



**STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
TRUSTEES OF BOISE STATE UNIVERSITY
TRUSTEES OF IDAHO STATE UNIVERSITY
TRUSTEES OF LEWIS-CLARK STATE COLLEGE
BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO
STATE BOARD FOR PROFESSIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION**

**APPROVED MINUTES
STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
June 20-21, 2012
Eastern Idaho Technical College
Health Care Education Building, Room 6163/6164
1600 South 25th East
Idaho Falls, Idaho**

A regularly scheduled meeting of the State Board of Education was held June 20-21, 2012 at the Eastern Idaho Technical College in Idaho Falls, Idaho.

Present:

Ken Edmunds, President	Milford Terrell arrived at 1:25 p.m.
Don Soltman, Vice President	Bill Goesling
Emma Atchley, Secretary	Richard Westerberg
Tom Luna, State Superintendent	arrived at 1:27 p.m.

Absent:

Rod Lewis; Board member Lewis joined the meeting on Thursday at 8:27 a.m.

Wednesday, June 20, 2012

The Board met in the Health Care Education Building at the Eastern Idaho Technical College in Idaho Falls, Idaho. Board President Ken Edmunds called the meeting to order at 1:00 pm.

BOARDWORK

1. Agenda Review

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Soltman/Westerberg): To approve the agenda as submitted. The motion carried unanimously.

Unanimous consent was requested to move BAHR agenda item 10 related to the Idaho State University (ISU) Bond Refinancing to just before lunch on Thursday, June 21, 2012. There were no objections to this request.

2. Minutes Review

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Soltman/Goesling): To approve the minutes from the April 18-19, 2012 Regular Board meeting and the May 16-17, 2012 Board Retreat, as submitted. The motion carried unanimously.

3. Rolling Calendar

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Soltman/Atchley): To set May 15-16, 2013 as the date and Boise, Idaho as the location for the 2013 Board Retreat and to set June 19-20, 2013 as the date and the College of Southern Idaho as the location for the June 2013 regularly scheduled Board meeting. The motion carried unanimously.

Dr. Goesling brought up moving the May meeting back because of conflicts with attending graduations. Ms. Bent responded that because of the fiscal year payroll deadlines, it would not work with the payroll schedule. They decided to keep the schedule as stated.

Prior to the work session, Board President Edmunds introduced Representative Jeff Thompson as a visitor today and thanked him for taking the time to attend the meeting.

WORK SESSION

BUSINESS AFFAIRS & HUMAN RESOURCES (BAHR)

1. Zero-base Budgeting (ZBB) – David Hahn, DFM and Roger Brown, Governor's Office

Mr. Freeman introduced David Hahn and Richard Budzich from the Division of Financial Management (DFM) for their presentation on zero-base budgeting. Mr. Freeman indicated there were materials handed out to the Board members for this presentation and work session.

Mr. Hahn thanked the Board for the opportunity to present material on zero-base budgeting and how it applies to the higher education system. He indicated his goal is to make this a collaborative and meaningful discussion and that the materials passed out previously contain the scope and purpose of the Governor's zero based budgeting initiative for colleges and universities. He said the purpose for zero-base budgeting can

be summarized as a means in which we maximize the potential of each appropriated dollar by assessing alternative approaches to cost centers and aligning those cost centers according to the strategic plan of the institution. He confirmed they are not using a pure zero-base budgeting approach; they are using a modified zero-base budgeting approach.

Mr. Hahn expressed there is a need to identify what *can* be done with the resources available and what *should* be done with resources available. He said the timeliness of ZBB is important when prioritizing the use of the resources and it will help show where opportunities are for reallocation. He said there is a misconception that it is all about cutting budgets. Further, he felt ZBB complements the performance based funding and the 60% goal by helping set the stage for performance based budgeting. This would be achieved by ensuring cost centers and their prioritization support the performance measures in the performance based budgeting initiative, and by increasing awareness of state goals and funding priorities for higher education. The principles of ZBB can be used to help make investment choices based on the CCI plan strategies in order to achieve the 60% goal.

Mr. Hahn commented that in discussion with staff on funding scope, they arrived at two options. The first is where ZBB could be limited to appropriated funds (i.e., General Funds) and not to self-supporting auxiliary enterprises such as student housing or athletics. The second variation would be to include all funds, but limit the scope to General Education only. This would still exclude most funding for auxiliary enterprises. In future discussion, they hope to determine which option makes more sense. Mr. Hahn favored limiting the scope to General Education only.

Mr. Hahn commented that in considering the methodology, it is clear a one-size-fits-all approach doesn't work. Existing institutional accounting, budgeting, and planning systems will be used to undertake several steps he summarized in his presentation, starting with an in-depth review by institutions of their strategic plan and performance measures to align with the Board's 60% goal. The strategic plans would be due next July to the DFM office. Mr. Hahn's handout included a ZBB timeline for reference.

President Edmunds commented ZBB only works if there is a clear description of what we're trying to accomplish. He asked for direction from the Board and DFM on how to get that direction.

Mr. Westerberg commented the direction is present, and using institutions' strategic plans to guide budget review would be where to start. Mr. Soltman felt it should go to the VP level because it would have the most impact on them. Mr. Westerberg pointed out that BAHR has solicited the institutions for what they think would be reasonable criteria to be used in performance based budgeting and that BAHR will be working with the institutions on the item.

President Edmunds asked if there is any difference between ZBB and performance based indicators. Mr. Hahn responded they have not yet dealt with an agency using

performance based funding. He suggested using the performance based funding measures to prioritize the base in order to establish a position for the performance based funding rather than using two separate sets of budgeting criteria. Mr. Soltman reminded the group that the Board has not yet defined with certainty the measures for performance based funding. Dr. Goesling responded he feels they are two different avenues and suggested the zero based budgeting should be considered *modified* zero based budgeting since it is not true zero based budgeting. Dr. Goesling suggested getting to the point of knowing what each cost center contributes and if that contribution was worth the dollars expended, then prioritizing from there and reprioritizing those cost centers that couldn't answer the question.

There was further discussion about whether this included just state appropriations or other auxiliary expenditures. Mr. Freeman summarized that if you look at only appropriated funds, it will be extremely difficult to isolate and exercise zero based funding on certain types of positions. They felt it would be a good approach to isolate General Education funds to eliminate the issue of breaking out what is appropriated and so forth. Those funds excluded would be professional-technical education (PTE), special programs, auxiliary enterprises, competitively awarded grants and contracts.

President Edmunds asked Dr. Rush if excluding PTE would be appropriate. Dr. Rush indicated as a separate division, PTE would be doing their own form of ZBB for its actual office operating budget. There would not be any zero based budgeting for any of the postsecondary technical college items.

Dr. Rush added that PTE has had in place for a number of years a performance based funding mechanism and also a program reduction and termination policy with very specific criteria for programs. Mr. Freeman added there was a possibility of excluding the community colleges from this exercise because they have their own locally elected boards and their own property tax revenue, and only a small percentage of their budget is from appropriated funds. Mr. Hahn responded that given the unique circumstances with community colleges they would be excluded. He added zero based budgeting would focus on those dollars agencies have control of.

Mr. Westerberg was interested in hearing from the institutions about what inclusions they feel are appropriate for zero based budgeting; whether to use just appropriated funds or whether that scope should be broadened. Mr. Ickes from the University of Idaho said it would be useful to look at all the component parts, but there is extreme complexity in doing so. He wanted to determine how certain pieces factor in. He felt the General Education would be a reasonable place to start. Dr. Fernandez agreed and added there are a lot of things associated that are not part of the 60% goal that are included.

Mr. Hahn responded that not everything would fall under the 60% umbrella, for instance facilities. There would need to be criteria established around the 60% and non-60% goal categories. Dr. Rush commented the strategic plan would be a good place to start because it goes beyond the 60% goal and deals with efficiencies. Mr. Fletcher from ISU

remarked that they are comfortable with the discussion but they feel performance based budgeting is quite separate from zero based budgeting. The 60% goal is related to performance and zero based budgeting is related to efficiencies. Ms. Pearson agreed with most comments and remarked the institutions have very extensive detail in their budgets which include performance indicators. She said they need to clarify the goal of zero based budgeting because it does go beyond the 60% goal. She added that in this industry, zero based budgeting is not widely used or accepted.

Dr. Goesling suggested keeping the eye on the 60% goal and letting the institutions take it to the next level on their own.

Mr. Luna read aloud the definition of zero based budgeting. He indicated the Governor's letter alluded to similarities between his recommendation and the definition. Mr. Luna said ZBB is not what we are talking about here. Mr. Luna felt it should not be called ZBB if it is truly not ZBB. Mr. Hahn responded that the definition read by Mr. Luna was a pure approach and what they are talking about is a modified approach. He indicated the problem with ZBB is the level of detail; what they are trying to do is determine the principles and review the efficiency of the cost centers to challenge the assumptions and determine the key outcomes which should prioritize the base.

Mr. Terrell felt there could be problems using ZBB in higher education. He felt higher education institutions are scrutinized so much currently on their budgets and spending, that it would not be beneficial for them to use ZBB. He suggested asking the Governor to define exactly what he was looking for because it may not work in higher education to take everything back to zero each year. He felt it would be too difficult for each of the institutions to prioritize where the cuts would take place because those cuts likely don't return each year after they are made. He expressed empathy to the institutions because of what they already go through in justifying their budgets.

