



Reporting Requirement Review Task Force Meeting Notes

Date 9/24/13
Time 10 am to 2 pm
Location Grimes Building – 2 Northwest Conference Room

MEMBERS PRESENT: Bobi Jo Friesen, Teacher/at large appointee; John Casey, Teacher; Patti Schroeder, IASB; Courtney Grotenhuis, IDE; Mike Cormack, IDE; Amy Williamson, IDE

AGENDA ITEM: Introductions

Expected Outcome	Lead	Follow Up

Notes: Jeff Berger gave a context for the purpose of the task force, commenting that this type of review has happened before in the past. Amy Williamson explained that the task force will, at the end of the process, submit recommendations that may or may not be acted upon in legislation.

AGENDA ITEM: Selection of Chair for Task Force

Expected Outcome	Lead	Follow Up

Notes: Amy Williamson was selected as Chair of task force.

AGENDA ITEM: Familiarize Task Force with list of required reports

Expected Outcome	Lead	Follow Up

Notes:

- a. Reading of HF215 task force requirements
 - i. Review of the required work of the task force, see 106(3).

- b. Mike Cormack gave his best explanation of the legislation’s interpretation of the definition of a report. It is extended beyond the title of report, to include data elements.
- c. Amy gave a walk-through of the survey that was used to collect the reports and data information and a brief explanation of each question on the survey. Some of the data collected is difficult to capture in a format such as the spreadsheet given. Additional information may be required for those sets of data.
- d. Amy and Mike both commented on the scope of the survey, noting that the survey out Department-wide to get as much information as possible.
- e. The members spent time finding focus for the work of the task force.
 - i. Members went through the list of reports, highlighting those reports that are to be the priority after the first pass of reviewing the reports and their comments or concerns about the report:
 1. Annual Transportation Report – is it asked for twice, or is it merely listed by more than one person as being a report that is collected?
 2. CTE data collection and comparable to other states’ processes for CTE.
 3. Group together some reports that have multiple components, such as CAR, IDEA Part C.
 4. Independent Audit Reports – are they requested from each school, and is it necessary if they are available online?
 5. Check accuracy of IJH reports cited in ch. 63.
 6. Clarification on all document names, such as if School Level Expenditures are a part of CAR.
 7. IDHH data collection.
 8. NSLP and CDC grant, explanation of DE required purpose.
 9. Home care providers, is the amount of certification and paperwork required keeping some providers from seeking certification.
 10. National School Lunch Program, Free and Reduced programs – some interaction with DHS for these types of programs.
 11. OASIS – are those in the DE the original recipient of report or if it is coming from another outside source?
 12. C-Plan – reducing redundancies and improving compilation efforts and clarify on submission dates.
 13. Site visit compliance – improving the usability of the tracking of compliance citations and findings.
 14. AEA accreditation and all accredited agencies site visits become compliance findings and needs based, in the place of a visit for a school that is already performing well.
 15. E-rate – amount of paperwork necessary to receive the grant.
 16. Home School Pupil Progress Form – necessary any longer?
 17. Screenshots of anti-bullying collection process.
 18. More information on graduate and dropout verification.
 19. Verifying that BEDS and SRI are not cross-collecting, or that it could be done a more efficient way.
 20. Need clarification on data collections for special education.

- 21. Check on multiple entries for IJH program budget information.
- ii. Patti Schroeder asked if for some programs, such as Title III, all reports could be rolled into one single document. Amy agreed that is a relevant question, and said that there is a desire in the Department to make reporting and application processes electronic to reduce paperwork and effort.

AGENDA ITEM: Determine process for work

Expected Outcome	Lead	Follow Up

Notes:

- a. Members to determine what it is that they want to look into at depth: what is it that is burdensome for the people that the members are representing?
- b. Make necessary and requested revisions to list of reporting requirements, including the additional information desired:
 - iii. Patti Schroeder asked for a justification of each report for further meetings:
 - 1. Why is it being collected? (specifically if it is cited “DE required” or “not in code”)
 - 2. Why should it continue to be collected?
 - 3. How is it used once collected?
 - 4. Is this report also required for another program or collected more than once?
 - iv. Are those requirements cited as federally required solely federal, or have those collecting added on more elements?
 - v. How are the reports and data collected, i.e. through hard copies, by electronic files attached to emails, through a Department porthole, etc. (some specific highlighted are Title III and SBRC hearing exhibits)
 - vi. More specific citations for those codes listed as the whole chapter of code or for the data elements that do not have a listed citation.
 - vii. Group multiple components of the same entity together.
 - viii. For next meeting bring data dictionary to clarify which data elements are included in SRI
- c. In between meetings, check the alignment of IC and IAC for those reports that are cited authority in IAC.
- d. Recommend that the Department improve its technological capacity in order to improve technological abilities of the schools, in regards to reporting and data submission programming.

AGENDA ITEM: Determine meeting schedule

Expected Outcome	Lead	Follow Up

Notes:

- a. Do not schedule the last two weeks of October; November 19th.
- b. Submit recommendations for approval to Board for January 23rd, 2014 meeting.
- c. Propose to schedule at least three more meetings before January 23rd, 2014.

AGENDA ITEM: Agenda for next meeting

Expected Outcome	Lead	Follow Up

Notes:

- a. Perform a second pass on the list of requirements with the additional information included.
- b. Draft criteria for establishing recommendations.