

OFFICIAL MINUTES

MEETING OF THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO

TRUSTEES OF IDAHO STATE UNIVERSITY

TRUSTEES OF LEWIS-CLARK STATE COLLEGE

TRUSTEES OF BOISE STATE UNIVERSITY

STATE BOARD FOR PROFESSIONAL TECHNICAL EDUCATION

TRUSTEES FOR THE IDAHO SCHOOL FOR THE DEAF AND THE BLIND

August 17, 1999 - Budget Meeting, BSU SUB

August 18, 1999 - Retreat, ISHS Museum

Boise, Idaho

Call To Order

The meeting notice was posted and distributed in compliance with Idaho Open Meeting Law requirements. With a quorum present, the meeting was lawfully convened at 8:00 a.m., on August 17, 1999, with Mr. Jerry Hess, Vice President of the State Board of Education and Board of Regents of the University of Idaho, presiding.

Members Present

Harold W. Davis, President (participated via telephone 8:00-9:00 on August 17)

Jerry Hess, Vice President

Tom Boyd, Secretary

Thomas E. Dillon

Curtis H. Eaton

James C. Hammond

Marilyn Howard, State Superintendent of Public Instruction

Karen A. McGee

Members Absent

Harold W. Davis - August 17 (except as noted above)

All exhibits, appendices and items referenced in these minutes are on file as permanent exhibits with the Office of the State Board of Education.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Call To Order	1
Compensated days	4
Non-compensated days	4
 BOARDWORK	
Agenda Approval	5
Approve Minutes	5
Rolling Calendar	5
Fall Videoconference Meeting	5
 OTHER	
School to Work Grants	9
BSU Facilities Use	9
Lewis-Clark State College	10
FY01 Operating and Capital Budgets	11
Enrollment Workload Adjustment	11
One-Time Requests for Equipment and Technology	11
Office of the State Board of Education	11
HERC Grant	12
Idaho - University of Utah Medical Program	12
Family Practice Residency	13
Scholarships & Grants	13
Idaho Council on Technology in Learning	14
Lewis-Clark State College	14
University of Idaho	14
WWAMI	14
Boise State University	14
North Idaho College	14
NICHE	15
Idaho State University	15
Small Business Development Center	15
College of Southern Idaho	15
State Division of Professional-Technical Education	15
Teacher/Student Request	15

Idaho School for the Deaf and the Blind	16
Idaho State Library	16

Idaho State Historical Society	16
Idaho Public Television	16
Idaho Division of Vocational Rehabilitation	16

Budget Line Items

Lines 1-17	17
Lines 18-19	17
Line 24	17
Lines 28-31	17
Line 32	18
Line 34	18
Lines 35, 38-39	18
Line 40	18
Line 41	19

Major Capital Requests	19
------------------------------	----

Board Retreat - August 18	19
---------------------------------	----

STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Public Schools Budget Request, FY01	20
Request for Waiver of State Board Rules - Weiser SD #431	20
Proposed Rule Change	21
Requests from Districts to Operate Schools	21
Professional School Personnel Certification	21
Superintendent's Report - Idaho's Reading Indicator	23

ADJOURNMENT	25
--------------------------	----

CERTIFICATION	25
----------------------------	----

Compensated days for members of the State Board of Education/Board of Regents of the University of Idaho for the month of July and August, 1999.

<u>Thomas Dillon</u>	<u>Days</u>	<u>Curtis H. Eaton</u>	<u>Days</u>
07/14,16,22,26	2.0	08/16	1.0
08/02,09,12,16,17,18	5.0		
08/24,25,31	2.0		
<u>Jerry Hess</u>	<u>Days</u>	<u>Tom Boyd</u>	<u>Days</u>
08/12,16,17,18,24	4.0	06/29	1.0
		07/01,28	2.0
		08/16,17,18,25	4.0
<u>Harold W. Davis</u>	<u>Days</u>	<u>Karen McGee</u>	<u>Days</u>
08/03	1.0	07/14	.5
		08/06,16,17,18,24/31	5.0
<u>James Hammond</u>	<u>Days</u>		
07/11,12,13,14	4.0		
08/16,17,18	3.0		

Non-compensated days for members of the State Board of Education/Board of Regents of the University of Idaho for the month of July and August, 1999.

