



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

**APPROVED MINUTES
STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
December 18-19, 2013
College of Western Idaho
Micron Center
Nampa, Idaho**

A regularly scheduled meeting of the State Board of Education was held December 18-19, 2013 at the College of Western Idaho in Nampa, Idaho.

Present:

Don Soltman, President
Emma Atchley, Vice President
Rod Lewis, Secretary
Tom Luna

Milford Terrell
Bill Goesling
Richard Westerberg

Absent:

Wednesday, December 18, 2013

The Board met in the Micron Center at the College of Western Idaho in Nampa, Idaho. Board President Don Soltman called the meeting to order at 1:00 pm. Superintendent Luna joined the meeting at 1:25 p.m.

BOARDWORK

1. Agenda Review / Approval

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Atchley/Goesling): By unanimous consent to approve the agenda as submitted. The motion carried six to zero. Mr. Luna was absent from voting.

2. Minutes Review / Approval

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Atchley/Lewis): To approve the minutes from the October 16-17, 2013 regular Board meeting, the October 31-November 1, 2013 special Board meeting, the November 18, 2013 special Board meeting, and the November 20, 2013 special Board meeting as submitted. The motion carried six to zero. Mr. Luna was absent from voting.

3. Rolling Calendar

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Atchley/Lewis): To set December 17-18, 2014 as the date and North Idaho College as the location for the December 2014 regularly scheduled Board meeting. The motion carried six to zero. Mr. Luna was absent from voting.

At this time, Dr. Mike Rush introduced and welcomed the Board office's new research analyst Ms. Cathleen McHugh.

WORKSESSION – Planning, Policy & Governmental Affairs

A. Board of Education Strategic Plan

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Atchley): To approve the 2014-2018 Idaho State Board of Education Strategic Plan as submitted and to authorize the Executive Director to finalize performance measures and benchmarks as necessary. The motion carried seven to zero.

Ms. Tracie Bent from the Board office walked the Board members through the various parts of the strategic plan, as well as provided additional information on potential performance measure changes. Staff has proposed initial amendments based on direction from the Board during the performance measure report at the October Board meeting.

Ms. Bent restated the Board's vision and mission statements and the three major goals that make up the plan. She pointed out the four performance measures under Goal 1, Objective A, are associated with access. She indicated there were no proposed changes to this portion of the plan and reported on how the ACT and SAT benchmarks were set. Under Goal 1, Objective B, there was a change to the percentage of first year freshmen returning for second year in an Idaho public institution. That language was changed to strike the words *first year freshmen* and insert the words *new full-time students*. The next change to that section is the benchmark for the Board's 60% goal. An additional benchmark was added for baccalaureate and graduate level degrees. It adds the language *26% with a Baccalaureate degree by 2020, and 8% with a graduate level degree by 2020*. The language regarding the percent increase of postsecondary unduplicated students receiving undergraduate awards has been deleted. The

performance measure around the percent of first-time, full-time degree seeking freshmen has been amended to state *postsecondary unduplicated awards as a percentage of total student headcount*, with a benchmark of 20% for both 2-year and 4-year institutions. This change was based on recommendations by institutions and Board staff. Under Goal 1, Objective C, there were no proposed changes. Under Goal 1, Objective D, Transition, the same number of performance measures were retained. However, based on discussion regarding STEM degrees, staff proposed a change to what previously was a count of the number of degrees conferred in STEM fields to a ratio of STEM to non-STEM baccalaureate degrees conferred. The benchmark will be a ratio of 1:4.

Ms. Bent moved on to discuss Goal 2 – Critical Thinking, Innovation and Creativity. Under Goal 2, Objective A, there are five performance measures. There was a change proposed to only look at the college readiness for Math on the SAT, with a benchmark of 42.2%. Mr. Soltman asked if the words “college entrance exam” could be eliminated. Ms. Bent responded she would make that change. Under Goal 2, Objective B, Quality Instruction, the only proposed change is to update the benchmark for the SAT to 1500 which is an average score of 500 on each exam. That change was based on work in which the research staff concluded the previous benchmark of 1650 was unreasonable. The 1500 is also the college readiness benchmark set by SAT.

Under Goal 3, Objective A, there are five measures. Previously under the average net cost to attend a public 4-year institution had not been determined. The benchmark of 90% of peers has been added. Additionally, related to the cost per successfully completed weighted student credit hour, the benchmark for 2-year institutions was amended to \$185; down from \$280. Mr. Howell commented that in using the cost per student credit hour, there was a range of discrepancies among institutions when comparing to our peers. He indicated the institutions did not want to set a specific number for that cost and felt a goal of “to-90%” of our peers was a good range and in line as a comparison with peer institutions. He added it is an aggressive goal but one that is attainable.

Ms. Atchley asked about the basis for cost per credit hour. Mr. Howell responded it is looking at the cost for undergraduate instruction. Mr. Freeman added that this is a different calculation than what the Board reviewed in October because after a meeting with the institution research teams, a consistent definition was arrived at for this benchmark going forward. There was concern that the previous benchmark was not realistic for the four year institutions. Mr. Westerberg expressed concern and reiterated that the institutions must use the same definitions so that they are all measuring the same thing. Mr. Freeman responded and Mr. Howell echoed that they believe they have correct and consistent methodology in place going forward. Ms. Bent added that these benchmarks are intended to be stretch benchmarks and not the status quo.

Ms. Bent indicated there were no proposed changes to Goal 3, Objective B. She indicated the objective deals with increasing the quality, thoroughness, and accessibility of data for informed decision making and continuous improvement of Idaho’s

educational system. The only performance measure under this objective is the development of the P-20 to workforce longitudinal data system and the schedule is to have the three phases of that system completed by 2015. Currently we are between phase two and three. She asked if there were any additional questions or changes regarding the proposed strategic plan. There were no changes.

Mr. Luna wanted to make clear the point that there are three separate data systems for the P-20 to work force data, and that it is not all from one data bank. Dr. Rush expounded on why they decided upon the specific state longitudinal data system (SLDS) model that was chosen, adding that they feel the system that is being designed will be effectively managed and very sensitive to protecting student data by using very high levels of security.

Dr. Goesling asked how we are relating to the other departments and agencies of the state in our partnerships and encouraged further discussion and development of those partnerships. He asked how student progress is measured as they enter the work force and suggested that may be part of the Board's Vision and Mission statements. He thought it may be helpful to include the words, *and employable*, in the vision statement after the words *highly educated*. He also suggested expanding on the global competitiveness language contained in the Mission statement, asking if we want an aspirational goal related to the statement such as becoming an education leader in the Pacific Northwest. He felt that would give institutions something to aspire to beyond the 60% goal. Dr. Goesling went on to question under Goal 1, Objective D, if we have evidence we have provided students with the educational needs to efficiently and effectively transition them into the workforce.

Dr. Goesling asked if the institutions are in support of the Board's strategic plan and if it gives them the guidance they need toward their own strategic plans and missions. President Soltman asked the institution presidents and representatives to respond.

