

1. Agenda Approval

Changes or additions to the agenda

**BOARD ACTION**

I move to approve the agenda as submitted

2. Minutes Approval

**BOARD ACTION**

I move to approve the minutes from the October 17-18, 2012 Regular Board meeting, the November 19, 2012 Special Board meeting, and the November 20, 2012 Special Board meeting as submitted.

3. Rolling Calendar

**BOARD ACTION**

I move to set December 18-19, 2013 as the date and the College of Western Idaho as the location for the December 2013 regularly scheduled Board meeting.



STATE OF IDAHO  
BOARD OF EDUCATION

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

**DRAFT MINUTES  
STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION  
October 17-18, 2012  
Lewis-Clark State College  
Williams Conference Center  
4<sup>th</sup> Street and 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
Lewiston, Idaho**

A regularly scheduled meeting of the State Board of Education was held October 17-18, 2012 at Lewis-Clark State College in the Williams Conference Center in Lewiston, Idaho.

**Present:**

Ken Edmunds, President  
Don Soltman, Vice President  
Emma Atchley, Secretary  
Rod Lewis (absent 10/17)

Bill Goesling  
Richard Westerberg  
Milford Terrell (absent 10/17)

**Absent:**

Tom Luna

**Wednesday, October 17, 2012**

The Board met in the Williams Conference Center at Lewis-Clark State College in Lewiston, Idaho. Board President Ken Edmunds called the meeting to order at 1:00 pm.

**BOARDWORK**

1. Agenda Review

**BOARD ACTION**

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

2. Minutes Review

**BOARD ACTION**

**M/S (Soltman/Atchley): To approve the minutes from the August 15-16, 2012 Regular Board meeting, the August 17, 2012 Special Board meeting and the September 14, 2012 Special Board meeting as submitted.** The motion carried unanimously.

3. Rolling Calendar

**BOARD ACTION**

**M/S (Soltman/Goesling): To set October 16-17, 2013 as the date and Lewis-Clark State College as the location for the October 2013 regularly scheduled Board meeting.** The motion carried unanimously.

**WORK SESSION****POLICY PLANNING & GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS (PPGA)**A. Board of Education Performance Measure Report.

Don Soltman introduced Scott Grothe from the Board office for a presentation and report on the Board's Performance Measures. Mr. Grothe covered state-level trends and measures related to the education pipeline and the Board's 60% goal collected from institution reports and submissions to the Board, IPEDS, CCA and DFM. He concluded his report with additional detail on specific institutional and PTE contributions to the Board's 60% goal.

Mr. Grothe provided a bit of historical information on the performance measures and shared new information released from the Census Bureau. He reported the new Census Bureau information shows that Idaho is currently at 35% for 25-34 year olds who have an associate's degree or higher, which is a jump from 31.2% shown in previous data.

Dr. Rush interjected and clarified to the Board members that this data is provided for the Board to review and reevaluate the target in this work session and whether the benchmark should be adjusted.

On the subject of remediation, Mr. Grothe reported that there is currently just short of 50% of students in need of remediation at Idaho postsecondary institutions. President Edmunds asked if there is an initiative for statewide remediation. Mr. Grothe answered in the affirmative and indicated there are reports available showing the number of students and from what schools are in need of remediation. President Edmunds asked several questions about student remediation and the data we are looking at showing where the weaknesses are. Ms. Grace interjected that Board staff is currently working with the Department staff to integrate data that is presently not linked to provide better detail on the subject. Dr. Rush also indicated there will be more questions answered on the subject at the December Board meeting.

Mr. Westerberg asked for information on how the remediation problem itself is being dealt with. Ms. Grace responded that there are multiple pieces that deal with remediation; the first will be addressed with the common core state standards, the second with assessment and placement. She commented that the intent is to make sure students are placed accurately into credit bearing courses and that as a state, Idaho will be looking at assessment and placement practices and how testing can be applied toward placement. There will be a committee coming together this spring with representatives from all institutions, as well as the College Board and ACT, to develop a new model for assessing and placing students and to ensure a common thread for assessment and placement throughout the state. This model will be followed by a delivery model of how the services will be delivered to students.

Mr. Grothe returned to his presentation, showing that for AY 2012 about 20% of high school students needed remediation at Idaho 4-year postsecondary institutions and roughly 55% needed remediation at Idaho 2-year postsecondary institutions. Mr. Grothe shared the statewide trends in math and reading which showed a gap that is widening between the two subjects, with students needing the most remediation in math. He indicated 4-year institution system wide cost per undergraduate credit has dropped to \$202 since 2008 and 2009. He shared data on Professional-Technical annual enrollment at public institutions which shows enrollment leveling off during the last few years. He shared that the retention rate at 2-year institutions for full-time students is at almost the benchmark rate of 60%; and for 4-year institutions the retention rate for full-time students is at about 68% where the benchmark is 70%.

Mr. Grothe reported on the average number of credits earned for 1-2 year certificates, associate's degrees and bachelor's degrees, showing that associates are above the benchmark for full time, part time and transfer students, and bachelors are at or above for full time and part time students and just short for transfer students. He added that the average number of years to earn credential ranges between 3-4 years for 1-2 year certificates, between 4-5 years for associate's degrees and between 4-7 years for bachelor's degrees. Bachelor's and associate's degrees for AY 2012 are above their projected track toward 2020, whereas 1-year or greater certificates are below their projected track.

Mr. Westerberg expressed that if we fixate on the number of years it takes to graduate a student it is not a good representation because it does not fit everyone's life for a variety of reasons. Mr. Westerberg followed-up by saying it's the number of classes students are taking rather than the number of years it takes to graduate that is important. Mr. Grothe concluded his presentation by stating that generally the number of degrees and certificates with goal related credential at public institutions are increasing. As related to the 60% goal, Idaho is presently above the curve with bachelors and associates certificates and below the curve with the 1-year certificates. In tracking annual goal related credential, we are above the curve toward the Board's goal of 60%.

Ms. Atchley commented this is an encouraging start but we still have a long way to go. Mr. Soltman encouraged the Board members work with staff on any items they needed clarification on and work toward refining the performance measures if necessary.

#### B. Institution and Agency Performance Measure Report

Dr. Todd Schwarz provided a report on PTE for the Board members. He summarized PTE's performance measures and shared trend, benchmark and actual performance data, pointing out that that 38% of students are above the benchmark. For the adult based education system (ABE), 24.9% of students met their stated goal which was well above the benchmark of 2%. The percentage of technical college PTE positive placement or transition shows they are at 93% which is also above their benchmark of 90%. This measure shows the percentage of student completers who successfully obtain training for work. He added that the number of secondary PTE completers who transition to postsecondary education has been above the 49.1% benchmark for the last four years; graduating seniors who completed professional technical programs was 64% for AY 2012. There were no questions for Dr. Schwarz.

Dr. Steve Albiston presented information on Eastern Idaho Technical Colleges (EITC) IPEDs retention rates. Their full time returning second year students are at 71% presently, up from 66% from 2010-2011 data. Degree seeking students returning a second year this year is at 79%, which is up from 78% last year. Dr. Albiston touched on their remedial English course data which showed an 81% pass rate. He added that with remedial math, students are at a 50% pass rate. They are taking steps to improve the remedial math and English pass rates and working with their tutoring center. He shared the number of certificate and degree completions per 100 FTE for 2011-2012 is 42%. The number of academic awards earned is at 261 for 2011-2012. There were no questions for Dr. Albiston.

Dr. Jeff Fox shared the performance measures report from the College of Southern Idaho (CSI). He commented that their strategic plan has been revised and approved by the CSI board in 2012 and that their planning is ongoing. He shared steps in their strategic planning process and commented that their head count has increased in 2012, adding that dual credit participation has also increased. He commented that access has always been an important factor for CSI and they are presently at \$110 per credit. He commented that remediation rates for students at CSI are down from 2011. He reported that state appropriations account for 36% of CSI's funding and that student fees accounted for more of their resource revenues than state allocations. He indicated that first-time full-time students this year needing remediation were at about 67%. Dr. Fox indicated they have hired a full time retention and graduation specialist. He also remarked on the CSI/CWI partnership that assists with meeting standards for accreditation. There were no questions for Dr. Fox.

The College of Western Idaho was not present for a report to the Board.

Mr. Graden Stanley and Ms. Ann Lewis reported to the Board for North Idaho College (NIC). Mr. Stanley commented NIC's strategic plan focuses on student success, educational excellence, community engagement, diversity and stewardship. He shared how their student success measures relate to the Complete College Idaho Plan (CCI). He indicated their success rate is nearly 37% and their ranking is about 47% for students that complete a degree or certificate and/or transfer. He shared persistence rates of students enrolled in reading and math and indicated there is room for improvement against the benchmark in this category. In the area of educational excellence, they show that 75% of students are meeting their goals over a three year period compared to 60% at other institutions. They are trying to increase their percentage of dual credit in the high schools. For the number of associates degrees awarded for Fall FTE they are at 12% which needs improvement, but is about 30% higher than last year. Their community engagement annual score is at 72% which is above their goal of 70%. Mr. Stanley reported that employers who indicate satisfaction with NIC students is at 93%. For their distance learning they are at about 62% of their goal and they hope to increase that number. There were no questions for Mr. Stanley.

Superintendent Luna joined the meeting at 3:00 p.m. at the conclusion of NIC's report.

