

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH & STUDENT AFFAIRS
JUNE 17-18, 2004**

TAB	DESCRIPTION	ACTION	PAGE
1	APPROVAL OF 8-YEAR INSTITUTIONAL REGIONAL PLANS AND UNIQUE STATEWIDE MISSIONS	Motion to Approve	1
2	PROGRAM APPROVALS <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Full Proposal – Master of Science in Mathematics, BSU• Notice of Intent – Technical Certificate, Massage Therapy Program, ISU• Notice of Intent—B.S., Nuclear Engineering• Notice of Intent – Technical Certificate, Landscape Technology Program, NIC	Motion to Approve	71
3	APPROVAL OF RESEARCH CENTER GRANT PROGRAM RECIPIENT	Motion to Approve	81
4	APPROVAL OF RULES ACCOUNTABILITY—ELP Standards	Motion to Approve	99
5	APPROVAL OF RULES FOR ACCOUNTABILITY—Failure to Meet Adequate Yearly Progress	Motion to Approve	175
6	APPROVAL OF DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERAL GRANTS	Motion to Approve	181
7	TITLE I REVIEW	Information Item	185
8	APPROVAL OF THE PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS COMMISSION (PSC) TO SERVE AS THE ADVISORY BOARD TO THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION AS A REQUIREMENT OF THE NATIONAL COMMISSION ON TEACHING STANDARDS (NCTAF)	Motion to Approve	189

THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK

INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH & STUDENT AFFAIRS
JUNE 17-18, 2004

SUBJECT

Approval of 8-Year Institutional Regional Plans and Unique Statewide Missions

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

Board Policy Section III.Z. Delivery of Postsecondary Education—Coordination and Planning of Academic Programs

BACKGROUND

At its August 14-15, 2003 meeting, the Board approved Board Policy Section III.Z. Delivery of Postsecondary Education—Coordination and Planning of Academic Programs. The policy includes a requirement for the creation of 8-year plan for the development of academic programs at the state's post-secondary institutions. The Policy directs that the plan will be updated every two years. Only those parts that require amendment or updating (such as the 8-year outline of proposed programs) will be presented in subsequent plan reviews. All parts that are unchanged in the plan will remain in effect until or unless amended by Board action.

DISCUSSION

For the past six months CAAP has conducted a process to create the 8-year plan. The plans consist of three regional plans: north, southeast and southwest. The lead institution in each region has assumed the responsibility to lead the creation of the regional plan.

The plan includes: background and board authority, assigned missions (regional and unique-statewide) for the universities, an inventory of existing programs at each institution, proposed programs for development over the ensuing 8 years and examples of developing collaborations between the post-secondary institutions.

Certain assumptions were used in the creation of the plan:

- (1) existing programs are assumed to be meeting an existing need and so no needs assessments are required for existing programs,
- (2) new programs will require, as part of the Program approval process detailed in Board Policy Section III.G. Instructional Program Approval and Discontinuance, a needs assessment to demonstrate demand for the program, and
- (3) approval of the this 8-year plan does not indicate final approval of individual programs. Institutions will be required to comply with Board Policy Section III.G. to implement the programs included in this plan.

IMPACT

This plan provides a clear picture of institutional plans to develop academic programs over the next 8 years. The Board may use this outline as a guide in the development of strategic issues such as budgets and capital plans.

INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH & STUDENT AFFAIRS
JUNE 17-18, 2004

The assignment of unique/statewide missions will also provide focus points for each institution as they continue to establish their unique presence in the state.

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Board approve the plan as written. This approval will include the assignment of unique-statewide missions and the programs outlined in the 8-year planning window.

BOARD ACTION

A motion to approve the assigned unique/statewide missions and the listing of academic programs that the postsecondary institutions plan to present for approval of the Board over the ensuing eight years.

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes _____ No _____

Idaho State Board of Education
GOVERNING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES
SECTION: III. POSTSECONDARY AFFAIRS
Subsection Z. Delivery of Postsecondary Education August 2003

4. Academic Planning Process

a. General Provisions

- (1) Each institution will create and maintain an eight (8) year rolling, academic plan that describes the programs, courses and services to be offered by the institution and by other public, postsecondary institutions governed by the Board to respond to the educational and workforce needs of the state, or a service region, as appropriate (with respect to each institution, the "Plan"). Plans should be developed pursuant to a process of collaboration and communication with and among the other institutions within the state.
- (2) Plans will be submitted to the Office of the Idaho State Board of Education ("OSBE") for review and approval by the Idaho State Board of Education (the "Board") in accordance with a schedule to be developed by the Chief Academic Officer of the Board (the "CAO"). Plans will be submitted first to the Council for Academic Affairs and Programs ("CAAP") at least sixty (60) days prior to submission to OSBE for review, discussion and coordination among CAAP members. Upon submission of the Plans to OSBE, the CAO will review the Plans for the purpose of optimizing through collaboration and coordination among the institutions the cost-effective delivery of quality programs and courses, access to such programs and courses, the avoidance of duplication of programs and courses and the efficient use of resources. The CAO will provide recommendations to the Board for enhancements, if any, to the Plans, no later than thirty (30) days prior to approval by the Board. The Plans will be used to advise and inform the Board in its work to plan and coordinate educational programs throughout the state. Each institution will be responsible for updating its Plan as follows:
 - (a) Plans pertaining to the delivery of programs and courses for baccalaureate degrees and postgraduate degrees will be updated and submitted to CAAP and OSBE every two (2) years in accordance with a schedule to be developed by the CAO and in accordance with the timelines set forth above.
 - (b) Plans pertaining to the delivery of programs and courses for associate level degrees or professional-technical degrees or certificates may be updated and submitted to CAAP and OSBE on an as needed basis in accordance with a schedule to be developed by the CAO. Plans for these programs and courses will be approved by the CAO.

INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH & STUDENT AFFAIRS
JUNE 17-18, 2004

- (3) The CAO will develop an academic plan form to be used by institutions as a guide for providing the information requested herein.

b. Statewide Mission Planning Process

(1) Statewide Mission Plan

Each institution assigned a statewide mission will create and maintain a Plan that describes the programs and services to be offered to respond to the workforce and educational needs of the state relating to the institution's statewide mission. Each plan will include at least the following:

- (a) A needs assessment that identifies the ongoing and future workforce and educational needs of the state relating to the institution's statewide mission.
- (b) A description of the statewide mission programs and courses to be delivered throughout the state by the mission owning institution and the resources to be employed.
- (c) A description of the statewide mission programs and courses offered, or to be offered, by institutions not assigned the statewide mission.
- (d) A summary of the terms of memorandums of understanding ("MOU"s), if any, entered into between the statewide mission owning institution and partnering institutions pursuant to Section 4 below. If it is anticipated that the program or course will be offered within three (3) years of approval of the Plan, the description will include a summary of the anticipated costs of delivery and the resources and support required for delivery of the programs and courses, including facility needs and costs.

(2) Statewide Mission Program or Course in a Service Region

If a statewide mission owning institution identifies a need for the delivery of a statewide mission program or course within a service region, and that program or course is not identified, or anticipated to be identified, by the designated institution in its Plan, the statewide mission owning institution will communicate with the designated institution (in accordance with a schedule to be determined by the CAO) for the purpose of including the same in the designated institution's Plan. It is intended that statewide mission programs or courses be included in the designated institution's Plan, as updated, and that the statewide mission owning institution and the designated institution collaborate and coordinate during the planning process. To facilitate this process, the statewide mission owning institution will deliver to the Chief Academic Officer of the designated institution and OSBE a description of the program or course intended to be delivered, including a plan for the delivery of the program or course, a timeline for delivery

INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH & STUDENT AFFAIRS
JUNE 17-18, 2004

of the program or course, the anticipated costs of delivery and the resources and support required for delivery, including facilities needs and costs.