<u>Curtis H. Eaton</u>	<u>Days</u>	<u>Marilyn Howard</u>	<u>Days</u>
------------------------	-------------	-----------------------	-------------

08/17,18	2.0	07/14	.5
		08/12,16,17,18,24	4.5
<u>Harold W. Davis</u>	<u>Days</u>		
08/05,17,18	3.0		

BOARDWORK

1. Agenda Approval

It was moved by Mr. Boyd, seconded by Ms. McGee and carried (8-0) to approve the agenda for the August 17, 1999 Budget Hearing. (Motion #1)

2. Approve Minutes

It was moved by Mr. Hammond, seconded by Dr. Dillon and carried (7-0) to approve the minutes of the June 17-18, 1999 meeting. (Motion #4)

Mr. Hess read page 43, PSC Nominations “the What Matters Most Committee would be reviewing the process at some time.” He asked if everyone understood that a recommendation would be coming from the committee to the Board. He asked that it be placed on a future agenda.

3. Rolling Calendar

Mr. Hess advised that Mr. Hammond had difficulty meeting on the first and third Tuesdays and had asked that meetings not be scheduled on those days.

It was moved by Mr. Hammond, seconded and carried (7-0) to approve August 15, 2000 as the date and Boise State University as the location of the June, 2000 budget hearing. (Motion #5)

Mr. Hess said within the motion was the understanding that future meetings would not be scheduled for either the first or third Tuesday of the month.

Mr. Hammond said that the August 15, 2000 meeting, although on Tuesday, would work for

him. Mr. Hess asked that the date be revisited at the September meeting.

4. Fall Videoconference Meeting

It was moved by Mr. Boyd, seconded by Dr. Dillon and carried (7-0) to approve November 10, 1999 as the date for the videoconference meeting. (Motion #6)

Boardwork materials on file as Exhibit #1 with the Office of the State Board of Education.

OTHER

1. School to Work Grants

Supplemental Grant

Ms. Karen Fraley reported that Idaho can apply for \$975,000 in federal funds to assist local partnerships. Three areas identified by Idaho partnerships as critical to sustaining the School to Work (STW) concepts are:

- 1) Models for career awareness in every classroom.
- 2) Models for integrated curriculum.
- 3) Enhancing the opportunities for young people to go out into business in significant roles.

Mr. Craig Neilson addressed the Board in support of the School to Work concept and in support of the supplemental grant proposal. He felt the STW concept would continue with or without the grant, but that having the additional monies would increase the odds for success.

Ms. MsGee was concerned about the grant review process in that the Workforce Development Council (WDC) did not have a chance to review it. She felt the defining features were great, but did not feel competitive grants were fair to all as some partnerships have been in place longer than others. She was also concerned that the grant committee had not sought input from the Workforce Development Council.

Ms. McGee asked why schools are being prepared to collect data for dead legislation and also why there is duplication with the Department of Labor, the Department of Commerce and the Workforce Development Council.

Ms. McGee said the Governor in an April 9 letter to Mr. Davis "I would appreciate a federal fiscal year-end update on the program from the Board in October, 1999. It is incumbent upon everyone connected with School to Work to start looking down the road to October, 2000."

Ms. McGee asked why all of the money could not be sent directly to the local levels without a 10 percent administration fee.

Ms. Fraley said both grants were sent to the Workforce Development Council asking that input be sent directly to the School to Work office. She said there was input from a number of WDC members and that her office tried to reach all members that had not contacted her. She said she gave a presentation to the WDC at its last meeting, asking for questions but none were brought forth. Ms. McGee said a WDC member from the north said the people from there are frustrated and are doing their own thing, and that other members did not understand the grant.

Mr. Davis said he supported School to Work and as he had been concerned about what would happen to the program when federal funding ends, several area partnerships had been invited to the Board to present their plans for their program's continuation. All had agreed that there would not be any need for either federal or state funding past the year 2000. He felt the grant request should be disapproved because the Board has not had any grassroots indication that the money is necessary. Ms. Fraley responded that the presentations did not address the need for additional funds as they did not know there would be additional funds available. She said she agreed with Mr. Neilson in that the programs would be sustainable without the additional funds, but the council feels the funds could be used to target some areas that are still weak in the system.

Mr. Davis felt there could always be justification for additional funds and asked when the program could sustain itself. He felt the federal funding should end as scheduled and that additional money should not be requested. He said he would vote in favor of the continuation grant, but against the supplemental grant.

Ms. Fraley said the grant reading committee, which has been in place for five years, is made up of several WDC members as well as other stakeholders.

Dr. Dillon asked if there was an administrative fee for the continuation grant. Ms. Fraley said there was a 10 percent administrative allowance.

Dr. Dillon asked what strings were attached to the supplemental grant and if the 10 percent administrative fee was added at the federal or state level. Ms. Fraley said it was allowed under both the federal guidelines and the Idaho proposal. He asked if the Board had an option to accept the grant with or without administrative fees. Ms. Fraley said there was that option.