Mr. Freeman made a few points of clarification. He commented that what the Governor has asked for is not a pure ZBB exercise. It is more to evaluate and reprioritize operations which is the focus of the initiative, and that institutions are not being asked to take their budgets back to zero each year. Mr. Terrell still didn't feel comfortable with it. Mr. Hahn followed up by saying the Governor's recommendation is a modified approach to zero based budgeting and agencies can use it by seriously examining cost centers and determining where they could be made more efficient.

Mr. Terrell felt the item should go back to BAHHR for more review. Mr. Soltman asked what DFM would do with the information submitted by the Board and the institutions. Mr. Hahn responded the information would be shared with the Governor and used to benefit the institution, perhaps even in proposing legislation.

President Edmunds expressed concern about changing the budgeting process for the institutions and asked for feedback from the institutions. Ms. Pearson responded that it describes what they do at the department level currently and expressed hope to keep the process they use because it has been successful; adding that they do look at their

budget structure very thoroughly. Dr. Fernandez commented they would likely not change the process it currently uses and echoed somewhat the comments and concerns of Ms. Pearson. Mr. Ickes responded they have only been doing base budgeting because there hasn't been base plus; he expressed base minus would be a better way to describe it. He added that they will need to look at auxiliaries, and that they will continue to take advantage of opportunities as they present themselves.

Ms. Atchley asked if DFM expects this to be an ongoing process each year. She indicated it is a major strain with resources being too thin for the financial staff to meet the requirements of a complete audit. She was concerned about taking away administrative resources which will reduce the resources and dollars that can be put into the basic process of student success. She felt the cost benefit of this process is not clear and asked DFM to describe how the cost process would work.

Mr. Hahn responded that the ongoing aspect of ZBB is for this to be on an every six-year cycle. Each year they are asking a group of agencies to undergo this process and at the end of the first cycle DFM and the Governor will review the results and determine if the agency needs to continue in another six-year cycle. They cannot do all of state government in one year which is why it is broken up. In terms of how it affects the student, he responded that by prioritizing the cost centers which fall into line with the strategic plan of the institution is how it would benefit students.

Mr. Luna said there is a perception that ZBB leads to areas to cut. He asked DFM what changes have they seen with the agencies who have already done this. He expressed concern about using the resources to do this analysis and then having no change or result. Mr. Hahn responded that there have been a number of agencies who have realigned their cost centers and realigned their resources. He said prior to this initiative, it has always been just base plus budgeting. Mr. Hahn indicated he felt it is a good process to use to examine the base and he would like to spend more time with financial VPs and Mr. Freeman to look at where the opportunities are and to avoid duplication of effort.

President Edmunds asked for the item to return to BAHF. Mr. Westerberg indicated he welcomed the opportunity to further explore this with the financial VPs and DFM to maximize the value of the process. Mr. Hahn indicated the expectation is for this to be a roadmap to budget submission for 2013. Mr. Budzich added that in looking ahead they need to look at something like this because of potential cuts and priorities in state government budgeting, and this analysis will help clarify where budgets should be.

PLANNING, POLICY & GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

2. Parliamentary Procedures Training

Dr. Rush provided a presentation on parliamentary procedure for the Board. He summarized that parliamentary procedure is often seen as a hurdle in participation when in fact it is used to make the meeting run more effectively. He said the purpose is

to accomplish the will of the majority while protecting the rights of the minority. It is used to facilitate a process, provide a focus for discussion and provide a series of methods by which action is taken.

Dr. Rush indicated the entire process is based on the main motion on the floor. That provides the focus for discussion and triggers the tools to dispose of the main motion. It is properly presented to say *I move that*. The chair is allowed to work with the maker of the motion to make it right. The motion is then restated by the chair and it becomes the property of the assembly and official record. Motions do require a second but if the chair forgets to ask for a second and discussion starts on the motion before receiving a second, the motion becomes moot. If you have a committee report, they do not need a second.

The committee chair makes the motion; the president is the only one that can solidify and arbitrate the motion. He can say the motion is moved and seconded, and then it becomes the property of the assembly. At this time, there may be discussion of the motion. It is important that there is an official record of the actual wording of the motion.

President Edmunds clarified that as a matter of practice the Board will use a second on all motions before going to discussion.

Dr. Rush indicated that a roll call vote is the only vote that is legally binding. The way you get around not using a roll call vote all the time is that nobody objects. In a small group such as the Board, a voice vote works most of the time. Any board member can request a roll call vote at any time and if that occurs, a roll call vote is required. He noted for Board members that requesting unanimous consent is a fast way to vote on minutes, the consent agenda and to modify an agenda. In any case of voting though, the chair needs to announce results.

Dr. Rush summarized the most common way to get the main motion off the floor is to vote on it and that there can be subsidiary motions to the main motion. One subsidiary is to amend the main motion. The primary way to change a motion is to strike a portion out or add something; or you can do both by striking out and inserting words. Once it is seconded and restated by the chair; it becomes property of the assembly. The motion becomes the focus of discussion until the amendment is voted on. The motion can be referred to a committee or the motion can be postponed to a definite time.

Dr. Rush summarized the two specialty forms of amendment. One is to amend by substitute; the other is to refer it to a committee. The substitute is used when the changes are too extensive to be effectively dealt with by the normal procedure of adding, striking out or striking out and adding. When the motion is referred to a committee, the committee can report back or take action. Dr. Rush pointed out that when you take action, you vote on these in reverse order. He provided examples of this process and how it might sound.

Dr. Rush briefly shared a number of other subsidiary motions including *limit debate*, *previous question*, and to *table the motion*. He said it is out of order to cut off debate if discussion is active. The motion to *limit debate* or anything which takes away a constitutional right (i.e., speech) requires a 2/3 vote. Dr. Rush reminded the Board members that Robert's Rules demand the protection of the minority. The *motion to table* was designed to take an item off the floor and put it aside momentarily and put something else on the floor. He cautioned that if the *motion to table* is used on any substantial issue, it is being used incorrectly because you would in effect be taking away a constitutional right (i.e., to debate). The *motion to table* is only limited to certain special circumstances and is used rarely. Instead, you would likely use a motion to postpone to a definite time.

Dr. Rush clarified what it means when a member calls out "*question*" during the discussion. It means that someone is ready to vote and they are looking to see if others are ready to vote. The proper response from the chair when that happens is to say "*question has been called, is there any further discussion?*" The person who called "*question*" is expressing a sentiment that they are ready to move on. If they want to cut off debate, they need to move the previous motion and it must have a second, and a 2/3 majority vote. He also indicated the president could call that motion out of order if it is obvious there are people who want further discussion.

Dr. Rush further indicated there are privileged motions such as a *call for order*. *Call for orders of the day* is where the chair and the assembly are obligated to follow the agenda. Another motion is a question of personal privilege – for instance if a member can't hear or would like to request a short break. Other motions are to recess and to adjourn. These all require a second.

There were a few more motions Dr. Rush mentioned briefly which included a *motion to reconsider* – it requires a second and is debatable. It is also a way to bring a motion back up for consideration. If it passes, it puts the main motion back on the floor and it may be used to refer a motion to a committee. There are a few incidental motions; that serve to withdraw or modify a motion. They are handled most generally by unanimous consent. Other motions include a *division of the house* which means a member requests a counted vote, a *request for information*, a *point of order*, and to *suspend the rules*. There is also a *motion to appeal from the decision of the chair*. With that, Dr. Rush concluded his parliamentary procedures presentation and stood for questions. There were no questions for Dr. Rush.

CONSENT AGENDA

M/S (Soltman/Westerberg): To approve the Consent Agenda as printed. Motion carried unanimously.

1. University of Idaho

By unanimous consent to approve the changes to University of Idaho policies on faculty promotion and tenure as set forth in Attachment 1 as submitted to the Board.

2. Approval of FY 2013 Appropriated Funds Operating Budgets

By unanimous consent to approve the FY 2013 operating budgets for the Office of the State Board of Education, Idaho Public Television, Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, College and Universities, Postsecondary Professional-Technical Education, Agricultural Research & Extension, Health Education and Special Programs, as presented.

3. Approval of Higher Education Research Council (HERC) FY13 Budget

By unanimous consent to approve the FY 2013 Higher Education Research Council Budget Allocation as presented.

4. Boise State University Law Enforcement Contract with Boise City Police Department

By unanimous consent to authorize Boise State University to enter into a law enforcement and security services annual contract with the Boise Police Department as presented in Attachment 1, and to authorize the vice president for finance and administration to execute the contract.

5. Idaho State University Network Switching Infrastructure Upgrade

By unanimous consent to approve the request by Idaho State University to upgrade the network switching infrastructure, for an amount not to exceed \$1.5 million.

6. University of Idaho Changes in Constitution and Bylaws of the University Faculty

By unanimous consent to approve changes to University of Idaho faculty constitution as set forth in the materials submitted to the Board as attachment 1.

By unanimous consent to approve changes to University of Idaho Faculty Senate Bylaws as set forth in the materials submitted to the Board as attachment 2.