(3) MOU with Designated Institution

If an institution having a statewide mission program or course has submitted the information set forth in Subsection 2 above to a designated institution and OSBE in a timely manner (in accordance with a schedule determined by the CAO) for inclusion in the designated institution's Plan, then the designated institution will identify the program or course in its Plan and enter into an MOU with the statewide mission owning institution for the delivery of such program or course in accordance with this policy. If, prior to the submission of an updated Plan by the designated institution, it is determined by the Board that an emergency need has arisen for such program or course in the service region, then upon Board approval the statewide mission owning institution and the designated institution will enter into an MOU for the delivery of such program or course in accordance with the provisions of this policy.

c. Regional Planning Process

(1) Designated Institution Plan

The designated institution in a primary service region (identified in Section III, Subsection L. of the Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies and Procedures) will create and maintain a Plan that describes the programs and courses to be offered to respond to the educational and workforce needs of its primary service region. It is intended that designated institutions communicate and collaborate with other institutions located outside of the service region in developing its Plan. If, in the course of developing or updating its Plan, the designated institution identifies a need for the delivery of a program or course within its service region, and the designated institution is unable to provide the program or course, the designated institution will coordinate with an institution located outside of the service region (a "partnering institution") to deliver the program or course in the service region. This will be done pursuant to an MOU to be entered into between the designated institution and the partnering institution in accordance with Section 4 below. Each Plan developed by a designated institution will include at least the following:

- (a) A needs assessment that identifies the ongoing and future workforce and educational needs of the region.
- (b) A description of the academic programs and courses to be delivered in the service region, or outside of the service region, by the designated institution and the resources to be employed.

INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH & STUDENT AFFAIRS
JUNE 17-18, 2004

- (c) A description of regional mission programs and courses offered, or to be offered, in the service region by partnering institutions, including any anticipated transition of programs or courses to the designated institution.
 - (d) A description of statewide mission programs and courses to be offered in the service region by the statewide mission owning institution or by the designated institution.
 - (e) A summary of the terms of MOUs, if any, entered into between the designated institution and partnering institutions pursuant to Section 4 below. If it is anticipated that the program or course will be offered within three (3) years of approval of the Plan, the description will include a summary of the anticipated costs of delivery and the resources and support required for delivery of the programs and courses, including facility needs and costs.
- (2) Program and Course Offerings by Partnering Institutions

If a partnering institution identifies a regional mission program or course not identified, or anticipated to be identified, in the designated institution's Plan, and the partnering institution wishes to offer such program or course in the service region, the partnering institution may communicate with the designated institution for the purpose of including the program or course in the designated institution's Plan. In order to include the program or course in the designated institution's Plan, the partnering institution must demonstrate the need within the service region for delivery of the program or course, as determined by the Board (or by the CAO in the case of associate level or professional-technical level programs or courses). In order to demonstrate the need for the delivery of a program or course in a service region, the partnering institution will complete and submit to the Chief Academic Officer of the designated institution, to CAAP and to OSBE, in accordance with a schedule to be developed by the CAO, the following:

- (a) A study of business and work force trends in the service region indicating anticipated, ongoing demand for the educational program or course to be provided.
 - (b) A survey of potential students evidencing demand by prospective students and attendance sufficient to justify the short-term and long-term costs of delivery of such program or course.
 - (c) A complete description of the program or course requested to be delivered, including a plan for the delivery of the program or course, a timeline for delivery of the program or course, the anticipated costs of delivery, the resources and support required for delivery (including facilities needs and costs), and program or course syllabuses
- (3) Designated Institution's Opportunity to First Offer a Program or Course

INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH & STUDENT AFFAIRS
JUNE 17-18, 2004

If,

- (a) (i) the partnering institution has submitted the information set forth in Subsection 2 above to the Chief Academic Officer of the designated institution in a timely manner (in accordance with a schedule to be determined by the CAO) for inclusion in the designated institution's Plan, (ii) a need is demonstrated by the partnering institution for such program or course in the service region, as determined by the Board (or by the CAO in the case of associate level or professional-technical level programs or courses); or
- (b) Prior to the submission of an updated Plan by the designated institution, it is determined by the Board that an emergency need has arisen for such program or course in the service region, then, the designated institution must within six (6) months (three (3) months in the case of associate level or professional-technical level programs or courses) determine whether it will deliver such program on substantially the same terms (qualitatively and quantitatively) described by the partnering institution. In the event the designated institution determines not to offer the program or course, the partnering institution may offer the program or course according to the terms stated, pursuant to an MOU to be entered into with the designated institution. If the partnering institution materially changes the terms and manner in which the program or course is to be delivered, the partnering institution will provide notice to the Chief Academic Officer of the designated institution and to the CAO of such changes and the designated institution will be afforded the opportunity again to review the terms of delivery and determine within three (3) months of the date of notice whether it will deliver such program on substantially the same terms.

d. Program Transitions

In order to appropriately balance (i) the ability of institutions to grow and develop programs and courses in accordance with their statewide mission or according to their service region mission, (ii) the desire that programs and courses be delivered to meet workforce and educational needs, and (iii) the reduction of costs and alignment of educational resources, it is the intent of the Board that, to the extent possible, designated institutions, partnering institutions and statewide mission owning institutions plan and coordinate the delivery of programs and courses anticipated to be offered by such institutions, but not currently identified in the designated institution's, partnering institution's or statewide mission owning institution's Plans. This should be achieved first in the process of developing an institution's Plan.

In the event (i) a statewide mission owning institution intends to develop the capacity to offer a statewide mission program or course within a service region currently being offered by the designated institution or a partnering institution, or (ii) a designated institution intends to develop the capacity to offer a program or

INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH & STUDENT AFFAIRS
JUNE 17-18, 2004

course that is being offered within its service region by a partnering institution (other than a program or course offered by a statewide mission owning institution), the statewide mission owning institution or designated institution, respectively, will identify its intent to develop the program or course in the next update of its eight (8) year Plan.

- (a) In order for the statewide mission owning institution, or the designated institution, to offer a program or course that is currently offered by another institution (the "withdrawing institution"), the statewide mission owning institution, or the designated institution, must demonstrate its ability to offer the program or course.
- (b) Except as otherwise agreed between the institutions pursuant to an MOU, the statewide mission owning institution, or the designated institution, will allow the withdrawing institution a minimum three (3) year transition period (thus creating three (3) to five (5) years' notice pursuant to a two (2) year update process) to allow the withdrawing institution to withdraw its program or course. If, upon notice from the statewide mission owning institution, or the designated institution, the withdrawing institution wishes to withdraw its program or course region prior to the end of the three (3) year transition period, the withdrawing institution will seek to enter into a transition MOU with the statewide mission owning institution, or the designated institution, as appropriate, to begin delivery by the statewide mission owning institution or designated institution at a date prior to the end of the three (3) year transition period, but in no event earlier than two (2) years from the date of notice (unless otherwise agreed by the statewide mission owning institution or designated institution). Included within the transition MOU will be an admissions plan between the institutions providing for continuity in student enrollment during the transition period.

e. Discontinuance of Offerings

Unless otherwise agreed between a statewide mission owning institution and the designated institution pursuant to an MOU, if, for any reason, a designated institution offering programs or courses in its service region that supports a statewide mission program of another institution, wishes to discontinue the offering(s), the designated institution will use its best efforts to provide the statewide mission owning institution at least one (1) year's written notice of withdrawal. In such case, the statewide mission owning institution will carefully evaluate the workforce need associated with such program or course and determine whether it is appropriate pursuant to its regional mission to provide such program or course. In no event will the statewide mission owning institution be required to provide such offering(s).

Unless otherwise agreed between the partnering institution (whether statewide mission owning, or otherwise) and the designated institution pursuant to an MOU, if, for any reason, a partnering institution offering programs or courses in a service region wishes

INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH & STUDENT AFFAIRS
JUNE 17-18, 2004

to discontinue the offering(s), the partnering institution will use its best efforts to provide the designated institution at least one (1) year's written notice of withdrawal. In such case, the designated institution will carefully evaluate the workforce need associated with such program or course and determine whether it is appropriate pursuant to its regional mission to provide such program or course. In no event will the designated institution be required to provide such offering(s).

f. Existing Programs

Programs and courses being offered by a partnering institution (whether statewide mission owning, or otherwise) in a service region prior to July 1, 2003, may continue to be offered pursuant to an MOU between the designated institution and the partnering institution, subject to the transition and notice periods and requirements set forth above.

g. Applicability of Section III. G. - Instructional Program Approval and Discontinuance

The requirements of this Subsection 4. Academic Planning Process relating to the approval and discontinuance of programs and courses are intended to apply in addition to the requirements of Section III. G. - Instructional Program Approval and Discontinuance. To the extent the provisions of Section III. G. - Instructional Program Approval and Discontinuance are not inconsistent with the provisions of this Subsection 4. Academic Planning Process, such provisions will remain in full force and effect. In the event of conflict, the provisions set forth herein will apply.

INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH & STUDENT AFFAIRS
JUNE 17-18, 2004

Please click on **this 8-Year Plan** link to obtain a copy of the 8-year plan or contact Patty Sanchez at 332-1562 or email at psanchez@osbe.state.id.us to obtain a copy.

INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH & STUDENT AFFAIRS
JUNE 17-18, 2004

SUBJECT

Program Approvals

- Full Proposal – Master of Science in Mathematics, BSU
- Notice of Intent – Technical Certificate, Massage Therapy Program, ISU
- Notice of Intent – Bachelor of Science, Nuclear Engineering, ISU
- Notice of Intent – Technical Certificate, Landscape Technology Program, NIC

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

Board Policy Section III.G. Program Approval and Discontinuance

BACKGROUND

In accordance with Board Policy Section III.G.4, all new academic and professional-technical programs must have full Board approval prior to implementation. Idaho State University is proposing a B.S., Nuclear Engineering degree and a Technical Certificate, Massage Therapy Program and North Idaho College is proposing a new Landscape Technology Program.

In accordance with Board policy III.G.5.a.3, a request for a new graduate program requires a full proposal. Boise State University is proposing a new graduate program in Mathematics.

DISCUSSION

CAAP, in using its policies on program review, has acted on the Board charge to evaluate new program requests. The review of these programs has been completed and is now being forwarded to the Board for approval. See attachment for summaries of proposed programs.

IMPACT

If Board approved, the institutions will implement these programs and will be subject to future monitoring for program compliance.

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Board staff and CAAP recommend approval as presented.

BOARD ACTION

A motion to approve Boise State University's program request to offer a new Master of Science in Mathematics.

A motion to approve Idaho State University's program request to offer a new B.S., in Nuclear Engineering and a request to offer a new Technical Certificate, Massage Therapy Program.

A motion to approve North Idaho College's program request to offer a new Technical Certificate, Landscape Technology Program.

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes _____ No _____

New Program - Summaries

Boise State University, Idaho State University and North Idaho College have submitted program proposals for Board approval. CAAP and Board staff has reviewed these proposals and recommend approval.

a. M.S., Mathematics—BSU

Boise State University proposes a new Master of Science program in Mathematics. This program will not only provide graduate training in this important discipline, but will enable BSU to offer students the graduate level courses they require to support their major field of study in technical areas such as engineering, geophysics, and computer science.

Currently, there is no accreditation of mathematics degrees by professional societies. The quality of the program will be ensured through the university's five-year program review process, which involves external peer review, and through the Northwest Accreditation process.

This request from BSU is not unique to the system; both the University of Idaho and Idaho State University offer a master's degree in mathematics. However, many of BSU's potential students are place bound to Boise and those degrees are not available to them.

To assess the demand of the program, BSU mailed questionnaires to all holders of a bachelor's degree in mathematics whom could be identified in the greater Boise area. The questionnaires demonstrated a nucleus of potential students in the Boise area, possibly place bound in Boise, interested in pursuing a master's degree in mathematics. Another need for the program comes from BSU's service mission to other graduate programs at Boise State University in technical areas such as engineering, geophysics, and computer science. A master's degree program in mathematics will enable BSU to offer students in these programs the graduate level mathematics courses which they need to support their major field of study.

Under the current role and mission statement of Boise State University, the university is to maintain "basic strengths in the sciences and liberal arts" including mathematics, but it is to place "continuing emphasis" on the physical sciences and "primary emphasis" on engineering. The university currently offers graduate education in geophysics and engineering, both of which require supporting mathematics. The presence of a master's degree in mathematics will make it more feasible to provide mathematics classes to those programs. In addition, the program will have a strong component in applied mathematics and statistics, the sub-disciplines of mathematics most closely related to engineering and the sciences.

INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH & STUDENT AFFAIRS
JUNE 17-18, 2004

Fiscal Impact

A. Source of Funds	FY06	FY07	FY08
1. Appropriated Funds—Reallocation	\$139,815***	\$273,390***	\$281,590***
2. Appropriated – New			
3. Federal			
4. Other			
B. Nature of Funds			
1. Recurring *	\$139,815***	\$273,390***	\$281,590***
2. Non-recurring **			
Grant Total	\$139,815***	\$273,390***	\$281,590***

* Recurring is defined as ongoing operating budget for the program, which will become part of the base.

** Non-recurring is defined as one-time funding in a fiscal year and not part of the base.

*** All funds will be reallocated from money currently used to pay adjunct faculty to teach developmental and other low-level mathematics classes. These funds will be used to support teaching assistants performing the same function

Beginning FY06, BSU will require four additional offices, each equipped with two desks, two chairs, two computers, and a bookcase. Beginning FY07, BSU will require a total of seven similarly equipped offices for the program.

b. T.C., Massage Therapy—ISU

Idaho State University proposes to create a new Massage Therapy program within their Health Occupations Department. This program is a minimum of 40 credits and will offer a Technical Certificate upon completion.

This program will have an advisory committee, which will assure consistent quality training that meets the needs of the industry. Also, graduates of the program will be eligible to set for the National Certification for Therapeutic Massage and Bodywork Exam, providing additional assurance that graduates of the program receive a quality education.

There is a high demand for this program training in Idaho. If approved, this would be the only training program in Idaho. ISU and its Health Occupations graduates would undoubtedly be interested in adding to their education. In fact, graduates of the Cosmetology industry are moving quickly toward a business that provides not only hair sculpting and design and nail technology but “spa” treatment as well. Other Health Occupations graduates can use their skills as a base for this training and use this training to enhance their career opportunities.

INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH & STUDENT AFFAIRS
JUNE 17-18, 2004

Job opportunities are available in private practice, health clubs, spas, beauty salons and working with other health care practitioners such as physical therapists, chiropractors, medical doctors, dentists, psychologists and psychiatrists.

The massage therapy program fulfills ISU and the Division of Professional-Technical Education mission statements to provide a broad range of educational services to a culturally diverse population of students and to the state and to provide Idaho with technical skills, knowledge and attitudes necessary for successful performance in a highly effective workplace. The massage therapy program will provide technical training in an expanding career area through an "other than a four-year college degree." It will also provide training to upgrade individuals already in a career that can be enhanced by specific training in this technical skill.

Fiscal Impact

A. Source of Funds	FY03-04	FY04-05	FY05-06
1. Appropriated Funds—Reallocation	\$63,500	\$60,000	\$60,000
2. Appropriated – New			
3. Federal			
4. Other			
B. Nature of Funds			
1. Recurring *	\$60,000##	\$60,000	\$60,000
2. Non-recurring **	\$3,500++		
Grant Total	\$63,500	\$60,000	\$60,000

* Recurring is defined as ongoing operating budget for the program, which will become part of the base.

** Non-recurring is defined as one-time funding in a fiscal year and not part of the base.

The costs of this program will involve the following:

Faculty (at a minimum, 1 full-time coordinator/instructor)

Other costs would include basic supplies, office supplies, etc.

++Initial cost to put up individual cubicles and purchase of a computer for the program.

c. B.S., Nuclear Engineering—ISU

Idaho State University proposes a new Bachelor of Science degree in Nuclear Engineering using existing courses. This will add nine credits to the already existing Interdisciplinary Engineering BS degree that currently has a focus available in nuclear engineering. The 137 credits is the same number of credits required by three other discipline specific B.S. degrees in the College of Engineering. Over 38 years there have been approximately 140 graduates with

INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH & STUDENT AFFAIRS
JUNE 17-18, 2004

the nuclear engineering focus under the 128 credit general engineering B.S. degree.