Dr. Nellis provided a report from the University of Idaho. He shared information about performance quantity, showing a 6.5% increase over last year in total degrees and certificates awarded. Adding that for STEM degrees, the University of Idaho is proud to have awarded 52% of all stem degrees in the state. Dr. Nellis reported that they have implemented a new core curriculum designed to be more integrated with statewide articulation efforts for performance efficiencies. Also, 54% of all undergraduate degree programs can be completed in 120 credit hours and inflation adjusted, 20% fewer dollars per student FTE than a decade ago, increasing their efficiency by 20%. He indicated that for performance quality, student rating of satisfaction is at 98% and that the University of Idaho's level of academic challenge is on par with their rocky mountain peers and entire NSSE survey base. He also indicated they continue to promote their service learning.

Dr. Nellis reported for performance benchmarks their actual graduation rate was 56%, clarifying this is a six-year number. They hope to push that to 60%-61%. Mr. Westerberg asked in the area of quality if there was any ability to track the performance on credentialing tests or job placement. Keith Ickes responded that they are working with placement offices and career centers to collect that data. Mr. Luna asked what classes they classify as STEM classes. Dr. Nellis indicated he would get that information for Mr. Luna and the Board. President Edmunds offered some comments on financial efficiencies. Dr. Nellis responded that they will continue to be as conservative as they possibly can in keeping tuition rates as low as possible. Dr. Goesling asked about the university's research efforts. Dr. Nellis responded this year their competitive research funding is stable. He added that their goal by 2020 is to go from close to around \$100 million to \$150 million in research funding through a number of collaborative efforts on campus as well as with other state and regional institutions. There were no further questions for Dr. Nellis.

Dr. Kustra reported from Boise State University, stating they are above the curve related to the Board's 60% goal. He indicated this progress is related to increased access and increased efficiency. Dr. Marty Schimpf presented the remaining information for the Board members, indicating that the targets set by the Board were set in 2010, and that BSU is substantially ahead of those targets by 14%. Along with increased access and efficiency, he indicated they also intend to add 10-12 faculty positions in the coming years. Dr. Schimpf shared a number of slides showing the progress since 2007. He commented they have observed a good increase in the number of BS nursing degree programs, and the number of bachelors and masters degree programs has also shown an increase. Mr. Westerberg asked about the effect CWI has had on BSU and its graduation rates. Dr. Schimpf responded that they are seeing a large increase in the number of transfer students this fall, many from CWI. He added that those transfer students from other institutions are not counted in the university's graduation rates and are not shown in this data. Dr. Schimpf concluded by stating there has been a divergence over time in the increasing number of students compared to the number of faculty; it is reaching a plateau which would indicate a need for increasing tenure track faculty. There were no further questions for Dr. Schimpf.

Dr. Vailas provided a report from Idaho State University. He expressed reservations about tracking students and felt it is not an accurate representation for the evaluation of the efficacy of an institution. He urged the Board members to not lose sight of the institution as a whole. Also, he pointed out the importance of knowing what happens after the student graduates. Dr. Vailas shared enrollment highlights showing an increase of 3.5% from 2011 in student head count. He indicated the early college dual credit program has increased by 16.3% from 2011 and the credit hours for this program have increased 21%. He commented on the issue of remediation and said their rate of students needing remediation has increased 3% from 2011, adding that math remediation was significantly higher than English remediation. He also commented that ISU students are among the most financially challenged. He shared that their graduation rates are up 5% from 2011 with undergraduate degrees increasing by 2% and graduate degrees increasing by 15%, adding that 33% of total degrees awarded were in the health professions programs. There were no questions for Dr. Vailas.

Dr. Fernandez welcomed everyone to Lewis-Clark State College and provided a report for the Board. He reported that in the area of retention for degree seeking freshmen they show an upward trend for both full-time and part-time students. This is below their benchmark of 65%, but they are trending upward. Their six-year graduation rates are also increasing but they have not met their goal of 35% this year, they are however, above 30%. For their pre-college enrollment, they are at about 1,800 dual credit and tech prep students combined. Degrees and certificates awarded for 2012 is just above 700 which is an increase of 100 degrees over what was awarded the year before, translating to between a 16-17% increase. Mr. Soltman asked about data on graduates. Dr. Fernandez responded that they contact between 35-40% of graduates (the target is 90%) for follow-up information and approximately 92% have gone on to further their education or landed a job.

### C. Research Strategic Plan Performance Measure Report

Mr. Soltman indicated the HERC Committee had met on presenting this information to the Board and determined the measures identified needed to be revised. The HERC Committee requested to collect data on the revised measures and present the information to the Board in December with those revised measures.

## **EXECUTIVE SESSION**

### University of Idaho

**M/S (Soltman/Goesling): To go into Executive Session pursuant to section §67-2345(1)(c), Idaho Code to conduct deliberations to acquire an interest in real property which is not owned by a public agency.** A roll call vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously. Mr. Lewis and Mr. Terrell were not present for voting.

**M/S (Goesling/Atchley): To go out of Executive Session at 4:20 p.m.** The motion carried unanimously.

Following executive session, the Board reconvened for further discussion regarding remediation and the data presented regarding the performance measures and benchmarks. They encouraged better consistency in the presentation of performance measures by the institutions going forward. The focus of the discussion was centered on the implementation and tuning of the common core and determining if proper progress is being made. The Board was very concerned about overall remediation benchmarks and that they may not be adequate.

Mr. Luna identified some areas where standards could be improved for teacher prep and K-12 students being more college and career ready. Provost Baker urged the recognition of students from different geographic areas and different demographic backgrounds and to not group all students together. Mr. Luna encouraged measuring improvement and comparing schools with the same demographics. Provost Baker also recommended holding the schools accountable and urged working on ideas toward solving the problem. Mr. Westerberg commented that once the common core is implemented, it should help

identify problem areas where work can then be done toward fixing the remediation situation. Mr. Luna responded that there are many things such as the common core standards that will impact whether the student is ready at the time of graduation to move on. President Edmunds urged immediate steps toward remediation.

Selena Grace indicated that next fall should be when implementation takes place on the steps derived from the work done this spring on assessment and placement practices. Ms. Atchley expressed concern over the amount of time the students are actually in school, suggesting lengthening instructional time is something the Board should discuss. Mr. Westerberg reminded the Board of the underlying issue and the expectation it should return to the IRSA committee for further discussion and implementation by the fall of 2013.

#### **BOARD ACTION**

**Unanimous consent was requested to recess from the meeting for the day at 4:43 pm.** The motion carried unanimously.

**Thursday October 18, 2012, 8:00 a.m., Lewis-Clark State College, Williams Conference Center, Lewiston, ID.**

Board President Edmunds called the meeting to order at 8:00 a.m. A roll call vote was taken; Milford Terrell was absent from the meeting.

#### **OPEN FORUM**

There were no participants during Open Forum.

#### **CONSENT AGENDA**

##### **BOARD ACTION**

**M/S (Soltman/Goesling): TO approve the Consent Agenda as presented.** The motion carried unanimously.

1. Adoption of Curricular and Related Instructional Materials as recommended by the Curricular Materials Selection Committee (SDE)

**By unanimous consent to approve the adoption of English Language Arts curricular materials and related instructional materials as recommended by the Curricular Materials Selection Committee as submitted.**

2. Idaho State University – Discontinuance of PTE Programs (IRSA)

**By unanimous consent to approve the request from Idaho State University to terminate the designated professional-technical education programs as presented in Attachments 1-5.**

#### **PLANNING, POLICY & GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS (PPGA)**

1. Lewis-Clark State (LCSC) College Report

Mr. Soltman introduced President Fernandez for a report from Lewis-Clark State College. He was joined by Amy Nelms, Student Body President, and Brian Fannesbeck, Faculty Senate Chair, who joined President Fernandez in welcoming the Board members to the college. President Fernandez provided a progress report starting with the mission of LCSC and its three core themes. He indicated their planning process has been successful over the last ten or more years by taking input from all aspects from the

campus and relating it to the Board's strategic plan. They integrate and assess their processes and focus on the role and mission of the college in tandem with the Board. President Fernandez reviewed the college's planning process through all of its phases.

He highlighted the LCSC strategic initiatives and identified those at the top such as faculty/staff compensation, accreditation, course fees, etc. He reviewed the legislative requests for FY 2014, commenting that employee compensation is at the top of the request. He provided a visual aid showing how far behind their peers the salaries of the faculty and staff of LCSC are presently. He reported on EWA, inflation and capital equipment replacement and indicated their legislative requests also include Complete College Idaho (CCI) initiatives including access, remediation reform and general education. Additionally, the president mentioned their Permanent Building Fund top capital project is the joint facility (LCSC-UI-NIC) in Coeur d'Alene, and identified several alteration and repair projects.

President Fernandez indicated the college's annual enrollment continues to grow and identified their dual credit enrollment as having an upward trend also. The average number of student credit hours has leveled off likely from students dropping to part time status due to financial circumstances. For degrees and certificates awarded, FY12 shows just over 700, with the majority being academic degrees. Their retention rate for FY12 is continuing to rise. They are presently below their goal on retention, but the rate continues to improve for first time, full time students. Additionally, their graduation rate continues to increase as well and is presently above 30%; their goal is 35%. He summarized their instructional and outreach programs and commented their college advancement continues to grow. For future goals of LCSC, they intend to complete the comprehensive 5-year plan, continue "Campaign LCSC", continue to bring faculty and staff salaries in line, implement the 2<sup>nd</sup> phase of the accreditation process, update student services within the LCSC organization, and to expand on collaborative opportunities.