Mr. Westerberg expressed concern in re-writing the Mission and Vision statements in this venue, and not working through the committees. Dr. Goesling encouraged additional discussion hoping it would generate feedback on where the Board wants to go in the future. Dr. Burnett from University of Idaho (UI) responded that in regard to employability, if the plan could include a set of employment measures that include a gap analysis, it may lead to more meaningful benchmarks in that area. Dr. Vailas from Idaho State University (ISU) felt the subject was controversial and that the real goal of the institutions is for student attainment of credentials. He felt the subject of student placement after their degree attainment is a sensitive one and that there are not good metrics to develop that kind of tracking. There is not always good correlation between a student's degree and the career path they choose or why they choose it. The options are too broad for how the student chooses their path after college either on their own, or out of necessity, and trying to track that information could end up showing a narrowing effect on student potential. President Albiston from Eastern Idaho Technical College (EITC) responded that the Board's strategic plan provides pretty good support and guidance for EITC's strategic plan. Dr. Fox from the College of Western Idaho (CWI)

also felt the Board's strategic plan contributes to CWI's strategic plan and provides a good roadmap to where the institutions are headed. Mr. Browning commented on behalf of North Idaho College (NIC) stating that the measurement of the voluntary framework of accountability model is a better measure for community colleges. Dr. Glandon from the College of Western Idaho (CWI) responded that it is easier for the community colleges to directly correlate to the placement of students. He added that as a driver for economic development, it also depends on incentivizing and motivating certain career paths which would drive students in various directions; for example the IT industry.

Dr. Goesling responded it would be important to realize the state's vision for industry and look at an aspirational goal.

Mr. Westerberg reminded the Board that the strategic plan should be broad enough to not limit others by becoming too specific, and provide enough direction to keep forward momentum. He emphasized the importance of a plan that does not inhibit the institutions ability to pursue the kind of opportunities suggested in this discussion.

Mr. Lewis questioned if there were any gaps in the strategic plan. He asked if the efforts of the Education Task Force have been sufficiently included. Mr. Soltman indicated the Task Force recommendations may not be completely ready just yet for that step. Mr. Luna felt the Task Force recommendations have direct ties to higher education and suggested there may be certain things that could be implemented at the higher education level. There was additional discussion about the Education Task Force recommendations.

Mr. Lewis remarked that the Quality Instruction goal related to teacher prep may need a new recommendation and commented about tiered licensure being tied directly to this goal. He suggested including a sub-goal or descriptor related to implementation of the Task Force recommendation related to quality instruction. Mr. Luna reported that there would be an update on tiered licensure later at this meeting.

Dr. Goesling also felt there should be something in the plan related to growing research. Ms. Bent indicated Goal 2, Objective A, contains some performance measures related to research, and added that the Board does have a Research Strategic Plan that is tied to the Board's strategic plan, and an update on it is forthcoming during the Planning, Policy and Governmental Affairs (PPGA) agenda. Ms. Bent clarified how the plans are intertwined and are aligned with Board's overall strategic plan, and pointed out that it could be problematic to combine the plans into one massive plan because it would not apply the same to, for instance, the community colleges and the four-year institutions and the agencies under the Board. Ms. Bent reiterated that the Board's strategic plan was the k-20 statewide education plan and while it was important to have measurable objectives and goals to determine progress in implementing the strategic plan it is also a guiding document for the institution and agency strategic plans and must be broad enough to encompass all aspects of the education continuum, to that end the Board has also approved a higher education research strategic plan and will be consider the first

phase of a STEM education strategic plan in an effort to address those areas that need a more specific focus statewide. The institution and agency strategic plans must then be in alignment to the Board's strategic while at the same time address their unique missions.

Mr. Soltman recommended further discussion in the PPGA Committee regarding the strategic plan and today's discussion. Mr. Lewis reiterated that the strategic plan needs to be flexible and should include some of the goals of the Task Force recommendations. Mr. Westerberg suggested a place holder for the Task Force recommendations because there is so much yet to do going forward. He also commented on the importance of not sacrificing quality to get to quantity.

Dr. Rush reminded the Board members that significant time and effort is being spent on quality, and staff will work on a better way to reflect that information to make it clearer.

Dr. Burnett indicated that the item of quality would be added as a future President's Council item. Reflecting on content from earlier in the discussion, Ms. Atchley thanked Dr. Vailas for his remarks and echoed the sentiment about the lack of correlation between what a person studies and what one ends up doing in their career path. She remarked that study after study shows it is the number of people with college degrees in any given population that affects directly the economic activity in an areas, no matter what type of activity it is. Raising the number of degrees clearly raises the economic activity and workforce. Ms. Atchley also pointed out that there is concern at a number of levels about designing postsecondary education and training solely for the workforce; particularly because of how dramatically the workforce can change over a relatively short period of time and based on demands.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

1. Superintendent's Update

Superintendent Tom Luna provided an update from the State Department of Education (SDE). He introduced Matt McCarter, Director of Student Engagement and Postsecondary Readiness at SDE, who provided a report on the Smarter Balanced Assessment System (SBAC) including key advancement opportunities for students. He indicated that one of their goals is to increase outreach for students, teachers, counselors, etc. The advanced opportunities align with recommendations from the Governor's Task Force on Education. He described the 8-in-6 program which is designed to enable students to complete eight years of school in six years. He clarified that it is a maximum potential program and many students will not reach completion in six years. Another key advanced opportunity is dual credit for early completers. Mr. McCarter recapped the highlights of the dual credit program. He also commented on the mastery advancement program which allows testing out for mastery in a particular area. He indicated that these three programs can work in collaboration with each other for students, with students realizing cost savings as well, and that counselor advisement

to students is critical. Mr. Luna voiced that better training for teachers and counselors will be paramount for communicating these opportunities to students and parents.

Mr. Lewis asked if the 8-in-6 program has a recommended curriculum or path for students. Mr. McCarter responded that there is not a cookie cutter approach for mapping a student's path, and that each student's path is different and treated as such. He added that there are some consortium activities between districts that are intended to benefit students. Mr. Westerberg asked how many students are on this track. Mr. McCarter responded that a strong push started this summer and that this Fall's report indicates 90 students are participating from 20 districts at this time. Mr. McCarter added that the student needs to work with the district on the course and enrollment for these types of courses. They flag the student as an 8-in-6 participant and track them accordingly. The students can participate 8-in-6 at any point between seventh and twelfth grade, but cannot be reimbursed retroactively.

Mr. Lewis asked if this is a program a district adopts or if it is infiltrated from the state level. Mr. Luna responded that there is nothing to compel the district to promote it. Mr. Lewis suggested promoting it at the district level. Mr. Luna also indicated that it could affect a school's five-star rating if they did not participate in these types of programs. Mr. Lewis suggested making a metric part of the Department's strategic plan to make a certain percent of district's 8-in-6 districts. Mr. McCarter indicated that the statute says districts are required to make a "reasonable effort" to inform parents of these opportunities, and stated that they are working out the issues. Mr. Lewis asked what kind of infrastructure exists on the postsecondary side to make the program work. Mr. McCarter indicated there are some technical issues they are working on presently, and they also deal with case-by-case issues as they occur. Mr. Lewis suggested more in the way of measuring advanced opportunities to the Department's strategic plan.

Mr. Luna updated the Board on the transition to the next generation of assessments. He outlined the Idaho Core math standards, stating we are moving to a level that balances conceptual understanding and procedural fluency. This will engage students to reason abstractly and quantitatively, and construct viable arguments and be able to critique the reasoning of others. He summarized the Idaho Core ELA standards in reading, writing, speaking and language.