Dr. Dillon asked if there was any way a formula could be developed so the supplemental grant could be distributed statewide. Ms. Fraley said this particular grant asked that areas where something significant in terms of modeling could be done be specifically targeted. Those models would then be shared statewide, but the funds would be made available to areas that were ready to move forward in targeted areas.

Dr. Dillon asked if there were any way the supplemental grant funds could be distributed to the local districts without any federal or state strings attached. Ms. Fraley said there was no way to just pass out any of the money and that the continuation grant also had to be tied to an approved plan developed under federal and state guidelines.

Mr. Hammond felt the supplemental funds, if 100 percent were sent to the local levels, could help them develop a more effective program.

Mr. Hess was concerned that five years into the continuation grant performance measures were still being developed. He felt they should have been in place three or four years ago.

Dr. Howard said five years was a short time for systemic change. She felt School to Work was a part of the standards movement, part of comprehensive school reform and part of creating the business-school connection.

Mr. Eaton said he was in favor of both grants with the understanding that 100 percent of the supplemental grant would go to the districts. He asked for clarification of the School to Work tenets the Board is supporting. He said he would vote in support of the grant with the understanding that the professional-technical academies would have adequate and substantial claims to apply for the funds; otherwise he agreed with Mr. Davis that this is found money that didn't need to be spent. He also felt the Board had an obligation to work with the WDC, the Governor, the Superintendent of Public Instruction and others to devise a plan with recommendations to the state and federal governments as to what it would like to see happen a year from now.

Ms. McGee said she could vote for the supplemental grant provided the Board could sit down with a new review committee from the Workforce Development Council and works with the State Board of Education. Dr. Dillon felt STW dealt with education and should stay with the Board.

It was moved by Mr. Eaton, seconded by Dr. Dillon and carried (6-1) ([Ms. McGee voted Nay; Mr. Davis was absent]) to support both of these as long as the supplemental had 100 percent going to the partnership councils. (Mr. Hess clarified that the motion was only for the supplemental grant.) (Mr. Eaton said his motion also included the provision that the professional-

technical academies have an ample opportunity to make a claim for the funds.) (Motion #2)

Dr. Dillon asked Ms. Fraley to provide a report on where the money is going, how it will be distributed and whether or not the awards are competitive. Mr. Eaton asked that Ms. Fraley give a report on the itemization of the tenets the Board is subscribing to as stated in the grant.

Ms. McGee asked Ms. Fraley to work with Roger Madsen and Dr. Howard on a report to the Workforce Development Council. The Council will be on the 70 Percent Committee's September agenda and will bring the topic to the Committee at that time.

Continuation Grant

Ms. Fraley said there were no changes to the grant.

It was moved by Dr. Dillon, seconded by Dr. Howard and carried (7-0) (Mr. Davis was absent) to approve the FY2000 Idaho School to Work Continuation Implementation Grant Request application. (Motion #3)

Exhibit #2

2. Education Commission of the States

Mr. Hammond, who recently returned from the ECS annual conference, reported his findings to the Board.

Mr. Hammond said his initial opinion of the ECS was that it appears to be a strong and professionally run organization. He also felt it was worthwhile for the Board to continue its membership, but that it needed to take advantage of the resources offered by the Commission.

Exhibit #4

3. BSU Facilities Use

Dr. Charles Ruch reviewed the status and trends affecting the BSU Pavilion. Major problems

facing the facility are loss of revenues due to competition from facilities that allow the sale of beer and wine as well as increased maintenance costs and a lack of funds for renovations.

Dr. Ruch will bring a formal request to the Board asking that selected, ticketed Pavilion events (excluding athletics) be approved by the Executive Director for wine and beer sales.

Dr. Ruch felt there should be discussion regarding expansion of the Pavilion. He felt corporate sponsorship would be a method of funding an expansion, and that there are companies interested in helping.

Mr. Hess asked if he wanted direction from the Board. Dr. Ruch replied that he did and that if strategies such as implementing beer and wine sales, and advertising were not acceptable, they will not spend any additional time on them.

Mr. Eaton said he would like to hear more about the role of BSU and the Pavilion in the community, i.e. is there still a reason to have the facility. He also asked if there were any alternatives to having BSU manage the facility.

Dr. Dillon said he did not have a problem with beer and wine sales as long as they did not occur at University events. However, he needed additional justification in order to approve any expansions to the facility.