President Edmunds asked how they will reconcile funding realities with their funding requests. President Fernandez responded that if their funding requests are accepted, tuition increases will be very low. He added that quite plainly, if economic support is not reached, they will not be able to reach the goals set by the Board.

In light of tight budgets, Mr. Luna reminded the Board about BYU's model that didn't require additional revenue, but implemented other changes. Dr. Fernandez acknowledged the efficiency of BYU's scheduling model and commented there are likely lessons to be learned from such a model. He suggested exploring how that type of model might work for some of Idaho's public institutions and indicated they have had some discussion on the subject.

## 2. President's Council Report

President Bert Glandon from the College of Western Idaho and current chair of the Presidents' Council gave the report from the most recent Presidents' Council meeting. He reported to the Board that they have restructured their format on how they meet for greater efficiency, where in the first part of the meeting the community college presidents and the four-year presidents meet separately, and during the second section the entire group meets together.

He indicated the group has come to some resolution on a few items, one of which is the statewide degree referred to as the regent's degree and that the first courses should be off the ground in the fall of 2013. The council has had continuous conversations about remediation and accountability and different models of staffing and instruction and how they can achieve better efficiencies there. They briefly discussed Western Undergraduate Exchange (WUE) allocation and it was determined it did not apply to Idaho out of state tuition waivers that are being applied. He indicated they have had discussion about becoming more creative in staffing to meet student needs. He also commented that the GED on-line process will be changing nationally and the new process will be in place by December 2014, and that the GED will be delivered completely differently than it is today. He also indicated there are ongoing conversations about collaboration, tech-prep and dual credit.

Mr. Soltman asked about the voluntary framework of accountability. Dr. Dunlap from NIC explained it is a



system designed by community colleges for community colleges through the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC). It is currently being tested at 58 community colleges throughout the country and next year the system will be available for anyone who wants to participate. It tracks student cohorts over a six-year period in terms of achievement, certificates and employability, and provides a comprehensive picture. Dr. Dunlap indicated the three community colleges are looking at possibly adopting the system.

President Edmunds returned to the subject of less state funds for colleges and universities. President Glandon reminded the Board that budget shortage is not just an issue for Idaho, but a nationwide issue. He suggested that there are different approaches that need to be considered by the colleges and universities. President Beck echoed the remarks of finding alternative funding sources and partnerships and figuring out how to close the gap between the state funding amount and what is needed to keep the colleges and universities going.

Dr. Kustra encouraged the Board to give the institutions the flexibility they need to address funding shortfalls. He also suggested looking at the University of Oregon model where the retiring president chaired a task force to examine the relationship between Oregon's public universities and state government. The taskforce reported that it was time for public higher education to be disengaged from the routine and cumbersome bureaucracy of state government. Oregon is now in the process of implementing the recommendations of the task force. Dr. Kustra commented on the overlapping and duplicative assignments for state government people and higher education people. Dr. Kustra further commented that in 2012 when their overall budget was funded by 18% of state appropriations, then it would seem like a good time for the State of Idaho and the Board to take a look at the relationship, disengage, and give universities the creative means they need. When the state is funding at a higher level, the role and need for strong oversight is understandable; but where the funding is diminished, it would seem the role of ruling and regulating public universities should be diminishing as well, adding that state resources are being spent in two different places for the same challenge. He encouraged the continued observation of the University of Oregon and to definitely solicit the support of state legislators in better understanding that a new day is dawning and things are changing around us.

President Glandon closed by saying the President's Council meetings and conversations between institutions have been more productive than they have ever been and the collegiality and professionalism during these meetings is noteworthy.

There was further discussion about breaking out of the current mold of institutions. There was also agreement about changes made over the recent years and the productivity that is coming out of the system whereby the progress that has been made has been very real and very positive. President Nellis reminded those present that the support of the state plays an important role in leveraging research and outreach missions and that those items in return are very important to the state.

Mr. Lewis asked about discussions by the presidents about on-line delivery. President Glandon responded that in their discussion, there was a distinct difference between on-line courses and on-line programs, summarizing that on-line courses pretty much go anywhere and on-line programs are not to be competitive across areas.

### 3. Idaho Division of Vocational Rehabilitation

Don Alveshere, Administrator of the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation (IDVR), provided an overview of IDVR's progress in carrying out the agency's strategic plan. Mr. Alveshere recapped for the Board IDVR's strategic plan with its three tracks, and highlighted some accomplishments for 2012 which included implementing the WorkStrides program for IDVR customers, completion of Motivational Interviewing training by field staff, increased counselor focus, increased average wage rates for rehabilitated customers. He identified that there has been a decrease in successful rehabilitations, and attributed it to the amount of new employees at IDVR that are still receiving training. He pointed out IDVR customers earn 64% of the average state wage (\$17.13) and the federal benchmark is 52%.

Mr. Alveshere commented on the work with the Idaho Department of Corrections (IDC) and indicated the partnership with IDC adds \$100,000 that they are able to match federal dollars with. They have specialized caseloads with IDC for both adults and juveniles.

Mr. Alveshere remarked that supported employment rehabilitations have gone down because of a dramatic decrease in available extended employment services and Medicaid Waiver funds for the long-term support. He indicated that IDVR cannot provide federal dollars for the long-term support of customers who need the support to stay employed. With the supplemental and on-going support of the Legislature, they expect to be able to increase the number of people going through the system resulting in more employment outcomes. He clarified by saying this group is primarily made up of individuals with profound intellectual disabilities or mental illness that are classified as the most significantly disabled. Additionally, the benchmark for the deaf and hard of hearing indicates the number of rehabilitations for this population will increase 6% between FFY 2011 and the completion of FFY 2013.

Mr. Alveshere indicated there are seven key federal standards and indicators they must pass each year and they have passed five of them. He highlighted the difference in the percentage of customers who are self-sufficient when they come into the IDVR program and those self-sufficient at closure of the program, sharing this number has increased to 75.1%. This result shows how much more independent people can become who go through their program.

He identified they are requesting a \$236,200 funding transfer request from the Renal Program, which is phasing out effective June 2013, to IDVR programs and services in FFY 2013. This transfer will also help them to meet more federal match dollars.

Mr. Alveshere reported audit findings from last year showed there was improvement needed regarding eligibility requirements being met under rehab service grants. He added that they also completed a policy update for the entire division which is now in the public comment phase. Mr. Alveshere provided some information on IDVR's Extended Employment Services and its successes, showing an improvement over SFY 2011 to 57%. He indicated that their legislative budget increase request for 2013 includes a transfer of \$170,000 to Extended Employment Services from the Renal Program. For the phasing out of the Renal Program, IDVR is ensuring customers of that program are receiving transition and coordination services for other resources. Mr. Alveshere identified some details of IDVR's fiscal activity including the recapture of social security monies, sequestration and zero-based budgeting.

At this time Board President Edmunds excused the group for a 10 minute break. Upon return from the break, Board President Edmunds requested changing the order of the agenda to present the Distinguished Schools Award. There were no objections.

#### 7. Distinguished Schools and Additional Yearly Growth (AYG) Awards for 2012

President Edmunds presented the Distinguished Schools Award to Filer Elementary, indicating that the Board has recognized Idaho K-12 schools who meet rigorous requirements as part of their performance on the Idaho Standards Achievement Test (ISAT). He provided some background on the rigorous requirements schools must meet to achieve the award, adding that there were only nine schools in the state that received the award. Filer Elementary Principal Matt Mahannah was present to accept the award. Superintendent Luna emphasized how challenging it is for schools to achieve these awards and explained how great an accomplishment it is. President Edmunds named the schools who received the awards, adding that there were six schools who received the Additional Yearly Growth Award this year as well.

#### 4. Idaho Digital Learning Academy

Ms. Cheryl Charlton, CEO from the Idaho Digital Learning Academy (IDLA) introduced Jacob Smith, Director of Operations and Mike Caldwell, Director of Program Development, to participate in the presentation. Mr. Smith provided a report on IDLA, sharing how IDLA plays a part in the Complete College Idaho Plan. He indicated they have served 17,649 enrollments for 2011-2012 which is a 17%

increase over the prior year. This year they are projected to serve about 20,000 enrollments which is about a 13% increase. The enrollments are split nearly 50/50 between rural and urban districts, and 99% of the school districts in Idaho participated in IDLA during the 2011-2012 school years. He indicated the primary reason students take IDLA courses is related to scheduling conflicts for students. Mr. Smith pointed out IDLA has increased both rural and urban enrollments 51% and 49% respectively. He highlighted their Flex program which is an open entry/open exit program that provides a more flexible opportunity for students with scheduling conflicts. He closed by commenting on how far IDLA has come in the last 10 years.

Mr. Caldwell reported on some of the services of IDLA which included a blended learning program that has shown an increase of 720% in enrollments since 2010-2011. He defined blended learning as classes that support students in breaking down the challenges of time, place, path and pace that they face in learning. They are working with districts and with about 11 other states in their partnerships; IDLA is a leader in the state group.

Mr. Caldwell commented their partnerships include work with the College Access Grant to expand dual credit, advanced placement and tech prep offerings, collaborative counselor training and support in the development of a web portal. For college and career readiness, they are working with nearly every institution across the state and are always looking for ways to expand partnerships. They are also collaborating with the IEN.