Mr. Luna indicated that Idaho is one of 23 states working together on the SBAC assessment and summarized the assessment timeline. He reported that 2012-2013 was the timing of the pilot program, 2013-2014 is the practice test/field test timeline, and 2014-2015 is the operational test timeline. Mr. Luna pointed out that with the SBAC test, there will be a formative digital library resource and in-term assessments that will provide immediate feedback for teachers. The end result of this assessment system is that students are more college and career ready. He indicated there will not be a cost burden for the student and the state will be getting a better test for the same price.

Mr. Luna provided a chart showing estimated testing times for the 2014 field test and 2015 operational assessment tests. The total time for all combined assessments is

between 7 and 8.5 hours. He clarified the testing time is flexible and students are not required to sit through eight hours of testing. The SBAC is a combination of all three assessments. Mr. Luna addressed the question of computer availability, and software and hardware requirements to handle the testing, responding that the technology is available to support the testing. He indicated that Idaho is testing 11th graders to more effectively measure college and career readiness. Also, the students can retake the test if necessary in 12th grade. He clarified that Idaho is testing all students because it serves as a “dress rehearsal” for students, and also the decision was reached by working with school administrators on the matter. He added that double testing was not an option.

Mr. Soltman asked if this will eventually be a graduation test. Mr. Luna responded that it will be a graduation requirement eventually. Mr. Soltman asked about keeping with the SAT. Mr. Luna responded the tests serve two separate purposes and the Department will continue to talk with administrators about using the SAT in the future.

Mr. Lewis asked about the ability of young students being able to type on the computer keyboard effectively. Mr. Luna indicated that item was not brought up as an issue in the pilot test and that they will keep an eye on it in the field test. He said they are not ignoring the concern, and added that there are also accommodations for students with limited English speaking abilities.

Ms. Atchley asked about how the tests would be proctored. Mr. Luna clarified how the tests would be proctored and clarified that there would be no additional expense for proctoring these tests. Ms. Atchley also asked about the loss of instructional time during testing time since the devices will be being used for testing. Mr. Luna responded that the testing time is less than 1% of instructional time, and additionally, there are many other instances where instructional time is sacrificed. He added that the value of these tests is in line with the benefit to the students. He indicated we would know a lot more after the conclusion of the field tests.

Mr. Westerberg thanked Mr. Luna for a robust communications plan on these efforts.

2. Tiered Licensure Presentation

Mr. Luna introduced Christina Linder, Director of Teacher Certification and Professional Standards from the Department, to provide a presentation on tiered licensure. He indicated that one of the recommendations of Governor Otter’s Task Force for Improving Education was “a continuum of professional growth and learning that is tied to licensure,” more commonly known as a tiered licensure system.

Ms. Linder started by providing a historical background of Idaho’s plan for tiered licensure which started from the Maximizing Opportunities for Students and Teachers (MOST) committee which was formed back in 1999. She outlined the recommendations of the MOST committee from 2004, and reviewed the current state of teacher licensure which is a single tier model. She described that there is entry into the profession,

maintenance of certifications, and then advanced/leadership certificates. She indicated that Idaho is only one of fewer than 10 states that still use this single tier system, and that approximately 21 states use a two-tiered system, and at least 17 states use three or more tiers. Ms. Linder pointed out that multi-tiered licensure structures can incentivize educators to develop and improve their performance as they work toward advanced status. Tiered licensure also serves as a way to incentivize, and serve as an accountability mechanism for advancement in the system.

Ms. Linder indicated that superintendent Luna's initiative as the President of the Council for Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) focused on educator preparation. That initiative included ten recommendations in three areas. A grant was available which the Department applied for. In the grant, the Department proposed a tiered licensure system where there would be greater accountability for entering the teaching profession. This included teacher preparation, performance measures, and data available to help with teacher improvement. Ms. Linder outlined the details of the initial tier of licensure which is based on performance measures. It will look at the first three years of a teacher's career to decide what the teacher needs to be able to do and learn once they are in the classroom, then look at performance measures that say the teacher is ready to go on to professional licensure. The second tier is also based on performance measures and shall be proposed as a five-year, renewable license. Ms. Linder indicated they are still developing the model and looking at types of performance measures as well as preparation and remediation programs for teachers who may need it on an individualized basis. Some measures include student surveys, student learning objectives, measured student growth, and evaluations performed by certified evaluators using the Danielson framework.

The Department is also in the process of ensuring that every administrator and school leader responsible for evaluating teachers goes through proper training and is certified. They are in the process of developing initial and professional tiers of administrator licensure which will be designed over the next two years. Administrators will have a three year period of induction, and a renewable professional license will be granted only if specific performance measures have been successfully met. These performance measures are aligned with the Idaho Administrator Standards. By the end of the second year, the model shall be ready to be piloted across the state.

Mr. Lewis asked how administrator performance will be determined at the district level. Ms. Linder responded and that superintendents will be responsible for using performance measures to determine whether an administrator is being effective. She reiterated it is in its early stages of development and those measurements have not been developed yet.

Mr. Westerberg asked if a teacher would move forward and back between tiers based on performance. Ms. Linder responded that in the model they were using, a teacher could become "stuck" at a certain point where they would require remediation. At this point, the answer to that question remains to be determined by the Technical Advisory Committee. Ms. Linder followed by saying that in accordance with the Task Force for

Improving Education's recommendation, the Department worked with stakeholders to form a Technical Advisory Committee that will make recommendations regarding the expectations and measures for each tier of the licensure model. Ms. Linder indicated that the committee is made up from many stakeholder levels.

Mr. Luna asked if the Board would like another update before the item comes back for rule in 2014 and recommended an update to the Board at the April meeting.

EXECUTIVE SESSION (Closed to the Public)

Boise State University

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Atchley/Westerberg): To go into Executive Session pursuant to Idaho Code §67-2345(1)(c) to conduct deliberations concerning labor negotiations or 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 seven to zero.

M/S (Atchley/Terrell): To go out of Executive Session at 3:10 p.m. The motion carried unanimously.

Thursday December 19, 2013, 8:00 a.m., College of Western Idaho, Micron Center, Nampa, Idaho.

The Board convened at the College of Western Idaho in the Micron Center for regular business on Thursday, December 19, 2013. Board President Don Soltman called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m. CWI President Glandon introduced several students who shared with the audience their personal accounts and successes with CWI in conjunction with their lives. Some of those students included Student Body President Joi Deter, Vice President Megan Carter, and Michael Kyle from the United Clubs and Registered Organizations (UROC) club.

Ms. Carter pointed out that the UROC club has representation from 26 of the 30 clubs at the university and remarked about the level of student participation campus wide. She reported on some of the clubs' fundraising events and commented on the success of the horticulture program and poinsettia sales this year. Biology club member Karen Gregory discussed how their club works with many members of the local and business community. President of Phi Theta Kappa honor society Jessica Bane remarked on how their club works with and gives back to the community by working with other clubs in the area. She introduced Michael Tamas, President of the Skills USA team, and the head of the heavy equipment and diesel technology program. He announced that April 5th is the date of their Skills on Wheels car show which is put on by students and teachers of CWI. Alicia Dickman of the Associated Students of CWI (ASCWI) commented on the contagion of student involvement in multiple clubs and

organizations. Matthew Watson, a Wyakin Warrior Phi Theta Kappa representative, thanked CWI for its service to that organization and spoke of how disabled veterans and veterans in general have been accommodated by the CWI community and its instructors. President Soltman thanked the students for their comments and feedback.