The mission of the INEEL is being redefined, and a new contractor is being sought for the research and development portion of the laboratory, to be designated the Idaho National Laboratory, as the nuclear energy R&D laboratory for the nation, under the auspices of the U.S. Department of Energy. The draft RFP for the contract to operate the laboratory states that the contractor will "Develop relationships with Idaho Universities to establish a strong network of science and engineering education programs at all levels with a goal of making Idaho a world leading center for nuclear education at the baccalaureate, master, and doctorate levels. This is being interpreted as not merely having a program focus available at the BS level (which ISU currently has), but an actual BS degree in nuclear engineering. ISU currently has a MS in Nuclear Science and Engineering (since 1966) and a PhD in Nuclear Science and Engineering (since 1990). The baccalaureate program has, for many years, had a nuclear component as Sequence F. This is one of seven 13-credit sequences offered at the senior level, two of which must be taken for graduation in a 128 credit Interdisciplinary Engineering BS degree, which is ABET accredited. It is proposed to make the discipline specific nuclear engineering BS degree 137 credits, consistent with the three other discipline specific BS degrees.

There is no similar BS degree or even a focus on nuclear engineering in any of the other Idaho universities. The closest university with a BS in nuclear engineering is Oregon State University, the only one in the seven northwestern states. The University of Utah has a nuclear engineering focus for the MS degree in Civil and Environmental Engineering, and does have a research reactor.

The College of Engineering currently has two full-time regular faculty in non-administrative positions, with nuclear engineering background and credentials. One of these is full time regular faculty, tenured, the other a tenure track assistant research faculty. The college has relied upon three other full-time faculty, staff, and administrators with nuclear engineering background who provide part-time effort to the nuclear engineering education and research mission. In addition, the college draws on numerous adjunct faculty recruited from the INEEL and other local organizations for nuclear course instruction. To become accredited by ABET, it appears absolutely necessary to retain the adjunct faculty resource in to the present full-time faculty. Currently there is no budget within the College of Engineering for the adjunct faculty. Hence this NOI requests specific funding for those adjunct faculty that are needed to support the program and enhance the probability of it being accredited. (The program is also supported by the research function in the Institute for Nuclear Science and Engineering, headquartered in Idaho Falls, under the ISU Office of Research.)

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH & STUDENT AFFAIRS
JUNE 17-18, 2004**

Fiscal Impact

A. Source of Funds	FY03-04	FY04-05	FY05-06
1. Appropriated Funds—Reallocation	\$80,000	\$81,000	\$84,000
2. Appropriated – New			
3. Federal			
4. Other			
B. Nature of Funds			
1. Recurring *	\$80,000	\$81,000	\$84,000
2. Non-recurring **	0	0	0
Grant Total	\$80,000	\$81,000	\$84,000

Budget Explanation: For FY 2005, \$60,000 is for 60% time (plus benefits) for a joint appointment, between the INEEL and ISU, of an Assistant Research Professor (hired in March 2004), plus \$20,000 for adjunct faculty.

d. T.C., Landscape Technology—NIC

North Idaho College proposes to offer a one-year Technical Certificate program in Landscape Technology.

All professional-technical programs meet the Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges' Commission on Colleges accreditation requirements and advisory committees comprised of regional community and industry members meet at least on an annual basis for review and curriculum guidance. All professional-technical education programs at NIC are reviewed through the program evaluation process every five years.

Currently, one-year industry certification is not available in Landscape Technology. NIC plans to add an AAS degree in Landscape Technology in the future if the program is successful. The degree program will offer certification through Associated Landscape Contractors of America. The one-year certificate was designed to meet the first-year requirements for this certification. Once the two-year degree program is in place, NIC plans to research possible articulation with the University of Idaho.

This request is unique to the system but Boise State University does have a horticulture program that works with landscaping. College of Southern Idaho offers a Horticulture degree, which focuses on plant growth and care and nursery management. This program will focus specifically on skills required of a landscape technician. In addition, due to the vast geographic regions in Idaho, this program will provide opportunity for students in the Northern region of Idaho.

The objective of this program is to meet growing industry need for trained/educated landscape technicians who have an understanding of the industry, customer service issues, design features, plant growth, and appropriate care and maintenance of landscapes and hardscapes.

INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH & STUDENT AFFAIRS
JUNE 17-18, 2004

NIC surveyed over 180 landscape and related businesses in the immediate region and surrounding regions to review industry concerns. Of the 76 responses received, 64 of these indicated that NIC's region would benefit from a landscape technology program of this type. According to the Department of Labor Occupational Handbook, grounds maintenance workers held about 1.1 million jobs in 2000, with landscaping and groundskeeping leading 894,000.

As a comprehensive community college, it is within the mission and goals of the college to ensure access to education and training for a broad range of students. The institution strives to offer innovative, flexible programs that support industry growth in the region. This program directly supports the 2004-2007 strategic initiatives of the college. A thorough needs assessment was completed which clearly indicates a need and positive response for this program by regional industry.

One full-time faculty position is required with support through Math and English divisions for required core courses. Initial equipment purchases will be necessary for program startup as well as program facilities. Library resources are adequate.

Fiscal Impact

Source of Funds	FY05	FY06	FY07	FY08
1.Total Resource Requirements	\$73,000	\$83,000	\$68,000	\$64,000
2. Existing Local Resources	\$43,000	\$50,000	0	0
3.Exisiting Local and State Applied Technology Allocation	\$30,000 Reallocation	\$33,000 Reallocation	\$68,000 New Funding	\$64,000 New Funding
4. Student Fees	0	0	0	0
Grant Total	\$73,000	\$83,000	\$68,000	\$64,000

Idaho State Board of Education

GOVERNING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

SECTION: III. POSTSECONDARY AFFAIRS

G. Program Approval and Discontinuance

October 2002

4. Program Approval Policy

Program approval will take into consideration statewide and institutional objectives.

- a. New instructional programs, instructional units, majors, minors, options, and emphases require approval prior to implementation;
 - (1) Board Approval – Board approval prior to implementation is required for any new:
 - (a) professional-technical program,
 - (b) academic program leading to a master's, specialist or doctoral degree,
 - (c) major,
 - (d) academic program, instructional unit, minor, option, or emphasis with a financial impact* of \$250,000 or more per year
 - (2) Executive Director Approval – Executive Director approval prior to implementation is required for any new academic program, instructional unit, minor, option, or emphasis with a financial impact of less than \$250,000 per year
- b. Existing instructional programs, majors, minors, options, emphases and instructional units.
 - (1) Changes, additions, expansions, and consolidations to existing instructional programs, majors, minors, options, emphases, or instructional units with a financial impact of \$250,000 or more per year require Board approval prior to implementation.
 - (2) Changes, additions, expansions, and consolidations to existing instructional programs, majors, minors, options, emphases or instructional units with a financial impact of less than \$250,000 require executive director approval prior to implementation. The executive director may refer any of the requests to the Board or a subcommittee of the Board for review and action. All modifications approved by the executive director shall be reported quarterly to the Board. Non-substantive name or title changes need not be submitted for approval.
- c. Routine Changes

Non-substantive name or title changes, credits, descriptions of individual courses, or other routine catalog changes do not require notification or approval.

