

LOCAL TRANSPARENT IDAHO



PROJECT TEAM

The project team is performing ongoing in-depth analysis of skill sets necessary not only today but into the future.



RESEARCH EFFORT

The project team is researching best practices for UAM, data templates for the registry, and how best to stand up pilot data.



COMMUNICATIONS

The project team has created a tactical communications plan, proactively presented at five conferences, and are building a outward facing informational



PILOT GROUPS

The project team is collaboratively identifying pilot groups for city, county, and school district data.



REGISTRY

The project team worked closely with LSO to strategize a temporary solution until a new portal that encompasses local transparency and the registry can be stood up.

NEXT STEPS: UNIFORM ACCOUNTING MANUAL



RESEARCH

In preparation for this meeting, the local transparency project team began researching Uniform Accounting Manuals that other states have created as well as the accounting manuals utilized by different groups currently within the state to better understand layout, content, and best practices.



COLLABORATE

This Committee will meet regularly to collaboratively steer the creation of the uniform accounting manual, direct the project team to gather information, and coordinate with Subject Matter Experts across the state to ensure the manual meets the needs of today as well as the future.



DRAFT

The Local Transparency project team in partnership with various associations and Subject Matter Experts will draft the Uniform Accounting Manual and present it to the Committee for review.



FINALIZE

Following a thorough review process by the Committee, the Uniform Accounting Manual will be finalized and posted for general consumption.



EDUCATE

The Local Transparency project team will deploy a high-level training strategy.

PROPOSED PILOT PROGRAMS

LOCAL ENTITIES THAT VOLUNTEERED TO PARTICIPATE

Pilot
1

LEA's: West Ada, Lake Pend Orielle, Bluum Charter, Moscow, Payette, Vallivue, Highland/Lapwai, Twin Falls, Troy, Bonneville, Preston, Post Falls, Jerome, Aberdeen, Bear Lake, and Boise.

Pilot
2

Cities: Meridian, Driggs, Idaho Falls, Moscow, Plummer, Hayden, Dalton Gardens, Sandpoint, Bonners Ferry, Star, Marsing, Boise.

Pilot
3

Counties: Ada, Bingham, Boise, Bonner, Fremont, Owyhee, Kootenai.

Findings To Date



Data Disparities

After an in-depth exercise with county budgets, it was discovered that there are greater data disparities amongst like stakeholder groups than was initially thought adding to the complexity of combining data into a uniform data set.



Differentiating Initiatives

In discussions, it has become apparent that most local entities do not differentiate between the Central Registry reporting requirements and the Local Transparency effort.



Sustainment Risks

We have noted an uptick in stakeholder groups directing local data inquiries to our team, leading us to believe this will only increase moving forward. Additionally, the workload around administering the Central Registry may strain our limited resources.



Local Entity Scope

After analyzing city, county, and LEA data disparities, the additional 1,000+ special districts' data, which has no uniformity, present a significant challenge.