At this time, President Soltman invited Dr. Todd Schwarz to the front of the room for recognition of his achievements, most recently as the Administrator of the Division of Professional-Technical Education, and to announce his transition to the Executive Vice President and Chief Academic Officer at the College of Southern Idaho. Mr. Soltman thanked Dr. Schwarz for his work and years of service to education.

Mr. Soltman also invited Dr. Trudy Anderson to the front of the room to recognize her length of service and notable achievements to Idaho's education. Ms. Anderson will be retiring at the end of 2013 from the University of Idaho and has spent her life supporting education.

OPEN FORUM

There was one individual who requested to speak during open forum. Mr. Max Cowan, University of Idaho Associated Student Body President, thanked the Board for the time to speak today. He commented on the student health insurance plans and offered the sentiments of students regarding the item. He remarked that the Affordable Care Act has created a lot of unknowns for students, and they are worried whether or not they will be required to have insurance coverage, whether they will be eligible for some form of subsidy, and finally what it will cost them to get insurance coverage. He reported that students have expressed great concern and also fear about the student health insurance issue.

CONSENT AGENDA

M/S (Atchley/Terrell): To approve the consent agenda as presented. The motion carried unanimously seven to zero.

Instruction, Research & Student Affairs

1. Quarterly Report: Programs and Changes Approved by the Executive Director
2. EPSCoR Idaho Appointment

Board Action

By unanimous consent to re-appoint Mr. David Barneby to the Idaho Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research Committee as a representative of the private sector, effective January 1, 2014 to June 30, 2019.

Policy, Planning & Governmental Affairs

3. Alcohol Permits Approved by University Presidents
4. Boise State University – Facilities Naming

Board Action

By unanimous consent to approve Boise State University's request to name the TECenter in Nampa the "Jim Hogge TECenter."

5. Indian Education Committee Appointment

Board Action

By unanimous consent to appoint the members of the Idaho Indian Education Committee as presented in Attachment 1.

State Department of Education

6. Professional Standards Commission Appointment

Board Action

By unanimous to appoint Roger Quarles as a member of the Professional Standards Commission for a three year term effective immediately, representing the Department of Education.

PLANNING, POLICY & GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

1. College of Western Idaho – Annual Progress Report

President Bert Glandon provided a report on the College of Western Idaho and started his report with a short but impressive video clip showcasing CWI. Dr. Glandon commented that their Board has set the number one goal for CWI as student success and remarked on the community learning centers and pre-enrollment support for all incoming students. He reported that in their strategic plan, they focus on many ways to help incoming students, mentioning their bridge and re-boot camp programs and a number of others. He commented that in addition to the academic needs of students, they need help with time management, access needs, and study habits which CWI is addressing. He maintained their focus is on continuous engagement and retention of students and building good foundations for those students through collaborative efforts and partnerships that engage learning. Dr. Glandon reported the retention rate for full time students is 49%, and part time students 37%.

Dr. Glandon also reported that as of just last week, Boise State University (BSU) is on the CWI campus and that they hope to continue developing relationships so other

institutions may have a presence at the college. Dr. Glandon closed by highlighting the institutional priorities that support SBOE goals such as their focus on student success, employee success, fiscal stability, community connections, and institutional health. They are also engaged in ensuring the sustainability of CWI's infrastructure.

Mr. Terrell commended Dr. Glandon on the progress and growth at CWI. He asked if they are close to having their own accreditation and separation from CSI. Dr. Glandon credited his team for the college's success and indicated they are looking at January 2016 target date for separation under the commission guidelines. Dr. Soltman echoed the remarks of Mr. Terrell and commented on Dr. Glandon's leadership and team.

2. President's Council Report

Interim President Don Burnett, current chair of the Presidents' Council provided a report on the recent President's Council meetings. Mr. Burnett indicated that during the August Board meeting the Presidents' Council, in response to the Boards request that the institutions evaluate their institution substance abuse policies, recommended the University of Idaho, Boise State University, Idaho State University, and Lewis-Clark State College submit a "Substance Abuse Safety Action Plan." Attachments 1 through 4 of the agenda materials are the institution responses to the request. Mr. Burnett summarized some highlights of those reports.

Dr. Goesling asked how the student response has been to the action plans. Mr. Burnett responded the students have responded favorably to the plans. Mr. Terrell thanked the presidents for their action on this item and felt these action plans will be very useful for the institutions in the future. Mr. Lewis echoed those remarks.

Mr. Burnett went on to report on the highlights of other council meetings from this Fall, indicating they met with the Idaho Business for Education (IBE) representatives Rob Gramer, Bob Lokken, and Skip Oppenheimer. He reported on the presentation by IBE and their findings which included Idaho data gathered from an on-line survey of 466 respondents from 26 organizations, most of which were at the CEO and executive level. The respondents were geographically located around the state. The findings suggested that 67% of jobs by 2018 would require some sort of postsecondary education, thus confirming the 60% goal, and in fact suggesting a sense of urgency to it. Additionally, employers are seeking soft skills in their employees and other areas where postsecondary education can play a distinctive role. The findings concluded the need to advise students starting at a younger age (such as 8th grade) about going to college and the need for career readiness. Mr. Burnett remarked that because the Presidents found the findings so pertinent, they have requested follow-up discussion with IBE, a possible gap analysis, and suggested a Board work session with IBE.

Mr. Burnett also summarized the discussion on regulatory materials, media opportunities for presidents, web portal development among others. They discussed strategic planning process, the Idaho Common Core, student preparedness for college

(remediation), and the importance of a change in employee compensation (CEC), and the development in the Department of Education of a postsecondary rating system.

Mr. Freeman noted that for the IBE data, it is still in draft status and not yet ready for public consumption. They estimate the data will be available in February.

Dr. Kustra remarked on the video presented earlier by Dr. Glandon about CWI and commented on what a remarkable conversion it has been at that institution. He commended President Glandon and his colleagues for their good work and success.

Dr. Goesling shared some comments on Arthur Taylor's memorial service and his contribution to the University of Idaho and the Native American culture. Mr. Taylor was recognized as a truly outstanding member of the educational community and his absence will be a great loss to the entire community.

Superintendent Luna left the meeting for a conference call at 9:45 am MST.

3. Idaho Digital Learning Academy (IDLA) – Annual Report

Ms. Cheryl Charlton from IDLA introduced Mr. Jacob Smith Director of Operations, and Mike Caldwell Director of Program Development, to assist with their presentation. Ms. Charlton thanked the Board for their work with the Governor's Task Force on Education, indicating they are looking forward to assisting with the deliverables from some of the recommendations made by the Task Force. She indicated many of IDLA's initiatives are in line with Board goals. Mr. Smith reported on IDLA's program data points. He indicated their organization spans eleven years now, and commented on the IDLA's initiatives to educate, innovate and elevate by creating new opportunities through collaborative partnerships. Mr. Smith reported IDLA has proudly served over 100,000 students through 208 course offerings; last year alone they served over 19,000 enrollments. They have 59 AP and dual credit courses, have trained 966 teachers, and have realized 100% district participation. He reported the top two reasons students take their courses is because they may not be offered at their local school districts or they want to free up their schedule during the day by taking the class on the weekends or during the evening.