7. Idaho Division of Vocational Rehabilitation Advisory Council Appointment

By unanimous consent to approve the appointment of Angela Lindig as a representative of a parent training and information center to the Vocational Rehabilitation State Rehabilitation Council for a term of three years July 1, 2012 and ending June 30, 2015.

By unanimous consent to approve the reappointment of Sean Burlile to the Vocational Rehabilitation State Rehabilitation Council as a representative of a disability advocacy group for a term of three years effective June 24, 2012 and ending June 30, 2015.

By unanimous consent to approve the appointment of Mark E. Marrott to the Vocational Rehabilitation State Rehabilitation Council as a representative for

business, industry and labor for a term of three years effective July 1, 2012 and ending June 30, 2015.

By unanimous consent to approve the appointment of Max Sorenson to the Vocational Rehabilitation State Rehabilitation Council as a representative for qualified vocational rehabilitation counselors for a term of three years effective July 1, 2012 and ending June 30, 2015.

By unanimous consent to approve the appointment of Lori Gentillon to the Vocational Rehabilitation State Rehabilitation Council as a representative of a community rehabilitation program service provider for a term of three years effective July 1, 2012 and ending June 30, 2015.

8. State Department of Education Request for Waiver of 103% Student Transportation Funding Cap for Six School Districts.

By unanimous consent to approve the request by Moscow School District for a waiver of the 103% transportation funding cap, at a new cap percentage rate for the fiscal year 2012 of 116% for a total of \$40,328 in additional funds from the public school appropriation.

By unanimous consent to approve the request by Garden Valley School District for a waiver of the 103% transportation funding cap, at a new cap percentage rate for the fiscal year 2012 of 143% for a total of \$37,726 in additional funds from the public school appropriation.

By unanimous consent to approve the request by Highland School District for a waiver of the 103% transportation funding cap, at a new cap percentage rate for the fiscal year 2012 of 143% for a total of \$2,615 in additional funds from the public school appropriation.

By unanimous consent to approve the request by St. Maries School District for a waiver of the 103% transportation funding cap, at a new cap percentage rate for the fiscal year 2012 of 110% for a total of \$3,897 in additional funds from the public school appropriation.

By unanimous consent to approve the request by Lapwai School District for a waiver of the 103% transportation funding cap, at a new cap percentage rate for the fiscal year 2012 of 120% for a total of \$14,716 in additional funds from the public school appropriation.

By unanimous consent to approve the request by Wallace School District for a waiver of the 103% transportation funding cap, at a new cap percentage rate for the fiscal year 2012 of 117% for a total of \$23,294 in additional funds from the public school appropriation.

9. State Department of Education Request for Approval to Transport Students Less than One-and-One-Half Miles for the 2011-2012 School Year.

By unanimous consent to approve the requests by the 100 school districts and 12 charter schools for approval to transport students less than one-and-one-half miles as listed in Attachment 1.

10. State Department of Education Appointment to the Professional Standards Commission.

By unanimous consent to approve Clara Allred as a member of the Professional Standards Commission for a term of three years representing special education administrators, effective July 1, 2012.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

M/S (Soltman/Goesling): A motion to meet in executive session to evaluate the presidents of Idaho's state higher education institutions and its executive director, pursuant to Idaho Code Section 67-2345(1)(b). A roll call vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously. Following the roll call, the Board members entered into executive session at 4:07 p.m.

M/S (Terrell/Soltman): To go out of Executive Session at 4:35 p.m. and adjourn for the day. The motion carried unanimously.

Thursday June 21, 2012, 8:00 a.m., Eastern Idaho Technical College, Health Care Education Building, Rooms 6163/6164, Idaho Falls, ID.

President Edmunds called the meeting to order at 8:03 a.m. He stated that there were no requests for open forum and then turned the time over to Mr. Soltman for the Policy Planning and Governmental Affairs (PPGA) agenda. Superintendent Luna was absent for this portion of the meeting.

PLANNING, POLICY & GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS (PPGA)

1. Eastern Idaho Technical College – Biennial Progress Report

President Albiston provided an overview of Eastern Idaho Technical College's (EITC) progress in carrying out the College's strategic plan, details of implementation, status of goals and objectives and information on other points of interest. He started out with a brief history of EITC and its progress over the years. He shared information on EITC's committees and their goals, adding they have a positive placement rate of 90% for their graduates. EITC serves nine counties in eastern Idaho. Their services fall into three categories and in FY11 they served over 16,000 students. Their largest division for

student enrollment is in health profession training. They saw a slight decrease in enrollment in FY11.

Dr. Albiston indicated over the past three years, they have surpassed their targets in several areas. In addition to the activities on the EITC campus, they provide a number of outreach programs such as adult basic education, workforce training and health profession training. He commented that more than half of the students receive some form of financial assistance and EITC has been very fortunate for the support of the EITC Foundation and J.A. and Kathryn Albertson Foundation in creating opportunities for many students by providing scholarships, materials and books to name a few. EITC's retention and collaboration efforts have been assisting the state toward its 60% goal.

Dr. Goesling asked how many programs produce a certificate in less than one year. President Albiston responded there are about 35 graduates per year in their certified truck driving school and in excess of 100 graduates in their certified nursing assistant program. Dr. Goesling asked if those students are apt to return to advance themselves further. President Albiston responded that with their CNA program several students return to advance their education. President Edmunds asked of the 53% of students in health care, how many are in nursing. President Albiston responded that about 60% are in nursing and the remainder in other health care professions. President Edmunds asked if they are using more distance learning for students. President Albiston responded affirmatively, adding that they are looking at the types of programs and how to best deliver those programs.

Ms. Atchley congratulated Mr. Albiston on the success of the college and asked to be kept updated on their cloud system.

Board Member Lewis joined the meeting at 8:27 a.m.

2. Boise State University – President's Council Report

Mr. Soltman invited the institution presidents to come forward for the President's Council report. Boise State University President and current chair of the President's Council, Bob Kustra, gave a report from the most recent Presidents' Council meeting and answered questions.

He summarized they have met twice since the last Board meeting and in May, they received an update on the statewide emergency operations plan and role the colleges and universities will play in that plan. They also discussed presidential succession plans and confirmed the chair rotation schedule for the Presidents' Council. Dr. Glandon is next in the rotation starting in August. At the June meeting, they discussed topics from the Board retreat, and focused on how to make the work of the President's Council more meaningful and productive.

President Edmunds asked if they had discussed a separate meeting schedule for four year institution presidents. Dr. Kustra responded that the discussion suggested presidents get together at Board meetings either before or after the Board meeting.

There was an item that was referred back to CAAP from the President's Council with regard to collaboration among universities. President Edmunds commented on a competency based baccalaureate degree and asked if it was being considered here. President Kustra responded not at this time and that the private sector is moving more quickly than the public sector on these programs and we will likely see some results from the private sector soon.

President Edmunds requested unanimous consent to move to item four on the agenda since Dr. Clark had not yet arrived for his presentation to the Board as scheduled under item three of the agenda. There were no objections.

3. BYU-Idaho Presentation

President Edmunds introduced Dr. Kim Clark from BYU-Idaho and also recognized Representative Bateman's attendance at the meeting. BYU-Idaho converted from a two-year institution to a four-year institution and now has the largest full time enrollment in the state. President Clark earned bachelors', masters', and doctorate degrees in economics from Harvard University. In 1978 Dr. Clark became a member of the faculty at the Harvard Business School and was named the dean of the school in 1995. He served in that capacity until he became president of BYU-Idaho in 2005.

Dr. Clark thanked the Board for the opportunity to present today. He addressed the Board regarding the concept of "modularization" and other initiatives that BYU-Idaho has implemented that have allowed them to become one of the largest postsecondary educational institutions within the state of Idaho. Modularization is a process in which students graduate within 120 credit hours, even if they have changed majors. Some of the other initiatives include: online learning, increased utilization of brick and mortar facilities, and processes for dealing with disadvantaged students in remote areas.

Dr. Clark shared a brief presentation to the Board starting with the background of BYU-Idaho. Their focus is on undergraduate education which is student centered and teaching oriented. They offer about 16 majors and about 20 associate's degrees. They serve roughly 28,500 students which is head-count – not full time equivalent students, and have 511 full time faculty. They have a strong honor code being affiliated with the Mormon Church and have no intercollegiate sports.

He shared the three imperatives that have driven the university which are improved student experience, to serve more students and to lower the relative cost of education. He also shared some initiatives they have launched to achieve the imperatives. He described a new academic calendar that uses a three semester/three-track system which allows them to run all year long with a new academic day from 7:45-5:30 that has 60 minute classes with 15 minutes in between. The standard faculty load is 4 classes

per semester; 120 students average. Dr. Clark commented this calendar change has caused fundamental changes in the operation of the university. They now have balance across the tracks between students and faculty. Their growth has increased rapidly and is credited to this new academic calendar which has allowed the growth without adding classroom space or new faculty. The new academic calendar has helped cut costs as well. For operating costs per FTE student, there has been a decrease of 21% since 2003; and 16.7% decrease in total operating and capital cost per FTE student.

