STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION MEETING
April 16-17, 2014
University of Idaho
Student Union Building, Ballroom
Moscow, Idaho

Wednesday, April 16, 2014, 9:00 a.m., Student Union Building, Ballroom, Moscow, Idaho

BOARDWORK
1. Agenda Review / Approval
2. Minutes Review / Approval
3. Rolling Calendar

WORK SESSION

A. BUSINESS AFFAIRS & HUMAN RESOURCES
Student Tuition & Fee Rates (Academic Year 2014-2015)
1. Boise State University – Student Tuition & Fee Rates
2. Idaho State University – Student Tuition & Fee Rates
3. Eastern Idaho Technical College – Student Tuition & Fee Rates
4. Lewis-Clark State College – Student Tuition & Fee Rates
5. University of Idaho – Student Tuition & Fee Rates

B. PLANNING, POLICY & GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
Institution, Agencies, Special/Health Programs Strategic Plans

EXECUTIVE SESSION (closed to the public)
Boise State University
1. I move to hold executive session pursuant to section 67-2345(1)(c), Idaho code “to conduct deliberations concerning labor negotiations or to acquire an interest in real property which is not owned by a public agency.”
Thursday April 17, 2014, 8:00 a.m., Student Union Building, Ballroom, Moscow, Idaho

OPEN FORUM

CONSENT AGENDA

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

PPGA
3. Boise State University – Facility Naming
4. President Approved Alcohol Permits Report

SDE
5. Professional Standards Commission Appointment
6. Curricular Materials Selection Committee Appointment

PLANNING, POLICY & GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
1. University of Idaho Progress Report
2. Presidents' Council Report
3. Idaho EPSCoR Annual Report
4. Division of Vocational Rehabilitation – Administrator, Interim Appointment
5. Amendment to Board Policy I.R.(V.L.) – Campus Security 1st Reading
6. 2014 Legislative Update

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
1. Superintendent’s Update

INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH & STUDENT AFFAIRS
1. WWAMI Program Curriculum Renewal Report
2. Amendment to Board Policy III.V, Statewide Articulation - 1st Reading
3. Amendment to Board Policy III.G, Program Approval and Discontinuance – 2nd Reading
4. Amendment to Board Policy III.N, General Education – 2nd Reading
5. Amendment to Board Policy III.Y, Advanced Opportunities – 2nd Reading
6. Boise State University - Graduate Certificate in Victim Services, Self-Support Program
7. Boise State University - Master of Athletic Leadership

BUSINESS AFFAIRS & HUMAN RESOURCES

Section I – Human Resources
1. Amendment to Board Policy – Section II.H. - Coaching Personnel – 2nd Reading
2. University of Idaho – Multi-Year Employment Agreement – Head Women’s Soccer Coach

Section II – Finance
1. Amendment to Board Policy – Section V.I. – Real and Personal Property and Services – 1st Reading
2. Amendment to Board Policy – Section V.K. – Construction Projects – 1st Reading
3. Amendment to Board Policy – Section V.W. – Litigation
4. Amendment to Board Policy – Section V.X. – Intercollegiate Athletics – 2nd Reading
5. FY2015 Appropriations
6. Intercollegiate Athletics – FY2015 Athletics Limits Reports
7. Intercollegiate Athletics – FY2015 Gender Equity Reports
8. FY2016 Budget Guidelines
9. Boise State University – Six-Year Capital Improvement Plan Amendment
10. University of Idaho – Integrated Research Center Project – Construction Phase
11. University of Idaho – College of Education – Renovation and Improvement Project
12. Idaho State University – Property Sale – East Terry Street, Pocatello

ELECTION OF OFFICERS FOR THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

If auxiliary aids or services are needed for individuals with disabilities, or if you wish to speak during the Open Forum, please contact the Board office at 334-2270 no later than two days before the meeting. While the Board attempts to address items in the listed order, some items may be addressed by the Board prior to, or after the order listed. The board meeting will commence at 9:00 am on Wednesday, April 17th, any items not addressed on Wednesday will carry over to Thursday April 18th. Time certain items will be addressed during the time listed on the agenda.
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 February 14, 2014 special Board meeting, and the February 26-27, 2014 regular Board meeting as submitted.