Mr. Caldwell reported on initiatives of IDLA and on how IDLA is supporting Board goals and Governor's Task Force recommendations. He remarked on the iPath collaborative program which is designed to provide unlimited opportunity for Idaho students through secondary, postsecondary and industry opportunities for students. The vision of the iPath program is to create strategic K-20 partnerships with Idaho businesses and industries. They hope to give high school students opportunities and access to credentials and skills needed to launch meaningful careers.

He reported that IDLA has been working collaboratively across Idaho to help students navigate a path to college and career readiness. They provided a handout to illustrate the opportunities for students through IDLA. They also have a college and career

success series which focuses on pathways to success, library research skills, career and life planning, high school to college transitions and a college readiness system called EdReady. Mr. Caldwell also reported on the many partnerships IDLA has benefited from and thanked those entities for their collaborative efforts. He also thanked the Board for their work on the web portal partnership.

4. Higher Education Research Council (HERC) – Annual Report

Dr. Mark Rudin provided a report from the HERC committee and thanked the people on that committee for their efforts. He also thanked industry partners for their contributions, and recognized a number of those partners in his comments. Dr. Rudin recapped what HERC has accomplished over the past year, such as the development and implementation of the Board's higher education research strategic plan and its importance as a guiding document. He also remarked on the success of the Incubation Fund related to the development of intellectual property as it relates to industry, adding that they are starting to see more of the results from seeds started in that program. Dr. Rudin reported that a study was done about tech transfer at each of the universities and results of that study would be presented to the Board at the April 2014 meeting. He closed by reporting that the HERC committee conducted a review of the HERC/iGEM proposals and intends to conduct a second review sometime this spring. HERC has also requested the universities provide regular updates on their CAES activities.

Mr. Soltman thanked Dr. Rudin and the members of HERC for their work on the committee.

5. Board Policy I.J. Facilities Use – First Reading

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Atchley): To approve the first reading of Board Policy I.J. Use of Institutional Facilities and Services with Regard to the Private Sector as submitted. The motion carried six to zero. Mr. Luna was absent from voting.

6. Division of Professional Technical Education – Interim Administrator Appointment

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Goesling): To appoint Dr. Vera McCrink as the Interim Administrator for the Division of Professional-Technical Education and to set her salary at \$44.95 hourly, effective January 1, 2014. The motion carried six to zero. Mr. Luna was absent from voting.

7. State Authorizer Reciprocity Agreement

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Goesling): To authorize Idaho join the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education State Authorization Reciprocity Agreement and to authorize the Executive Director to sign the agreement on behalf of the Board. The motion carried six to zero. Mr. Luna was absent from voting.

8. Statewide STEM Education Strategic Plan

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Atchley): To approve the 2014-2018 P-20 STEM Education Strategic Plan mission, vision, goals, and objectives as submitted. The motion carried six to zero. Mr. Luna was absent from voting.

Ms. Willits provided some comments regarding the item indicating Superintendent Luna has been very supportive of it. She did point out that Mr. Luna was not in favor of adopting the next generation of science standards because it is consortium based, and that they will be reviewing the rotation of science standards in the next two years. Ms. Bent clarified that the action today was to approve the Goals and objectives of the plan. Once that step was accomplished Board staff would return at a later date with proposed performance measures and benchmarks. The mention of NextGen Science standards was an example provided by the stakeholder group who worked on the plan of a potential strategy on improving student success in science after high school. The stakeholder group was made up of representatives and teacher and administrators, business and industry, as well as, INL, the Micron Foundation, the Discovery Center, a representative of postsecondary professional-technical educators as well as the colleges and universities.

Ms. Atchley asked about the fact that over half of students who receive STEM degrees end up in careers in non-STEM fields. She asked about how to identify those students earlier on who may not end up in STEM fields after education and respond to that trend. Ms. Willits responded about connecting with students early on so they know more clearly what a career in a STEM field may look like, and ensure students are moving forward on a path that will retain their interest instead of deciding later it is not for them. She discussed the importance of providing STEM exposure before the student reaches the level of postsecondary education.

Mr. Luna returned to the meeting at this time.

Mr. Lewis asked about the increased graduation requirements for math and science and asked if the Department has a recommendation in mind. Mr. Luna responded that increasing graduation requirements is a strategy for student improvement that involves more seat time, credits, and rigor, and he is in support of holding students to higher standards.

Mr. Lewis expressed concern about the science standards and not wanting to adopt a consortium of standards. He asked if it would cause any delay in the implementation of

new science standards. Mr. Luna responded that when standards were developed for Math and English, they were in line with other states while remaining specific to Idahoans. They determined that in working with other states to develop standards in science, it was difficult to find “common” standards for some things that are controversial in science. They believe that they have the time to develop standards that will be good for Idaho students. There was a request by Mr. Lewis that when the science standards are developed, the Department present them to the Board along with a comparison to the national science standards.

9. CCA STEM Grant Announcement

Marilyn Whitney from the Board office reported that Idaho was successful in its grant application to Complete College America (CCA) and CCA has named Idaho as one of five states to receive a Guided Pathways to Success (GPS) in STEM Careers Initiative technical assistance grant. Other awardees are The District of Columbia, Illinois, Massachusetts, and Ohio.

Ms. Whitney reported that the goal of that initiative is to improve competitiveness of the US economy by increasing the number of students who complete degrees in STEM fields. The University of Idaho, Idaho State University, Boise State University, and College of Southern Idaho will each participate as part of the grant. Business in industry partners were also included and included partners such as the J.R. Simplot Company, Con-Agra Foods, St. Alphonsus Regional Medical Center, St. Luke’s Regional Medical Center, Idaho Business for Education, and Idaho Technology Council.

The grant runs from September 2013 to March 2015, and during the two-year grant period, State Board of Education staff, policy makers, and campus teams will work with national experts and practitioners to develop STEM completion goals, analyze local STEM labor markets, and implement Complete College America’s GPS best practices. In addition, Idaho will participate in a national network of state and postsecondary leaders dedicated to increasing STEM degrees and will have access to state convening’s that showcase proven models of implementation. Ms. Whitney added that there are also detection systems in place to identify students who are struggling.

10. University of Idaho – Statement of Student Rights

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Goesling): To confirm that pursuant to Board Policy III.P., subsection 12, the President of the University of Idaho has the authority to approve amendments to the University of Idaho’s Statement of Students Rights and that the requirement of a prior affirmative student vote and direct approval of the Board to effect any such change is inconsistent with Board Policy III.P., subsection 12. The motion carried 6-1. Ms. Atchley voted nay on the motion.

Mr. Burnett provided some historical background on the item and commented on the inconsistency between the Board and University of Idaho policy, and the need for clarity in the amendment process for the University of Idaho policies to have consistency with overarching policies of the Board.