Dr. Clark pointed out the idea behind the BYU- Idaho learning model is to create a university-wide set of principles and processes that apply to all disciplines. The learning model uses small classes where faculty knows the students. The class size is about 30 with a maximum size of 85. He commented their learning model is deeply rooted in their faith but can be translated for secular application. It puts responsibility for education on the student and uses the student in the teaching process rather than just having them taught. Their process includes investment, engagement and assessment. These processes translate to preparing the individual, teaching one another and pondering and proving what is learned, respectively. BYU-Idaho also requires their faculty to learn and teach in other areas other than those of their specialty within reason.

President Edmunds asked if they have any information on improvement in students' critical thinking with this teaching model. Dr. Clark indicated they are seeing some improvement, but not what it needs to be.

Dr. Clark said they use their faculty as designers of learning experiences with a focus on active learning, experiential learning and engaged students. He added that on-line education has played an important role for BYU-Idaho. They use on-line and hybrid classes which use integrated curriculum, increases on-campus capacity and increases the university's reach. They offer about 135 on-line courses and plan to offer only select courses on-line. They serve approximately 10,253 students on-line.

Dr. Clark mentioned that starting in the fall of 2010, the index of gain in student learning started improving. The gain was realized by not increasing the on-line course offerings, but by focusing on re-designing the courses that were offered. Their studies show that their on-line learning is close to that of face-to-face learning in quality. He said they also use modular degrees to improve student learning and time to graduation, summarizing the modularity as built on blocks of complementary courses that combine in different ways to create degrees. The standard degree has 40-55 credits, the integrated standard degree has 67 credits, the specialized degree has 80 credits and the interdisciplinary studies degree as 60 credits.

Dr. Clark commented they also use the Pathway program which is designed to offer higher education to students who are not attending college, or who are not making progress and who desire higher education. This system helps students find their pathway as the name suggests. It is a combination of on-line courses overseen by church members who assist and mentor the student. The Pathway program will

eventually operate in about 65 sites throughout the United States, Mexico and other countries. They also discovered it was necessary to expand their target group to include the over 30 age group.

President Edmunds asked if their system is applicable to a public education system. Dr. Clark responded in the affirmative and indicated it would have several beneficial areas that could translate to public institutions. He felt the challenge would be in the implementation area and how to make it work. He used the year-round calendar as an example. Dr. Clark said it requires change to change traditional patterns, figuring out what works and what doesn't, and implementing what works. He believes on-line education will become so effective that it is completely necessary to offer it, adding that if it was not offered, it would be a disservice to students. There were no other questions for Dr. Clark.

Mr. Soltman thanked Dr. Clark for his presentation to the Board.

4. Idaho Division of Vocational Rehabilitation – 2013 State Plan

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Soltman/Terrell): To approve the Idaho State Plan for the Vocational Rehabilitation Services as submitted. The motion carried unanimously.

5. Board Policy IV.G. – Second Reading

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Soltman/Goesling): To approve the second reading of Board policy IV.G. Idaho State Rehabilitation Council as presented. The motion carried unanimously.

6. Legislative Ideas - 2013 Legislative Session

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Soltman/Westerberg): To approve the six (6) legislative ideas as submitted and to authorize the Executive Director to submit these and additional proposals as necessary through the Governor's legislative process. The motion carried unanimously.

7. 2012-2017 Strategic Plans – BSU & NIC

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Soltman/Westerberg): To approve the 2012-2017 (FY13-FY17) strategic plans for Boise State University and North Idaho College as submitted and to authorize Board staff to work with the institutions to make necessary changes for

submission of the plans to the Division of Financial Management. The motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Atchley commented about seeing comparative material in their strategic plans and discouraged including comparisons to other public Idaho institutions. She encouraged looking at system strengths and not system competitions. She said comparison to peers would be acceptable.

8. Famous Idaho Potato Bowl – Request for Alcohol Permit-NCAA Football Games

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Soltman/Terrell): To approve Famous Idaho Potato Bowl's request to operate a corporate tent village consistent with the terms herein for the 2013 through 2016 Bowl games in compliance with Board Policy I.J. and the terms submitted as Attachment 1. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Terrell recognized the presence of Kevin McDonald, Executive Director of the Famous Idaho Potato Bowl and turned the time over to him for comments.

Mr. McDonald spoke briefly about the Bowl game and tent village indicating the tent village has been a big part of the Bowl Game in providing revenue. Over the last six years since Mr. McDonald has been Executive Director, tent village has have been incident free. They have asked to move tent village to a different location because of the construction at BSU. He commented the Bowl Game has been a major part of the community for over ten (10) years and has made a positive impact on the economics of the city of Boise. The Famous Idaho Potato Bowl will earn revenues from the lease of the corporate tents. The university will also earn revenues from the lease of the stadium. Bowl management has reported no incidences associated with the event.

Mr. Terrell asked how the Bowl is perceived overall and throughout the nation. Mr. McDonald responded positively and said the disconnect that existed previously with the name of the Humanitarian Bowl has faded with the rename of the Famous Idaho Potato Bowl. Since then, they have seen substantial increase in sponsorships, ticket sales and participation, and on a national level they are celebrating their 16th annual game this year. Mr. McDonald expressed appreciation for the partnership with the state of Idaho, city of Boise, Boise State University and the University of Idaho.

At this time, the unanimous consent was requested to return to item three on the agenda. There were no objections.

9. Boise State University – Alcohol Permit for 2012 Home Football Games – Stueckle Sky Center

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Soltman/Atchley): To approve the request by Boise State University to allow the sale of alcohol in the Sky Center during home games, Famous Idaho Potato Bowl, and the 2013 Spring Game in full compliance with Board Policy I.J for the 2012/13 football season. The motion carried with a five-to-two vote. Mr. Terrell and Mr. Lewis voted nay.

Mr. Soltman reminded the Board members that Mr. Terrell had requested to speak in the aggregate to the next several agenda items regarding alcohol permits. Mr. Terrell requested the presidents come forward for discussion of alcohol permits. He commented on his understanding of monetary gain by having alcohol on campus and also the advantages of public relations at these games. However, Mr. Terrell expressed concern about sending the wrong message to students by issuing these alcohol permits. He felt there is a double standard shown to students with having alcohol at athletic events and felt that the Board is not setting the right example for students. He asked the presidents to provide a response to the importance of having alcohol at football events specifically.

President Vailas responded for Idaho State University (ISU) commenting on the long standing cultural expectation to serve alcohol at sporting events, along with it being a revenue generator. He felt there is a commitment to the people and the revenue helps support other sports as well. Dr. Vailas commented there are policies that are followed in allowing alcohol at events on campus, adding it is important it is policed properly.

Dr. Kustra from Boise State University (BSU) responded with regard to tailgating and indicated it is a culture that has gone on for generations. He felt it is in fact increasing on all campuses nationwide as a family friendly and social gathering and has long been understood as somewhere people can bring their beverages to enjoy during the event, alcoholic or not. Dr. Kustra added that Boise State polices their policy thoroughly and commented that if alcohol were to be banned on campus, it would be impossible to effectively police it, and further it would hurt revenues.

Dr. Kustra commented their policy is reasonable and checks behavior. He added that there are isolated incidents, but the reports from BSU and any of the other campuses do not show that alcohol is creating a major problem. He commented on the benefit of entertaining donors and how those donors support universities through events where food and alcoholic beverages are available. Dr. Kustra summarized they are part of a society that over the years has increased alcohol at events, but at the same time have cracked down on overuse and abuse at these events as well. He felt alcohol is not a major issue on the BSU campus, reminding Board members they have a system in place that has been working well with very few incidents, keeping alcohol out of where it doesn't belong and only for those over 21.

President Nellis from the University of Idaho echoed the remarks of Dr. Kustra and responded they monitor the events closely where alcohol is served and encourage responsible alcohol consumption. He commented the donors also have an expectation that alcohol is available on campus at sporting events. He said there have been a

limited number of incidents off campus and there are significant penalties for students who violate the rules and policies on misuse of alcohol. Dr. Nellis recalled a recent report that indicated alcohol incidences are actually declining. He added that at their permitted events, he is not aware of one incident that has occurred regarding alcohol abuse.

President Fernandez indicated Lewis-Clark State College has not served alcohol at sporting events with the exception of VIP events, fundraising events and community events. He said there is one exception to this, which is a reception before the World Series. There are few isolated misuse incidents, but they are not rising. He said their student athletes are held at a higher standard as well. He echoed the sentiments of the other presidents and commented favorably about experiences he has had at the University of Idaho sporting events where alcohol has been served.

Mr. Terrell thanked the presidents for their responses and asked the Planning and Policy chair Don Soltman for the committee to review the alcohol policies and provide an update on how the policy may be cleaned up, if there should be a cap on alcohol permits, the timelines that are set forth for football games for when alcohol service begins and ends, and how the Board should react to tailgating.

Dr. Goesling commented that he concurs with Mr. Terrell, but his concern is that they have already reviewed this material in detail with the Athletics Committee.

Mr. Lewis asked Mr. Terrell about his thoughts on what the Board should aspire to and the objectives he has in mind. Mr. Terrell responded about his opposition to having alcohol on campus and that it should not be acceptable as the norm. He feels they should have a no-alcohol policy except in certain areas and there should be caps on the alcohol permits issued. He sees no benefit of having alcohol on campus and would like to see it have less visibility than it presently has.