5. Approval Procedures

INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH & STUDENT AFFAIRS
JUNE 17-18, 2004

a. Board Approval Procedures

- (1) Subsequent to institutional review and consistent with institutional policies, all requests requiring Board approval will be submitted by the institution as a notice of intent in a manner prescribed by the Chief Academic Officer of the Board.
- (2) The Chief Academic Officer shall forward the request to the CAAP for its review and recommendation. Professional-technical requests will be forwarded to the Idaho Division of Professional-Technical Education for review and recommendation prior to CAAP review and action. If the CAAP recommends approval, the proposal shall be forwarded to the Board for action. Requests that require new state appropriations will be included in the annual budget request of the institution and the State Board of Education.
- (3) CAAP may, at its discretion, request a full proposal for any request requiring a notice of intent. A request for a new graduate program requires a full proposal. Full proposals should be forwarded to CAAP members at least two (2) weeks prior to the CAAP meeting.
- (4) As a part of the full proposal process, all doctoral program request(s) will require an external peer review. The external peer-review panel will consist of at least two (2) members and will be selected by the Board's Chief Academic Officer and the requesting institution's Chief Academic Officer. The review will consist of a paper and on-site review followed by the issuance of a report and recommendations by the peer-review panel. Considerable weight on the approval process will be placed upon the peer reviewer's report and recommendations.

b. Office of the State Board of Education Approval Procedures

- (1) All requests requiring approval by the Executive Director will be submitted by the institution as a notice of intent in a manner prescribed by the Chief Academic Officer of the Board. At his discretion, the Chief Academic Officer shall forward the request to the CAAP for review and recommendation. Professional-technical requests will be forwarded to the Division of Professional-Technical Education for review and recommendation prior to CAAP review and action.
- (2) If the CAAP recommends approval of the request(s), the notice of intent will be submitted to the Executive Director for consideration and action. The Executive Director shall act on any request within thirty (30) days of receipt of the CAAP recommendation.
- (3) If the Executive Director denies the request he or she shall provide specific reasons in writing. The institution has thirty (30) days in which to address the

INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH & STUDENT AFFAIRS
JUNE 17-18, 2004

issue(s) for denial of the request. The Executive Director has ten (10) working days after the receipt of the institution's response to reconsider the denial. If the Executive Director decides to deny the request after re-consideration, the institution may send its request and the documents related to the denial to the president of the Board for final reconsideration.

(4) Distance Learning Delivery and Residence Centers

All academic programs delivered to sites outside of the service area defined by the institution's role and mission statement shall be submitted to the Executive Director using a notice of intent.

INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH & STUDENT AFFAIRS
JUNE 17-18, 2004

SUBJECT

Approval of Research Center Grant Program Recipient

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

Board Policy Section V.N. Grants and Contracts

BACKGROUND

Every three years, the Higher Education Research Council (HERC) runs a Research Center Grant Competition in accordance with Board policy. The Research Center Grants are intended to establish a focused research center at one of the three universities, which will provide research teams with the necessary facilities and researchers necessary to conduct investigative efforts at a nationally competitive level. Further, these centers have a significant economic benefit to the state and region. A center is funded for a three-year period at which time the center must be self-supporting. To date, the Board has funded five such centers and this item, if approved, would be a sixth center if approved by the SBOE. The five previously funded centers have met all the Board's expectations.

DISCUSSION

The Research Center Program requires both a paper and an on-site review by external peer reviewers. The latter results in a formal report signed by the review team. HERC receives that report and then takes action to forward a recommendation to IRSA and the full Board. At a special teleconference call held May 28, 2004 meeting, HERC took action to recommend funding of the Center for Applied Technology and Natural Resources Management at the University of Idaho.

IMPACT

If funded, the center will be required to submit an annual report to the Office of the State Board of Education summarizing Center accomplishments and plans for the coming year. The report will also provide accountability information as described in Section V. Grant Programs—General Guidelines of HERC's policies and by-laws.

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Board staff support the recommendation to fund the UI's proposed Center for Applied Technology and Natural Resources Management as indicated by HERC and the on-site evaluation panel.

BOARD ACTION

A motion to approve funding of the Center for Applied Technology and Natural Resources Management at the University of Idaho as recommended by HERC and the on-site review panel.

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes _____ No _____

REFERENCE: APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

Idaho State Board of Education

GOVERNING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

SECTION: V. FINANCIAL AFFAIRS

Subsection: N. Grants and Contracts

April 2002

N. Grants and Contracts

1. Approval of Grant and Contract Applications

All applications for grants and contracts that require the institution, school or agency to dedicate current funds or facilities or will obligate the institution, school or agency or state to dedicate future funding or significant facilities require approval by the executive director. Cost sharing or other types of in-kind matching requirements are not considered as dedicated commitments. If there is no dedicated funding or facilities obligation, the application shall be approved by the chief executive officer of the institution, school or agency or his or her designee. When requests for approval of such applications are presented to the executive director the following information must be included:

- a. Agency to which application is made.
- b. Amount of the proposal.
- c. Period of the grant or contract.
- d. Purpose of the grant or contract.
- e. Nature of obligations including amount of funds involved or facilities to be committed.

2. Acceptance of Grants and Contracts

Grants and contracts accepted by the institution, school or agency must be reported to the executive director quarterly by the institution, school or agency of official notification, when the amount of the grant or contract award exceeds one hundred thousand dollars (\$100,000). When grant or contract awards are presented to the executive director, the following information must be provided:

- a. Name of grantor or contract.
- b. Amount of the grant or contract.
- c. Grant or contract period.
- d. Purpose of the grant or contract.
- e. Indicate nature of institution, school or agency's obligations in the form of dedicated funding or dedication of significant facilities. If there is none, the following statement should be included: "No future state obligation will be incurred with the acceptance of this grant or contract."

INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH & STUDENT AFFAIRS
JUNE 17-18, 2004

To obtain a copy of the on-site panel report, please contact Patty Sanchez at 208-332-1562 or email at psanchez@osbe.state.id.us.

INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH & STUDENT AFFAIRS
JUNE 17-18, 2004

SUBJECT

Approval of Rules Accountability—ELP Standards

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

Section 33-105, Idaho Code

Title III: Language Instruction for Limited English Proficient and Immigrant Students PL 107-110 - 3113.b.2

BACKGROUND

Title III of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 mandates that all states develop standards for Limited English Proficiency (LEP) students. These standards are to be derived from the four recognized domains of speaking, listening, reading and writing. The English Language Proficiency (ELP) standards are also to be aligned with State academic Achievement Standards in addressing student academic achievement in language arts.

The proposed English Language Proficiency standards are designed for inclusion into IDAPA 08.02.03, Rules Governing Thoroughness.

DISCUSSION

Idaho has been working with the Mountain States Consortium in developing ELP standards. ELP standards for the consortium were developed and approved by the Consortium in June 2003. A content panel made up of English for Students of Other Languages (ESOL) Bilingual teachers, university professors, Curriculum Directors, as well as Title I and Title III Directors met and reviewed the ELP standards to ensure alignment with the Idaho Language Arts standards.

Following the work of the Mountain States Consortium, the Board's LEP Sub Committee appointed four Standards' Committees to further the work of the ELP Standards. Specialists and practitioners were chosen to complete the Standards for approval.

Idaho's ELP standards have four proficiency levels: Pre-Emergent, Beginning, Intermediate, and Early Fluency. Each Proficiency level will address the domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing and are matched to the state Language Arts/Communications Standards for each respective domain. Comprehension is measured within the reading component. These four proficiency levels allow for individual, student-by-student progression along the continuum. The other content standards remain the same for all students and LEP students will have to know grade-level content for the ISAT.

IMPACT

The adoption of these rules will enable ELP Assessments and State approved curriculum to be incorporated in the State approved standards, so that all LEP students are measured consistently in the state of Idaho. Teachers will use assessment data to design the appropriate learning programs for incoming students and develop consistent measure progresses for each student, as well.

INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH & STUDENT AFFAIRS
JUNE 17-18, 2004

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Board staff recommends the approval of the ELP Standards for inclusion into IDAPA 08.02.03. Adoption will enable the school districts to move forward in assessing and placing Limited English Proficiency students, as well as allow curriculum specialists to ensure that materials are in line with State ELP Standards. The approval would allow for the ELP Standards to be incorporated for the 2004-2005 school year.

BOARD ACTION

A motion to approve the proposed ELP Standards for inclusion into IDAPA 08.02.03.

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes _____ No _____

INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH & STUDENT AFFAIRS

JUNE 17-18, 2004

REFERENCE: APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

TITLE 33

EDUCATION

CHAPTER 1

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

33-105. RULES -- EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT. (1) The state board shall have power to make rules for its own government and the government of its executive departments and offices; and, upon recommendations of its executive officers, to appoint to said departments and offices such specialists, clerks and other employees as the execution of duties may require, to fix their salaries and assign their duties.