Mr. Max Cowan of the Associated Students of the University of Idaho (ASUI) provided a few remarks on the item and asked that the Board not remove the provision for a student vote, but instead change the requirements so that they include the ASUI Senate, or change it so it does not have such stringent requirements as to a number of students that must be voting in that ballot.

Mr. Westerberg expressed concern regarding setting a precedent about interpreting Board policy. He felt counsel should opine on what Board policy is and communicate it to the institutions. Ms. Marcus indicated that this motion does restate what is in Board policy and that UI felt there were unique circumstances regarding the item which is why it was brought before the Board.

AUDIT

1. FY 13 Financial Statements Review

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Atchley/Terrell): To accept from the Audit Committee the Fiscal Year 2013 financial audit reports for Boise State University, Idaho State University, University of Idaho, Lewis-Clark State College, and Eastern Idaho Technical College, as presented by Moss Adams LLP. The motion carried six to zero.

Ms. Mary Tate and Mr. Scott Simpson from Moss Adams reported on the audit findings for 2013. In October, they conducted a review of their audit findings with members of the Audit Committee, Business Affairs and Human Resources Committee, and Board staff. Mr. Simpson reported that audits were completed for BSU, ISU, UI, LCSC and EITC and a clean audit opinion for those five institutions was issued. They audits were started at the beginning of May and concluded at the end of October. There are four partners and approximately 30-40 auditors involved in this process. The institutions were thanked for their cooperation in the process.

Mr. Freeman remarked on the complexity of this work and thanked Moss Adams and their staff for their effort and communications in this process.

2. FY13 Net Assets Report

Mr. Freeman requested institution representatives provide comment on this item. Ron Smith from UI provided a brief report on the net assets for the university, commenting the net assets between this year and last year are nearly the same, but show a slight increase. Despite challenges and opportunities, they addressed needs and expenses

to move the institution forward. He commented they are aware they need to increase institution reserves and intend to do that moving forward.

Mr. Westerberg asked Mr. Freeman if a minimum target for net assets of 5% was set. Mr. Freeman responded in the affirmative, indicating the strategic plan Goal A, Objective B, sets a target measure of 5%. Mr. Lewis followed up by asking if a time period goal should be set for UI to meet the 5% goal. Mr. Smith estimated they could be at 5% within three years. Mr. Westerberg recommended a financial recovery plan that the Audit Committee could review. Mr. Terrell recommended waiting for the new institution president to be on board before this type of time commitment was made. Mr. Lewis supported the idea of a recovery plan, and suggested that it would be helpful for it to be in place for the new president. Mr. Westerberg confirmed the Board is requesting a recovery plan. Ms. Atchley requested a report be provided to the Audit Committee at their June meeting.

Mr. Herbst reported for LCSC that they have been keeping tight control on expenses. They are at just over 5% for unrestricted funds available and are hopeful that with the upcoming legislative session an increase in CEC will be forthcoming. Ms. Atchley asked if their program prioritization is giving them some perspective in certain areas. Mr. Herbst responded that it will help increase efficiency in programs, but is not creating a windfall of reserves. Mr. Freeman reinforced the point that these reports are a snapshot in time from June 30.

Mr. Fletcher reported that ISU has \$26.1 million or 11.7% in unrestricted funds available and commented on the amount of deferred maintenance hurting ISU. Mr. Freeman asked what ISU's target is for unrestricted assets. Mr. Fletcher responded they want to be at the two month level or around \$37 million.

Mr. Westerberg asked about developing and optimal number, such as two months for example, for the same reasons the 5% was set. Mr. Luna cautioned about being too critical on an institution who has achieved optimal reserves. Mr. Lewis directed Board staff to work to find an optimal number and then collaborate with JFAC leadership. Mr. Freeman acknowledged this request.

Stacy Pearson reported that BSU's net position is \$385 million of which approximately 70% is their investment in capital assets. Their unrestricted net assets figure went up by about \$2.5 million, and their debt payment stayed close to the same. With regard to an optimal amount of unrestricted funds available, Ms. Pearson commented that they believe 5% is a prudent amount.

Dr. Goesling asked about their student fee increase and if any of those dollars ended up in the reserve. Ms. Pearson responded that it was very likely that some dollars returned to the reserve.

Mr. Lewis expressed concern about designated funds and how they appear to the Legislature. Mr. Soltman asked if designated funds could be itemized. Mr. Freeman

responded they could, but an effort is to keep it on one page; adding that some institutions provide the detail in a separate worksheet.

Mr. Westerberg requested the BAHR committee do further work on this item. Mr. Terrell acknowledged this request.

3. FY13 College and Universities' Financial Ratios

Mr. Freeman provided a brief analysis of the financial ratios to the Board via a short PowerPoint presentation. The ratios discussed included the primary reserve ratio, the viability ratio, return on net assets, net operating revenues, and the composite index. The ratios are designed as a management tool to measure financial activity and trends within an institution. Mr. Freeman summarized the primary reserve ratio which indicates the sufficiency and flexibility of resources. The intent of the ratio is to focus on expendable net assets, with a ratio of .40% or higher being optimal. The viability ratio indicates the ability to repay total debt through reserves. It measures the availability of expendable net assets to cover long term debts. The benchmark of 1.25% shows an institution having sufficient assets. The return on net assets ratio indicates whether an institution is better off financially than in previous years. It measures a total return on investment and a benchmark of 6% indicates an institution is increasing its net assets and is strengthening its future financial flexibility. The net operating revenues ratio indicates an institution is operating within its available resources. It measures income/deficit that the institution generates. The benchmark is between 2-4% over a period of time. The Composite Financial Index (CFI) is an accumulation of those four ratios that combines it into a single score. The CFI threshold of financial health is equal to a score of three. A score of less than three requires attention; a score of greater than three indicates an opportunity for strategic investment for the institution. Mr. Freeman also pointed out these ratio benchmarks are the industry standard, and no benchmarks have been developed which exclude affiliated entity assets.

Mr. Freeman showed a diamond graph for BSU, ISU, UI and LCSC for illustrative purposes, pointing out where administrative action is recommended. He added the ratios are not a comparative analysis tool.

Mr. Smith from UI reported their primary reserve ratios stayed the same, their net income increased to the 2.0 benchmark, their return on net assets increased to 4%, and their viability ratio stayed the same, meaning that their expendable assets to recover debt is not at the benchmark. Overall CFI went up to 2.0. Mr. Smith commented this indicates that UI was able to meet the critical mission expenditures, but they did not have additional flexibility needed in resources for unexpected circumstances. They need to increase primary and viability ratios.

Mr. Herbst from LCSC reported that their primary reserves are at .60%, their net income for operations is at 4.7%, and their return on net assets is above the benchmark at 6.80%. Their viability is at 5.54% and CFI is at 7.6%. Mr. Herbst reported they are comfortable with where they are at in each of their ratios, and over all they are doing ok.

Mr. Fletcher reported that all of their financial ratios have increased over the past year, and they are essentially at or above the benchmarks for each of the five ratios. Mr. Fletcher reported that regarding their return on net assets, they are continuing to invest in investments that generate resources and that the institution is pleased with their CFI of 3.7%. Their goal is to continue to increase each of the ratios.