Dr. Howard agreed with Mr. Eaton and felt there were two facilities within the structure, i.e. a Pavilion that offers University events and a Pavilion that offers community events..

Mr. Boyd was concerned that there could be an advantage to BSU over the private facilities in the area which could cause conflict. He was also concerned that an expansion of the facility would create problems.

Ms. McGee felt that as long as the playing field is kept level, communities enjoy using campus facilities.

Mr. Hammond said he would be interested in hearing more.

Mr. Hess said his concern was the possible elements that come with the sale of beer and wine, which could increase the cost and fallout of that type of activity. He said he also questioned the wisdom of seeking corporate sponsorships to develop a facility to compete with one that is in the same city. He asked that a proposal include maintenance costs.

Exhibit #5

5. Lewis-Clark State College

5.51 - Acquisition of Property

The Campus Master Plan indicates a long-range need for the college to acquire additional property near campus for parking. The subject property is immediately adjacent to the campus. LCSC requested permission to complete the loan agreement, using the First Security Loan Agreement approved by the SBOE January, 1999 for the purchase of the property. The loan amount will not exceed \$99,000.

It was moved by Mr. Hammond, seconded by Ms. McGee and carried (6-0) to approve the purchase as presented. (Motion #17) (Mr. Eaton abstained from discussion and voting.)

6. FY01 Operating and Capital Budgets

Mr. Keith Hasselquist provided an overview of the process, programs and specific request areas. The budgets will be submitted to the Division of Financial Management and the Legislative Service Office by September 1.

Mr. Hess felt the Board should be advised that with regard to Exiting Standards testing, there may be a need to come back in September with a supplemental request.

Mr. Eaton suggested the Board advise the legislature of a percentage of the General Fund it felt should be used for education and then use those figures to align policy goals for public and higher education.

Enrollment Workload Adjustment

Dr. Dillon felt there needed to be additional discussion regarding Workload Adjustments before the budget is submitted. Mr. Hess said the Finance Review Committee had looked at it and made recommendations. He said changing the Workload Adjustment would have fiscal implications and that if time permitted, there could be a discussion later in the meeting. Mr. Hasselquist suggested it be

brought back to the September meeting and that they could deal both with the weights and emphasis.

One-Time Requests for Equipment and Technology

Mr. Hess said the probability was low that the requests would be funded, but if the requests were not submitted, the funding would be zero.

It was moved by Mr. Hammond, seconded by Mr. Boyd and carried (7-0) to approve the one-time requests in the amount \$5.15M. (Motion #18)

Office of the State Board of Education

Mr. Eaton felt and Mr. Hess agreed that there needed to be a research/white paper position in the OSBE. He suggested the Personnel/Student Affairs Officer and the Grants and Contracts Officer job descriptions also include provisions that those individuals will also do research and write policy papers on issues coming to the Board. Dr. Fitch felt the Grants & Contracts Officer job description could be expanded to include Mr. Eaton's suggestion so that person could do the research associated with plans and policy.

Mr. Eaton said he was not convinced there needed to be a Student Affairs Officer as students have many ways of accessing the Board. He was concerned that it could put the Board in a position of making decisions contrary to what may have already been decided on campus. Dr. Fitch said the position was not to specifically allow students to come to the Board, but to provide student support.

Dr. Dillon questioned the large difference in the amounts of money to be paid to the individuals. He also asked if a priority for either position was built into the request. Dr. Fitch said the salary levels are set based on Hayes points and salary competitiveness. He said a specific priority had not been included in the breakdown, but he leaned towards filling the personnel position first. Mr. Boyd cautioned about putting a roadmap in front of the JFAC.

Dr. Dillon asked that it be understood that there be some internal prioritizing of the position requests.

It was moved by Dr. Dillon, seconded by Ms. McGee and carried (7-0) to approve the budget for the Office of the State Board of Education for FY01. (Motion #19)

HERC Grant

It was moved by Dr. Dillon, seconded by Mr. Eaton and carried to approve the HERC

grant request in the amount of \$500,000. (Motion #20)

Idaho - University of Utah Medical Program

Dr. Sam Shoemaker of the University of Utah Medical School (UUMS) addressed the Board regarding Idaho students in their medical program. He said the UUMS is asking the Board to consider the following items in the renegotiating of the contract:

- 1) Removal of the \$3,000 surcharge currently paid by Idaho residents attending the UUMS.
- 2) Increase in the support fee paid to the UUMS from \$22,800 to \$26,300.
- 3) Include a built in cost-of-living adjustment.
- 4) Include additional physicians on the UUMS admissions committee to assist in the selection of Idaho students.