Mr. Lewis responded in thanks for Mr. Terrell's leadership on this issue and for challenging the Board to think differently about it. Mr. Lewis said he was surprised by the responses of the presidents and encouraged them to be leaders and not followers in regards to allowing alcohol permits, meaning they don't have to issue the permits just because it is commonplace nationwide. He expressed concern that the culture is suggesting a successful football program has a successful tailgating culture. He agrees with Mr. Terrell that the example set is not the best for families, children and students; and that it would be interesting to make the statement to the students and community by not having alcohol on campus.

Dr. Kustra responded that he differs from the suggestion that the presidents are not culture leaders. He felt that there is a general understanding in society that one can use alcohol in a social setting in moderation without reaching a state of inebriation and felt wine and beer are as widely accepted as water or lemonade. He said the real issue is not the service of alcohol itself, but how much is consumed. Dr. Kustra suggested

considering options on regulating how much alcohol is consumed at games, and not prohibition in general, as something to consider.

There was further discussion about the topic of alcohol consumption at football games. In regard to tailgating where moderation is likely not occurring in some instances, Mr. Lewis and Mr. Terrell were concerned with promoting that kind of culture to students and families.

10. Boise State University – Alcohol Permit for 2012 Home Football Games – Carven Williams Complex

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Soltman/Atchley): To approve the request by Boise State University to establish secure areas specified in Attachment 2 and Attachment 3 for the purpose of allowing alcohol service during pre-game activities in full compliance with Board Policy I.J for the 2012/13 football season. The motion carried with a five-to-two vote. Mr. Terrell and Mr. Lewis voted nay.

Mr. Lewis asked for better consistency in the lists and description of controls with these motions from year to year. Mr. Soltman clarified that the 13 descriptor items were put in policy. Mr. Lewis indicated that satisfied his concern.

11. Idaho State University – Alcohol Permit for 2012 Home Football Games

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Soltman/Atchley): To approve the request by Idaho State University to establish secure areas as specified for the purpose of allowing alcohol service during pre-game activities in full compliance with Board Policy I.J. for the 2012/13 football season. The motion carried with a five-to-two vote. Mr. Terrell and Mr. Lewis voted nay.

12. University of Idaho – Alcohol Permit for 2012 Home Football Games – Pre-Game Events

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Soltman/Goesling): To approve the request by the University of Idaho to allow alcohol service during the 2012 football season in the North Kibbie Field, Student Activities Field, and the Menard Law Building foyer under the conditions outlined in Board policy section I.J. subsection 2.c. The motion carried with a five-to-two vote. Mr. Terrell and Mr. Lewis voted nay.

Mr. Lewis clarified he is voting nay as a statement relative to the comments heard earlier today.

13. University of Idaho – Alcohol Permit for 2012 Home Football Games – Club Seating

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Soltman/Atchley): To approve the request by the University of Idaho to allow alcohol service during the 2012 football season and during the spring 2013 football scrimmage, in the Litehouse Center/Bud and June Ford Club Room located in the ASUI Kibbie Activity Center under the conditions outlined in Board Policy I.J. subsection 2.c. The motion carried with a five-to-two vote. Mr. Terrell and Mr. Lewis voted nay.

14. Alcohol Permits – Issued by University Presidents

There was no discussion on the informational item.

15. Lumina Foundation Grant

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Soltman/Goesling): The Board directs Eastern Idaho Technical College, Boise State University, Idaho State University, Lewis-Clark State College and the University of Idaho to participate in the Lumina Foundation Grant to explore and implement consistent approaches to awarding reverse transfer associate degrees to students who transfer from Idaho’s community colleges or technical college to four-year institutions. The motion carried unanimously.

At this time unanimous consent was requested for a 15 minute break from 10:30-10:45; there were no objections. After the break, they moved to address item 10 on the BAHF agenda; then immediately returned to the IRSA agenda.

INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH & STUDENT AFFAIRS (IRSA)

1. Complete College Idaho Plan

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Atchley): To approve the postsecondary degree and certificate projections as presented. A roll call vote was taken and the motion carried four-to-three. Mr. Terrell, Dr. Goesling and President Edmunds voted nay on the motion.

Substitute Motion: M/S (Terrell/Soltman): I move to send this item back to the IRSA committee. Mr. Westerberg clarified that this motion refers only to the allocation of numbers back to the committee. Mr. Terrell chose to withdraw the motion. Unanimous consent was requested and granted to withdraw the motion.

M/S (Westerberg/Atchley): I move to approve the Complete College Idaho plan as submitted. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Westerberg turned the floor over to Selena Grace from the Board office who introduced Scott Grothe and Jessica Piper, also from the Board office; and Byron Yankee, Senior Policy Advisor from the Idaho Business Coalition for Educational Excellence (IBCEE). State Board Executive Director Mike Rush provided a brief summary and overview of the Complete College Idaho Plan to the Board members. He discussed some of the strategies and collaborative efforts that will help Idaho reach those goals and indicated they are ready to take the next step which involves the refining of the 60% goal in terms of specific responsibility for institutions and the approval of the revised plan itself.

Bryon Yankee indicated at the Coalition's meeting Tuesday, they changed their name to Idaho Business for Education or IBE. He announced from that same meeting that they adopted Idaho's 60% goal directly and established a two-year priority with a focus on increasing enrollment and retention rates. He indicated IBE is eager to provide support and opportunities for this focus throughout the state. Mr. Yankee provided some background on his work on a college access network project which looked at a way to go across the state and interact with a large cross-section of Idaho students and individuals to gather data and information about how to increase college access and the percentage of students who will go on to some form of postsecondary education. In doing this, a series of surveys were developed after which focus groups and a design team met to analyze the data obtained and provide recommendations.

Mr. Yankee indicated a document was developed from this analysis that will be available soon for review. He shared some of the high points they identified and that the biggest barrier to postsecondary education for most is how to pay for the education; the second largest barrier was the lack of financial aid. All groups reported that parents had the greatest influence on whether students chose some sort of program after high school, and that by supporting parents in providing needed information earlier and more frequently during a student's secondary education could both prepare and assist the students and the parents. He added that the lack of family support can be detrimental.

Mr. Yankee listed several areas within the community that could assist in being a source of information for parents such as banks, clubs, state agencies, non-profit organizations. He emphasized the importance of creating a collaborative network among these groups to improve communication and promote the shared focus of increasing postsecondary education to help promote a college-going culture. Mr. Yankee shared some observations and findings from meetings with focus groups, and commented that when stakeholders were surveyed on how they would rate the economic impact of Idaho reaching the 60% goal, 89% rated reaching that goal as *valuable* or *very valuable*.

Mr. Yankee shared some broad recommendations from the findings which included creating a readily accessible database of Idaho scholarships, providing earlier and expanded access to financial planning for parents and students, expanding the usage of

existing resources and Career Information Systems (CIS), increasing the access to information to a broader audience in a more focused way, and developing communication and network strategies.

Mr. Yankee expressed his appreciation for being part of the CCI Plan and committee. He pointed out the congruence between the strategies identified by the focus groups and the CCI Plan.

Ms. Grace indicated that a complete copy of the revised plan was included in the agenda materials to Board members. She provided the main highlights of the revised plan which included additional focus on statewide initiatives along with institution and agency initiatives. She commented they had highlighted five strategies and added a new strategy: *leverage partnerships*. They removed *demystify college* because the initiatives and activities align better with *strengthening the pipeline* and *structure for success*. Additional changes included more direct focus on initiatives and activities that are both statewide and at the institution and agency level.

Dr. Rush offered some comments on the refinement of the 60% goal. He indicated the 25-34 year old target was not picked to limit what institutions do or to discriminate against the older age group. It was picked to target that group of people who are going to have the most impact on our economy for the longest period of time. He also addressed how they intend to define what is counted in the 60% goal and indicated they are still having some difficulty with the data because there is not specific census data available to measure by; the census data measures by *some college*.

Scott Grothe from the Board office presented an updated review of the data analysis since the December Board meeting. He commented that we are around 35%-36% presently in regards to the 60% goal. He identified a recent development that could impact the ability to measure the data in the future, commenting that the U.S. House of Representatives has voted to eliminate the Census Bureau's American Community Survey. If this happens, it will eliminate our ability to track the percent of 25-34 year-olds with an associate's degree or higher. He commented that they expect to hear more about this in the next few months.

On refining the 60% goal, the Board office reconciled historical degree production with the subsequent Census Bureau population education attainment levels. Those historical reconciliation factors were applied to recent and future goal-related credential production to get the projections presented today. In doing this work along with additional vetting among staff and institution analysts, assumptions were validated on population estimates, in-out migration rates, and age of the student at graduation. Mr. Grothe pointed out that 20% of our graduates are beyond the age of 35; 37% are between the ages of 25-34 and 43% are younger than 25 years of age.

In comparing Idaho to other Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE) states, Idaho is at 31% for those with an associate's degree or higher. The WICHE average is 37.2% and the U.S. average is 39.3%. Mr. Grothe summarized data

from the other categories and indicated that staff recommends Idaho aspire to education levels of the top seven performing WICHE states. In looking at how Idaho might compare to the top seven performing WICHE states, the public institutions need to collectively confer on average 16.3% per year between now and 2020. Mr. Grothe pointed out in attaining this goal we will likely be boosting the education level of non-targeted populations as well.