Ms. Pearson directed attention to their net operating revenues ratio of 4.7% and their viability ratio of .77% which shows they are building up reserves because of the amount of debt issued to grow the campus recently. Ms. Pearson indicated they are still seeking resources from outside the university to increase their viability ratio. She reported BSU's primary reserve ratio is down slightly, but is still above the benchmark; and their return on net assets has increased slightly above the benchmark to 6.9%. She pointed out their CFI went up slightly to 3.31%.

There were no questions for the institutions.

BUSINESS AFFAIRS AND HUMAN RESOURCES

Section I – Human Resources

1. Boise State University – Multi-Year Employment Agreement – Head Swimming and Diving Coach

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Terrell/Westerberg): To approve the request by Boise State University to approve a two year employment agreement with Women's Swimming and Diving Head Coach, Kristin Hill, for a term commencing July 1, 2014 and expiring on June 30, 2016 with an annual base salary of \$75,000, and such base salary increase and supplemental compensation provisions in substantial conformance with the terms of the agreement set forth in Attachment 1. The motion carried six to zero. Mr. Lewis was absent from voting.

2. Idaho State University – Multi-Year Employment Agreement – Head Women's Softball Coach

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Terrell/Goesling): To approve the request by Idaho State University to approve a two year employment agreement with Julie Wright, Women's Softball Head Coach, for a term commencing retroactively on October 1, 2013 and expiring on June 10, 2016 with an annual base salary of \$54,340, and such base salary increase and supplemental compensation provisions in substantial

conformance with the terms of the agreement set forth in Attachment 1. The motion carried seven to zero.

Dr. Goesling requested consistency in using either a percent or an APR score. Mr. Terrell responded the Athletic Committee would address the issue for consistency. Ms. Atchley expressed continued concern about academic achievements in coach contracts and recommended the Athletics Committee look at that as well.

3. Appointment of the Chief Academic Officer

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Terrell/Goesling): To appoint Dr. Christopher Mathias as the Chief Academic Officer for the State Board of Education and set his salary at \$44.24/ hr (\$92,019.20 annually), effective January 6, 2014. The motion carried five to zero. Mr. Lewis and Mr. Westerberg were absent from voting.

4. Boise State University – Material Terms for Employment Agreement – Head Football Coach

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Lewis/Goesling): To approve the Material Term Sheet between Boise State University and Bryan Harsin as Head Football Coach, subject to final approval of an employment agreement in substantial conformance with the Term Sheet set forth in Attachment 1. The motion carried seven to zero.

BUSINESS AFFAIRS AND HUMAN RESOURCES

Section II – Finance

1. University of Utah Agreement Renewal and Annual Report

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Terrell/Atchley): To approve the three-year agreement extension between the University of Utah School of Medicine and the State Board of Education for the provision of a total of up to 32 medical school seats annually, and to authorize the Executive Director of the State Board of Education to execute the agreement in substantial conformance with the terms of the agreement set forth in Attachment 1. The motion carried seven to zero.

Mr. Freeman from the Board office provided a brief summary of the contract renewal, pointing out the only material change to the contract is related to leaves of absence. The contract provides that one leave of absence is allowed, and that multiple leaves of

absence are not allowed. All changes contemplated in this agreement have been internally vetted and approved by UUSOM.

2. Amendment to Board Policy Section V.R. – Establishment of Fees – First Reading

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Terrell/Atchley): To approve the first reading of proposed amendments to Board policy Section V.R., Establishment of Fees, with all revisions as presented. The motion carried seven to zero.

Mr. Freeman provided a brief summary of the policy stating this change is the same change the Board approved previously for employee/spouse fees. The current senior citizen fee is for Idaho residents 60 years and older, and includes a \$20.00 registration fee plus \$5.00 per credit hour. This revision will allow each institution to determine eligibility and set the fee, subject to Board approval. The proposed revisions change the senior citizen fee from a set dollar amount to mirror language used for the employee, spouse, and dependent fees.

3. Amendment to Board Policy Section V.U. – Entertainment and Related expenses – First Reading

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Terrell/Atchley): To approve the first reading of proposed amendments to Board policy V.U. Entertainment and Related Expenses, with all revisions as presented. The motion carried seven to zero.

Mr. Freeman indicated that based on research and comments received, the proposed changes will provide more clarification and controls for entertainment expenses. Additionally, staff suggests that membership in clubs outside of certain categories, such as a dining or country club (e.g. the Arid Club), should be limited to senior management and included in their contracts, subject to Board approval.

Mr. Lewis felt that paragraph two should be stated more clearly with what expenses should and should not be allowed.

4. Amendment to Board Policy Section V.F. – Bonds and Other Indebtedness – Second Reading

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Terrell/Westerberg): To approve the second reading of proposed amendments to Board Policy V.F., Bonds and Other Indebtedness, with all revisions as presented. The motion carried seven to zero.

5. Boise State University – Sports/Recreation Green Field Project

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Terrell/Atchley): To approve the request by Boise State University to proceed with construction of the Sports/Recreation Green Field for a total cost not to exceed \$1,762,000. The motion carried seven to zero.

Mr. Satterlee indicated this project will abate and demolish the Applied Technology and Mechanical Technology buildings to construct a natural grass field for Athletics and student intramural sports. He pointed out they will only be demolishing part of the building, so there may be some cost savings realized.

6. University of Idaho – Aquaculture Research Facility Building Project

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Terrell/Atchley): To approve the University of Idaho's updated six-year capital plan to include the proposed aquaculture research facility. The motion carried seven to zero.

M/S (Terrell/Atchley): To move to approve the request by the University of Idaho to implement the planning and design phases of a Capital Project for the replacement of the Poultry Hill Aquaculture Research facility, in the amount of up to \$120,000, and to repay UI funds expended in this phase through bond proceeds at a later date. Authorization includes the authority to execute all necessary and requisite consulting contracts to fully implement the planning and design phases of the project. Bond Indebtedness Authorization and Construction Authorization will require separate authorization actions at later dates to be determined. The motion carried seven to zero.

M/S (Terrell/Atchley): To move to approve the Resolution of the Board of Regents regarding authority for the University of Idaho to use future bond proceeds to reimburse the planning and design expenditures associated with the replacement of the Poultry Hill Aquaculture Research facility as set forth in Attachment 2 to the materials submitted to the Board. The motion carried seven to zero.

Mr. Soltman remarked this item should have been included on the institution's six year plan.

7. FY 2015 Opportunity Scholarship

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Terrell/Lewis): To approve the maximum award amount of the Idaho Opportunity Scholarship, to be \$3,000 per year (\$1,500/semester) for the fiscal year 2015. The motion carried seven to zero.

M/S (Terrell/Goesling): To set the Cost of Attendance to be used in the formula that determines the award for the Opportunity Scholarship at a maximum of \$18,600 for 4-year institutions and at a maximum of \$12,700 for 2-year institutions for the fiscal year 2015. The motion carried seven to zero.

M/S (Terrell/Lewis): To set the student contribution for the fiscal year 2015 at \$6,500 for students at 4-year institutions and at \$4,500 for students at 2-year institutions, and to accept student-initiated scholarships and non-institutional and non-federal aid as part of the student contribution. The motion carried seven to zero.