(2) Statements of the state board of education and board of regents of the university of Idaho which relate to the curriculum of public educational institutions, to students attending or applicants to such institutions, or to the use and maintenance of land, equipment and buildings controlled by the respective institutions, are not rules and are not statements of general applicability for the purposes of chapter 52, title 67, Idaho Code.

(3) Notwithstanding any other provision of chapter 52, title 67, Idaho Code, the state board of education and board of regents of the university of Idaho shall be deemed to be in full compliance with the notice requirements of section 67-5221, Idaho Code, if:

(a) Notice is given by including the intended action in the official written agenda for a regularly scheduled meeting of the board, and the agenda is available for public inspection at the central office of the board not less than five (5) days prior to the meeting; and

(b) Notice of the intended action, accompanied by the full text of the rule under consideration prepared so as to indicate words added or deleted from the presently effective text, if any, is transmitted to the director of the legislative services office at the same time that notice is given under paragraph (a) of this subsection. The director of the legislative services office shall refer the material under consideration to the germane joint subcommittee created in section 67-454, Idaho Code, to afford the subcommittee opportunity to submit data, views or arguments in writing to the board prior to the time for receiving comment as provided in paragraph (d) of this subsection; and

(c) The intended action is discussed but not acted upon during the regularly scheduled meeting for which the agenda was prepared, but instead is held for final action at the next regularly scheduled or later meeting of the board; and

(d) At least fifteen (15) days prior to the scheduled date for final action, the board shall mail to all persons who have made timely request in writing to the board and shall publish in an issue of the Idaho administrative bulletin a brief description of the intended action, or a concise summary of any statement of economic impact required pursuant to section 67-5223(2), Idaho Code, and shall note the time when, the place where, and the manner in which interested persons may present their views thereon; and

(e) Upon adoption of a rule, the board, if requested in writing to do so by an interested person either prior to adoption or within twenty-eight (28) days thereafter, shall issue a concise statement of the

INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH & STUDENT AFFAIRS
JUNE 17-18, 2004

principal reasons for and against its adoption, incorporating therein its reasons for overruling the considerations urged against its adoption.

Title III - SEC. 3113.b.(2) STATE AND SPECIALLY QUALIFIED AGENCY PLANS.

Each State educational agency and specially qualified agency desiring a grant under this subpart shall submit a plan which shall describe how the agency will establish standards and objectives for raising the level of English proficiency that are derived from the four recognized domains of speaking, listening, reading, and writing, and that are aligned with achievement of the challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards described in section 1111(b)(1).

INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH & STUDENT AFFAIRS
JUNE 17-18, 2004

Please click on **this ELP Standards** link to obtain a copy or contact Patty Sanchez at 332-1562 or email at psanchez@osbe.state.id.us to obtain a copy.

INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH & STUDENT AFFAIRS
JUNE 17-18, 2004

SUBJECT

Approval of Rules for Accountability—Failure to Meet Adequate Yearly Progress

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

Section 33-105, Idaho Code

BACKGROUND

The Board has created a comprehensive state accountability system that includes all the elements required to comply with the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. The accountability system was approved at the November 2003, meeting and was subsequently accepted by the Idaho State Legislature in January 2004.

DISCUSSION

The U.S. Department of Education issues clarifications as needed to the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. As these clarifications are received, board staff review and identify any changes necessary to the accountability system in order to utilize the flexibility provided by the U.S. Department of Education. Earlier this year, the Board approved rule changes for Limited English Proficient (LEP) students based on guidance received from the U.S. Department of Education.

Over the last month, discussions with representatives of the U.S. Department of Education and the Idaho State Department of Education have yielded additional and necessary clarifications of the accountability plan, specifically elements of Section 114, Failure to Meet Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP).

The clarifications to the rules are:

- Subsection 114.01.b: Renamed School Improvement heading to “Intervention School Improvement Plan.” All Idaho districts/LEAs must have a continuous school improvement plan. The Intervention School Improvement Plan heading aids in differentiating between these two plans.
- Subsection 114.01.f: Renamed Alternate Governance to “Restructuring.” Under the federal law, restructuring includes two phases: creating a plan for alternative governance and the actual restructuring of a school. This section clarifies that difference.
- Subsection 114: Added language to clarify that all federal laws related to receipt of federal grants, for example Title I, must be followed in addition to those accountability measures outlined in this section.
- Subsections 114.01 and 114.02: Created a separate District/Local Education Agency (LEA) section to more clearly outline the sanctions that apply only to districts of LEAs.
- Subsections 114.01 and 114.02: Outlined the previous sanctions that continue to be applicable with increasing sanctions and years missing AYP.
- Subsections 114.03 and 114.04: Further clarification between schools and districts/LEAs.
- Subsection 114.04.c: The identification of a school or district/LEA for failing to meeting AYP could include determinations of all sanctions outlined in subsection 114.01 and 114.02, not just for school improvement.

INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH & STUDENT AFFAIRS
JUNE 17-18, 2004

IMPACT

The state accountability plan includes elements that comply with the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 that will ensure ongoing receipt of federal education monies.

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends the Board approve the changes to IDAPA 08.02.03, Rules Governing Thoroughness, Section 114, Failure to Meet Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP).

As Idaho approaches the implementation of the Failure to Meet Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) sanctions in spring 2004, it has become apparent that Section 114 needed to be expanded and clarified.

If the rules are not approved the following are potential issues for the Board:

- An Alternate Governance Plan would be put into place one year prior to the requirement by the federal law for Title I schools.
- It could be interpreted that Districts/LEAs must offer choice to neighboring districts.
- The differences between School Improvement Plans and the Intervention School Improvement Plans and the different phases of Restructuring could be misinterpreted.
- The sanctions that continue to be applicable as Schools and Districts/LEAs continue to not meet AYP are not readily apparent in the current version of the rules.

BOARD ACTION

A motion to approve the changes to IDAPA 08.02.03, Rules Governing Thoroughness, Section 114, Failure to Meet Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) as written.

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes _____ No _____

INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH & STUDENT AFFAIRS
JUNE 17-18, 2004

REFERENCE: APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

TITLE 33

EDUCATION

CHAPTER 1

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

33-105. RULES -- EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT. (1) The state board shall have power to make rules for its own government and the government of its executive departments and offices; and, upon recommendations of its executive officers, to appoint to said departments and offices such specialists, clerks and other employees as the execution of duties may require, to fix their salaries and assign their duties.

(2) Statements of the state board of education and board of regents of the university of Idaho which relate to the curriculum of public educational institutions, to students attending or applicants to such institutions, or to the use and maintenance of land, equipment and buildings controlled by the respective institutions, are not rules and are not statements of general applicability for the purposes of chapter 52, title 67, Idaho Code.

(3) Notwithstanding any other provision of chapter 52, title 67, Idaho Code, the state board of education and board of regents of the university of Idaho shall be deemed to be in full compliance with the notice requirements of section 67-5221, Idaho Code, if:

(a) Notice is given by including the intended action in the official written agenda for a regularly scheduled meeting of the board, and the agenda is available for public inspection at the central office of the board not less than five (5) days prior to the meeting; and

(b) Notice of the intended action, accompanied by the full text of the rule under consideration prepared so as to indicate words added or deleted from the presently effective text, if any, is transmitted to the director of the legislative services office at the same time that notice is given under paragraph (a) of this subsection. The director of the legislative services office shall refer the material under consideration to the germane joint subcommittee created in section 67-454, Idaho Code, to afford the subcommittee opportunity to submit data, views or arguments in writing to the board prior to the time for receiving comment as provided in paragraph (d) of this subsection; and

(c) The intended action is discussed but not acted upon during the regularly scheduled meeting for which the agenda was prepared, but instead is held for final action at the next regularly scheduled or later meeting of the board; and

(d) At least fifteen (15) days prior to the scheduled date for final action, the board shall mail to all persons who have made timely request in writing to the board and shall publish in an issue of the Idaho administrative bulletin a brief description of the intended action, or a concise summary of any statement of economic impact required pursuant to section 67-5223(2), Idaho Code, and shall note the time when, the place where, and the manner in which interested persons may present their views thereon; and

INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH & STUDENT AFFAIRS
JUNE 17-18, 2004

(e) Upon adoption of a rule, the board, if requested in writing to do so by an interested person either prior to adoption or within twenty-eight (28) days thereafter, shall issue a concise statement of the principal reasons for and against its adoption, incorporating therein its reasons for overruling the considerations urged against its adoption.

INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH & STUDENT AFFAIRS
JUNE 17-18, 2004

114. FAILURE TO MEET ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS (AYP).

The State Department of Education shall develop procedures for a Technical Assistance Plan, School Improvement Plan, School Choice, Supplemental Education Services, Corrective Action, and ~~an Alternate Governance Plan~~ Restructuring for approval by the State Board of Education. All schools and districts/Local Education Agencies (LEAs) will comply with applicable federal laws governing specific federal grants. (3-20-04)()

1. School Sanctions. (3-20-04)()

~~01a.~~ Technical Assistance Plan. Schools ~~and districts~~ that fail to achieve AYP for two (2) consecutive years will be provided with technical assistance from the ~~State Department of Education.~~ District/LEA. (3-20-04)()

~~02b.~~ School Improvement Plan. Schools ~~and districts~~ that fail to achieve AYP for two (2) consecutive years must be placed on School Improvement; and develop an two-year Intervention School Improvement Plan (ISIP) and offer school choice the following year. (3-20-04)()

~~03c.~~ School Choice. Schools ~~and districts~~ that fail to achieve AYP for two (2) consecutive years must inform all parents of the School Improvement Status and offer students the option to choose another school within the District/LEA. ~~This School Choice is at the expense of the school/district that did not meet AYP.~~ (3-20-04)()

~~04d.~~ Supplemental Education Services In Reading And Math. Schools/~~Districts~~ that fail to meet AYP for three (3) consecutive years must offer ~~school choice and~~ supplemental services in reading and math to eligible students. The school must continue to offer School Choice and the district/LEA must continue to provide technical assistance. (3-20-04)()

~~05e.~~ Corrective Action. Schools/~~Districts~~ that fail to meet AYP for four (4) consecutive years must be placed on corrective action. The school must continue to offer School Choice and Supplemental Education Services and the district/LEA must continue to provide Technical Assistance. (3-20-04)()

~~06f.~~ Alternate Governance Plan Restructuring. (3-20-04)()

i. Schools/~~Districts~~ that fail to meet AYP for five (5) consecutive years ~~may become governed by the State~~ should plan to restructure the operation and governance of the school by the following school year. All previous years' sanctions still apply: School Choice, Supplemental Education Services, Corrective Action and the district/LEA must continue to provide Technical Assistance. (3-20-04)()

ii. Districts/LEAs will implement an Alternative Governance Plan for schools that fail to meet AYP for six (6) consecutive years. The school must continue to offer School Choice and Supplemental Education Services and the district/LEA must continue to provide Technical Assistance. ()

02. District/LEA Sanctions. ()

a. Technical Assistance Plan. Districts/LEAs that fail to achieve AYP for two (2) and three (3) consecutive years will be provided with technical assistance from the State Department of Education. ()

b. LEA Improvement Plan. Districts/LEAs that fail to achieve AYP for two (2) and three (3) consecutive years will be placed on District/LEA Improvement, and develop a two (2) year Intervention LEA Improvement Plan (ILIP). ()

c. Corrective Action. Districts/LEAs that fail to meet AYP for four (4) consecutive years must be placed on corrective action. The State must continue to offer Technical Assistance. ()

073. "Safe Harbor" Provision. If any subgroup(s) does not meet or exceed Idaho baseline (see Section 112), the public school or district/LEA may be considered to have achieved AYP if any one (1) of the following conditions are met: (3-20-04)()

a. The subgroup(s) that did not meet or exceed Idaho's baseline reduces by ten percent (10%) the percentage of nonproficient students, and the ~~district/school~~ or District/LEA as a whole achieves the state baseline

INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH & STUDENT AFFAIRS
JUNE 17-18, 2004

for proficiency for the additional academic indicator. ~~(3-20-04)~~()

b. The subgroup(s) that did not meet or exceed Idaho's baseline for the additional academic indicator maintains or makes progress towards the baseline for the additional academic indicator or graduation rate. (3-20-04)

084. Appeals Process. ~~(3-20-04)~~

a. The State Department of Education determines preliminary identification of all schools and districts/LEAs that have not met AYP according to the state criteria. ~~(3-20-04)~~()

b. Within thirty (30) days of preliminary identification, the agency (~~district/school or District/LEA~~) reviews its data and may challenge its identification. The agency (~~district/school or District/LEA~~) not meeting AYP may appeal its status and provide evidence to support the challenge to the State Department of Education. ~~(3-20-04)~~()

c. No later than thirty (30) days after preliminary identification, the identifying agency reviews the appeal and makes a final determination ~~of identification for school improvement~~. ~~(3-20-04)~~()

INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH & STUDENT AFFAIRS
JUNE 17-18, 2004

SUBJECT

Approval of Distribution of Federal Grants

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

Section 33-110, Idaho Code

BACKGROUND

As the SEA the SBOE is responsible to receive federal grants and facilitate their distribution.

Recipients of funds include OSBE, SDE, and LEAs.

Since 1996 the Idaho State Legislature has annually appropriated funds to be used for the education of LEP students around the state.

DISCUSSION

The state LEP funds are appropriated in the budget of the SDE, and since the beginning the funds have been allocated based on the number of LEP students in individual districts. There has been no appropriation for administering the funds. It is important that, although a number of districts not eligible for federal funds receive state funds, that the two programs be similarly managed: based on the same goals and coordinated to be as effective as possible. OSBE and the SDE have worked together to collect the necessary data and make the allocation for SFY05 at the same time as federal allocations were made.

In June of 2003 the Board approved the following distribution of federal 2003 monies:

All monies, including administrative funds, funds for state required activities, and LEA pass through dollars, from the following grants were drawn by OSBE for the SDE upon their request.

TITLE	FUNDS	% PASS THROUGH	STATE ACTIVITIES REQUIRED
Title I-A Low Income	\$39,875,687	99	Y
Title I-B-1 Reading 1 st	4,213,421	80	Y
Title I-B-3 Even Start Family Literacy	1,120,106	94	Y
Title I-C Migrant Education	4,572,256	95	Y
Title I-D Neglected and Delinquent	212,128	100	N
Title I-F Comprehensive School Reform	715,130	95	Y
Title II-B Math/Science Partnerships	499,218	95	N
Title II-D Educational Technology	3,214,970	95	Y
Title IV-A Safe and Drug free Schools	2,292,555	93	Y
Title IV-A-2 Community Svcs.			
Expelled/Suspended Students	248,375	92	
Title IV-B 21 st Century Community Learning Centers	2,755,958	95	Y
Title V-A Innovative Programs	1,899,100	85	Y
Title VI-B-1 Small, Rural Achievement	772,475		
Title VI-B-2 Rural/Low Income Schools	340,442	95	N

INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH & STUDENT AFFAIRS
JUNE 17-18, 2004

SDE retained the pass through funds and sought and gained approval from OSBE for a portion of the administrative funds as well as state directed activity funds for the following grant:

TITLE	PASS THROUGH	STATE DIRECTED	ADMINISTRATION
Title II-A Teacher Quality	\$13,134,313	\$345,640	\$118,280

OSBE received the following grant program and a portion of the administrative funds:

TITLE	PARTNERSHIPS	ADMINISTRATION
Title II-A Teacher Quality (SAHE)	\$345,640	\$21,372

OSBE retained the following grants, including administrative and pass through funds:

TITLE	PASS THROUGH	ADMINISTRATION	OPERATING
Title III-A English Language Acquisition	\$1,067,349	\$175,000	
Title VI-State Assessments			\$4,108,407

The federal 2004 estimated allocations for the coming year are detailed on attached sheet.

IMPACT

Continued operation of federal programs as the Board designated them for FY04.

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

OSBE and SDE staffs have worked throughout the year to make the transition of the programs transferred from SDE to OSBE. Personnel are now realigned and programs are functioning well and are appropriately coordinated. It is recommended that the current assignments be continued for FY05.