3. **Rolling Calendar**

**BOARD ACTION**
I move to set April 15-16, 2014 as the date and University of Idaho as the location for the April 2015 regularly scheduled Board meeting.
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
- Emma Atchley, Vice President
- Rod Lewis, Secretary
- Milford Terrell
- Richard Westerberg
- Bill Goesling
- Tom Luna

**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.
A regularly scheduled meeting of the State Board of Education was held February 26-27, 2014 at Boise State University’s (BSU) Simplot Ballroom in Boise, Idaho.

Present:
Don Soltman, President
Emma Atchley, Vice President
Richard Westerberg
Rod Lewis, Secretary (arrived at 1:10)

Absent:
Tom Luna, State Superintendent (Mr. Luna was present for Thursday’s portion of the Board meeting.)

Wednesday, February 26, 2014

The Board met in the Simplot Ballroom of the Student Union Building at Boise State University in Boise, Idaho. Board President Don Soltman called the meeting to order at 1:00 pm.

BOARDWORK

1. Agenda Review / Approval

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Atchley/Goesling): To approve the agenda as submitted. The motion carried 5-0. Mr. Lewis and Mr. Luna were absent from voting.

2. Minutes Review / Approval

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Atchley/Terrell): To approve the minutes from the December 18-19, 2013 Regular Board meeting, the January 10, 2014 Special Board Meeting, the January 17, 2014 Special Board meeting, and the February 3, 2014 Special Board meeting as submitted. The motion carried 5-0. Mr. Lewis and Mr. Luna were absent from voting.

3. Rolling Calendar

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Atchley/Goesling): To set February 25-26, 2015 as the date and Boise State University as the location for the February 2015 regularly scheduled Board meeting. The motion carried 5-0. Mr.
Lewis and Mr. Luna were absent from voting.

Mr. Soltman recognized new University of Idaho President Dr. Chuck Staben and welcomed him to Boise and to today’s meeting.

WORKSESSION

A. Idaho Business for Education Employer Survey and Idaho Workforce Needs

Mr. Soltman introduced Idaho Business for Education (IBE) President Rod Gramer to present the findings of the IBE Employer Survey and to discuss Idaho workforce needs. Mr. Gramer provided some introductory information for the Board, stating that IBE conducted a survey of business leaders across the state to gather information on the education level and background needed to meet workforce needs. The survey was conducted from May-September 2013, and there were 466 respondents to this survey; most of which were at the senior executive level. After the initial data was gathered, IBE presented its findings to the Presidents’ Council in December 2013. The data was further refined and formed the basis for a presentation and panel discussion with IBE representatives and the presidents of the four-year institutions at the Board’s legislative luncheon on February 3, 2014. The question that came from that discussion was how the mix of degrees the higher education institutions award could be better aligned with the needs of Idaho’s employers.

To start, Mr. Gramer shared a chart showing a very distinct gap in wages between educational levels for full time, full-year male U.S. workers from 1963-2007. The education levels ranged from the high school dropout level to the graduate school level, summarizing that as your education level goes down so does your income. For the responses to the IBE survey, 21% were from northern Idaho, 46.5% were from southwest Idaho, 11.4% were from south central Idaho, and 21.2% were from eastern Idaho. The bottom line of the survey results indicates that 61% of jobs by 2018 will require postsecondary credentials. Mr. Gramer reported that this supports the Board’s goal of having 60% of Idaho’s 25-34 year olds holding a postsecondary credential by 2020. Mr. Gramer reviewed the current credential level and identified that there is a 21% gap between the educated workforce we have and the one we need to fill jobs by 2018. Mr. Gramer shared the regional differences observed from the survey and concluded that the top five degrees in highest demand are in computer science and technology, business and economics, engineering, health sciences, and in communications. The top degrees in all regions were computer science and technology, business and economics. Additionally, the top four skills employers desire most include employees who perform with integrity, contribute to a team, acquire knowledge, and have the ability to communicate orally.