Mr. Soltman asked if there has been an institutional break down done. Mr. Grothe responded that has not been done, and to do so would require guesswork in estimating those numbers. Mr. Soltman responded that unless the institutions receive feedback, they will not know how they are doing in relation to the goal. Dr. Rush indicated that if this motion is approved, it is the first time they have set a goal by degree level. In doing so, it will give institutions significantly more information than they have had in the general 60% goal. He recommended each of the institutions need to determine how much they can contribute in consideration of the refined goal.

There was further discussion on the refined analysis and how institutions and community colleges will be contributing to the goals. President Edmunds commented that he is very uncomfortable with the projection of certificates and asked if the chair of the committee would consider segregating the motion into two components. IRSA Chair Richard Westerberg agreed to the request.

Ms. Atchley asked for further clarification on the projections. Ms. Grace responded the projections evaluated were based on current workforce trends with the intent to increase educational attainment along with the standard of living.

The meeting recessed until 1:00 for lunch. The meeting reconvened at 1:16 pm.

2. Proposed Amendment to Board Policy III.Y., Advance Opportunities – Second Reading

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Goesling): To approve the second reading of amendments to Board Policy III.Y., Advanced Opportunities as submitted. The motion carried unanimously.

3. Memo of Understanding between Boise State University and Idaho State University Regarding Nursing Programs

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Atchley): To approve the Memorandum of Understanding between Idaho State University School of Nursing and Boise State University School of Nursing as presented in substantial conformance to the form submitted as attachment 1. The motion carried unanimously.

4. Idaho State University – Nursing Ph.D.

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Goesling): To approve the request by Idaho State University to offer a new online Ph.D. in Nursing. The motion carried unanimously.

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Terrell): To approve the request by Idaho State University to designate a professional fee for the Ph.D. in Nursing program and to set the fee at \$1,000 per student per semester. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Westerberg invited the attendees from ISU to present information on this item. Dr. Hatzenbuehler introduced Dr. Karen Neil, Professor of Nursing and Interim Assistant Director of Graduate Studies at Idaho State University School of Nursing to report on this program. She commented the PhD in Nursing program has been built on a strong foundation and will prepare nurse scientists to conduct original research to contribute effectively to healthcare systems. She said this will be the first PhD in Nursing program in the state of Idaho and that there is a real need for this program.

Ms. Atchley asked about the number of faculty and students in the program. Dr. Neil clarified there will be three full time faculty and six students per year admitted to the program in the initial three years. Ms. Atchley asked where the funds come from for this program. Dr. Nancy Renn, Interim Director for the School of Nursing, responded that the funding comes from a reallocation from a program that is going away.

Dr. Goesling expressed appreciation for this program and for the opportunity of advancement beyond the masters' level.

5. Idaho State University – Partnership with College of Idaho

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Soltman): To approve the Memorandum of Understanding between Idaho State University and the College of Idaho for the purpose of offering a joint Physician Assistant Studies Program on the College of Idaho Caldwell campus in substantial conformance to the form submitted as attachment 1. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Lewis asked if they have conferred with the other university in the region about the program. Dr. Hatzenbuehler responded it is an expansion of an existing program and not a new program. Mr. Lewis asked additional questions on whether ISU is in alignment with Board policy III.Z. Ms. Grace clarified for Board member Lewis that

Board Policy III.Z. provides that ISU has the statewide responsibility for the physician assistant (PA) program and that ISU is in alignment with the Board policy.

6. Accountability Oversight Committee Appointments

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Atchley): To reappoint Accountability Oversight Committee member Christine Donnell to a 2-year term beginning July 1, 2012 and ending June 30, 2014. The motion carried unanimously.

7. Value of Research to Postsecondary Education Report

Tracie Bent from the Board office provided an overview on this informational item. Ms. Bent indicated the report provided to Board members is based on the initial request from the May 2011 Board Retreat. An initial report was brought to the Board in October 2011. From there came a request for additional information and that the vice presidents of research (VPRs) work with the IRSA Committee. In doing so, the VPRs established some additional matrix which is the hard data found in the later portion of the report.

Mr. Soltman asked what the IRSA Committee intends to do with the report and desired clearer information. Mr. Westerberg responded that the Committee intended the report be for the edification of the Board relative to the question of the value of research in the overall subject of education; it was intended to show that research has value and how it has value in the overall education mission of the institutions. Ms. Atchley responded that there is a need for a clearer picture on the findings of the report.

Mr. Westerberg suggested forwarding any questions on this item to IRSA and that additional information would be provided from the IRSA Committee and the institution VPRs.

AUDIT

1. Extension of External Audit Contract

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Atchley/Lewis): To ratify the Audit Committee's approved contract extension with Moss Adams for three (3) years through execution of the Fifth Amendment to Agreement for Audit Services, as submitted. The motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Atchley extended thanks to the internal auditing group as well as BSU and ISU for their help with LCSC in working through its risk assessment. She recognized their efforts and thanked them on the Board's behalf for their work. Ms. Atchley indicated they will either need to renew their contract or seek other proposals at the end of this contract extension in three years.

BUSINESS AFFAIRS & HUMAN RESOURCES (BAHR) - Section I – Human Resources

1. Boise State University – Multi-Year Employment Agreement – Head Women’s Volleyball Coach

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Terrell/Soltman): To approve the request by Boise State University to enter into a multi-year employment agreement with Shawn Garus, Head Women’s Volleyball Coach, for a term commencing July 1, 2012, and terminating January 31, 2015, in substantial conformance with the agreement submitted to the Board as Attachment 1. The motion carried unanimously.

2. Chief Executive Officer Employment Agreements/Terms

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Soltman): To approve the amended employment agreement for Dr. Nellis as President of the University of Idaho, incorporating the salary approved at the May 2012 Special Board meeting and extending the current contract term for one (1) additional year, as submitted. The motion carried unanimously.

M/S (Westerberg/Goesling): To approve the amended employment agreement for Dr. Kustra as President of Boise State University, incorporating the salary approved at the May 2012 Special Board meeting and extending the current contract term for one (1) additional year, as submitted. The motion carried unanimously.

M/S (Westerberg/Lewis): To approve the amended employment agreement for Dr. Vailas as President of Idaho State University, incorporating the salary approved at the May 2012 Special Board meeting and extending the current contract term for one (1) additional year, as submitted. The motion carried unanimously.

M/S (Westerberg/Lewis): To approve the amended employment agreement for Dr. Fernandez as President of Lewis-Clark State College, for a term of three years and incorporating the salary approved at the May 2012 Special Board meeting. The motion carried with a six-to-one vote. Dr. Goesling voted nay.

M/S (Westerberg/Soltman): To approve the amended employment terms for Dr. Rush as Executive Director of the Idaho State Board of Education, setting the salary at \$58.76/hr or \$122,220.80 annually. The motion carried unanimously.

BUSINESS AFFAIRS & HUMAN RESOURCES (BAHR) - Section II – Finance

1. FY 2013 Line Item Budget Requests

BOARD ACTION

Mr. Westerberg asked for unanimous consent to modify the original motion to read:

M/S (Westerberg/Terrell): To approve Occupancy Costs and the funding levels associated with Unfunded EWA as FY 2014 line items for the college and universities, and to direct the college and universities to identify specific line item expenditures related to the EWA funding levels along with one other top priority line item for Board consideration at the August meeting and to approve the FY 2014 line items as listed on the Line Items Summary at Tab 1 pages 4-5. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Westerberg introduced the item and provided a brief explanation of the motion. He indicated the recommendation is to approve the occupancy costs and funding levels associated with unfunded EWA today, and leave the additional line item request to come before the Board in August for approval. Mr. Lewis asked for clarification on the second portion of the motion. Mr. Freeman clarified that the pages referred to in the second part of the motion are for the community colleges, agencies and special programs. Dr. Rush clarified that creating a blank for each line item allows for return to the item to make change or do something different.

2. FY 2012 Intercollegiate Athletics Budget Report

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Terrell/Goesling): To accept the Athletics Operating Budget reports for Boise State University, Idaho State University, University of Idaho and Lewis-Clark State College, as presented. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Terrell introduced the item and asked the institution presidents to come forward for discussion. President Nellis reported that the University of Idaho budget presented was a balanced budget and they are pleased with it. President Vailas reported Idaho State University is in a positive cash flow this year and their infrastructure is improving as well. President Kustra reported Boise State University's budget is balanced, but with leaving the Mountain West Conference they forfeited that conference's distribution. Settlement and contribution dollars helped with balancing the budget despite the Mountain West forfeiture. President Fernandez reported Lewis-Clark State College has a positive balance on the balance sheet.

Mr. Lewis asked Dr. Kustra if there were other issues that played into BSU's operating budget given the loss of the Mountain West Conference. Dr. Kustra responded the gap from the Mountain West Conference was filled with settlement, contribution and Bronco Athletics Association (BAA) dollars. Ms. Pearson clarified that for FY12 the operating

budget is positive. In FY 13 they are anticipating a revenue hit with the loss of the Mountain West Conference. For FY13 they have additional contributions that will help cushion the budget and as they get into that year, they will be able to give a better assessment on what the impact will be.

Mr. Lewis commented that even with the contributions there will be a shortfall, and asked if this would continue into the following year or just be a one-time event. Ms. Pearson responded it is a one-time event due to the Mountain West Conference exit and they will realize other conference revenues in FY14.