Mr. Caldwell commented on the importance of keeping classes affordable for students and reported that there was \$357,000 in savings to Idaho students before graduation through IDLA dual credit classes in 2011-2012. Ms. Charlton indicated they are looking at a 76% drop in their budget for FY 2013-2014 which will equate to around a 300% increase in costs to student stakeholders and districts. She commented on IDLA's cost efficiencies and that they are experimenting with different programs and models to keep costs down for students and still maintain quality assurance for their programs. Ms. Charlton expressed the importance partnerships and collaborative efforts play in relation to budget constraints.

Mr. Westerberg asked about the increase in costs of services and questioned what it might do to volume. Ms. Charlton responded that based on national data when a state virtual school loses its funding they see a significant drop in enrollments. She said they anticipate their student enrollments would decline to around 5,000 or lower. There was further discussion about the decrease in funding for the coming year and how fractional ADA will play a role in shifting the stream of state funding.

#### 5. Scholarship Committee Recommendations

#### **BOARD ACTION**

**M/S (Soltman/Atchley): To accept the recommendations of the Scholarship Committee.** The motion carried unanimously.

Marilyn Whitney from the Board office and former Board President Cutis Eaton, both members of the Scholarship Committee, provided recommendations to the Board regarding the statewide scholarship program. Mr. Eaton directed Board members to detailed information they received in their agenda materials. Mr. Eaton provided an overview which included the reasons the Committee decided to review Idaho scholarships. Mr. Eaton indicated with regard to legislation, it was the goal of the Committee to make some recommendations to the Board that would cover proposed changes in the current statute so that the statewide scholarship program would be modified by the legislation. Some of the reasons the Committee decided to review Idaho scholarships included the Board's 60% goal, increasing the need for financial aid and the contents of the Office of Performance Evaluations (OPE) report on the barriers to postsecondary education.

The Committee started by asking the question of should there be state support for scholarships and clearly, the answer was yes. The next questions was how should scholarships be fashioned to be aligned

with other strategic goals around the state, i.e., what is the state's role in creating a scholarship and for what purpose. The result of the discussion found that consolidating the scholarships in the state would be beneficial. The simplification of scholarships offered is another recommendation, along with an incentive for students to complete in a timely manner. The Scholarship Committee work included defining a statement of purpose, outlining guiding principles, assessing current programs and developing recommendations. In their work, the Committee identified economic and social benefits to the state due to having an educated citizenry and also the importance of providing access and incentives to students through scholarships.

Mr. Eaton identified the three tiers of scholarships which equate to a total of 12 scholarships currently being offered. He highlighted the details of the revised Opportunity Scholarship and reported that the Committee recommends a program evaluation process to gather and analyze outcome data to better assess the impact of scholarships on completion of postsecondary degrees. Principle measures will include credits completed, credits accumulated, continued enrollment and degree or certificate completion.

Additional recommendations from the Committee are to explore alternate investment options for the Opportunity Scholarship, explore ways to increase Opportunity Scholarship funding, and to support adequate staffing resources requested by the State Board of Education to manage the scholarship program.

Mr. Lewis asked about the scholarship being both need and merit based. Mr. Eaton indicated the current Opportunity Scholarship is both, with need at 70% and merit at 30%. The proposal would be to continue to use those measures going forward. Mr. Lewis asked if the distribution would be scaled based on need and merit. Mr. Eaton described the calculation and indicated the money would be available to cover the gap in costs and would also be restricted to tuition, fees and books.

Mr. Luna thanked the Committee and Mr. Eaton for their work on this subject. He commented on the difficulty of finding the right balance between need and academic success and how that message is received by students. Mr. Eaton responded about the importance of the Board's 60% goal and how by providing an incentive to need based students who would otherwise not have the means or encouragement to attend college, it is a contributor to the Board's 60% goal.

Ms. Atchley asked if there is a provision for private donations or contributions to the endowment. Mr. Eaton responded that they are allowed.

Dr. Rush clarified on the need for tracking information that it will be used to evaluate the effectiveness of the scholarship every year and the information will be used to modify the criteria and scholarship model going forward. Dr. Rush publicly thanked Mr. Eaton for his contribution to the Committee, the Board and to education.

#### 6. Legislation for the 2013 Legislative Session

### **BOARD ACTION**

#### **Scholarship Program**

**M/S (Soltman/Goesling): To approve the legislation amending sections of Idaho code related to the Idaho scholarship programs administered by the State Board of Education in substantial conformance to the form submitted as Attachment 1 and to authorize the Executive Director to make additional changes as necessary in accordance with the accepted recommendations from the Scholarship Committee and the Governor's Office.** The motion carried unanimously.

**Statewide Purchasing Contracts**

**M/S (Soltman/Westerberg):** To approve proposed amendments to section 67-5728, Idaho Code as submitted and to direct the Executive Director to make any non-substantive changes as necessary as the legislation moves forward through the Governor's legislative process. The motion carried unanimously.

**Workman's Compensation Alignment**

**M/S (Soltman/Westerberg):** To approve proposed amendments to section 72-102 and section 72-205, Idaho Code as submitted and to direct the Executive Director to make any non-substantive changes as necessary as the legislation moves forward through the Governor's legislative process. The motion carried six-to-one. Mr. Lewis voted nay on the motion.

**Proprietary Schools and Postsecondary Educational Institutions**

**M/S (Soltman/Goesling):** To approve proposed amendments to section 33-2406, Idaho Code as submitted and to direct the Executive Director to make any non-substantive changes as necessary as the legislation moves forward through the Governor's legislative process. The motion carried unanimously.

**Public School Facilities Cooperative Funding Program**

**M/S (Soltman/Atchley):** To approve proposed amendments to section 33-909, Idaho Code as submitted and to direct the Executive Director to make any non-substantive changes as necessary as the legislation moves forward through the Governor's legislative process. The motion carried unanimously.

**Scholarship Legislation Discussion**

Mr. Soltman introduced Tracie Bent from the Board office to provide a brief review on the five pieces of legislation being proposed in 2013. Ms. Bent summarized the scholarship legislation which incorporates the recommendations from the Scholarship Committee. The Armed Forces and Public Safety Officer Scholarships have been combined into one section of code, adding that the eligibility requirements and amounts have not changed for those scholarships. The Opportunity Scholarship was in a separate section of code and it has been moved into the scholarship section. She commented the Robert R. Lee and the Minority and "At-Risk" scholarships have been eliminated as the funds have been rolled into the Opportunity Scholarship. Ms. Bent summarized other changes for Board members and Dr. Rush provided clarification on changes to the scholarship program and the reasons behind those changes.

Mr. Lewis asked how the timing works by being simplified. Dr. Rush described how the timing on scholarship delivery presently works and provided an explanation that the goal going forward needs to be when the financial aid package is ready for students, all the information needs to be available to them. Dr. Rush pointed out that part of the problem is the Legislature doesn't appropriate money until March or April, after which the Board allocates it to the institutions. The challenge is to not promise money to students before it is appropriated by the Legislature. The Board office is trying to manipulate the timelines to get the information to the students and not promise money to students before it is appropriated.

**Worker's Comp Legislation Discussion**

Mr. Lewis asked if there will be a clear delineation between which students this applies to and which it does not because the interpretation is very broad with the way the rule is worded. Mr. Satterlee from BSU provided further explanation for Mr. Lewis on this item, indicating currently BSU does not provide workers compensation to a student doing work in a credit bearing program even if it is a work related program.

Dr. Rush added comment that this rule has worked very successfully at the secondary level; it has not gone out of control and has not realized unexpected costs.

#### Proprietary Schools Discussion

Mr. Lewis asked for an explanation of this item. Dr. Rush indicated that currently we have a bond requirement for proprietary schools. The bond would cover the tuition for students of any enrolled class, so if the school went out of business the bond would cover the tuition costs back to the students. What they have discovered is that the environment has changed from bonding companies and most states have shifted to a provision where a deposit to a bank can be made that would cover an equivalent of the bonding requirement, or work in collaboration with the bonding company. He clarified the proposed changes allow entities greater flexibility in establishing the surety bond requirements.

Mr. Lewis asked if the process and structure has been reviewed by bankruptcy council so that we have comfort that the account would be available for payments to students if the need arose. Dr. Rush responded that sort of review would be forthcoming.

#### 8. President Approved Alcohol Permits

Mr. Soltman indicated this information item is a review of the president approved alcohol permits, and information was provided to the Board members for review in their agenda materials as an informational item. There was no discussion.

At this time, the meeting recessed for a 30-minute lunch break.

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

#### 1. Amendment to Optional Retirement Plan

#### **BOARD ACTION**

**M/S (Soltman/Westerberg): To approve the amendments to the Optional Retirement Plan document as presented in Attachment 1.** The motion carried unanimously.

#### 2. Amendment to Board Policy II.H. – Coaching Personnel – First Reading

#### **BOARD ACTION**

**M/S (Soltman/Westerberg): To approve the first reading of proposed amendments to Board Policy Section II.H., Policies Regarding Coaching Personnel and Athletic Directors with all revisions as presented.** The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Lewis commented on the policy and asked if institution presidents could approve consecutive one-year contracts at any level without Board approval. Mr. Freeman responded the language would be revised before the second reading.

