

MINUTES

P-20 Longitudinal Data System Advisory Council
June 2, 2016, 1:30 – 4:00 p.m.
Michigan Library and Historical Center- Lake Superior Room

Council Members Present: Don Dailey - Public Schools
Jan Dodge - Public Schools
Kristina Martin - Public Schools
Kathleen Miller - Public Schools
Stephanie Murray - Public Schools

Council Members Absent: Amy Fugate - Community Colleges
Toni Glasscoe - Community Colleges
Jeffery Guilfoyle - General Public
Leena Mangrulkar - Public Schools
Tracy Pattok - Higher Education
Laura Schartman - Higher Education
Nick Wagner - Higher Education

Ex Officio Members Present: Susan Broman - MDE Early Childhood
Robbie Jameson - SBO
David Judd - MDE K-12 Assessment & Accountability
Venessa Keesler - MDE K-12 Academic Affairs
Ward Beauchamp - DTMB
Anne Wohlfert - Treasury

Ex Officio Members Absent: Stephanie Beckhorn - BWT

CEPI Representatives: Trina Anderson
Rod Bernosky
Melissa Bisson
Tom Howell
Tosha Johnson
Michael McGroarty

- I. Welcome** – Tom Howell (Center for Educational Performance and Information (CEPI))
- The meeting was called to order at 1:35 p.m. with a welcome by Tom Howell.
 - Tom thanked everyone for coming and mentioned that Jan Dodge is retiring. He thanked her for her service.
- II. Prior Meeting Minutes** – Tom Howell
- An overview of the proposed minutes from the March 10, 2016 meeting was provided.
 - A change to the proposed minutes was made by a Council member. The minutes should clarify that one Council member brought up a topic, but this was not discussed in length by the Council, as the proposed minutes suggested.
 - A motion to approve the minutes with that change was made by Kristina Martin.
 - The motion was seconded by Stephanie Murray.
 - The minutes were approved by unanimous consent of the Council.

III. **Old Business:** Action Item Update – Trina Anderson (CEPI)

- Trina provided a status on the issues and recommendations raised at prior P-20 Advisory Council meetings that CEPI has been working on. She recapped the issues and provided CEPI's progress on them:
 - It was recommended that an idea of an Institution of Higher Learning (IHE) Student Pathways Aggregate Report should be discussed at the next Adult Learner Workgroup (ALW) meeting. This topic is on the agenda for the next ALW meeting, which is set for June 20, 2016.
 - The ALW should add members to fill vacancies or to add different perspectives based on new initiatives coming up. New members were added and they will attend the June 20, 2016 ALW meeting.
 - CEPI should reach out to the K-12 school personnel who are using the Student Pathways Report and get an understanding of the unique ways these schools are using the information. CEPI reached out to the Michigan College Access Network to gather this information. CEPI received responses regarding why schools are using this report: 1) its free, 2) the data is consistent with those posted on MISchoolData.org, 3) there is confidence in its accuracy, 4) strong validity of CEPI collected data, and 5) there is a lot of pertinent information in one report. CEPI is still collecting information regarding how they are using this report. This information will be included in a document and posted on MISchoolData.
 - CEPI should do early childhood (EC) attendance and chronic absenteeism reports. CEPI and the Michigan Department of Education (MDE)-Office of Great Start (OGS) is developing a report exploring the relationship of attendance rates and chronic absenteeism in K-3 with whether or not they had state-funded EC prior to kindergarten. For each grade level, there will be information showing the distribution of absences and the median for four groups: 1) participated in state-funded EC programs, 2) did not participate, 3) economically disadvantaged children who did not participate, and 4) all children in the grade level. This will enable the user to see how the median number of absences changes by group and by grade level. This report will be released in late 2016.

IV. **K-12:** TRIG Integration Project – Data Hub Recent Successes – Don Dailey (Kalamazoo RESA)

- Don began his presentation providing an overview/agenda. His presentation will mention the success stories of the BrightArrow Integration and the Single Sign On (SSO) Integration at the Eastern Upper Peninsula (EUP) Intermediate School District (ISD). Then he will discuss the recent updates regarding the PowerSchool connector that will be available June 10, 2016 and the implementation status.
- The BrightArrow Technologies vendor worked with TRIG to integrate a digital voice dialer using phone numbers and email addresses from a student information system. It is a mass notification solution for calling parents and staff quickly to deliver pre-recorded voice, text and email messages for emergency and non-urgent announcements. St. Joe County used it to send an alert. It was a success within a few minutes.
- The SSO login with EUPschools Federation was a success. It uses staff members' own existing login to consolidate all the schools that the staffer has access to onto one screen with one login. The process is seamless and eliminates having to use multiple logins. Over 100 districts have signed up.
- For more information, the Council was advised to visit the 22itrig.org site.
 - A Council member inquired as to why some districts may be resisting. Perhaps those districts may not understand and think that they already have all the connections.

