-school suspension, out-of-school suspension, and expulsions. Minor incidents are not included.
  - Department staff reminded workgroup members that there are no plans to publish this data and no state mandates to use this data in certain ways at a district level. The EWS is meant to be a trigger that can build on modules for monitoring and assigning interventions to students.
  - Since this information will not be in the Data Collector, one workgroup member emphasized the need for getting ODDEX "buy-in." Many guidance counselors and other

district personel are not utilizing ODDEX, so more awareness and training around this might be helpful.

- o Concerns were mentioned for receiving districts seeing a student who might be coming to them with a high- or ultra-risk level flag. How would we ensure integrity for this kind of situation? Would need to make sure the districts try to understand how the student got to the level of high-risk and ensuring they are on a graduation path that makes sense for them individually. Ideally, eventually, it would be nice to have ODDEX/SCM contain a student's graduation plan in it.
- Department staff said that the initial release of the EWS will be for grades 9-12. Within the next two years, it could go down to elementary school, it just depends on the data points that could be used from elementary level. Workgroup members felt this would be especially valuable as elementary attendance is a huge indicator for high school level attendance and graduation.

EWS Feature Requests
- o Workgroup members were asked several questions regarding feature requests for the EWS:
  - o *What types of reports would you like to have?*
    - ▪ Different lists for students who meet one indicator as well as those who meet all three indicators.
  - o *How do you think you would use the system?*
    - ▪ Need to be able to easily move between EWS and PTG.
  - o *Work within the system vs. exporting lists?*
    - ▪ This information absolutely needs to be exportable.
    - ▪ Filters to customize and manipulation capabilities at district level.
  - o *What types of users would you have in your district?*
    - ▪ Generic as well as detailed reports based on different types of users.
    - ▪ Need building level and not just district level.
    - ▪ Create custom group for list of SSIDs (i.e. guidance counselors can select only their students within a building if they don't want to see the entire list).
    - ▪ Could there be position based roles? (i.e. guidance counselor role)
      - • Department staff said that this is not always reliable as people move around in a district. We could do a roles suggestion list (i.e. building principals might find X, Y, and Z roles most helpful).

Additional Data Needed?
- Some early warning systems use data we do not currently collect in EMIS. Workgroup members were asked if we should start the conversation around adding any of the following optional EMIS reporting of this data for use by our EWS?
  - o Middle school grades (non-credit courses)
    - ▪ Workgroup members felt that this could be valuable and may not be a heavy lift by districts.
  - o Discipline incidents where the Type of Discipline is less severe than suspension
    - ▪ Workgroup members felt that this would be questionable value and could be an extra lift.
    - ▪ Error checking on discipline incidents. Multiple detentions would eventually escalate anyways.
  - o Better extracurricular data collection

- Workgroups members mentioned that this should already be reported in SIS so not a huge lift. This could help emphasize the need to report this required data and districts would find more value in reporting it since it would be seen as actually being used.
- One workgroup member believed that the more data in the system, the more accurate we can be, and the better suited districts will be with helping students. It would be worth it to start having the conversation about these additional pieces of data.
- Multiple members raised the emphasis around the need for training for guidance counselors once this tool is released.

Review of Progress Towards Graduation (PTG) Module
- The PTG module will be released soon. The workgroup walked through a review of the PTG user interface. They were encouraged to go ahead and use this link to grant access to specific OEDS roles needed for this interface. Something newly presented for the module is the new program code option for progress towards seals or earned seals.
- Catalog of Reports
    - Creating reports related to courses, competency, and readiness.
    - Could create hundreds of reports based on various data combinations, but want feedback from the workgroup. *Now that the current senior class is under the latest requirements, what are pain points?*
        - Where students have made progress and where they haven't and where to go from there.
        - Different ways to drill down (i.e. juniors that haven't been competency and have taken assessment twice and now have access to take alternatives).
        - COVID exemption on assessment score
            - Department staff told the workgroup that if a student is reported in the right grade level, they have already filtered out those who can't use the exemption.

Adjournment
- The meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

Ohio | **Department** of **Education**