Mr. Gramer summarized why this information is so important to Idaho and its future. Without educated workers businesses cannot grow, existing businesses will leave, there is difficulty recruiting companies to the area, and the economy will stagnant or shrink. Mr. Gramer pointed out that the problem needs to be tackled with urgency by getting more high school graduates to go on, by reducing costly remediation, and by getting more students to graduate.

Mr. Gramer reported that the Albertson’s Foundation did a survey on what Idaho thinks about the education crisis. The results provided that 60% of Idahoans don’t think we are doing enough for education; that most think education should be the state’s highest priority; and nearly 90% say Idaho’s economy will suffer if we don’t do something to improve education.

Mr. Gramer projected that the key takeaways are that the Board’s 60% goal is valid and perhaps may be too low; that most jobs by 2018 will require more education; that Bachelor’s Degrees will be in the greatest demand; that all postsecondary credentials are important; that employers want workers with so-called soft skills; that high school graduates can fill 19% of jobs; and that those with no high school degree will face a dim future.

The recommendations shared by Mr. Gramer are to support the Idaho Core Standards; to implement the Governor’s Task Force recommendations; to do a “gap analysis” of future jobs and post secondary credentials; to conduct research to understand the go-on problem; to strengthen efforts to help high school students prepare for postsecondary education and careers; and to get more students to
successfully obtain their credentials. Mr. Gramer suggested that researching the go-on rates would be a great collaborative project for institutions to engage in. He remarked on the retention and graduation rates of institutions everywhere, not just in Idaho, and that it is a real and growing problem. He felt that until the two studies are done it would be very difficult to reach the Board’s 60% goal.

Ms. Atchley commented that the problems for students start much earlier; perhaps around the eighth grade or earlier. Mr. Gramer concurred and remarked that steps must be taken before then. Mr. Terrell asked how the Board can help provide the necessary things to improve and increase education without more money. Mr. Gramer responded that this is an educational process and IBE is working with the challenges facing Idaho right now. If their surveys are correct, we are on a crash course with the future and must figure out a better way to educate students and grow business. The big picture includes economic imperative. States that recognize this as a problem are trying to address funding challenges. He hopes that this kind of study will be a sobering call for the state. Mr. Gramer indicated the results of the IBE survey have been shared with state legislators and the Chamber of Commerce, and they intend to stand with the Board on talking about this issue with anyone who will listen.

Mr. Westerberg remarked that one of the most challenging questions is the question of the go-on problem. He questioned if IBE has had any conversations with the institutions of higher education about how to conduct a study related to go-on rates. Mr. Gramer responded there are many different theories about the go-on rate, but no one has the data. He felt institutions would be uniquely qualified to do this type of research. Mr. Westerberg felt that a more data-driven explanation would be very beneficial. Mr. Gramer responded that IBE could work with the Board to secure private funding for this task. He added that until there is some data available on the issue, it would be very difficult to address how to resolve and work on the problem. Mr. Westerberg suggested committee work on the item and follow-up with database research to find out the reasons why some students decide not to go on.

Dr. Goesling felt the social aspect of the go-on rate of rural communities should also be explored. The example he used is when a family member does not go on to college in order to take on a family business or work. He also felt that the eighth grade would be too late to help students and that they should be interacted and exposed to business ideas as early as the third grade. Mr. Gramer responded in agreement with Dr. Goesling that there is a definite social aspect in rural areas contributing to the problem. He added that many jobs in Idaho formerly didn’t require a high school diploma and did pay fairly well, but that has changed and more parents in Idaho need to understand that technology and the economy is changing, and that the only way for kids to get ahead is to go on.

Dr. Rush felt this data would be very helpful in responding to some push back related to Georgetown Data or national level data. Mr. Lewis wanted to ensure the data and questions are aligned.

At this time Carson Howell from the Board office presented information on supply and demand. He provided an excellent analogy about supply and demand as it relates to students and power bars – with education as the upstream supplier; there is a careful balance between supply and demand. The 60% goal will require a partnership between education and the workforce. Mr. Howell discussed an education survey the Board is presently conducting on education levels. It was sent to 10,000 people randomly and the results should be back available toward the end of March. The study is geared toward determining employment and certificate attainment in the respondent’s field of study. They are hopeful the data will provide some solid information on what Idaho’s environment looks like.