- V. **K-12: Academic Measurement Protocol – David Judd (MDE) and Venessa Keesler (MDE)**
- The focus of this presentation was on the MDE assessments as they are now and looking beyond. David began by mentioning some of the M-STEP improvements for Spring 2016:
 - Shorter test time from 9-16 hours in 2015 to 4-8 hours in 2016
 - More flexible scheduling for schools
 - Faster results. Preliminary scaled score results were made available to educators on the MDE secure site within 48 hours. Also, final results were made available to schools and parents prior to the start of the 2016-17 school year.
 - The computer adaptive testing for grades 3-8 in English Language Arts (ELA) and Mathematics had personalized testing, more precise measurement of ability and improved test security
 - 2015 had 80% of schools testing online, whereas 2016 had an increase to 95%
 - The SAT will serve as the college entrance exam and the state ELA and Mathematics assessment. This reduces test time by up to 8 hours.
 - He then provided a few links for the Council to visit. One was an M-STEP video for districts and parents to help eliminate stress. The other was a student experience video from a student perspective.
 - Some Spring 2016 testing statistics:
 - Over 1.3 million test sessions
 - Number of incident reports during the first week of testing saw a nearly 69% reduction compared to prior year
 - Students did not take too long to take the assessments. In all but two cases the actual time to complete was faster than the estimated time.
 - MDE and district personnel were so happy at how quick the preliminary results came out, but those results could not be printed out, so MDE is working on that.
 - David showed an example of a seventh grade preliminary report layout, complete with student name, preliminary scale score, range, margin of error, and if the student is at risk of falling behind, if attention is indicated, or if the student is making adequate progress based on content sub-score.
 - The M-STEP uses computer adaptive testing (CAT). How it works:
 - The M-STEP computer adaptive software draws from a large pool of on-grade-level test questions. The software runs in the background while students take the assessment. After each response, it selects the next question based on a number of criteria, including: the test blueprint (the content areas and types of questions that will appear on the test), the number of times a question is likely to be used (to prevent overexposure of questions), and previous responses from the student.
 - When the test begins the student receives an initial question in the medium range of grade-level difficulty. The adaptive software then selects items. The test ends once the adaptive software determines that all the specifications from the test blueprint have been met and there is sufficient information to provide accurate scores.
 - He then discussed the dynamic reporting project. It is legislatively funded and based on a concept delivered in other states. The goals of the project are to deliver assessment data in a timelier manner, allow parents, students and educators electronic access to the data, and to deliver reports that will allow educators to make data driven instructional decisions. How it works:
 - Integrated through the Student Information System (SIS) and allows students, parents and educators to access reports through their SIS sign-on. The access is determined by rights given in the SIS. The reports also allow for drill down capability tied to a teacher or a

course. Reports are categorized by "summary" and "detailed," and by "student/parent" and "educator."

- The reports are being piloted by three local districts and two SISs. MDE is gathering the feedback.
- Venessa finished the presentation by discussing the future:
 - Spring 2017
 - The M-STEP will be the same
 - No required kindergarten testing. It was determined that these students are too young. Thus, no Spring testing and no observations.
 - In grades 1 and 2, MDE is working on getting benchmark data. The districts can use their own or that of MDE. The goal is to not over-test, be developmentally appropriate, and MDE will report out those who did take the MDE test.
 - Spring 2018
 - Grades 3-4 and 6-7 will move to a summative test.
 - Testing will not be done every year. Then test on a teamwork ability.
 - High school grades are not slated to change.
 - MDE wants to offer options for tests and make a change around the benchmarks.
 - The Council discussed the great work done so far regarding getting the preliminary results in the hands of educators in lighting speed, which has never been done before.

The Council recessed for a 10 minute break.

VI. Postsecondary: Success Rates Release – Michael McGroarty (CEPI) and Rachel Edmondson (CEPI)

- Michael and Rachel began their presentation providing a report overview and re-cap.
 - The purpose of the report is to showcase postsecondary student outcomes and provide public transparency showing the importance of the success of students in Michigan.
 - The report starts with the 2009-10 enrollment class and calculates success metrics from 2-6 years for community colleges and 4-8 years for public universities. The report has two success rates: success rate and comprehensive rate.
 - The success rate represents a 2- or 4- year degree attainment and 2-year transfers to 4-year institutions. It includes a broader population of college enrollees than other nationally-known graduation rates. It also calculates metrics enabling comparisons across colleges within a sector.
 - The comprehensive success rate includes the success rates successes and adds certificate completion and non-traditional degree attainment (e.g., an associate's degree at a university). It measures success that aligns more to college mission/goal without limiting students solely to a 2- or 4-year degree attainment. Lastly, it incorporates those other successes not typically included in other standard graduation-only rates.
- CEPI strategically collaborated with a workgroup that included representatives from the State Budget Office, the colleges and higher education associations to define and design the calculation of the rates. The workgroup:
 - Participated in requirements gathering sessions
 - Created the methodology (CEPI refined into documents)
 - Created business rules (CEPI refined into documents)
 - Created a glossary of terms (CEPI refined into documents)
 - Reviewed mock-ups and prototype reports created by CEPI
 - Validated and tested rate results using testing packages created by CEPI

