

Online Learning Advisory Committee

September 29, 2011

**WELCOME &
REVIEW OF AGENDA**

ALE & 2065 UPDATE

What did ESHB 2065 do?

- Defines ALE in statute.
- Adds new restrictions to spending on ALE programs (in addition to OSPI rule change eliminating reimbursements):
 - Purchases of materials, equipment, supplies;
 - Contracts for services, experiences, activities (“substantially similar”).
- Creates differential funding scheme to accomplish 15% statewide cut to BEA.
- Prohibition against employees receiving recruitment bonuses.
- Requires districts to issue credit for certain online courses.
- Requires single district programs to be OSPI approved by 2013-14.

ALE Rules Timeline and Formal Process

- CR-103E effective September 1
- CR-102 filed to permanently adopt CR-103E language.
- Public hearing was held on Wednesday, August 17, 2011.
- CR-103P filed August 22, 2011, effective September 1, 2011.

RESCINDMENT

Two sides of OSPI's regulatory role

- Approval process
 - Every 4 years
 - Focused on policies, procedures, documentation
 - Based on assurances and criteria
- Monitoring and rescindment
 - Ongoing
 - Focused on provider actions
 - Based on assurances and criteria

Rescindment Process

- Requires evidence a provider isn't meeting one or more of the approval conditions.
- Provider can submit a corrective action plan.
- OSPI either accepts plan, or offers opportunity for provider to clarify and adjust.
- If provider successfully carries out plan, they remain approved.

Actions to Date

- One successful resolution
 - Provider developed and implemented a corrective action plan
- One provider rescinded
 - Productive Learning

Productive Learning

- Approved as a Program Provider
- Contracted with Kittitas School District (K-8) and Castle Rock School District (9-12)
- Concerns:
 - Alleged failure to follow state law/rule re: teacher placement, curriculum, and special education
 - Allegations that they failed to pay teachers, leading to fiscal uncertainty
 - NWAC accreditation in danger
 - Failure to respond to OSPI requests for information

Productive Learning

- Allegations by Kittitas SD in January
- OSPI requested information in February
 - Productive Learning supplied limited information
- Additional allegations by Castle Rock SD in June
- OSPI moved Productive Learning into the rescindment process in June
 - Productive Learning's corrective action plan was not accepted by OSPI, and Productive Learning made no further modifications
- OSPI rescinded Productive Learning's approval on July 26, 2011

FALL 2011 REVIEWS

Applications

- 9 providers submitted applications
- All 9 will be reviewed
 - (No “affiliate provider” applications)
- Each provider will be reviewed by 3 reviewers

Approval Reviewers

- Again, using volunteers
 - Thanks to OLAC for helping with recruitment!
- 17 applicants (+ existing reviewers)
- 12 selected/returning
- 9 committed to the fall cycle
 - 3x3 reviews

Training & Facilitator Changes

- All training was conducted online via newly developed training modules
 - with webinars, assigned activities and support resources
- New facilitator: a veteran reviewer will be standing in for Maile

Fall 2011 Timeline

- April 1 Criteria and forms posted
- Sept 1 Applications due
- September Independent reviews
- October Protocol discussions conducted
- Nov 1 Initial decisions to applicants
- Nov/Dec Appeals
- February 1 Final approval decisions

APPROVAL REVIEWER SOURCING

Challenges

- Even with increased recruitment, we only have 9 reviewers at start of the cycle
 - Attrition often reduces number of available reviewers for appeals
- Conflict of interest rules limit reviewer pool
 - Individuals who currently work with an online K-12 school program, or teach online courses for a company or school district, are not eligible to apply for a reviewer position due to the potential for a perceived conflict of interest.
- Process now requires multiple online meetings so scheduling is an issue

Options

- Continue with volunteer pool
 - Move to a more fluid training calendar
 - Eliminate “selection committee” and use training process to select reviewers
- Explore outsourcing reviews
 - OSPI trains reviewers
 - OSPI oversees the process
 - Contracted reviewers score applications
 - Allows for multiple review cycles per year
- Other ideas and recommendations?

PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE APPROVAL PROCESS

Proposed changes to:

- Criteria
- Who is subject to approval
- Affiliate approval process
- Timeline

Revision Process

- Sources:
 - New requirements from ESHB 2065
 - Criteria feedback from providers, reviewers, and score analysis
 - OSPI staff review
- Process:
 - OSPI drafts proposed changes, rules
 - Feedback from OLAC
 - OSPI incorporates feedback into updated criteria and CR-102 (WAC changes)
 - Public comment and hearing on CR-102
 - Final rules adopted

Criteria Changes

Who is subject to approval? (ESHB 2065)

- “Beginning with the 2013-14 school year, school districts may claim state funding under RCW 8A.150.260, to the extent otherwise allowed by state law, for students enrolled in online courses or programs only if the online courses or programs are offered by an online provider approved under RCW 28A.250.020 by the superintendent of public instruction.” (Section 8)
- “Beginning in the 2013-14 school year, alternative learning experience online programs must be offered by an online provider approved by the superintendent of public instruction under RCW 28A.250.020 to meet the definition in this section.” (Section 3)

“Online Provider”

- “‘Online provider’ means any provider of an online course or program, including multidistrict online providers, all school district online learning programs, and all regional online learning programs.” (2065, section 6)

“Online School Program”

- Any entity that offers online courses in a sequential manner
 - Can a student, if they want, take their entire basic education for the term/year through the program?
- Models:
 - Homegrown
 - Fully outsourced
 - Outsourced curriculum
 - DLD course catalog
 - Consortium

“ALE online program”

- All ALE programs that meet the definition of an “online school program”
- Any ALE program that offers “set of online courses” (even if it isn’t sequential)

Who needs to be approved?

- Prior to 2013-14:
 - Multidistrict online school programs
 - Multidistrict online course providers
 - Multidistrict online program providers
- 2013-14 and beyond:
 - Multidistrict providers (see above)
 - Single-district programs and course providers
 - Regional/consortium providers
 - ALE online programs

Who *doesn't* need to be approved?

- District programs using courses “offered” by another approved provider.
 - The school must not meet the “online school program” definition.
 - An entity “offers” a program/course if it provides all of the following:
 - the course’s teacher for the purpose of instruction,
 - the course content,
 - the online learning management system.
 - Example: a high school that offers individual courses from an OSPI-approved course provider

Affiliate approval process

- Affiliate approval goals:
 - Streamline process and eliminate duplication
 - Ensure same standards of quality
- Current process:
 - An online school program must fully outsource (content, teachers, platform) to an approved provider.
 - Program's approval status tied to approved provider

Proposed affiliate approval

- Allow a program to use *multiple* approved providers.
- The program must assure OSPI that they will not:
 - Modify the content or instruction of the approved provider's offerings,
 - Offer to its students any online course offerings provided by any non-approved online providers.
- If an approved provider is rescinded, program must discontinue use of provider.
- Program can develop courses. Homegrown offerings must go through approval process.

Feedback

Current Timeline

- April 1 Criteria and forms posted
- Sept 1 Applications due
- September Independent reviews
- October Protocol discussions conducted
- Nov 1 Initial decisions to applicants
- Nov/Dec Appeals
- February 1 Final approval decisions

Current Timeline Issues

- Long application period (yet most activity is at the last minute)
- Reviews take place during “back-to-school” season, making reviewer meetings hard to schedule
- Approvals don’t take effect until the following school year – 8-10 months away

Proposed Timeline

- January 1 Criteria and forms posted
- February 1 Applications due
- February Independent reviews
- March Protocol discussions conducted
- April 1 Initial decisions to applicants
- April/June Appeals
- End of June Final approval decisions

Impact of Proposed Timeline

- Shortened application period concentrates provider attention
- Reviewers easier to schedule in early spring
- Shorter time between approval decisions and the effective date
- Creates one additional cycle prior to the 2013-14 deadline for all providers to be approved

Feedback

STUDENT SUPPORT WORKGROUP

WEBSITE UPDATE

- More detail on approved providers
- Results from approved provider survey
- Streamlined school sign-up

Next Meetings

- Thursday, February 9, 2012, 9:30am – noon
- Thursday, May 31, 2012, 9:30am – noon