#### 3. Compensation Adjustments for Agency Heads

#### **BOARD ACTION**

**M/S (Soltman/Westerberg): To amend the salary for Mike Rush as Executive Director of the Idaho State Board of Education, and to set an hourly rate of \$58.27/hr or \$121,201.60 annually, effective June 24, 2012.** The motion carried unanimously.

**BOARD ACTION**

**M/S (Soltman/Atchley): To amend the salary for Peter Morrill as General Manager of Idaho Public Television, and to set at an hourly rate of \$46.74/hr or \$97,219.20 annually, effective June 10, 2012. The motion carried unanimously.**

4. Boise State University – Multi-Year Employment Agreement – VP of University Advancement

**BOARD ACTION**

**M/S (Soltman/Goesling): To approve the request by Boise State University to enter into a multi-year contract with Laura Simic as Vice President for University Advancement of the University, for a term commencing on November 1, 2012 with an annual salary of \$220,000, in substantial conformance to the form submitted to the Board, and to authorize the President of Boise State University to execute the contract.** The motion passed with a four-to-three vote. Ms. Atchley, Mr. Soltman and Mr. Westerberg voted nay on the motion.

Dr. Kustra from BSU spoke to this item, indicating they have conducted several searches for a Vice President of University Advancement. He offered some clarifying comments on the request for a one-time multi-year contract to provide some security for Ms. Simic since she had already made an investment by moving to Boise from Nebraska for this position. He pointed out the salary rate is 11% above the CUPA median and within the CUPA range of \$160,000 to \$235,000. Dr. Kustra assured the Board that this position was necessary for university advancement.

Mr. Westerberg reiterated his continued opposition to multi-year contracts for administrative positions. He recommended the contracts should be structured similarly like the president's contracts.

Mr. Soltman expressed concern about the level of compensation being excessive. Dr. Kustra responded that this is not the highest paid position in his administrative team and that the salary comparisons warrant what was agreed upon for this position.

5. University of Idaho – Multi-Year Employment Agreement – Track & Field Cross-Country Coach

**BOARD ACTION**

**M/S (Soltman/Atchley): To approve the request by the University of Idaho to extend the University's employment contract with Wayne Phipps, as Director of Track and Field and Cross Country, for a term commencing retroactively on August 13, 2012 and expiring on August 12, 2017 with an annual base salary of \$63,252.80 and such contingent base salary increases, annual media payments, and incentive/supplemental compensation provisions as set forth in the materials presented to the Board, in substantial conformance with the terms of contract set forth in Attachment 1 to the Board materials.** A roll call vote was taken and the motion carried five to two. Mr. Soltman and Mr. Westerberg voted nay on the motion.

**Substitute Motion:**

**M/S (Westerberg/Soltman): To approve the request by the University of Idaho to extend the University's employment contract with Wayne Phipps, as Director of Track and Field and Cross Country, for a term commencing retroactively on August 13, 2012 and expiring on August 12, 2015 with an annual base salary of \$63,252.80 and such contingent base salary increases, annual media payments, and incentive/supplemental compensation provisions as set forth in the materials presented to the Board, in substantial conformance with the terms of contract set forth in Attachment 1 to the Board materials.** A roll call vote was taken and the motion failed four to three. Ms. Atchley, Dr. Goesling, Mr. Lewis and Mr. Luna voted nay on the motion.

President Nellis provided some information to the Board on this contract extension request adding that

Mr. Phipps has been at the University of Idaho for 17 years and has done an outstanding job. Ms. Atchley expressed disappointment that the incentive for academic achievement is not emphasized more. Dr. Nellis clarified for Ms. Atchley that the incentive is per sport, so his incentive is six times the incentive because he oversees six sports.

Mr. Soltman felt the contract should be a three year contract rather than a five year contract to be consistent with other contracts. There was further discussion on the length of the contract and Mr. Nelson commented that this is a contract renewal and that Mr. Phipps has performed exceptionally in the past, adding that he has won coach of the year nine times. Dr. Goesling commented that in light of this coach's exceptional performance, they should keep the five year contract in this instance.

Mr. Westerberg expressed disagreement with a five year contract in consideration of policy limiting contracts to three years with little exception and offered an amended motion, but the motion failed. There was no further discussion.

#### 6. University of Idaho – Multi-Year Employment Agreement – Women's Soccer Coach

#### **BOARD ACTION**

**M/S (Soltman/Goesling): To approve the request by the University of Idaho to enter a new employment contract with Peter Showler, as Women's Soccer Coach, for a term commencing January 1, 2013 and expiring on December 31, 2015 with an annual base salary of \$38,438.40 and such contingent base salary increases, annual media payments, and incentive/supplemental compensation provisions as set forth in the materials presented to the Board, in substantial conformance with the terms of the contract set forth in Attachment 1 to the Board materials.** The motion carried unanimously.

#### **BOARD ACTION**

**M/S (Atchley/Goesling): To change the academic achievement award from the current level so the top level would be \$1000 and the lowest level would be \$400.** The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Smith from the University of Idaho clarified that the changes would be consistent with the previous contracts. Ms. Atchley commented the academic incentives should be higher and proposed a motion which carried unanimously.

#### 7. Amendment to Board Policy – Section II.G. – First Reading

#### **BOARD ACTION**

**M/S (Soltman/Westerberg): To approve the first reading of amendments to Board Policy II.G. Policies Regarding Faculty (Institutional Faculty Only) as presented.** The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Lewis commented that it would be difficult to evaluate what the merits of this policy change are one way or another. Mr. Westerberg requested comment on the requirement for students and non-tenured faculty participation to be optional. Provost Doug Baker clarified for the Board members that the change is for permissive language and not required language to avoid a conflict of interest for students and non-tenured faculty.

Mr. Westerberg asked if this excludes students from the process. Mr. Baker responded that student feedback is always included in the tenure and promotion process and student feedback is taken into consideration.



**BUSINESS AFFAIRS & HUMAN RESOURCES (BAHR) - Section II – Finance**1. FY 2013 Sources and Uses of Funds

Mr. Soltman indicated this is an informational item and asked Mr. Freeman to provide further explanation for the Board. Mr. Freeman indicated this is a standard report and that there have been no changes to the report. Mr. Lewis asked what institutional student fees are. Mr. Freeman responded that they are fees approved by the institution presidents. Ms. Pearson added that they include activity fees and other non- appropriated fees.

Ms. Atchley interjected that the Audit Committee has this item scheduled for further review and report to the Board.

Dr. Goesling requested that a change be made to the report for the addition of a one-year to three-year column. Dr. Goesling also asked for clarification on indirect costs of “other” and for research. Mr. Freeman responded that those costs can be any contract or grant, or it could be internal cost recovery. There was further discussion surrounding indirect costs and Dr. McIver and Mr. Ickes provides additional clarification for Board members. Ms. Pearson indicated she would provide more information regarding BSU after further review.

2. Amendment to Board Policy – section V.N. – Grants & Contracts, First Reading**BOARD ACTION**

**M/S (Soltman/Goesling): To approve the first reading of Board policy V.N., as presented in Attachment 1.** The motion carried unanimously.

**Mr. Westerberg requested unanimous consent to return this item to BAHR for further work and to return this item to the Board at a later time.** There were no objections.

Dr. McIver expressed opposition to this motion and expressed concerns with the policy going forward. He identified some concerns for Board members which included the \$50,000 cap, the costs of doing a project and federal pass-through dollars among other concerns.

Mr. Freeman provided some background and that the policy was last amended in December of 2011 to define terms and added language that provides for no cost recovery on contracts administered by the Board, PTE or IDVR. Mr. Freeman acknowledged the concerns of Dr. McIver on fixed costs and indicated language on federal pass-through dollars should be included.

Mr. Westerberg asked if there are any time constraint issues on this policy and if it should it be sent back to BAHR or have revisions made before the second reading. Mr. Freeman indicated time is not a concern.

3. Amendment to Board Policy Section V.B. – Occupancy Costs – Second Reading**BOARD ACTION**

**M/S (Soltman/Westerberg) To approve the second reading of the proposed amendments to Board Policy V.B., as presented in attachment 1.**The motion carried unanimously.

Dr. Goesling recommended the institution include the cost of occupancy in their lease/buy analysis report. Mr. Freeman responded that request would be appropriate and would not affect the policy being considered now.

4. Boise State University – Employee Dependent Fee

Mr. Soltman introduced Ms. Pearson from BSU to provide a report on this item. Ms. Pearson remarked that provided in Board members' agenda materials is a report which includes the details and usage of the dependent fee. She reported that the dependent fee was well received although the participation was not as high as anticipated. Feedback from participants was for this to become a permanent benefit. Ms. Pearson gave notice that she would be bringing this item forward for permanent approval at a later date, but pointed out that Board policy does not presently allow for a dependent. President Edmunds directed staff to proceed with a policy revision.

5. Boise State University – University Hotel

Mr. Soltman asked Ms. Pearson to provide information on this item. Ms. Pearson commented that BSU plans to issue a Request for Information (RFI) and qualifications to select one or more hotel development firms to negotiate a proposal on development of a campus hotel. The intent is for the hotel to be located on the university campus within the current master plan. She indicated the hotel is not listed in the master plan, but is consistent with some of the goals and directives of the master plan to allow for potential commercial development at the outer edges of the campus. Mr. Soltman asked if any of the property was acquired by condemnation. Mr. Satterlee responded that depending on the location some of the land may have been acquired through condemnation.