Mr. Howell reported on postsecondary credentials showing a graph that revealed starting in 2010 there is an increase in postsecondary credentials despite economic cutbacks. The question is where do the graduates go? Mr. Howell reviewed STEM graduate data. Of those with a certificate, a little more than 70% stayed in Idaho; Washington captures the largest number of Idaho graduates. STEM graduates with bachelor’s degrees showed consistently lower wages in Idaho. There is a need for STEM degrees and there are opportunities for these graduates, but wages are low. When looking at engineering, computer science, and physical science, Idaho is lagging behind Washington and Oregon. He discussed retention of students in the pipeline, and indicated that losing graduates is not a problem unique to Idaho. In order to address the problem, we need to know where the problem is; on the supply side or on the demand side?
Mr. Howell stated it will take a collaborative effort between business, commerce and the Board to find the answers; and the solution likely lies somewhere in the middle. He applauded IBE for the work they have done. Discussions related to the skills gap and the skills IBE reported on are not skills that would be outdated in a few years; they are long-term skills. Mr. Howell recommended that next steps would be to do a skills gap analysis and ask how higher education can better prepare students for the jobs that are or will become available. Mr. Howell provided that another difficult question is how to help students plan for an economy 5-6 years down the road. Aside from the needed soft skills, teaching students how to acquire knowledge and integrity will be important. Part of the gap analysis will be to figure out where the overlap and the underlap lies.

At this time, there was additional discussion about the IBE presentation and the institution presidents were invited to remark. Ms. Atchley commented that it seemed rather obvious that Idaho’s wages speak to at least a portion of the problem. Dr. Fernandez asked if the programs that are being offered are those needed to meet the needs of Idaho businesses. If not, what are the programs that need to be offered? Dr. Fernandez questioned whether the problem might be a student quantity or student quality issue and felt some real data would be helpful.

Mr. Soltman commented that institutions may need to look closer at their recruiting and advising efforts.

Dr. Kustra remarked that they have recently moved their career services function into orientation services for new students. He added that multiple reports indicate the real reason new college grads can’t get hired is the lack of soft skills that also include problem solving and team work. He also felt real data would be very helpful to look at, and until then, institutions are still guessing as to how to fix the problem.

Mr. Gramer echoed those remarks and pointed to a study conducted by Dr. Wagner at Harvard University that every CEO consulted for the study returned to the fact that graduates need to have soft skills. He added the institutions are uniquely qualified to teach these skills.

Don Burnett remarked on the importance of the gap analysis and suggested the universities should be helping determine impediments to students going on and the relevance of what they are learning. Dr. Staben also remarked that these issues are not unique to Idaho. He felt this would be a great opportunity for Idaho to conduct collaborative research. Dr. Vailas asked what institutions could do to encourage the values of our state to reach for a higher attainment. He also asked how to get discussion at the family or local level of how education will impact a person’s life; that education doesn’t end with a degree but instead opens doors. Dr. Jeff Fox remarked that there needs to be a better connection with high schools. He also asked how to engage business in this proposition, commenting that if we are looking at attracting business, businesses need to be assured there is a quality workforce available.

Mr. Soltman asked if the GAP analysis is the next step. Mr. Gramer responded it is what IBE would like to see, and that it would include Commerce, Labor, the Board, business community, etc. Dr. Rush felt the study should include the evaluation of the general education core, and discussion on how to design an education system that will meet the needs of the future. Dr. Schwarz also commented that PTE has conducted a gap analysis consistent with the discussion and that results would be available soon.

The group agreed the gap analysis is part of the next step and would help guide further steps. Dr. Goesling asked if it should be statewide or by region. Mr. Howell responded that they would start with a statewide look, but it would be important to recognize the differences by region. Don Burnett recommended a task force for postsecondary education and that its first project should be a gap analysis.

Dr. Rush requested two items be added to the research topic questions which are how to motivate people to support higher education; and what messages will get people motivated about educational improvement.

