

Online Task Force, Meeting #7

Wednesday, December 3, 2014

Link to the meeting recording:

<http://connect.enetcolorado.org/p3kbg!pqqglx/>

Meeting Notes

The seventh meeting of the Online Task Force (OTF) was called to order by Ethan Hemming, Task Force chair. Task Force members and guests introduced themselves.

OTF Members and Staff in Attendance:

Judy Bauernschmidt
Brian Bissell
Scott Campbell
Leanne Emm
Diana Gamboa
Ethan Hemming
Chaille Hymes
Renee Martinez
Kim McClelland
Gretchen Morgan
Dan Morris
Amy Valentine
Linda VanMatre
John Myers
Melanie Sloan
Sunny Deyé

Guests

Introduced themselves.

Housekeeping

John Myers discussed public comment. Forty-five minutes of time has been set aside for public comment. Each speaker will be given three to five minutes, depending on the number of commenters.

Dan Morris stated five people had registered online for public comments: one left a written comment, three would be attending the meeting and providing public comment in person, and one was being contacted to determine how they will share their comment.

John announced that the eighth meeting of the online task force will have a presentation of CDE accountability data from 2014.

Agenda

John Myers reviewed the agenda. There were no requests for changes.

OTF Meeting 6 Notes

An OTF member made a request for the following changes to the draft meeting 6 notes:

- The last sentence of the second paragraph under Presentations, Alex Medler, NACSA, Questions (page 3) is incorrect. The last word of that sentence should be “authorizer” not “operator.”
- That the “Support of charge, per HB 14-1382” section stated two votes on two separate questions took place, which was incorrect
 - Ethan clarified, and OTF members generally agreed, that the notes were correct: two votes on two separate issues had taken place.
 - The OTF member requested that the introductory sentence be changed from “. . . whether they support” to “. . . whether they want to proceed.”
- The Performance Contracting section incorrectly stated “this member offered to provide edits to the document by Nov 24th to reflect this separation.” This was deleted.
- The Renewing Authorizers section stated “OTF members were opposed to “grandfathering” authorizers though there were OTF members that were not. The OTF member requested that this be noted.

No other edits were provided.

There was general consensus to approve the meeting notes with the edits provided.

Review of the OTF Draft Final Report

The OTF members had received the draft copy of the final report prior to this meeting, and a printed copy was provided in the meeting packets.

John asked for feedback and suggestions from the OTF members.

A few edits were made to the draft document, which are reflected in the second draft of the final report.

John detailed the remaining timeline for the final report:

- Suggested edits and changes to the first draft of the final report is due to the Melanie at APA by December 8th
- The second draft of the final report is due to the OTF members by December 9th
- Substantive suggested changes to the second draft of the final report must be provided by the 8th OTF meeting, December 16th, because consensus must be had for these changes

- Non-substantive changes (precision, grammar, flow, sentence structure, etc.) are due to Melanie at APA by December 18th
- The third draft of the final report is due to the OTF members by December 18th
- OTF member non-substantive suggested edits and changes to the third draft of the final report are due to Melanie at APA by December 23rd
- Final report is due to CDE by December 29th

Homework:

OTF members will provide substantive edits to Melanie at APA by December 8th. Melanie will provide the second draft of the final report to the OTF members by December 9th.

Public Comment

The OTF received public comment in a variety of forms.

Five people provided public comment in person: Tillie Elvrum, Lori Cooney, Speros Vouriotis, Patricia Allen, and Judith Stokes.

Two people provided public comment via the online link: Kesia Janeece Taylor, and Cory Morehead.

Thirty-three people provided public comment via email to the CDE: Richard Adrends, Paula Atkins, Staci Bachman, Donna Ballew, Kelli Behrend, Anna Cardelli, Shane and Margaret Chavez, Gary C Collins, Angela Christenson, Richard Damerau, Daniels Family, Scott Duft, Scott A Edholm, Mindi Edholm, Bradley N Edholm, Joan Evans, Sabrina Fritts, Penny Gabardi, Heather Gittings, Dianne Gray, Maria Hensley, Lance Kigert, Corinna P Kromer, Terry Lindsley, Kathy Mathern, Michael and Debra Mills, Vicki Moore, Cory Morehead, Lane and Jeff Morrell, Norma Oster, Gary Potts, Maggie Ratliff, Kistrina Kay Skiba, Jane and Kesia Janeece Taylor, Stacy Telck.

OTF members decided to not have the emailed public comments read aloud. They are compiled and circulated to the members and also posted online.

Authorizer Standards

OTF members conducted the final review and revision of the authorizer standards documents. These changes are reflected in those documents (Standards and Practices 120514, and Systems and Process Elements 120514).

Votes

Several votes were taken in deciding the content of the authorizer standards.

The following provides the motions made and votes taken by the OTF members. One vote was requested to be a roll call vote and so the names and comments of the OTF members are reflected in the vote tally.

Standards & Practices

To use the following language for #2 under Authorizer Commitment and Capacity under Authorizer Standards & Practices:

“Demonstrate sufficient staffing and expertise to provide proper oversight (direct or indirect).”

Vote: The majority of OTF members agreed to use this language.

Further Recommendations

To use the following recommendation regarding certification of authorizers:

“Review and certification of all authorizer’s currently overseeing multi-district online schools be completed on or before January 1, 2016.”

Vote: 1 in favor, 9 opposed

To delete the following recommendation regarding recertification of all authorizers:

“Ongoing reviews of all authorizers of multi-district schools occurs every 5 years.”

Vote: 6 in favor, 4 opposes

To decide if existing authorizers must submit (for authorization) within five years using the existing (authorizer standards) documents.

Roll Call Vote:

Yes:

Judy Bauernschmidt

Scott Campbell

Diana Gamboa, with comment: “(it) honors stakeholder assurance (that students) are getting quality schools because is on a timeline”

Ethan Hemming

Renee Martinez

Kim McClelland

Dan Morris

No:

Brian Bissell, with comment: “all or nearly all of stakeholder public comments have noted grandfathering existing authorizer school relationships is important and needs to be heard by CDE and legislature.”

Chaille Hymes

Amy Valentine

Absent:

Linda Van Matre

Dale McCall

Joe Dinnetz

Final Vote: 7 in favor, 3 opposed

Meeting Adjourned

The meeting was adjourned at 2:45 p.m.

DRAFT