Mr. Soltman expressed concern that other business owners could view the property acquisition through condemnation as an unfair advantage. Ms. Pearson responded that they would do an analysis to ensure there were no violations of statute.

Dr. Goesling expressed great concern for the university getting involved in the hotel business. Mr. Luna echoed the remarks of Dr. Goesling and expressed concern regarding ownership of the facility. Ms. Pearson clarified that the university would not own the facility or run a business in competition with the private sector.

Mr. Lewis commented that property is limited for future growth of the institution and struggled with the idea of giving up the land as a limited resource. Ms. Pearson urged the Board to allow the issuance and review of an RFI, stating they are fully aware of the limited land resource. Mr. Lewis suggested the university be aware that the idea does not seem well received by the Board members and to consider those concerns going forward with the amount of work forth coming. Mr. Westerberg echoed the reservations of the other Board members.

6. University of Idaho – Arboretum Easement to Local Utility Provider**BOARD ACTION**

**M/S (Soltman/Atchley): To approve the request by the University of Idaho for authority to grant an easement to Avista Corporation 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 easement and any related transactional documents.** The motion carried unanimously.

7. Performance Based Funding Initiative (PBF)**BOARD ACTION**

**Mr. Westerberg requested unanimous consent to return the item back to BAHR.** There were no objections.

Mr. Westerberg provided some general observations that the metrics and submissions are good. He suggested the need for measures that measure something institutions are not presently doing to show performance beyond what is presently happening. Mr. Soltman recommended the ISU benchmarks need

further work. Dr. Goesling requested the item return to BAHR for further development.

#### 8. FY 2014 Capital Budget Requests

#### **BOARD ACTION**

**M/S (Soltman/Goesling): To reconsider the motion of August 18, 2012, wherein the Board approved a recommendation for no major capital funding for FY 2014 and to have the Permanent Building Fund Advisory Council concentrate on alterations and repairs and other non-major projects.** The motion carried unanimously.

#### **BOARD ACTION**

#### **Substitute Motion:**

**M/S (Soltman/Lewis) To recommend to the Permanent Building Fund Advisory Council the number one priority major capital project as identified by each institution on page 3 for consideration in the FY 2014 budget process.** The motion carried unanimously.

Dr. Rush clarified that the motion to reconsider puts the original motion back on the floor for discussion and the substitute motion replaces the language in the original motion. Mr. Soltman invited the institution FVPs to comment. Ron Smith from the University of Idaho commented that they strongly encourage moving the item forward. Ms. Pearson echoed the remarks of Mr. Smith.

#### **INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH & STUDENT AFFAIRS (IRSA)**

#### 1. University of Idaho – Second Year Law Program

#### **BOARD ACTION**

**M/S (Westerberg/Soltman): To approve the request by the University of Idaho to offer a second-year law curriculum in Boise.** A roll call vote was taken and the motion carried with a four-to-three vote. President Edmunds, Mr. Lewis and Mr. Westerberg voted nay on the motion.

President Nellis came forward to speak about the second year law program in Boise. He indicated they propose to broaden the third-year law curriculum currently offered in Boise to include the second-year law curriculum in an effort to meet the demand for legal education in the Treasure Valley. He commented the University of Idaho demonstrates the need for legal education in the Boise area as evidenced by the extensive market study conducted by the College of Law in 2008, which assessed the demand and impact of expanding its course offerings in Boise.

Don Burnett, Dean of Law at the university, introduced Roger Fisher, a former student of the law school who provided some brief remarks on his positive experience at the university. He indicated he chose the University of Idaho because of its location, its affordability as far as law schools go, and its outstanding reputation. Dean Burnett offered additional comments in support of the law school and providing the second year in Boise.

Mr. Westerberg encouraged further discussion on the item. Mr. Lewis was concerned with the resources tied to two locations and that there is an oversupply of law students presently. He was particularly concerned with the location issue. He believes the University of Idaho law school would be better located in Boise but not necessarily in two locations. He felt resources in Boise would enhance the quality of a law school, but did not favor two locations.

Dr. Nellis remarked on the documented need and expressed support for a law school at both locations. Dean Burnett indicated that there was an exhaustive study on demand for both locations showing favorable support for both and a solid basis for enrollment demand at both locations.

Mr. Lewis responded that he is asking for a study specifically to bring the law school to Boise and the dedication of resources necessary. He felt strongly that the demand is not present for two law schools now and discouraged using public funds toward something where the need is not warranted. Mr. Westerberg expressed concurrence with Mr. Lewis, adding that he questioned the allocation of already limited resources. President Edmunds provided comments in line with Mr. Lewis and Mr. Westerberg.

There was further discussion on the item and Mr. Burnett commented that a complete comprehensive S.W.O.T. analysis was done that suggested success of the program in Boise. He added that there is not a building in Boise that can accommodate the entire law school if it were located in Boise, adding that a law school in both locations is far stronger than it can be at one location alone.

#### 2. Boise State University – IDo Teach Program

##### **BOARD ACTION**

**M/S (Westerberg/Lewis): To approve the request by Boise State University to implement the IDo Teach Program, discontinue five stand-alone Bachelor of Science majors, and create five new emphases and an undergraduate program as presented.** The motion carried unanimously.

Dr. Marty Schimpf provided a review for the Board on this item. He commented BSU proposes to significantly change their math and science teacher education programs by adopting the UTeach Teacher Preparation Program from the University of Texas, which will be known as the IDo Teach Program. This change represents the creation of an entirely new structure of STEM education courses and a set of new programs. BSU will offer the existing and new programs in parallel for several years to accommodate students in the pipeline.

Dr. Schimpf commented on the collaboration efforts to provide this program and that BSU projects that the program will accommodate 32 new students the first year of the program, 64 new students in the second year, 96 in the third, and 128 in the fourth year and thereafter. Enrollment and graduate projections from the IDo Teach program includes all students enrolled in science and math secondary education programs and the certificate program.

#### 3. Board Policy III.N. and III.V. – Statewide Articulation and Associates Degree – First Reading

##### **BOARD ACTION**

**M/S (Westerberg/Goesling): To approve the first reading of amendments to Board Policy III.N. Private, In-state, Out-of-state, Non-Accredited Institution and Other Educational Source Offerings as presented.**

**AND**

**I move to approve the first reading of the amendments to Board Policy III. V. Statewide Articulation and Associate Degree as presented.** The motions carried unanimously.

#### 4. Board Policy III.AA. – Accountability Oversight Committee – First Reading

##### **BOARD ACTION**

**M/S (Westerberg/Lewis): To approve the first reading of amendments to Board Policy III.AA. Accountability Oversight Committee.** The motion carried unanimously.

5. Board Policy III.AB. – Idaho Rural Physician Incentive Program – First Reading

**BOARD ACTION**

**M/S (Westerberg/Lewis): To approve the first reading of amendments repealing Board Policy III.AB. Rural Physician Incentive Program Oversight Committee.** The motion carried unanimously.

**DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**

1. Superintendent's Update

In the interest of time Superintendent Luna will report to the Board at the December meeting.

2. Professional Standards Commission Recommendation

**BOARD ACTION**

**M/S (Luna/Goesling): To accept the Professional Standards Commission recommendation and to grant conditionally approval of Boise State University's IDo Teach program as an approved Teacher Certification Program.** The motion carried unanimously.

3. ESEA Waiver

**BOARD ACTION**

**M/S (Luna/Atchley): To approve Idaho's application for ESEA Flexibility as submitted.** The motion carried unanimously.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

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

**M/S (Westerberg/Atchley): To adjourn the meeting at 2:50 p.m.** The motion carried unanimously.



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

**DRAFT MINUTES  
STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION  
November 19, 2012  
Special Board Meeting  
Boise, ID**

A special meeting of the State Board of Education was held November 19, 2012. It originated at the Office of the State Board of Education, in the Len B. Jordan Building, 650 W. State Street, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor in Boise, Idaho. Board President Ken Edmunds presided and called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. MST. A roll call of members was taken for the meeting.

**Present:**

Ken Edmunds, President  
Don Soltman, Vice President  
Emma Atchley, Secretary  
Milford Terrell

Tom Luna (joined at 10:15)  
Bill Goesling  
Rod Lewis  
Richard Westerberg

**BUSINESS AFFAIRS AND HUMAN RESOURCES**

1. University of Idaho – Property Acquisition

**BOARD ACTION**

**M/S (Terrell/Soltman):** To approve the request by the University of Idaho to purchase the McCall campus for a purchase price of \$6.1 million and to pay transaction costs as set forth in the Purchase and Sale Agreement submitted to the Board; and further to authorize the Vice President for Finance and Administration, and Bursar of the University of Idaho to execute all necessary transaction documents for closing the purchase. A roll call vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously.

**M/S (Terrell/Atchley):** To approve the request by the University of Idaho for authority to use future bond proceeds to reimburse for the purchase of the McCall campus, including the purchase price and the costs and expenses associated with the purchase (including in this approval the Board's finding that the acquisition of the McCall campus is necessary for the proper operation of the University of Idaho and economically feasible), and further to approve the Resolution of the Board of Regents regarding the same, as set forth in Attachment 2 to the materials submitted to the Board. A roll call vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Terrell introduced the item and indicated the McCall property has been part of the University of Idaho's off-site campus for many years. The property is in a desirable location and has been a major asset to the University of Idaho and the Board staff recommends approval of this acquisition.