3. Amendment to Board Policy – Section III.T. and V.X. – First Reading

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Terrell/Goesling): To approve the first reading of proposed amendments to Board Policy moving Section III.T., paragraphs 1-4, Intercollegiate Athletics to Section V.X., Intercollegiate Athletics, and renumber Section III.T.5., Student Athletes – Conduct, as Section III.T.1., with all revisions as presented. The motion carried unanimously.

4. Universities' Intellectual Property Policy

BOARD ACTION

President Edmunds requested unanimous consent to postpone this agenda item and the motion until revised motion language was presented in writing for the BAHF chair and Board members later during this meeting. There were no objections.

M/S (Atchley/Goesling): To approve the Intellectual Property policies of the University of Idaho, Boise State University and Idaho State University as submitted and to direct the institutions to collaboratively develop and implement a system wide research and technology transfer organization similar to the WiSys model. A roll call vote was taken on the revised motion which failed with a three-to-four vote. Dr. Goesling, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Westerberg and President Edmunds voted against the amended motion. Mr. Luna abstained from voting on account of his absence during discussion.

M/S (Terrell/Lewis) Mr. Terrell requested unanimous consent for the item to go back to the IRSA committee. The motion carried five to two. Mr. Westerberg and Ms. Atchley voted nay on the motion. Mr. Luna abstained from voting.

President Nellis commented on the amended motion indicating that they would like to determine the feasibility if this will work for Idaho rather than being directed to do it without that determination. Dr. Kustra echoed the remarks of Dr. Nellis and added it would be wise to study the feasibility of such things rather than jumping right into them.

Ms. Atchley clarified her thoughts behind the proposed amendment. She felt that it was too easy to look at feasibility for a long time and to resist the change; she felt there is a need to move forward on intellectual property.

Dr. Nellis responded suggesting the Board set a deadline for the feasibility phase. Mr. Lewis felt that what we are talking about is potentially far more complex than it may appear and it would take a substantial amount of work. He supported the recommendation of Dr. Nellis about requesting a deadline in determining feasibility. Dr. Goesling recommended returning this item to the President's Council for a report back to the Board at the October meeting. Mr. Lewis urged the group to move carefully on this item and to give it thoughtful consideration and whether it is consistent with what we want to see happen as a system.

There was further discussion after the vote on the original motion. Mr. Lewis asked if during the development of the policies the institutions worked with any industry consortiums or groups to develop the policy and to get a view from private industry. Representatives for each of the institutions responded that they had worked with advisory groups on this policy.

Mr. Lewis commented there is tremendous tension in the intellectual property arena and provided an illustrative example of an infringement lawsuit and background for his concern. Mr. Lewis asked if in their policy there is a statement that the goal is to interact with industry in a collaborative way that helps provide real benefits and technology transfer developments with those institutions for the purpose of economic development of those institutions within the state. President Nellis responded this work is being guided by Board Policy II.B., where it says "the Board claims ownership of any intellectual property development for any of the following circumstances . . .".

Mr. Westerberg expressed concern as well on the institution policies that may not have been vetted or collaborated on. Mr. Satterlee spoke to Mr. Lewis' concern and said they would not be opposed to making sure the policy statements are more clearly stated. Ms. Atchley commented that with the institutional input it might be an incentive to develop an insulating intellectual property policy.

There was extensive discussion around this item and what should be done with it. Mr. Terrell recommended the item return to committee for further development and discussion. President Edmunds recommended the item go back to IRSA.

5. Board Policy V.R. – Professional Fees – Second Reading

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Terrell/Soltman): To approve the second reading of proposed amendments to Board Policy Section V.R.3.b.iv., Professional Fees, as presented in Attachment 1. It is the intent of the Board that all current Board-approved

professional fees would be grandfathered in under this policy. The motion carried unanimously.

6. Board Policy V.R. – Professional Fees – Second Reading

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Terrell/Soltman): To approve the second reading of proposed amendments to Board Policy Section V.R.3.b.v., Self-Support Certificate and Program Fees, with the following changes: (1) in V.R.3.b.v.3) strike the phrase “at the same meeting institutions submit proposals for tuition and fees,” and (2) change V.R.3.b.v.4) to provide that an audit is required every three years instead of annually. It is the intent of the Board that all current Board-approved self support fees would be grandfathered in under this policy. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Freeman offered some information about the materials provided to Board members, summarized staff comments and recommended the motion.

Ms. Pearson requested, as they continue to add self-support programs that they have some flexibility in setting those fees based on what the financials indicate they need to charge.

Mr. Freeman clarified for the Board that once the self-support program fee is approved, any subsequent increase in the fee would require Board approval. It is not an annual review; just if there is any increase.

Mr. Luna joined the meeting at 2:30 at which time the meeting returned to item 4 of the BAHF Finance agenda.

7. Boise State University – Charter Agreement – Frontier Airlines

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Terrell/Soltman): To approve Boise State University’s request to enter into an agreement with Frontier Airlines for air charter services for the 2012-2016 football seasons and authorize the Vice President for Finance and Administration to execute the current agreement and renewal agreements through 2016. The motion carried unanimously.

8. Boise State University – Self-Support Funding for Twin falls Baccalaureate Programs

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Terrell/Soltman): To approve the request by Boise State University to move the following Twin Falls baccalaureate programs to the self-support model effective fiscal year 2014:

- **Bachelor of Business Administration – Accountancy**
- **Bachelor of Business Administration – General Business**
- **Bachelor of Arts or Science – Criminal Justice**
- **Bachelor of Social Work**

The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Lewis tied this request back to what was approved under item 6 which are the rules relating to self-support academic program fees. He asked Ms. Pearson for an explanation if the request meets the requirement set forth on Tab 6, page 3, item B.

Ms. Pearson indicated they did vet this item and felt comfortable bringing this degree under this policy because the program occurs offsite from the campus. The interest of turning this program into the self-support category is to say students will not pay the recreation center fees and all the money would go into the instructional part of the program. She indicated they feel this is more beneficial to the student. Currently faculty are paid from appropriated funds.

Mr. Lewis asked if the fee would be no different than the per-credit charge that they would otherwise pay as part of their tuition. Ms. Pearson responded that question would be difficult to respond to in case the program costs changed in Twin Falls and needed to be adjusted. The intent is to stay within the current fees that Boise State students pay.

Mr. Lewis asked if the program complies with each of the criteria in the policy. Ms. Pearson responded on each of the criteria and indicated they are substantially compliant.

Mr. Freeman pointed out these are degree completion programs for students who have already received their associates degree.

Ms. Grace clarified the intent of this request regarding the students who don't have access to the recreation center and additional services that students on campus do. It was intended for the institution to have a better ability to manage the program.

There was additional dialogue regarding this item. Ms. Pearson indicated that when this program was developed there was not a self-support policy. They believe they are following standard process for an undergraduate program and all of the fees would go where they are supposed to go according to Board policy.

Mr. Lewis felt there is a better solution for this situation. He felt the problem being dealt with is not directly related to the self-support mechanism. He suggested the committee may want to develop a policy for this kind of scenario. President Edmunds recommended returning the item to the BAHHR committee to work with the FVPs on the item.

9. Boise State University – Six Year Capital Improvement Plan Amendment

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Terrell/Soltman): To approve the Six-Year Capital Improvement Plan as amended for Boise State University. The motion carried unanimously.

10. Idaho State University – Issuance of General Revenue Refunding Bonds

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Terrell/Westerberg): To approve a Supplemental Resolution for the Series 2012 Bonds, the title of which is as follows: A SUPPLEMENTAL RESOLUTION of the Board of Trustees of Idaho State University authorizing the issuance and sale of General Revenue and Refunding Bonds, Series 2012, in the principal amount of up to \$28,280,000; authorizing the execution and delivery of a Bond Purchase Agreement and providing for other matters relating to the authorization, issuance, sale and payment of the Series 2012 Bonds. A roll call vote was required. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Fletcher from Idaho State University provided an overview for the Board members of the proposed bond refinancing. He shared some new news related to the item, indicating that according to the financial advisors, this is the best time in the market in 40 years to refinance and the interest rates will reflect that. He also commented that the report on the University's rating from Standard and Poor's was as good as the rating report provided by Moody's. Mr. Fletcher indicated that they are not extending the maturities of any of the offerings, they are being held until 2023 which is the same as their current offerings. They have no plans to further extend their debt capacity by making additional bond offerings.

Mr. Lewis asked if the maturity schedule was the same as the bonds they have replaced. Mr. Fletcher responded it was.

President Edmunds asked about the 8% mark related to bonded indebtedness. Mr. Freeman clarified that the accrediting body recommended a ceiling and the 8% was what was agreed upon by the institution finance officers. Mr. Lewis added that the discussion occurred several years ago and the finance officers from the institutions recommended it as an appropriate level. Mr. Terrell indicated the BAH Committee would review the percentage related to bond indebtedness further.

Dr. Goesling commented that now would be a good time for other institutions to be looking at refinancing bonds. He also asked if BAH should discuss the possibility of having a Board issued bond to help catch up on the backlog of maintenance items. Mr. Terrell responded that the refinancing of bonds is left up to the Vice Presidents of Finance at the institutions and that the Board does not involve itself in that. Mr. Freeman indicated the Idaho State Building Authority has been refinancing a number of

2003 bonds related to projects on each campus recently, and regarding deferred maintenance, there will be future discussions on this subject with the Idaho State Building Authority.