BOARD ACTION

Motion to retain the following amounts from the No Child Left Behind Act grant funds, based on U.S. Department of Education estimates, for management by the Board office (OSBE)

TITLE	AMOUNT
Title II-A Teacher Quality (SAHE + Admin fee)	366,892
Title III-A English Language Acquisition	1,419,535
Title VI State Assessments	4,151,376

The following amount to be passed through to SDE to be spent according to tentative plan attached with the exception that \$25,000 be dedicated for Office of the Board research of a merit based performance system for teachers

Title II-A Teacher Quality (State Activities + Admin. Fee)	463,834
--	---------

INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH & STUDENT AFFAIRS
JUNE 17-18, 2004

The balance of federal funds is to be drawn by OSBE upon request of the SDE for operations and pass through to the LEAs.

OSBE will allocate the state LEP funds based on the number of LEP students according to the previous practice of the SDE. The SDE will issue state LEP funds. Programs will be coordinated and administered by OSBE.

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes _____ No _____

INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH & STUDENT AFFAIRS
JUNE 17-18, 2004

REFERENCE: APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

TITLE 33
EDUCATION
CHAPTER 1

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

33-110. AGENCY TO NEGOTIATE, AND ACCEPT, FEDERAL ASSISTANCE. The state board is designated as the state educational agency which is authorized to negotiate, and contract with, the federal government, and to accept financial or other assistance from the federal government or any agency thereof, under such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by congressional enactment designed to further the cause of education.

INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH & STUDENT AFFAIRS
JUNE 17-18, 2004

To obtain a copy of the Funds for State Formula-Allocated and Selected Student Aid Programs (U.S. Education Funding for Idaho), please contact Patty Sanchez at psanchez@osbe.state.id.us.

INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH & STUDENT AFFAIRS
JUNE 17-18, 2004

Teacher Quality - Title II-A, ESEA, State Activities Programs 2004-2005

WORKING DRAFT AS OF 06-01-2004

Professional Development for Teachers and Principals		\$250,000
Idaho Mathematics Academy		
Idaho Standards Teacher Education Project (ISTEP)		
Arts Education Institute		
Education/Business Partnerships in Mathematics and Science		
Surveys of Enacted Curriculum		
Leadership Development		\$45,000
Idaho Science Teachers Association		
Idaho Council of Teachers of Mathematics		
Idaho Environmental Education Association		
Idaho Humanities Council		
Idaho Academic Decathlon		
Teacher Retention and Recognition		\$50,000
Professional Recognition for Outstanding Teachers		
Professional Development Recognition for Contributing Teachers		
DMA & DWA Range Finders (course credit)		
DMA & DWA Steering Committee Workshops (course credit)		
DMA & DWA Scoring (course credit)		
TOTAL		\$345,000

Idaho Department of Education
Working document as of 6/1/04

INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH & STUDENT AFFAIRS
JUNE 17-18, 2004

SUBJECT

Title I Review

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

Section 33-101, Idaho Code

Section 33-110, Idaho Code

BACKGROUND

The Federal Government grants Title I monies to the Board as the State Educational Agency to assist schools to improve achievement of at-risk students and to meet challenging state academic standards.

Title I includes six subsections

Title I-A Low Income

Title I-B-1 Reading 1st

Title I-B-3 Even Start Family Literacy

Title I-C Migrant Education

Title I-D Neglected and Delinquent

Title I-F Comprehensive School Reform

DISCUSSION

The Board received a letter from Representative Jack Barraclough, Chairman of the House Education Committee of the Idaho House of Representatives. He requested that the Office of the State Board "conduct a thorough review of current practices related to the distribution and management of the Title I funding programs in Idaho." (letter attached)

Staff has created a proposed schedule and timeline for conducting this review (attached).

IMPACT

All Title I students (approximately 65,000) and LEAs in Idaho

Total dollars in Title I grants is \$52,426,015

BOARD ACTION

This item is for informational purposes only. Any action will be at the Board's discretion.

INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH & STUDENT AFFAIRS
JUNE 17-18, 2004

REFERENCE: APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

TITLE 33
EDUCATION
CHAPTER 1

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

33-101. CREATION OF BOARD. For the general supervision, governance and control of all state educational institutions, to wit: University of Idaho, Idaho State University, Boise State University, Lewis-Clark State College, the School for the Deaf and the Blind and any other state educational institution which may hereafter be founded, and for the general supervision, governance and control of the public school systems, including public community colleges, a state board of education is created. The said board shall be known as the state board of education and board of regents of the University of Idaho.

For the purposes of section 20, article IV, of the constitution of the state of Idaho, the state board of education and all of its offices, agencies, divisions and departments shall be an executive department of state government.

Where the term "state board" shall hereafter appear, it shall mean the state board of education and board of regents of the University of Idaho.

TITLE 33
EDUCATION
CHAPTER 1

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

33-110. AGENCY TO NEGOTIATE, AND ACCEPT, FEDERAL ASSISTANCE. The state board is designated as the state educational agency which is authorized to negotiate, and contract with, the federal government, and to accept financial or other assistance from the federal government or any agency thereof, under such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by congressional enactment designed to further the cause of education.

TITLE IA PROJECT

To identify the requirements and intentions of Title I A, then to examine current practices in Idaho to ascertain whether Idaho's practices are 1) consistent with federal requirements and guidelines, 2) effective with districts, and result in improved student achievement.

-
- | Task | Start Date | End Date |
|--------|-------------|--------------|
| Task 1 | June 1 | June 10 |
| Task 2 | July 1 | September 10 |
| Task 3 | September 1 | October 10 |
| Task 4 | October 1 | October 10 |
| Task 5 | November 1 | November 10 |

TAB 7

INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH & STUDENT AFFAIRS
JUNE 17-18, 2004

To obtain a copy of the letter from Representative Jack Barraclough referenced, please contact Patty Sanchez at 208-332-1562 or email at psanchez@osbe.state.id.us.

INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH & STUDENT AFFAIRS
JUNE 17-18, 2004

SUBJECT

Approval OF the Professional Standards Commission (PSC) to serve as the Advisory Board to the State Board of Education as a requirement of the National Commission on Teaching Standards (NCTAF)

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

N/A

BACKGROUND

In January 1998, the Idaho State Board of Education approved Idaho to become a partner state with NCTAF. The NCTAF focus is on teaching quality, with its mission being that every child should have a “competent, caring, qualified teacher”. In November 1998, the Board formed the Idaho’s MOST Advisory Group composed of stakeholders from throughout Idaho to supervise the Board’s MOST initiative. The Board appointed the MOST Advisory Group as the NCTAF representative group for Idaho, a role that continued until the conclusion of the MOST initiative in August 2003.

There are no membership fees for a state belonging to NCTAF. Instead, the twenty member states benefit from their partnership.

NCTAF conducts research in pertinent educational issues, such as its most recent report, *Fifty Years After Brown v. Board of Education: A Two-Tiered Education System*, which studied the quality of education of low income students and students of color. NCTAF also has included innovative teaching practices from their partner states in their research reports, such as their featuring of Cascade Junior-Senior High School in their publication, *No Dream Denied: A Pledge to America’s Children* (January 2003). NCTAF has been a resource of current research and data from other sources that Idaho has requested. Additionally, NCTAF assisted Idaho’s MOST in finding research consultants.

DISCUSSION

To maintain a partnership with NCTAF, Idaho must have an advisory group made up of representative stakeholders. Because Idaho’s MOST Advisory Group has been disbanded, the Board Office is recommending that the Professional Standards Commission take on the role as NCTAF’s representative group for Idaho. The Professional Standards Commission, as established in Idaho Code §33-1258, is already an advisory group to the Board and is composed of a diverse group of educational stakeholders, which is a requirement of NCTAF.

RECOMMENDATION

Board staff recommends that the Professional Standards Commission become the Board’s representative advisory group to NCTAF.

INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH & STUDENT AFFAIRS
JUNE 17-18, 2004

BOARD ACTION

A motion to approve the Professional Standards Commission as NCTAF's representative advisory group for Idaho, replacing the now disbanded Idaho's MOST Advisory Group.

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes _____ No _____