

Suggested Changes & Comments for Draft 2 of the Final Report

Executive Summary

Second paragraph:

Suggested Change	OTF Member Comments
	We wouldn't say we reviewed or received a breadth of sources. I would say we received sources.

#2:

Suggested Change	OTF Member Comments
To support those practices and the inclusion of the standards and expectations of the current process.	

#3:

Suggested Change	OTF Member Comments
Can we please clarify that this is the 2017-18 school year and not January 2017.	

#7: Insert the work of the OTF regarding pilot programs

Suggested Change	OTF Member Comments
	I am not comfortable signing off on this until we have had a discussion. I will want to see the final wording before I agree to any part of this being in the report.

#8: Insert the work of the OTF regarding other recommendations

Suggested Change	OTF Member Comments
	I am not comfortable signing off on this until we have had a discussion. I will want to see the final wording before I agree to any part of this being in the report.

Online Task Force

Work of the Task Force

Middle of paragraph 7:

Suggested Change	OTF Member Comments
	Can we clarify more on the presentation that Elizabeth and Heather presented more than this brief comment?

They had significant information to share that was more relevant than other presentations.

End of paragraph: insert a summary of policy scan conducted by NCSL (to be provided by Sunny Deyé)

End of paragraph 7: insert a summary of 2014 accountability data from CDE (to be provided by Marie Huchton)

Recommendations

Authorizer Standards

Recommendation 1:

Middle of 2nd paragraph, regarding the sentence that ends “. . . CDE’s School Performance Framework report)”:

Suggested Change	OTF Member Comments
	Why would this be different than any other school and why do we need to point this out.

Recommendation 1 & Recommendation 2

Definitions and Terms

Administrative Capacity:

Suggested Change	OTF Member Comments
Personnel are assigned and processes defined for oversight of multi-district online school.	

Authorizer:

"Authorizer" means an entity that authorizes an online program. "Authorizer" shall include a school district, any group of two or more school districts, a board of cooperative services created pursuant to §22-5-104 C.R.S., or the state Charter School Institute established pursuant to §22-30.5-503, C.R.S.

Financial Capacity:

Suggested Change	OTF Member Comments
Delete	Not sure how finances for authorization should be a part of this. It is implied in administrative capacity.

Organizational Capacity:

Suggested Change	OTF Member Comments
Delete	I think administrative capacity should be the overarching definition as financial and organizational

are implied under administrative capacity
 This is redundant paperwork and takes away from the education of students, because time is spent on this and not students.

Recommendation 2:

In response to the first paragraph:

Suggested Change	OTF Member Comments
	We need to provide guidelines not systems as there are many ways to make this happen, but each district needs to define if for themselves. This decreases the likelihood of a district being innovative...

Systems & Process Elements

Evaluation:

Authorizer Commitment and Capacity

(1)(a):

Suggested Change	OTF Member Comments
Change (1)(a) to: Assurance that the authorizer has done their due diligence to become knowledgeable about implementing and supporting online learning Delete: (1)(a)(i), and (1)(a)(i)	I think administrative capacity should be the overarching definition as financial and organizational are implied under administrative capacity

(1)(b):

Suggested Change	OTF Member Comments
Change (1)(b) to: Assurances that the authorizer commits to offering quality, sustainable education options for students and commits to holding schools accountable for performance Delete: (1)(b)(i), and (1)(b)(ii)	I think administrative capacity should be the overarching definition as financial and organizational are implied under administrative capacity

(2):

Suggested Change	OTF Member Comments
	This forces the new districts to have to go outside of their school district innovation and almost requires them to have to find EMP.

(2)(b):

Suggested Change	OTF Member Comments
Delete (2)(b)	Financial commitment is already discussed in "3" Why is this just being done for online schools and not all schools? Do we do this in all schools?

(2)(c):