11. Idaho State University – Athletic Outdoor Field Renovation Project

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Terrell/Westerberg): To approve Idaho State University’s six-year capital construction plan as amended and to authorize the University to proceed with planning and design for an athletic outdoor practice field renovation project for a cost not to exceed \$140,000. The motion carried unanimously.

12. University of Idaho – College Street Property Improvement Project

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Terrell/Goesling): To approve deeds of dedication to the City of Moscow in substantial conformance to the forms submitted to the Board in Attachment 1, and to authorize the University’s Vice President for Finance and Administration to execute these documents. The motion carried unanimously.

13. University of Idaho – Dependent Tuition/Fee Reduction

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Terrell/Soltman): To waive Board policy V.R.3., and to approve the request by the University of Idaho to create a Dependent Tuition and Fee Benefit as set forth in Attachment 2 as submitted to the Board. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Westerberg asked if they see this as an employee benefit or as increased enrollment. Mr. Smith from the University of Idaho responded they see it as an employee benefit.

LATE AGENDA ITEM

Business Affairs and Human Resources

1. University of Idaho – Collaborative Research and Marketing Agreement

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Terrell/Soltman): To approve the request by the University of Idaho to enter into the collaborative research and marketing agreement with Limagrain Cereal Seeds, LLC in substantial conformance to the form submitted to the Board in Attachment 1, and to authorize the university’s Vice President for Finance and

Administration to execute the Agreement and all necessary documents ancillary to the Agreement. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Lewis asked how the new technology is to be marketed. Kent Nelson from the University of Idaho responded that the marketing aspect uses a series of licensing agreements back and forth between the university and Limagrain for plant varieties that come from this research. It is being done in conjunction with the Wheat Commission.

Ms. Atchley asked if they have concerns about the limited liability corporation (LLC) structure in terms of having assets if this agreement doesn't work as planned. Mr. Nelson responded they will require insurance and are also supported by the Limagrain of France. If they fail at some point, the university has the option to pull back their licenses and continue their research.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

1. Superintendent's Update

Superintendent of Public Instruction, Tom Luna, provided a brief update from the State Department of Education (SDE). He updated the Board on one of the components of Students Come First and the implementation of it. They are moving high schools to a one-to-one ratio of students to mobile computing devices. They will begin implementing and delivering the laptops to the schools; September of 2013 is when students start receiving these devices. They will furnish 1/3 of the high schools per year over a three year period. The schools were polled to determine who would like to be in the first third and 85% responded; from there they used a detailed process to narrow it down to 1/3. They are currently in the process of selecting the provider and that should be announced in July 2012.

2. Temporary Proposed Rule IDAPA 08.02.01.250, Rules Governing Uniformity, Fractional ADA calculations and payments, and division of ADA for Dual Enrolled Students

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Luna/Soltman): To approve the temporary and proposed changes to IDAPA 08.02.01.250, Rules Governing Uniformity, Fractional ADA Calculations and Payments as submitted. The motion carried unanimously.

3. Proposed Rule – IDAPA 08.02.02.016 – Mathematics In-Service Program Waiver

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Luna/Soltman): To approve the proposed rule changes to IDAPA 08.02.02.016 Rules Governing Uniformity, providing waivers from the State of Idaho Math In-service Requirement as submitted. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Luna indicated the proposed rule ensures that state resources in providing the MTI course are focused on current teachers. Therefore, the proposed rule would offer a waiver to those educators who are not currently employed or live outside of the state of Idaho from taking the MTI course. The rule also offers a standard three year interim certificate for those educators who move to the state and haven't taken the MTI course to be certified while they take the course.

Mr. Lewis asked if anyone who lives outside the state could get a waiver. Mr. Luna responded that this allows those who live outside the state to keep their certificate current and if they return to Idaho to teach, it allows them three years to get their MTI certificate. There was further discussion about the language of the rule and Mr. Luna recommended it have a language clarifying change when it returns for the second reading.

4. Temporary Proposed Rule – IDAPA 08.02.03.105 – On-Line Learning Requirement for High School Graduation

BOARD ACTION

Mr. Luna requested unanimous consent to withdraw the original motion. There were no objections. He then stated a revised motion.

M/S (Luna/Lewis): To approve the Temporary/Proposed rule IDAPA 08.02.03.105 with the amendment to section to 01.d. allowing students to be exempt from the final year of high school math requirement if they have taken six (6) credits of math prior to the fall of their final year of high school including at least two (2) semesters of an Advanced Placement or Dual Credit calculus or higher level course. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Luna indicated the proposed change concerning online graduation requirements will allow those students graduating in 2016 to use either asynchronous or synchronous online classes to fulfill their online learning graduation requirement. For the math graduation requirements, students will be able to appeal to their local school district board of trustees to not take math in their senior year of high school if they have met the requirements as outlined in the proposed revisions. This rule is a temporary rule because if a proposed rule were approved instead, the change would not go into effect until the end of the 2013 after the legislative session.

Mr. Luna indicated that for some students who are advanced, providing them an opportunity to not take math their senior year opens up more advance opportunities. He summarized for Board members the materials they received showing the level of math a student must take before graduating from high school. The question is for those who are accelerated math students seeking to be waived from math their senior year, what higher levels of math does the Board want them to accomplish. The math 170 calculus course is what is currently recommended.

5. Proposed Rule – IDAPA 08.02.03.118 – Rules Governing Thoroughness, Curricular Materials Selection and On-Line Course Approval

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Luna/Atchley): To approve the proposed rule changes to IDAPA 08.02.03.118 as submitted. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Luna commented the approval process for textbooks has been a fee based system. For approval of text books, there will be no additional fiscal impact, merely a codification of existing practice. For online course review, the funds generated will help defray the cost of completing those reviews.

6. Proposed Rule – IDAPA 08.02.03.160 – Rules Governing Thoroughness, Safe Environment and Discipline

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Luna/Goesling): To approve the proposed amendment to IDAPA 08.02.03.160, Rules Governing Thoroughness, Safe Environment and Discipline as submitted. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Luna commented this rule will help to ensure that Idaho public schools provide and support a safe environment conducive to learning that promotes healthy relationship skills and opportunities for Idaho students and addresses the growing problem of adolescent relationship abuse and sexual assault in Idaho schools.

He said this rule will have local districts add adolescent relationship abuse and sexual assault prevention to their current comprehensive Safe Environment and Discipline policies and procedures and review these policies annually and update them based on current research and practices. Training, sample policy language, and resource information/materials will be supported by SDE and community partners, including the Idaho Coalition Against Sexual and Domestic Violence and its project, the Center for Healthy Teen Relationships.

7. Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Waiver – Cut Scores for College Readiness Approval

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Luna/Goesling): To approve the College Entrance/Placement Exam Benchmarks and encompassing goals as part of the ESEA Waiver as submitted. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Luna summarized this rule deals with the state Board setting a benchmark score that will be used in the five-star rating system for high schools, specifically those that have grade twelve. On the Star Rating point matrix in the first year, all five points possible will be awarded to schools that have 25% of their students hit the sub-score or the composite benchmark for any of the four eligible tests: ACT, SAT, ACCUPLACER or COMPASS. The points awarded scale down from there and are included in Attachment 3. Over the next three years, the percentage of students meeting this benchmark is recommended to increase by 10%.

There was some discussion about the benchmarks. Mr. Luna responded that they look at two things. They have to hit the target for each of the sub categories or they have to receive a composite score of 1550 or higher. He went on to further explain some details of the materials handed out to Board members and was assisted by Ms. Grace in clarifying that information.

Ms. Atchley asked why the community colleges have higher numbers for success than the four-year institutions. Ms. Grace responded that the intent of the tests is to assess students' content knowledge at a point in time. They will be looking at those scores to assess if they have the right benchmarks in place.

There was further discussion around the rating process. Ms. Atchley asked if this would be an on-going process. Mr. Luna responded it was limited to a three year process. Mr. Lewis reminded the Board members what a great thing it is to have these tests and entrance exams to help students and also to use them as an accountability tool. Mr. Luna added that it has been ten years where we have only had one measure to determine how schools were doing academically and now we have multiple measures and rankings; commenting it has been a step in the right direction.

8. Excision-Annexation of Property – Lakeland/Coeur d'Alene School Districts

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Luna/Soltman): To accept the findings and conclusions of the hearing officer and to approve the excision and annexation of property from the Lakeland School District to the Coeur d'Alene School District. The motion carried unanimously.

9. Northwest Nazarene University – Proposed Online Teaching Endorsement Program Approval

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Luna/Terrell): To accept the Professional Standards Commission recommendation to conditionally approve the Online Teaching Endorsement program offered through Northwest Nazarene University. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Luna commented that in order to maintain status as an Idaho approved program and produce graduates eligible for Idaho teacher certification, Northwest Nazarene University must have all new programs reviewed for State approval.

OTHER BUSINESS

There being no further business, a motion to adjourn was entertained.

M/S (Edmunds/Goesling): To adjourn the meeting at 4:41 p.m. The motion carried unanimously.