

MINUTES
TECHNOLOGY TASK FORCE
Online Learning Implementation Subcommittee

DATE: November 7, 2011
TIME: 1:15 PM
PLACE: EW 42

MEMBERS: Vice-Chair Aaron McKinnon, Spencer Barzee, Cliff Green, Alan Dunn, Michael Fornander, Mike Caldwell, Brad Patzer, Penni Cyr, John Goedde

The Committee was called to order by Vice-Chair Aaron McKinnon at 1:40 p.m.

Jason Hancock, State Department of Education (SDE), discussed the draft RFI questions that had been compiled after discussion between the SDE and the Division of Purchasing after last month's meetings. Any feedback or suggestions from the Committee can be used to update the RFI, with the RFI being sent out by Friday, November 11, 2011.

The seven categories in the RFI are: Learning Management System, Registration, Content Quality, Assessment and Student Data, Instructors, Technical Support and Pricing/Billing.

Regarding a question over "punch out" listed under registration, Cliff Green explained that using the portal would allow students/parents to view classes. They could then click on link that would take them to a separate registration page.

A question was asked about how districts would receive registration data. Mr. Hancock explained that the SDE's goal was to have a system in place that would ensure districts to receive registration information in a timely manner so it can be reviewed and approved before the registration would be considered "final."

Questions were asked about the motivation for companies to submit a RFI. There is none, and an RFI is not mandatory for companies to be eligible to submit a RFP, its sole purpose is for the SDE to gain more information.

The Committee suggestions for the RFI are:

1. Add a question regarding how the company would ensure that registration data would be sent to the district.
2. Add a question to ask how companies will interact with districts to ensure districts receive student data and are able to upload the data to I.S.E.E.
3. Add a question allowing companies to describe their system for registration (a general question would allow companies to ask questions in return which could drive how the portal is designed.)
4. In question 2.1, replace "punch out" with "link to" or a less colloquial term.
5. On question 3.2, strike out, "the different instructional delivery methods offered by your LMS, as well as."
6. Replace question 3.5 with a question about accreditation.
7. Add a question regarding how a provider will ensure that content is aligned to Common Core and scope/sequence of Idaho standards (reword 3.3 to avoid repetition and confusion.)
8. Include a question regarding costs and communication – difference for asynchronous vs. synchronous?

9. Include in question 3.9 how students interact with each other, the content and the instructor. How will the company report student progress and benchmarks to parents/district?
10. Replace 3.10 with, "Can your institution offer dual credit opportunities, and if so, with which universities?"
11. Create a section entitled Communication/Engagement – keep separate then technical support.
12. On question 4.1, change "testing" to "assessment" and add "formative and summative."
13. In section 4, add 4.3, "How is assessment data used to inform retention strategies and inform practice?"
14. In section 5, rephrase intro sentence to state, "Idaho is only interested in highly qualified instructors who meet Idaho online standards." Add a question that asks how companies ensure that instructors are Idaho certified and provide a link to Idaho standards.
15. In section 5, ask a question regarding how instructors are monitored/evaluated and separate 5.1 into two separate questions.
16. Change Instructors category to "Instruction," which would include questions under course structure and questions regarding instructional behaviors.
17. Under Technical Support, find out what tier of support they provide and who they provide the support to (students, district IT personnel, etc)
18. Under Pricing/Billing – add the following: "describe your expectations in terms of payments and billing and are those expectations negotiable?"

Mr. Hancock will revise the RFI and send out to the Committee. The final RFI will be sent to the Division of Purchasing and sent to the public by the end of this week. By December's meeting there should be some responses back to share with the Committee.

The Committee revisited the discussion from last month regarding dual credit courses and overload courses.

Sen. Goedde told the Committee about a charter school in North Idaho that is a college preparatory school where standards are higher than the local community college. The principal of this school is concerned that credits for online classes must be given even if the online courses have lower standards. The district can choose which two courses are to be taken online but cannot restrict students from taking additional online courses than the two required to graduate.

When asked if any new legislative changes were expected regarding online courses, Mr. Hancock replied that there may be some resolutions by ISBA and there may be legislation to "iron out" some minor details regarding online course definition and to correct technical errors.

There being no further business to come before the Committee, the meeting was adjourned at 3:15 p.m.