Mr. Soltman thanked IBE for its efforts and Mr. Gramer for his presentation. At this time the meeting recessed for a break.

EXECUTIVE SESSION (Closed to the Public)

Boise State University
BOARD ACTION

M/S (Atchley/Goesling): To go into Executive Session pursuant to Idaho Code §67-2345:

- Subsection (1)(c) – “to conduct deliberations . . . to acquire an interest in real property which is not owned by a public agency”; and
- Subsection (1)(f) – “to communicate with legal counsel . . . to discuss the legal ramifications of and legal options for pending litigation, or controversies not yet being litigated but imminently likely to be litigated”; and
- Subsection (1)(b) – “to consider the evaluation, dismissal or disciplining of, or to hear complaints or charges brought against, a public officer, employee, or staff member.”

A roll call vote was taken and the motion carried five to zero. Mr. Luna and Mr. Lewis were absent from voting.

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Atchley/Terrell): To go out of Executive Session at 5:33 p.m. The motion carried unanimously.

Thursday February 27, 2013, 8:00 a.m., Boise State University, Simplot Ballroom, Student Union Building, Boise, Idaho.

The Board convened at Boise State University in the Simplot Ballroom located in the Student Union Building for regular business. Board President Don Soltman called the meeting to order at 8:00 a.m. MST. Mr. Luna arrived at 9:00 a.m. after PPGA item 3.

Mr. Terrell presented a plaque to Dr. Dale Mock on behalf of the Board in recognition of his years of service and contribution to the Medical Education Committee. Dr. Mock thanked the Board and offered supportive comments on the needs of a medical school in Idaho.

Mr. Soltman recognized the students of the Idaho Student Association (ISA) and thanked Dr. Kustra for BSU’s hospitality at this Board meeting.

CONSENT AGENDA

M/S (Atchley/Goesling): To approve the consent agenda as posted. The motion carried unanimously.

Policy, Planning & Governmental Affairs (PPGA)

1. Alcohol Permits – Issued by University Presidents

This item was provided in the agenda materials as an information item to the Board.

2. Idaho State Rehabilitation Council Membership Appointment

BOARD ACTION

By unanimous consent to approve the appointment for Molly Serpa to the Vocational Rehabilitation State Rehabilitation Council as a representative for Disability Advocacy groups for a term of three years effective April 1, 2014 through March 31, 2017.

PLANNING, POLICY & GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
1. Boise State University (BSU) – Annual Progress Report

BSU President Dr. Bob Kustra, as part of his report, shared a short video presentation about BSU highlighting many of the programs and academic possibilities available for students. Dr. Kustra applauded many of the distinguished students highlighted in the video. He discussed how they are using technology on campus, funding equity and administrative flexibility.

He reported on the foundational studies program which is in its second year, and discussed workforce preparation which was in alignment with presentation by IBE. Dr. Kustra reported on faculty going beyond their disciplinary boundaries to collaborate and reach out to students and other faculty. He remarked on a tool that BSU is using for students called an e-portfolio that is a history and a record of their progress in writing communications skills throughout their college degree. Dr. Kustra also reported on BSU’s career center and pointed out it has one of the nation’s experts in career development working on campus part of the year – Dr. Phil Gardner – from Michigan State University. He indicated that Dr. Gardner has incredible amounts of resource information available about workforce needs and studies, and invited the Board to work with BSU staff to obtain information from those studies and reports. Dr. Kustra also discussed, as related to the IBE report and working on a GAP analysis, how BSU is working to prepare students for the future and developing their soft skills in areas such as communications, interpersonal development, work ethic, commitment, and loyalty.

2. President’s Council Report

Interim President Don Burnett and current chair of the Presidents’ Council thanked the Board for the opportunity to chair the Council. He introduced Dr. Chuck Staben and reported that Dr. Staben would be starting at the University of Idaho on March 1.

Mr. Burnett remarked on the guns on campus legislation and the additional concerns it has brought to the institutions in conjunction with the complications of the subject.

Mr. Burnett reported presidents have discussed the data submitted on institutional performance, tuition support, and the calculation of tuition for WICHE and WUE circumstances. He remarked on the presentation by IBE to the Presidents Council and the soft skills that employers are looking for and the need to grow those skills in students. He also shared some information about the economic impact and viability of liberal arts degrees.