Dr. Dillon felt there should be additional negotiations to get the best possible deal for Idaho. Dr. Robin Dodson said he felt the terms outlined were the best that could be negotiated and that the question remaining was whether to phase them in over time or begin immediate implementation for all students.

It was moved by Mr. Eaton, seconded by Mr. Hammond and carried (7-0) to ask the Academic Officer to negotiate a reasonable increase in fees with the University of Utah. (Motion #21)

Family Practice Residency

Mr. Hasselquist said there were fewer funds flowing to the hospitals to support the program which was why the requested increase for the ISU program is in excess of the guideline.

Dr. Dodson said there were distinct differences in the programs in that the Family Practice Residency of Idaho program (Boise Family Practice Residency) is community-based whereas the ISU program is university-based.

Dr. Peter Kozisek, Interim Director of Boise Family Practice Residency said their funding request was driven by:

- 1) Salaries and benefits lower than the national average.
- 2) The ramifications of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 which mandates sequential five percent decreases over four years in the pass-through federal funding which goes to hospitals.

Dr. Dillon asked if it would be valid to split the funds based on the number of residents in each program or were the programs so different that it would not be equitable. Dr. Kozisek said there are differences between programs.

It was moved by Dr. Dillon and seconded by Mr. Hammond to accept the total from both programs and distribute the money proportionally, based on the number of residents in the respective programs. **The motion failed (7-0).** (Motion #22)

Mr. Hammond suggested representatives of the two programs get together and come back with more workable amounts. Mr. Hess agreed and asked that they bring the requests back at the end of the meeting.

Later in the day Dr. Robin Dodson addressed the Board regarding the negotiations with ISU and Boise Family Practice Residency. He said the institutions opted to stay with their original requests.

It was moved by Dr. Dillon, seconded by Ms. McGee and carried (6-0) to accept the recommendation of the residency programs as submitted. (Motion #24)

Scholarships & Grants

It was moved by Mr. Boyd, seconded by Dr. Dillon and carried (7-0) to approve the request. (Motion #23)

Idaho Council on Technology in Learning

Mr. Hasselquist said the ICTL has not met to formally present the Board with a request. After they have met, a request will be brought forth. Action was deferred.

Lewis-Clark State College

Dr. James Hottois reviewed LCSC's requests.

University of Idaho

Dr. Robert Hoover reviewed the UI requests.

WWAMI

Dr. Dillon asked for clarification of the \$30,000 amount for the WRITE program. He was

advised that this program would bring 3rd and 4th year medical students back to Idaho, which would result in an increase in the number of Idaho students staying in Idaho to practice.

Dr. Dillon asked for information on the Infra-Idaho Ambassador Program. He was advised that the program (modeled after an Eastern Washington program) is a voluntary program designed to put students interested in health careers in contact with a mentor from the community.

Dr. Dillon felt the Board should support the WWAMI requests except for the Medical School Seat request as he felt the money would be better spent on the residency programs.

Boise State University

Dr. Charles Ruch reviewed BSU's requests.

North Idaho College

Dr. Michael Burke reviewed NIC's requests.

NICHE

Mr. Hess asked that when the reports on the Northern Idaho Center for Higher Education (NICHE) are given to the Board, the amounts and purposes from each institution be detailed.

Mr. Eaton asked for clarification of the item listed as Software Development. Dr. Burke replied that they are anticipating the need to develop software that will bridge between inter-institutional systems. Mr. Eaton felt it was a good idea, but felt the institutions needed to know where they are going and what they expect to obtain and then decide how much money to spend.

Dr. Burke said the software writing company would be writing programs for the NICHE and then using it for other applications, which would keep the costs down for the NICHE. Mr. Eaton felt there should be an itemization of costs so people could be held accountable.

Mr. Hess felt it made sense for the institutions' computer to be able to talk to one another and felt the Board's Learning Technology Officer should make sure that software programs being used are compatible.

Idaho State University

Dr. Jonathan Lawson reviewed ISU's requests.

Small Business Development Center

Mr. Jim Hoage reviewed the SBDC's requests.

College of Southern Idaho

Mr. Jerry Meyerhoeffler reviewed the CSI's requests.

State Division of Professional-Technical Education

Dr. Mike Rush reviewed the SDPTE's requests.

Teacher/Student Request

Mr. Hasselquist said this request came from the 70 Percent Committee and was included in the Special Programs Category.

Mr. Hector DeLeon reviewed the program request. Mr. Hess felt if there were defined outcomes, i.e. specific actions and performance indicators, the chance of getting funding approval would be increased.