Dr. Goesling asked for clarification on the reserves identified by the University. University of Idaho's Vice President for Finance and Administration Ron Smith clarified the reserves are working capital and it is money obligated for future expenditures of which the balance is around \$10-\$15 million. Mr. Smith indicated the University intends to borrow from their working capital and pay it back with the sale of bonds. Mr. Edmunds asked if these reserves were previously set aside for this transaction or if they were unrestricted reserves. He wanted clarification on how this would be reported for accounting purposes. Mr. Smith responded it will show on their annual financial statement as unrestricted reserves. He added that in the net asset report by the University, they will be considered designated funds, clarifying that there will be a \$63 million unrestricted amount which will have designated funds subtracted from it.

Dr. Goesling asked for clarification for when they go to a bond issuance. Executive Director of Planning and Budget Keith Ickes responded that the University will use internal reserves to fund the purchase price and acquisition costs, and intends to reimburse its reserves from a future bond issuance. Mr. Ickes indicated that they have a base budget for the McCall property of \$55,535 which is and has been the lease payment for several years. The Land Board increased the lease rate to up to \$250,000 at which time the University discussed purchasing the property instead of leasing it. They estimate going forward that \$350,000 will be needed to do the debt service, and in the ensuing 18 months, they will receive monetary gifts and naming opportunities for this property to reduce the debt service and bonding. Mr. Terrell asked for an estimate of future gifts and if there is an interest in the naming of this property. Mr. Ickes indicated there is an expression of interest, but nothing specific at this time. He added that they are prepared to go forward in 18 months even if no gifts are received toward this opportunity and pay the full debt service.

Board President Edmunds asked a few questions about the acquisition regarding the appraisal value of the property, a third party involvement and title insurance. Mr. Nelson responded to the questions, summarizing the details of the appraisal by the Department of Lands as part of the exchange transaction, the third party involvement in the purchase, and that the title insurance is a safeguard in the transaction despite the fact that the transaction is with another state entity.

There was further discussion on the appraisal of the property. The University's legal counsel, Kent Nelson, responded by providing additional history on this item and that in the University's opinion it is a solid appraisal and the University stands behind it.

## **PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS**

### 1. Pending Rule Docket 08-0110-1201 – Work Study Program

#### **BOARD ACTION**

**M/S (Soltman/Terrell): To approve the Pending Rule with changes, Docket 08-0110-1201 as submitted.** A roll call vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously.

### 2. Pending Rule Docket 08-0111-1201 – Proprietary School and Postsecondary Education Institution Registration

**BOARD ACTION**

**M/S (Soltman/Atchley): To approve Pending Rule Docket 08-0111-1201 as submitted.** A roll call vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously.

3. Pending Rule Docket 08-0114-1201 – Rural Physician Incentive Fund

**BOARD ACTION**

**M/S (Soltman/Terrell): To approve Pending Rule Docket 08-1114-1201 – Idaho Rural Physician Incentive Program.** A roll call vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Lewis asked if the rules that went to the Department of Health and Welfare were the same as the rules that were in place. Ms. Bent from the State Board office indicated the Department of Health and Welfare worked closely with Board staff and incorporated the requirements that were in Board rules into their legislation last year. The majority of the requirements are now part of Idaho Code.

4. Pending Rule Docket 08-0202-1206 – Alternate Route to Certification

**BOARD ACTION**

**M/S (Soltman/Goesling): To approve Pending Rule with changes Docket 08-0202-1206 – Rules Governing Uniformity as submitted and in compliance with federal regulation.** A roll call vote was taken and the motion failed five to three. Mr. Lewis, Mr. Luna, Mr. Terrell, Mr. Edmunds and Dr. Goesling voted nay on the motion.

**M/S (Terrell/Luna): To return this motion back to committee to bring it back to the floor on a day set forth before the Friday deadline with amendments.** A roll call vote was taken and the motion carried seven to one. Mr. Westerberg voted nay on the motion. It was agreed by all Board members to reconvene for a special meeting on Tuesday, November 20, 2012, at 2:00 p.m. MST to bring this item back to the floor.

Mr. Soltman introduced the item and indicated that for the second reading of this rule, there were some changes requested during the comment period to further clarify what extenuating circumstances would be acceptable for receiving a waiver under subsection 045.04. Otherwise, there were no comments or additional changes to the rule.

Mr. Lewis asked for further explanation on the deletions associated with the limited approval alternatives. Ms. Bent responded that the deletion was due to the expiration of that section. Mr. Lewis asked about the terms of the requirements necessary for a content specialist and para educator. He pointed out certain details in the previous rule and asked if the requirements were adequate for content specialists, and additionally what our requirement is for teachers in general if they are not required to hold at least an associate's degree and be required to fulfill certain requirements after that. Ms. Bent responded this rule was promulgated through the Board office and staff worked closely with the Professional Standards Commission and State Department of Education staff Christina Linder on the language of the rule. The issues they were trying to address with these changes were for better alignment with the federal requirements for para professionals and to address timeline restrictions related to mentoring.



Ms. Bent indicated they can approve the pending rule without the language in subsection 01. There was discussion around holding a special meeting for this item before November 23<sup>rd</sup>. Mr. Lewis indicated there may still be a problem with the para educator portion even with that language deleted.

At this time during the meeting, Ms. Linder's comments were necessary to provide additional information. Unanimous consent was granted to postpone the item and proceed with the remainder of the agenda and return to the item at a time when Ms. Linder was able to participate in the meeting via phone.

Ms. Atchley made some additional comments regarding teacher certifications and that a bachelor's degree is required, but not in a specific area of content. Mr. Lewis expressed concern that a bachelor's degree is not required for a content specialist or para educator with the proposed amendments.

Ms. Linder provided clarification that the addition of a bachelor's degree or its equivalent is because the federal requirement for an alternate route. She commented that often student teachers have in essence everything up to the point of a bachelor's degree with the exception of completion of student teaching hours. Districts would like to hire those student teachers, but technically they do not have the actual degree in hand. The intention for this rule was to allow for the equivalent of a bachelor's degree in those cases where content knowledge exists.

Mr. Lewis suggested including the specific items or circumstances in the rule. Mr. Luna reiterated that the language in this rule is for compliance with federal law which is clear about a bachelor's degree and content knowledge. He also added that Department and Board staff walked this rule through the Professional Standards Commission. Ms. Linder insisted that they cannot have an alternate route for para educators because an alternate route has to have a bachelor's degree. With the federal requirements, they cannot legally do it without striking the language.

After extensive discussion, the Board requested that Board staff revise the proposed rule to clarify the requirement that candidates for certification must hold a Bachelor's degree or credit equivalent per review by the State Department of Education in accordance with specific federal regulations.

Ms. Bent suggested adding the language "in accordance with federal regulations" to the motion. There were no objections to the addition, however the motion failed. Mr. Terrell expressed confusion and concern about the changes being made to this rule. He recommended taking the motion off the table and returning to the item in a special board meeting later this week.

#### 5. Pending Rule Docket 08-0203-1201 – Home Schooled Student Recognition

#### **BOARD ACTION**

**M/S (Soltman/Goesling): To approve Pending Rule Docket 08-0203-1201 as submitted.** A roll call vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Lewis asked if the money received for financial aid for home schooled students is retained by the local school. Ms. Bent responded that this rule applies to the student's financial aid and if a school does not recognize a home schooled student as having received a secondary education then they are not eligible for federal financial aid that the student receives at the

postsecondary level. Mr. Lewis wanted to ensure what is being adopted doesn't have unexpected consequences by imposing a requirement on home schooled students that was inadvertent. Ms. Bent indicated that language is quoted directly from what is in statute. Mr. Luna added the language has been in place for some time and has worked without problem thus far. Mr. Lewis recommended examining the language in statute in the future.

Ms. Atchley asked for clarification on staff comments in the agenda materials about home schooled students being "forced to pass the GED exam, thereby dismissing the secondary education they had received." Ms. Bent responded that the post secondary institutions' immediate response to the change in federal requirements was to require home schooled students to take the GED exam. Parents disagreed with the requirement, expressing that it discounted the education home schooled students receive. Mr. Lewis asked about the level of education achieved coming out of a home schooled environment. Ms. Bent responded that currently the language in statute and now in rule recognizes a home school education, but there aren't any requirements other than they be taught subjects commonly and usually taught in public schools. Mr. Luna followed up by stating there are no requirements in place for parents of home schooled students to evaluate educational outcomes. Only when the child goes on to pursue postsecondary education are requirements imposed by an institution to demonstrate the student has a certain knowledge and skill base – such as the GED exam or other assessments.

Mr. Lewis indicated it would be useful to know what our institutions require for home schooled students. Dr. Rush from the Board office responded that the institutions do require entrance examinations for all students such as the ACT or the SAT. Ms. Bent added that for home schooled students, an additional placement test is required as well. Mr. Lewis requested based on discussion that there be further review by the Department on this item. Dr. Goesling also asked for the requirements each institution places on home schooled students be included.

#### 6. Pending Rule Docket 08-0204-1201 – Charter Schools

##### **BOARD ACTION**

**M/S (Soltman/Terrell): To approve Pending Rule Docket 08-0204-1201 as submitted.** A roll call vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously.