Mr. Burnett introduced Dr. Vera McCrink, Interim Administrator of the Division of Professional-Technical Education (PTE), who recognized Kirk Dennis who is retiring this spring. She thanked Mr. Dennis for his contribution to PTE over the years, and recognized that this would be his final Board meeting.

Dr. Kustra thanked Mr. Burnett for his work as the interim president at ISU and as chair of the President’s Council. Board President Soltman echoed those remarks.

3. Idaho Public Charter Commission – Annual Report

Mr. Alan Reid, President of the Charter School Commission (Commission), thanked the Board for the opportunity to address them today. He also thanked the Board office and Ms. Tamara Baysinger, Public Charter School Commission Director, for their work with the Commission. He reported that the relationship between the schools and the Commission is on a very positive note right now.

Ms. Baysinger provided a report to the Board, reporting on the growth of Idaho’s public charter schools, on achievement and funding, and on Commission and stakeholder efforts to implement legislation passed in 2013.

She reported the Commission authorized 35 schools; four were new for 2014 and three new schools are approved for 2014. She remarked on the number of schools who show an increase in academic results and used a chart for visualization purposes. She reported that there is more focus now on outcomes rather than inputs. The feeling in the charter school community presently is that the quality concerns and the autonomy concerns are moving together in the right direction. Ms. Baysinger reported on resources
and capacity, and that the PCSC budget for FY15 is $324,886.50. She also provided a comparison of Idaho’s authorizing, and remarked that the budget and staff per school is among the lowest of some of its peers. Ms. Baysinger reported that the Commission is currently implementing 11 out of 12 essential authorizing best practices (based on NACSA October 2011), which is up from 7 out of 12.

Mr. Luna arrived at 9:00 am. at the conclusion of this item.

4. Idaho Commission for Libraries – Presentation

Ms. Ann Joslin from the Idaho Commission of Libraries (Commission) thanked the Board for the opportunity to present today and introduced Stephanie Bailey-White, Project Coordinator, to assist her.

Ms. Joslin reported that there has been a lot of attention on getting increased broadband in Idaho libraries, and how technology and the internet are dramatically changing people’s reading habits and their relationships with libraries. During this internet library stage, internet and public library usage has increased 21% from 2008 to 2013. She reported the Commission serves the community in a number of ways, including professional development, and that they leverage national initiatives to support their mission; their library network includes 143 libraries. Ms. Joslin reported on how their work supports the Governor’s Task Force recommendation on literacy.

Ms. Joslin reported on the very low budgets for books in elementary schools and how it directly affects students and their reading level, resulting in students reading at a level below where they should be by a certain age. Ms. Joslin reported on the positives from the Read to Me program and highlighted three initiatives of Read to Me. One initiative, Routes to Reading, increases access to books through public libraries and outreach programs. They have initiated summer reading programs among the libraries, along with Literacy in the Park which is in partnership with Idaho Food Bank’s Picnic in the Park. A third way they are getting more books into the hands of children is through their Read to Me mini-grants to elementary school libraries. The Legislature approved $100,000 in ongoing funds for these grants in FY2013. As a result of the number of requests for these mini-grants, only one third were able to be funded in that year. In FY14, they limited the requests to only elementary schools because their need is so great; 59 applied and 23 were able to be funded. In FY15, they requested an additional $100,000 to make more grants available, and JFAC approved that request on a one-time basis for FY15. The grant monies are to be used only for books. Ms. Joslin reported providing books for students to check out through the school lending program is one of the most cost effective strategies used to increase literacy skills.

Ms. Joslin reported that in a new initiative they are piloting a program called “Make it at the Library” where students can work with Idaho entrepreneurs and library staff on STEAM elements. STEAM includes science, technology, engineering, art and math. The program was so successful they are piloting it a second year and have been invited to share the “Make it at the Library” experiences and concept at a national and international level.