Mr. Eaton felt it would be helpful to come up with a single definition of “dropout.” He also felt there needed to be language clarifying how/if the program fits in with the Reading Initiative.

Dr. Howard asked the Board to note the effort the Department has taken to identify Limited English Proficiency (LEP) students. She updated the Board on steps the SDOE is taking to identify and address the problems of LEP and minority students.

Idaho School for the Deaf and the Blind

Mr. Ron Darcy reviewed the ISDB’s requests.

Idaho State Library

Dr. Charles Bolles reviewed the ISL’s requests.

Idaho State Historical Society

Mr. Steve Guerber reviewed the ISHS’s requests. He was asked to bring additional information to the Board in September.

Idaho Public Television

Mr. Peter Morrill reviewed IPTV’s requests.

Idaho Division of Vocational Rehabilitation

Mr. Pat Young reviewed IDVR’s requests.

Mr. Hasselquist said the MCO budget requests were for a 7.2 percent increase and the total budget requests were for 14.4 percent, which includes one-time requests and what is anticipated will be requested for the ICTL. Taking out the one-time requests reduces the amount to 11.9 percent.

Mr. Hess said the Board had set the increase percent at a maximum of 4 percent for the enhancement requests. He said if that figure was not going to be adhered to, the Board needed to redefine how it sets the budgets. He also felt that if the budgets were approved, Board members

needed to contact legislators in support of them.

It was moved by Mr. Eaton and seconded by Mr. Boyd to approve the budgets submitted as shown on page 3.2, with the exception of health programs which are contained in lines 20-26 and with the exception of the Historical Society, which is shown on line 40. **The motion was amended** that Teacher/Student Success, line 34, would be an exception to the approval. **The amended motion was withdrawn.** (Motion #25)

Lines 1-17

It was moved by Dr. Dillon, seconded by Mr. Boyd and carried (6-0) to approve the budget as presented on page 3.2, lines 1-17. (Motion #26)

Lines 18-19

It was moved by Mr. Eaton, seconded by Ms. McGee and carried (6-0) to approve the budget requests as shown on page 3.2, lines 18 and 19. (Motion #27)

Line 24

It was moved by Dr. Dillon and seconded by Mr. Boyd to approve those health program, with the exception that we are not endorsing the increase in the number of seats at the WWAMI program for Utah. **The motion was amended by Mr. Eaton and Dr. Howard** under line 24, page 3.2, referring to WICHE that the dollar amount and percentage be the maximum amount and that the Board had authorized the Academic Affairs Officer to negotiate a lesser amount to the extent possible. **Both the motion and the amendment carried (5-1).** (Motion #28)

Mr. Hess asked Dr. Dillon for clarification of Motion #28. Dr. Dillon said he felt the amounts for the residence programs and the family practice residence programs, even though they exceed the budget, could be defended. However, he did not think there needed to be an increase in medical school seats.

Ms. McGee felt there needed to be an increase in the number of seats because limiting them also limited Idaho residents access to medical school. Dr. Dillon said he understood, but felt there were better places to spend the money. He also felt there needed to be a additional discussion of the topic.

Lines 28-31

It was moved by Mr. Eaton, seconded by Ms. McGee and carried to approve the items shown on lines 28-31, page 3.2. (Motion #29)

Line 32

It was moved by Mr. Eaton to approve line 32, page 3.2. **No second. The motion died.** (Motion #30)

It was moved by Mr. Eaton, seconded by Ms. McGee and carried (6-0) to defer the budget request for the Small Business Center to September. (Motion #31)

Line 34

Mr. Hess felt the Board needed to work aggressively and definitively to address the problem of the dropout rate of Limited English Proficiency students. But he felt this program was poorly put together and could not be defended at the presentation nor could it be defended in the area of accountability..

Dr. Dillon agreed and felt it was a part of the assessment piece of the Reading Initiative. He asked if Dr. Howard could come back with a plan so that it can be endorsed and incorporated into another program.

Mr. Eaton felt the request could be approved with a recommendation that the people who brought it forward, including the 70 Percent Committee and others, work closely with the Superintendent to see how it might be incorporated into appropriate funding under the Reading Initiative. Dr. Howard felt it should also be coordinated through the What Matters Most Committee.

