A special meeting of the State Board of Education was held February 14, 2014 via teleconference. It originated from the Board office’s large conference room in Boise Idaho. Board President Don Soltman presided and called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. MST. A roll call of members was taken. Mr. Soltman welcomed Senator Jim Patrick, Senator Bert Brackett, and Senator John Goedde to today’s special meeting. Dr. Richard Ledington and Joe Stegner were also welcomed to the meeting.

Present:
Don Soltman, President Richard Westerberg
Emma Atchley, Vice President Bill Goesling
Rod Lewis, Secretary Tom Luna
Milford Terrell

PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS (PPGA)

1. Legislative Update

BOARD ACTION

SB1275

M/S (Westerberg/Goesling): To support additional funding for professional-technical programs with proven industry support and high standards. The motion carried unanimously seven to zero.

SB1343

M/S (Terrell/Goesling): That the State Board of Education oppose Senate Bill 1343. The motion carried unanimously seven to zero.

HB500
M/S (Terrell/Atchley): That the State Board of Education oppose House Bill 500.
The motion carried unanimously seven to zero.

Senate Bill 1275

Ms. Bent from the Board office introduced the item, indicating Senator Patrick is the bill’s sponsor. Senator Patrick provided a brief history on the bill, indicating he and Senator Brackett have worked together on it. He commented that the bill hearing in the Senate Education Committee included testimony from students, educators and industry, all of which were in support of the bill. Additionally, during the summer, meetings were held across the state and the feedback was also in support of the bill. Senator Patrick identified the purpose of the legislation is to enhance secondary Agriculture and Natural Resource programs offered in Idaho schools. These programs would be managed through the Division of Professional Technical Education (PTE). The legislation written was for two grants and would create an Idaho Quality Program Standards Incentive Grant for instructors of agricultural and natural resource education programs offered in grades 9 through 12 for up to $10,000 each, and an Agricultural Education Program Start-Up Grant for up to $25,000 for school districts and/or charter school, for up to four (4) grants per year. He added it would also help students learn about work ethic. Senator Patrick indicated it is determined on funds available and allows for voluntary donations from industry, and meets many of the Education Task Force recommendations.

Senator Bert Brakett echoed the remarks of Senator Patrick. He commented that the bill addresses three other parts that include added cost allocation, to restore funding for the Director, and mentoring professional development. The purpose of the legislation is to get the quality standards and start up grants into statute. Senator Brackett added what is impressive is how the program has affected high school students. He reflected on the go-on probability of students and felt it would help improve go-on rates. Senator Patrick commented that this program could be used as a model for other programs as well. Mr. Luna asked about the funding source, if it would be from a PTE source or the general fund. Senator Patrick indicated they have not identified the funding source. He added it would be a PTE program and perhaps additional funding would be allocated by JFAC to fund it. Senator Brackett indicated they would likely find new money for it and clarified that they do not want to take away from existing programs or sources.

Mr. Terrell asked if PTE was supportive of this program. Senator Patrick responded that PTE is in support, but also wants more money. Senator Brackett responded that it would be up to JFAC for appropriations and emphasized not taking money away from other programs. Mr. Terrell asked for Dr. Rush’s opinion about the bill.

Dr. Rush responded that the content of the bill is extremely well suited to best practices in PTE and that PTE should be able to administer the content of the bill. PTE would need to secure start up funding and funds for program improvement and those things do not exist under the bill’s purview at this time; they could likely come from private funds. Dr. Rush concluded that there is nothing in the bill that suggests taking money away, but rather adding it to program development. Senator Patrick added that in the fiscal note, it indicates that it is determined on the funds available.

At this time Vera McCrink, Interim Administrator for PTE, joined the meeting.
Dr. Goesling asked whether the program includes dual credit. Senator Patrick indicated this program does include dual credit.

**Senate Bill 1343**

Ms. Bent introduced the item and indicated the bill could have far reaching consequences for the policy work of the Board. This bill would require that the State Board of Education and the State Department of Education bring legislation forward ratifying any multistate consortium or federal government agreements regarding K-12 student assessments, curriculum, and sharing of individual student data gathered by any part of the Idaho K-12 educational system. An example of a current agreement that could be impacted is the agreement the Board has with WICHE for the multi-state data exchange pilot. The pilot project tracks a cohort of students who cross state lines.

Mr. Luna commented on the impact of some of the specific work the Department is doing and that a key component is the large amount of unknown with the way the bill is written. He remarked that in its current form, there are too many unanswered questions. There is also a question as to the separation of powers and how it would affect the Board’s constitutional and statutory authority. He indicated it may be premature to take action on the bill today because a revision would be forthcoming.

**House Bill 500**

Marilyn Whitney introduced the bill indicating the bill is being sponsored by Representative Kelly Packer and it would create a service or repayment requirement for Idaho residents who participate in any of the state supported medical education programs such as the WWAMI Regional Medical Program, the Idaho Dental Education Program, the University of Utah School of Medicine, and the W-I Veterinary Education Program. Ms. Whitney pointed out that the effect would be that students in these programs would be required to repay “all amounts expended by the state” for their education unless the student agrees to practice in Idaho for a specified period of time. The minimum term of service would be three (3) years in a rural community or five (5) years in an urban area. The legislation would require the Board to promulgate rules to implement the new provisions. The bill’s fiscal note anticipates that the Office of the State Board of Education would need an additional $35,000 to administer the program with a 0.5 FTP. Research indicates a full-time position may be necessary, thus the fiscal impact is likely to be at least double that indicated in the fiscal note.

Ms. Whitney indicated Board staff has discussed the legislation with representatives of the state’s medical education programs, who believe this bill would be detrimental to those programs, and will reduce both the number and caliber of physicians choosing to practice in Idaho. She indicated that research also shows many states with servitude requirements have experienced lower return rates (around 41%) than Idaho’s current rate of 51%.

Dr. Goesling indicated he had contacted the Washington State University (WSU) veterinary program and they reported that the students who are currently being accepted to WSU are being accepted at eight to ten other vet schools. Their sense was that if we were to initiate this requirement of payback, those students would be lost very quickly. The current cost of the vet school is approximately $135,000 plus additional room and board costs which puts the student with a debt load of around $160,000. The feedback from WSU is that it would really hurt Idaho’s medical education programs, decrease the number of students, add further financial burden on
students. Dr. Goesling recommended opposing the bill. Mr. Terrell commented he is also in opposition to the bill.

Mr. Lewis asked why the rate of return would go down. Dr. Rush responded that the Board office has done some research on payback provisions and have become convinced this is not a good idea; explaining several reasons why it is not good for students or the state. Mr. Freeman added that when Alaska implemented a payback provision, their retention rate dropped because they couldn’t fill all of the medical education seats.

**Other Business:**

Mr. Luna indicated that in regards to SB 1343, another version is anticipated to come forward. Senator Goedde added that there were two AG opinions done on the item and that he believes the opinions were satisfied. He indicated that a new bill would likely start on the House side and they would wait to see what happens from there.

Dr. Goesling asked about claw back on EWA funds and suggested an update at the February Board meeting during the BAHR agenda.

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

**M/S (Westerberg/Luna): To adjourn the meeting 4:47 p.m.** The motion carried unanimously.