#### 7. Pending Rule Docket 08-0301-1201 – Public Charter School Commission

##### **BOARD ACTION**

**M/S (Soltman/Atchley): To approve the amendment of Temporary and Pending Rule with changes Docket 08-0301-1201 as submitted.** A roll call vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously.

#### 8. Pending Rule Docket 47-0101-1201 – Division of Vocational Rehabilitation

##### **BOARD ACTION**

**M/S (Soltman/Terrell): To approve the Division of Vocational Rehabilitations Field Service Manual as submitted and incorporate it by reference into IDAPA 47.01.01.** A roll call vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously.

**AND**

**M/S (Soltman/Atchley): To approve Pending rule with changes Docket 47-0101-1201 as submitted, effective July 1, 2013.** A roll call vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously.

At this time, the meeting returned to item #4 on the PPGA agenda.

#### **STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**

1. Pending Rule Docket 08-0202-1201 – Endorsements, Health, Physical Education, Special Education Director, and Generalist

#### **BOARD ACTION**

**M/S (Luna/Goesling): To approve Pending Rule – Docket No. 08-0202-1201 with changes to IDAPA 08.02.02.023, .024, and .028, Rules Governing Uniformity as submitted.** A roll call vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Luna introduced the item and indicated the only changes to Docket No. 08-0202-1201 between the proposed and pending stages was the removal of language added to IDAPA 08.02.03 subsection 026.03 during the proposed stage. These changes were made based on public input.

2. Pending Rule Docket 08-0202-1202 – Mathematical Thinking for Instruction Waiver

#### **BOARD ACTION**

**M/S (Luna/Terrell): To approve Pending Rule – Docket No. 08-0202-1202 as submitted.** A roll call vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Luna indicated the proposed rule ensures that state resources that go toward the cost of the Mathematical Thinking for Instruction (MTI) course go toward teachers that are currently teaching in an Idaho school.

3. Pending Rule Docket 08-0202-1203 – Certification Standards, Teacher Leader

#### **BOARD ACTION**

**M/S (Luna/Goesling): To approve Pending Rule – Docket No. 08-0202-1203 as submitted.** A roll call vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Luna indicated no public comments were received for this pending rule during the public comment period. As a result, the rule should be approved as originally proposed.

4. Pending Rule Docket 08-0202-1204 – Endorsements, Literacy, Consulting Teacher

#### **BOARD ACTION**

**M/S (Luna/Goesling): To approve Pending Rule – Docket No. 08-0202-1204 with changes to Idaho Administrative Code IDAPA 08.02.02.007, .016, .021, .022, .023, .024, and .029, Rules Governing Uniformity as submitted.** A roll call vote was taken and the motion carried

unanimously.

No public comments were received for sections .021, .022, .023, .024, and .029 during the public comment period. As a result, they are being submitted as originally proposed.

5. Pending Rule Docket 08-0203-1202 – Relationship Abuse and Sexual Assault Prevention

**BOARD ACTION**

**M/S (Luna/Goesling): To approve Pending Rule – Docket No. 08-0203-1202 as submitted.**  
A roll call vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Luna indicated 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.

6. Pending Rule Docket 08-0203-1203 – High School Graduation Requirements

**BOARD ACTION**

**M/S (Luna/Terrell): To approve Pending Rule with changes – Docket No. 08-0203-1203 as submitted in Attachment 2.** A roll call vote was taken and the motion passed seven to one. Ms. Atchley voted nay on the motion.

Mr. Luna introduced the rule and provided some background comments, stating that the language requiring two on-line credits has been removed in response to the failure of Proposition 3. Mr. Soltman asked for clarification on the action being taken on the waiver of the math requirement. Mr. Luna indicated it would be the same as in February where the school districts were given the waiver and local districts would be allowed to waive the third year of math for seniors who have demonstrated a high level of math proficiency. There was further discussion around the math requirements. Ms. Bent clarified both voting options leave the math requirements in place. It was also clarified that the rule did not allow local school boards to waive Board rule, but that it set a minimum standard students must meet to be exempt from the math requirement during their last year of high school.

Moving on to discuss the on-line learning requirements, Mr. Edmunds asked whether they should be kept in place as part of the high school graduation requirements. Mr. Luna responded that that the reform package originally included a graduation requirement in the law itself. Mr. Soltman commented the issue arose of opposition to the law itself. Dr. Goesling commented that during the hearing process, stakeholders agreed that there should be some sort of technology requirement, but the type and number of credits were in question. Mr. Lewis encouraged the Board to continue to look at the topic of on-line learning as an important part of student preparation for postsecondary education. Dr. Goesling added that while visiting Salmon River High School, he had received feedback from junior and senior students and teachers that they agreed it was critical to have their education actively involved in technology.

Mr. Westerberg expressed concern on how the waiver is granted for math and noted this for the record that the process of granting the waiver needs improvement. Ms. Willits from the Department provided background on how the math waiver portion arrived at where it is today, commenting that they are bringing forward what the Board had approved in June. Mr. Luna

reminded the Board of the importance of setting high school graduation requirements that provide essential skills and knowledge for students to be ready for postsecondary education and one of those critical skills is knowing how to learn in an on-line environment. There was additional feedback from Board members on this item in support of on-line learning. Mr. Lewis reiterated that as the Board discusses future education reform, there is a great need to look closely at the levels of math that are required for high school students because currently the highest level of math required is geometry.

7. Pending Rule Docket 08-0203-1204 – Curricular Material Approval

**BOARD ACTION**

**M/S (Luna/Goesling): To approve Pending and amend Temporary Rule – Docket No. 08-0203-1204 with changes to IDAPA 08.02.03.128 as submitted.** A roll call vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Luna reported that there were no comments during the comment period and that the rule authorizes the Board to determine the process by which the Department reviews and approves on-line courses. In response to the failure of Proposition 3 the language pertaining to on-line course approval is being stricken. There was one change to the rule regarding committee appointments to limit the number to no more than three from a given stakeholder.

8. Pending Rule Docket 08-0203-1205 – WIDA Standards

**BOARD ACTION**

**M/S (Luna/Terrell): To approve Pending Rule – Docket No. 08-0203-1205 as submitted.** A roll call vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Luna indicated this rule is for the adoption of the 2012 World Class Instruction Design and Assessment (WIDA) standards which come at no cost to the state. The Idaho Department of Education has entered into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with WIDA for licensing and use of the standards. Currently Idaho funds professional development for standards implementation within the districts in the state. This cost for professional development will continue at the same rate and no additional expenses will be incurred.

9. Pending Rule Docket 08-0203-1206 – Definition of Professional Development

**BOARD ACTION**

**M/S (Luna): I move to approve Pending Rule – Docket No. 08-0203-1206 with changes as submitted.** A roll call vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Luna clarified that the definition in the proposed rule was crafted in order to define a holistic approach to professional development that is well planned and administered to develop and promote effective instructional practices. He indicated no comments received relevant to the remaining portion of this rule. In response to the rejection of Proposition 3, the definition of “one-to-one mobile computing program” has been stricken.

10. Rescission and/or Vacation of rules – Docket 08-0201-1201, Fractional ADA and Docket 08-0202-1205, Teacher and Principal Evaluations

**BOARD ACTION**

**M/S (Luna/Terrell): To rescind the Temporary and Vacate the Proposed Rule – Docket No. 08-0201-1201.** A roll call vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously.

**AND**

**M/S (Luna/Atchley): To vacate the Proposed Rule – Docket No. 08-0202-1205.** A roll call vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Luna indicated the temporary rule should be rescinded and that vacating the proposed Docket 08-0201-1201 will make the temporary rule null and void and eliminate the proposed rule.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

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

**M/S (Terrell/Luna): To adjourn at 12.13 p.m. The motion carried unanimously.**



STATE OF IDAHO  
BOARD OF EDUCATION

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

**DRAFT MINUTES  
STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION  
November 20, 2012  
Special Board Meeting  
Boise, ID**

A special meeting of the State Board of Education was held November 20, 2012. It originated at the Office of the State Board of Education, in the Len B. Jordan Building, 650 W. State Street, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor in Boise, Idaho. Board President Ken Edmunds presided and called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. MST. A roll call of members was taken for the meeting.

**Present:**

Ken Edmunds, President  
Don Soltman, Vice President  
Emma Atchley, Secretary  
Milford Terrell

Tom Luna  
Bill Goesling  
Rod Lewis

**Absent:**

Richard Westerberg

**PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS**

**4. Pending Rule Docket 08-0202-1206 – Alternate Route to Certification**

**BOARD ACTION**

**M/S (Soltman/Atchley): To approve Pending Rule with changes Docket 08-0202-1206 – Rules Governing Uniformity as submitted.** A roll call vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Terrell and Mr. Lewis expressed that they are satisfied with the redrafting of this rule.

Ms. Atchley asked with regard to the on-line program why there was a background check requirement inserted into the language to requirements for completion. Ms. Bent from the Board office responded that the language has actually been in place since 2005 and has not been amended. She added that there is another section that says all personnel who have unsupervised contact with students are required to have a criminal background check and the language Ms. Atchley referred to was a redundancy oversight. It will be noted for future changes in this section that it may be removed from the on-line program requirement since the

language is contained in another section of the rule. Ms. Atchley requested no additional information.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

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

**M/S (Terrell/Atchley): To adjourn at 2:07 p.m. MST. The motion carried unanimously.**