It was moved by Mr. Eaton, seconded by Dr. Howard and carried (6-0) to approve the request on the condition that the proponents coordinate the program's legislative presentation through the Superintendent's Reading Initiative. (Motion #32)

Lines 35, 38-39

It was moved by Dr. Dillon, seconded by Mr. Eaton and carried (6-0) to accept lines 35, 38 and 39. (Motion #33)

Line 40

It was moved by Dr. Dillon, seconded and carried (6-0) to accept in principle line 40 with the understanding that we will, in one month, develop a phase-in plan to enhance the probability of funding. (Motion #34)

Line 41

It was moved by Mr. Eaton, seconded by Dr. Dillon and carried (6-0) to approve line item #41. (Motion #35)

Major Capital Requests

It was moved by Mr. Eaton, seconded by Dr. Dillon and carried (6-0) to approve capital budget requests on page 3.6 in the following order: (Motion #36)

1. ISHS Library/Archives/Administration - Phase II, in the amount of \$500,000
2. LCSC Campus
3. CSI Fine Arts Addition
4. UI Teaching and Learning Center
5. BSU Canyon County Campus Infrastructure
6. EITC Creek Building Library Improvement
7. ISHS Museum Addition

Mr. Eaton felt the Board President and anyone who could join him should go to the Public Works meetings and advocate for the Board's requests. Mr. Hasselquist said he would talk to Larry Osgood and ask that an invitation be extended.

Exhibit #6

6. Board Retreat - August 18

The following topics were discussed:

- 1) Deputy Attorney General Relationship/Role/Compensation
- 2) Statewide Strategic Plan
- 3) BSU Computer Problems
- 4) Alcohol Policy
- 5) Education Policy Setting

- 6) Violence Update
- 7) Fees, Scholarships
- 8) JFAC Presentation
- 9) Funding

Exhibit #7

Exhibit Materials on file with the Office of the State Board of Education.

STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

A. Public Schools Budget Request, FY01

Dr. Howard reported that the Public Schools Coalition met three times for budget discussion and to offer its recommendations to her.

Dr. Robert West reviewed items in the budget and responded to Board member's questions.

Mr. Hess felt the coalition would benefit by having people other than those in education, i.e. business people, as members.

Mr. Eaton asked for definition of Reading Improvement and asked how it dovetailed into the new reading program. Dr. West said it was a continuation of the same money that has been in the budget for several years which allows the continuation of reading improvement in areas other than primary grades.

Mr. Eaton asked if it had been determined whether or not the mentor program was effective. Dr. Howard replied that a survey was conducted that indicated it is an effective program. She said the survey identified areas in which mentoring is most helpful and areas where it is less effective.

Mr. Hess said What Matters Most research indicates the mentoring portion of the teacher skill set increases is a big part of the process and one of the components that increases student learning is the ability to assess and evaluate during the day those student skill sets and growth. He felt the mentor program budget would probably increase and asked Dr. Howard to establish some type of accounting system to justify it.

Mr. Hess reminded the Board that by voting for the budget, it was officially going on record as supporting and lobbying for it to the legislature.

It was moved by Dr. Dillon, seconded by Mr. Hammond and carried (7-0) to approve the request by the Superintendent of Public Instruction, Marilyn Howard, for the Public Schools Budget Request for FY01 as submitted. (Motion #7)

B. Request for Waiver of State Board Rules - Weiser SD #431

Weiser SD #431 requested a waiver to the rules because of the lack of personnel and facilities available in the district to conduct the classes.

It was moved by Dr. Dillon, seconded by Ms. McGee and carried (7-0) to approve the request for a one-year waiver for Weiser SD #431 from the rule that Physical Education, Health, and Family and Consumer Science be offered in the eighth grade. (Motion #8)

C. Proposed Rule Change

The Idaho legislature enacted HB 310A changing the date for reallocating unused charter school allotments from October 1 to June 1 of each year. The proposed rule change implements the new legislation and makes the rule consistent with the statute.

It was moved by Dr. Howard, seconded by Mr. Boyd and carried (7-0) to approve the request to amend IDAPA 08.02.04.012. (Motion #9)

D. Requests from Districts to Operate Schools

It was moved by Dr. Howard, seconded by Mr. Hammond and carried (7-0) to approve the request by Prairie Elementary School SD #191 to operate Prairie Elementary-Junior High School with fewer than ten pupils in average daily attendance during the 1999-2000 school year as requested. (Motion #10)

E. Professional School Personnel Certification

In June the Board approved a temporary rule for the certification manual for Certification Standards.

Upon approval by the Board as a Proposed Rule, a public hearing will be held prior to the Board's consideration for a final rule in September. Upon final approval, the proposed rules will be included in the Administrative Bulletin in time for final consideration by the 2000 Legislature. Approval by the legislature will authorize the changes to be included in the Certification Manual.

Mr. Larry Norton reviewed the recommendations and responded to Board member's questions.