Suggested Change	OTF Member Comments
Remove authorizer staffing (to read: Demonstration of plan for professional development)	This can't always be provided by the authorizer
(3):	
Suggested Change	OTF Member Comments
Change this to Documentation (D)	This is more than an assurance; this is a documented activity if the schools have to report authorizer finances
(3)(a):	
Suggested Change	OTF Member Comments
	We need to note that this will be included in the annual transparency that is reported by all schools.
(4) and (4)(a):	
Suggested Change	OTF Member Comments
Change (4) and (4)(a) to Documentation (D)	
<i>School Application Process and Authorizer Decision Making</i>	
(1):	
Suggested Change	OTF Member Comments
Change (1) to: Define roles and responsibilities for authorizer and applicant	
(1)(a):	This was addressed above. Do we still need this?
Suggested Change	OTF Member Comments
Change (1)(a) to: Provide written explanation of the roles and responsibilities of both authorizer and applicant	
(1)(b):	Who is this? Is this the school or the authorizer applicant?
Suggested Change	OTF Member Comments
	Is this the school or the authorizer? Didn't we address this above?
(2):	
Suggested Change	OTF Member Comments
	Are these different than the state system we already have?
(2)(a)(i):	
Suggested Change	OTF Member Comments
Change (2)(a)(i) to: Including state-mandated and other standardized assessments, student academic growth measures, internal assessments, qualitative reviews, and performance comparisons with other	OTF Member Comment: It is difficult to use a brick/mortar school that is similar to get a comparison.

multi-district online public schools in the state.

(2)(e):

Suggested Change

OTF Member Comments

Delete (2)(e)

This seems like a restatement of “d”

(3):

Suggested Change

OTF Member Comments

Change (3) to: Implement sound decision making criteria and practices that use performance outcomes for application evaluation

Change (3)(a) be changed to Documentation (D)

(3)(a):

Suggested Change

OTF Member Comments

Delete (3)(a), and (3)(b)

This is overstating what can be said in one line

(4), (4)(a), and (4)(b):

Suggested Change

OTF Member Comments

Change (4) to: Define a timeline for local application submission, review and decision making along with ongoing oversight processes

This can be said in one line

Delete (4)(a), and (4)(b)

Ongoing Oversight, Evaluation, and Accountability

(1):

Suggested Change

OTF Member Comments

Change (1) to: Description and evidence of outcomes-based annual review process

Change (1) to: Outcomes-based annual review process that includes, at a minimum:

(1)(b):

Suggested Change

OTF Member Comments

Change (1)(b) to: Description of comprehensive review of performance outcome data to date, inclusive of SPF and UIP, along with any other relevant data. Describe the final results of the annual review and what data was used to determine the review result.

(1)(c):

Suggested Change

OTF Member Comments

Delete (1)(c)

This seems overly rigorous as compared to all other CO public schools. Can't these be combined into “b”?

(2), (2)(a), and (2)(b):

Suggested Change

OTF Member Comments

Change (2) to: Description of compliance monitoring systems and procedures

Combine for brevity

Delete (2)(a), and (2)(b)

(3), and (3)(a):

Suggested Change

OTF Member Comments

Change (3) to: Description of timeline for authorizer review of school(s) (annually, at a minimum), and provision of feedback

Delete (3)(a)

(4)(a):

Suggested Change

OTF Member Comments

Change (4)(a) to: Documentation of educational, organizational, and financial performance records based on (delete all) existing schools (if applicable)

Recommendation 3

In response to the first paragraph:

Suggested Change

OTF Member Comments

Does this mean 2017-18 school year?

In response to the second paragraph:

Suggested Change

OTF Member Comments

This timeline doesn't say when the application becomes available. That is important, because authorizers can't begin preparing to apply until there is an application. Above it indicates that the process begins August, 2016 but that looks like when the applications are due, so the process would actually begin sooner than that. Does this allow enough time for the preparing of the application and for authorizers to apply?

Recommendation 5

Suggested Addition (to end of the first paragraph)

OTF Member Comments

Additionally, ongoing reviews of all authorizers of multi-district online schools shall occur every 5 years, following initial application and approval by CDE, so long as School Performance ratings remain at either "Performance" or "Improvement." The state(CDE) shall reserve the right to modify the frequency of review to a 3 year cycle for any multi-district authorizer of one or more online schools in priority improvement or turnaround status

It appears to me that we have to add (this) language as we have to have a review process for an authorizer to lose certification.

Additional Recommendation

Suggested Addition

OTF Member Comments

That current multi-district online schools should have a pathway to find a new authorizer should their current authorizer be disallowed.

Additional Recommendation

Suggested Addition	OTF Member Comments
That disallowed authorizers should have an appeal process to the State Board of Education	

Pilot Programs

Recommendation 7

Insert the OTF work on parameters, duration, and/or methods for evaluating at the end of the first paragraph.

Other Recommendations

Recommendation 8

Insert the OTF work on other recommendations after the first paragraph.

Suggested Change	OTF Member Comments
	Given the lack of time on these two items, I think a more appropriate statement in the report is that the OTF didn't have sufficient time to address these items.

Conclusion

Insert outcomes of OTF work on pilot programs and other recommendations to the end of paragraph three.

Appendix D

Insert reference list of materials from Sunny Deyé.