- Will reconvene after the report release to discuss preparation for next year's calculation
- Next, a summary for some of the rates were provided:
 - The comprehensive success rates are greater than success rates because it also includes those other paths to student success (certificate completion, non-traditional degree attainment)
 - When given additional years, a cohort of students attain significantly greater success.
 - The comprehensive success rates and success rates at year 3 for community colleges overall are significantly greater than compared to year 2.
 - The comprehensive success rates and success rates at year 5 for universities overall are significantly greater than compared to year 4.
 - The success rates are greater each year when only giving students 4 years at a university.
 - Some college's rates (and therefore the statewide rates) may increase over time as focus on data quality of submitted data improves.
- Next, the presenters discussed the report release plans:
 - Early June: Informing the higher education committee and Governor's office of the upcoming plans to release publically. Also sending statewide and individual college reports to all community colleges and public universities for a two week preview window prior to public release.
 - Late June: Release publically on www.MISchoolData.org.
 - July: Meeting with workgroup members and any additional members who come forward after the preview window to discuss potential methodology enhancements for 2016 report
 - Early 2017: 2016 report release
- Lastly, the presenters discussed the communication strategy for the release. The communication materials will contain a high-level methodology, an explanation for how our rates differ in methodology from other nationally-known rates, memos describing the methodology and purpose at a high level, and a press release. The materials will be shared with the colleges, the college associations, higher education committee and the Governor's office, reporters, the P-20 Advisory Council, workgroup members and MI School Data keyholders.
 - The Council discussed getting K-12 and the higher education community together to discuss impacts. A strategy is to help the K-12 community know how to use the report and getting it in the hands of a high school counselor. The Michigan College Access Network could help get the word out to that group.

VII. Postsecondary: Scholarship Success Measurement Capability – Anne Wohlfert (Treasury)

- Anne began her presentation by mentioning that Treasury had 13 different financial awards, totaling \$107 million across eight different programs, which were all housed in different systems. Now all of the Michigan awards are in the same system, on a platform called MiSSG. The new system is organized by student and allows users to see the total amount a student received from each program. This enables Treasury to look across years of awards. Also, counselors can now see if a student filled out a FAFSA (yes or no) or if the student started and then stopped.
- Treasury will work with CEPI this year to match more than one million student records (FAFSAs) between the MiSSG and CEPI's systems to apply the student Unique Identification Code (UIC) onto the Treasury records. This will allow the State to provide data showing which students received which of Treasury's programs and how those students are progressing and graduating from college. This will enable us to show our legislators which programs are working.

- A student can also log into the system and view the awards he/she received and the status of his/her FAFSA. The counselors have been using this system since January 2016.

VIII. Workforce: Master Person Index Integration – Michael McGroarty and Vern Westendorf (WDA)

- Michael and Vern (from the Workforce Development Agency (WDA) started their presentation off by explaining what the Master Person Index (MPI) is. It is an enterprise-wide citizen registry that provides a single, trusted, 360 degree view of each Michigan resident. It will be the source of truth for citizen demographics and identifiers. It will provide a framework for improving data quality, reducing fraud and increasing customer satisfaction.
- On a high-level, the MPI collects data about citizens from multiple systems. It will store the IDs from each agency's system (e.g., SSN, UIC). It determines which records belong to the same person and then creates a "master" list of all unique people found. It works between existing systems, allowing individual departments and agencies to continue ownership of their data, using their existing system. Security effectively controls access to the information.
- A great benefit of the MPI is that it will allow agencies to connect their siloed data leveraging the match performed by the MPI. It reduces the work needed by the agencies to run the records to be matched. Then the agencies can engage in data connection projects (governed by Data Sharing Agreements (DSA)) pertaining to their source data.
 - A Council member asked if a list of the fields to be submitted by CEPI to the MPI could be made available. CEPI will distribute that list.

IX. Workforce: Workforce Longitudinal Data System Update – Vern Westendorf

- Vern provided a quick update on the status of the Workforce Longitudinal Data System (WLDS). First, in regards to the DSA with the Department of State, there is no word yet on the addendum approval from the legal review. Second, WDA met with the Bureau of Labor Market Information and Strategic Initiatives to discuss the changes for the next round of report refreshes. Lastly, WDA is waiting for final word from the feds regarding getting the outcome data back to colleges about graduates.

X. Roundtable

- It was suggested by an audience member that Treasury add a data element to their collection regarding occupation from a new hire/worker. A recommendation from another member was to first present this idea to the Enterprise Information Management committee and ask who (if any) already collects this data element, which other agencies could benefit by having this data shared and if that agency can/will share it.
- Tom Howell thanked everyone for their contributions.
- The next meeting is scheduled for October 6, 2016.
- 4:00 p.m. meeting adjourn.