Mr. Hess asked if during the public hearings there had been any dissenting comments. Ms. Trudy Bishop, Chair-Professional Standards Commission, said six hearing had been held around the state and that written comments were also accepted. All comments received were favorable.

- 1) School Nurse, Family Consumer Science and Early Childhood/Early Childhood Special Education

It was moved by Dr. Howard, seconded by Dr. Dillon and carried (7-0) to approve the proposal regarding School Nurse, Family Consumer Science and Early Childhood/Early Childhood Special Education as a proposed rule, subject to the outcome of the Administrative Procedure Act process. (Motion #11)

2) Principal, Superintendent and Director of Special Education and Related Services

Dr. Dillon said he would vote against the motion because he felt the internship requirement for superintendents imposed state rules on a local decision.

It was moved by Mr. Hammond to change the wording on Page E-12, A-3 of the exhibit to read “have completed administrative internship for the superintendence or have one year of experience as an assistant superintendent or superintendent in grades Pre-K-12, while holding that state’s administrative certificate. **No second.** (No motion #)

It was moved by Dr. Howard and seconded by Mr. Hammond to approve the changes regarding Administrator Certification requirements for Principal, Superintendent, and Director of Special Education and Related Services as a proposed rule, subject to the outcome of the Administrative Procedure Act process. **A roll call vote was taken:**

AYES: Mr. Eaton, Dr. Howard, Mr. Hess, Mr. Hammond
NAYS: Dr. Dillon, Mr. Boyd, Ms. McGee
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: Mr. Davis

The motion passed (4-3). (Motion #12)

3) Standards for National Board Certification

At the January 21-22, 1999 meeting of the Professional Standards Commission, a motion was made, seconded and carried to:

“grant an Idaho teacher achieving National Board certification an Idaho Teaching Certificate for the length of time the National Board Certificate is in force.”

Mr. Hess felt the action was premature as he has not seen data documenting whether or not National Board Certified teachers are superior, but that what the motion does is grant extended tenure to those individuals.

Concerns were expressed about the proposed elimination of the five-year recertification process for teachers who were National Board Certified.

Dr. West said the Department also had concerns and did not support approval of the motion.

Dr. Howard said she as well as the Department supported National Board Certification and that their objection was not against certification, but that as it is not available to everyone, she was recommending disapproval.

It was moved by Dr. Howard, seconded by Dr. Dillon and carried (7-0) to disapprove the proposal regarding National Board Certification as a proposed rule. (Motion #13)

F. Superintendent's Report - Idaho's Reading Indicator

The SDOE is in the process of training test coordinators and school personnel in preparation for testing in the schools. The first year of testing is intended to be a pilot year to collect data and inform students, teachers and parents about student reading performance. Schools will use the data as they develop their intervention plans. Legislation calls for the SBOE to specify the tests to be administered.

Dr. Howard gave a presentation on the history of reading legislation in Idaho and updated the Board on its status.

It was moved by Dr. Howard, seconded by Mr. Hammond and carried (7-0) to temporarily approve the Idaho Reading Indicator for administration in grades K-3 to meet the requirements of Idaho Code 33-1614. (Motion #14)

It was moved by Dr. Howard, seconded by Ms. McGee and carried (7-0) that within 45 days that we ask for a convening of people from the former Reading Committee and others who are interested to review the progress to date, chart future progress and make adjustments as necessary to review the aspects of the bill and to help determine our future direction. (Motion #15)

Dr. Dillon felt what is occurring is a watershed on where the State Board is in the standards movement, and that this segment of reading has to fit in with the standards. However, he felt there needed to be consequences and accountability in the legislation. He thought the Board should have a discussion at the next presentation on how it fits in to reading standards, what are the consequences and how it will work.

Mr. Eaton asked Dr. Howard to address the intervention portion of the legislation. Dr.

Howard replied that the districts will determine their intervention plans which will include effectiveness measurements and timelines, and that the SDOE will provide provide assistance.

It was moved by Dr. Dillon, seconded by Mr. Hammond and carried that with the report that has been approved (to be given within 45 days) that there be a presentation from the Department and the Exiting Standards Subcommittee that will address the reporting sequence and those things necessary to establish accountability. (Motion #16)

Agenda and materials on file as Exhibit #3 with the Office of the State Board of Education.

ADJOURNMENT: 6:15 p.m. (August 17)
2:45 p.m. (August 18)

CERTIFICATION:

These minutes are not verbatim. However, they are, to the best of my knowledge, a complete and

accurate record of the proceedings of the meeting.

Recording Secretary: Vicki E. Barker