Mr. Freeman clarified that they believe appropriate methodology was used in setting the student contribution rates between the 2-year and 4-year institutions. He indicated the way the student contribution amount was calculated is by looking at a ratio of the 4-year student contribution amount to the 4-year cost of attendance. The same calculation of ratio was used for the 2-year institutions. This provides for the same proportional amount in terms of student contribution to scholarship amount for both the 2-year and 4-year institutions.

INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH & STUDENT AFFAIRS

1. Affordable Care Act and Student Health Insurance

Mr. Westerberg introduced Ms. Shelli Stayner, Principal in the Boise office of Mercer Consulting, who provided the Board with a summary of the impact of the federal Affordable Care Act (ACA) on student health insurance in Idaho. Ms. Stayner provided a handout for the Board members and touched on some of the major items in an effort to inform the Board on the impact of ACA on students in Idaho and how it may impact Board policy.

Ms. Stayner indicated that the initial intent of student health plans was to offer inexpensive, limited benefits to cover a young, healthy population and outlined that the ACA mandates require student health insurance policies to meet many benefit limits identified in the handout provided to Board members. Ms. Stayner pointed out that many carriers that have traditionally underwritten these policies have left the market because of increased plan limits. Ms. Stayner pointed out challenges for educational institutions such as increasing costs and competition with public exchanges. She reported that institutions now need to determine if they will continue or discontinue offering plans to students. The obvious questions to the institutions are if they continue, how do they manage the plans, and if they discontinue, where will the students get health insurance?

Ms. Stayner commented that a large area of concern is that when looking at student health plans, it is difficult to determine what is affordable for students and their families. She reported that increasing costs to student health plans is a great concern. She discussed the options available to students if they do not enroll which were also described in the handout. Ms. Stayner also summarized the penalties for being without health insurance, which are fairly light for 2014 but increase greatly in 2016 and beyond.

There was discussion about the different levels of plans and Ms. Stayner posed several key questions for higher education institutions to ponder including if institutions should offer insurance plans to students. Additionally, she offered options available to students if plans are not available through the institutions, as well as a brief description of some plans and rates available on the exchange.

2. Student Health Insurance Program

Mr. Westerberg indicated that this item was originally intended to be an action item. He requested that, given the discussion from the previous item on the Affordable Care Act and student health insurance, and the lack of consensus on the item at the committee level as well as at the institution level, unanimous consent be granted to return IRSA item 2 back to the BAHR Committee for additional research.

Mr. Terrell recommended the IRSA and BAHR committees work together on the item, rather than BAHR working alone. Mr. Terrell requested unanimous consent to have both committees review the item. There were no objections to Mr. Terrell's request. Dr. Goesling added that he felt there should be more people working on the item instead of just the two committees. Mr. Soltman acknowledged that recommendation.

3. Remediation Update

Ms. Brenda Pettinger from CWI introduced Ms. Heidi Estrem from BSU to speak briefly on the English remediation portion of the remediation update. Ms. Pettinger provided a brief history on the work that has been done as a result of the Remediation Summit in April 2013. They identified two goals; one of which is an assessment and placement piece affecting under-prepared students and the second is to explore remediation models for transforming remediation at the postsecondary level.

Ms. Estrem thanked the Board for their work and support throughout the state on this effort. She reported that individuals across the state have been working together through workshops and meetings, and indicated that in English most of the institutions have moved to a co-requisite support model. She reported that four institutions have completely eliminated remediation altogether at the college level. She maintained that they continue to gather data to support student success. Early indicators were that Idaho students will follow national trends, and students who are moved into credit bearing courses that contain additional support will do as well as those in remedial courses. She reported 400 fewer students would be in remedial classes this spring at CWI than there were in the past, which realizes a monetary benefit for students by them

moving through the system faster. They are exploring efficient and multiple measures and placement options for students.

Ms. Pettinger reported that the Math remediation group met this Fall and has been working with the general education Math discipline groups to establish competencies for college level math. That group is working on recommendations and cut scores for the state and will be continuing their work in the Spring.

Ms. Pettinger reported that independent of the placement and assessment piece, each of the institutions are in varying stages of planning and implementing the Math remediation models. Ms. Pettinger commented on the level of collaboration on this project and how beneficial it has been for driving momentum and enthusiasm.

Dr. Goesling asked about students who get below a certain grade point average being dis-enrolled. Kathy Aiken responded on behalf of the University of Idaho. She indicated there is not a correlation between those students and the ones who need remediation. She clarified that in their opinion it is more of a behavior issue for those students with a very low grade point average and is not related to academic remediation.

Mr. Luna excused himself for the rest of the meeting due to a conflicting meeting on his schedule.

4. Eastern Idaho Technical College – Approval to discontinue the Mechanical Trades program and convert Automotive Technology and Diesel Technology Options into Stand-Alone Programs

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Atchley): To approve the request by Eastern Idaho Technical College to terminate the Mechanical Trades program and convert the Automotive Technology and Diesel Technology options into stand-alone programs as shown in Attachments 1, 2, and 3 effective immediately. The motion carried six to zero. Mr. Luna was absent from voting.

5. Amendments to III.E. Certificates and Degrees – First Reading

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Goesling): To approve the first reading of proposed amendments to Board policy III.E. Certificates and Degrees as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried six to zero. Mr. Luna was absent from voting.

6. Amendments to III.Q. Admission Standards – First Reading

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Goesling): To approve the first reading of proposed amendments to Board Policy III.Q. Admission Standards as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried six to zero. Mr. Luna was absent from voting.

7. Repeal III.F. Academic and Program Affairs – Amendments to III.G. Program Approval and Discontinuance – Second Reading

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Terrell): To approve the second reading of amendments to Board Policy III.F, Academic Program and Affairs, repealing the section in its entirety. The motion carried six to zero. Mr. Luna was absent from voting.

M/S (Westerberg/Terrell): To approve the second reading of proposed amendments to Board Policy III.G, Program Approval and Discontinuance as submitted in attachment 2. The motion carried six to zero. Mr. Luna was absent from voting.

8. Repeal III.K. Prior Learning – Second Reading and Amendments to III.L. Continuing Education/Off-Campus Instruction – Second Reading

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Goesling): To approve the second reading of amendments to Board Policy III.K, Credit for Prior Learning, repealing the section in its entirety. The motion carried six to zero. Mr. Luna was absent from voting.

M/S (Westerberg/Atchley): To approve the second reading of Proposed Amendments to Board Policy III.L, Continuing Education and Credit for Prior Learning as submitted in attachment 2. The motion carried six to zero. Mr. Luna was absent from voting.

9. Amendments to III.Z. Planning and Delivery of Postsecondary Programs and Courses – Second Reading

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Lewis): To approve the second reading of proposed amendments to Board Policy III.Z, Planning and Delivery of Postsecondary Programs and Courses as submitted. The motion carried six to zero. Mr. Luna was absent from voting.

Mr. Westerberg thanked all involved in the revisions to this policy, adding that Board staff and the CAAP committee recommend approval as presented.

Dr. Goesling requested including a section to address multi-state programs and courses in the future. Mr. Soltman indicated CAAP would address those recommendations. Mr. Lewis thanked Dr. Rush and others for their collaboration on the item as well.

OTHER BUSINESS

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

Mr. Soltman requested unanimous consent to adjourn the meeting at 2:35 p.m.

There were no objections to the motion.