Dr. Goesling asked how the Commission helps people who need to retool themselves, and also about benefit to seniors. Ms. Joslin responded that they did an upgrade to broadband for the most underserved communities. They also work with the Department of Labor who refers their clients to public libraries for use of many of their resources.

Mr. Terrell asked about the use of e-books in libraries. Ms. Joslin responded that providers of e-books have made it difficult for libraries to get e-books and indicated those providers fear they will lose revenue. She indicated there are a number of complications that go along with e-books; for instance if you purchase an e-book, you are not allowed to donate it or loan it out to more than one person at a time. Ms. Bailey-White responded that they are looking at other avenues to address these types of situations.

Ms. Joslin provided a brief update of LiLI which stands for Linking Idaho Libraries. LiLI is a group of projects and services providing networked library services to the residents of Idaho. The LiLI Databases provide easy online access to the full-text of thousands of magazines, professional journals, reference materials, and newspapers. Also included are databases for personal and professional development including auto-repair, and health information. Ms. Joslin reported that the vendors with which they
contract continue to add more resources to their products and the LiLI database use continues to increase. She did indicate there is a need to reach more teachers with the information about the content of the LiLI database. The LiLI database is available to any Idahoan through any internet connection.

5. Small Business Development Center (SBDC) Presentation

Mr. Soltman provided some background on the SBDC indicating that their organization is funded under the special programs of the Board. They are hosted at BSU and have contractual arrangements with NIC, LCSC, CSI and ISU; they also have a collaborative relationship with the University of Idaho’s small business legal clinic. Mr. Soltman introduced Ms. Katie Sewell, State Director for the Idaho SBDC, who presented the Board with an update on the organization’s activities, economic impacts, and future opportunities.

Ms. Sewell indicated their mission is to grow small business in Idaho by providing consulting and training, and by leveraging the resources of their host universities and colleges. They have a statewide program that is delivered through Idaho’s colleges and universities, and remarked on the collaborative efforts among the institutions and agencies. They have offices in many different locations and serve every county in Idaho, working to grow small business. Ms. Sewell reported they are also part of a national network of small business development centers.

Ms. Sewell reported on the importance of small businesses to Idaho’s economy and that 84% of small businesses have less than 20 employees, yet small businesses create 60-70% of net new jobs. Of that number approximately 60% are existing businesses that are expanding and 40% are new businesses starting up. Ms. Sewell reported their main service is consulting/coaching and they serve about 1,600 clients per year, and host about 300 trainings per year. She reviewed their leadership team and remarked that students are a very important piece of their makeup. Having offices on campuses throughout the state has proven beneficial to both students and the SBDC. She provided examples of some of the small businesses they have helped and remarked on the success of those businesses. On a yearly average they helped 72 new businesses start-up, helped them raise $19 million in capital, and helped them create and save 1000 new jobs.

Ms. Sewell showed a chart that compared SBDC clients with average Idaho small businesses. The comparison showed average Idaho small businesses growing at 2% and SBDC small businesses growing at over 12%. These businesses provide increased state tax revenue of $2.2 million and $1.8 million in increased federal tax revenue. Their return on investment is at 4:1. Ms. Sewell reported that they are looking at opportunities to grow and have identified three areas: exporting, innovation and technology based companies, and strengthening rural Idaho.

Ms. Sewell briefly reviewed their budget and highlighted the line item proposal for FY16 which includes four additional FTEs, for an additional investment of $298,100 in funding that will focus on statewide distribution. She reviewed the economic impacts that the additional funding would assist and highlighted the annual goals they intend to achieve.

Ms. Atchley asked if they work with career centers at the institutions to help develop programs. Ms. Sewell responded that they don’t work very closely with the career centers, but they do assist with internships and student projects that also aid in permanent placement. She indicated they like collaboration and would be looking into what else they could do with the institutions.

At this time the meeting recessed for a 15 minute break.

6. CenturyLink Arena Request

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/ Goesling): To disapprove the request by CenturyLink Arena to pour alcohol at college basketball games played in their facility, as long as they have the appropriate licenses, security, and abide by proper alcohol management. The motion carried 7-0.
Mr. Eric Trapp from Century Link and Mr. John Cunningham from The Grove Hotel provided some remarks to the Board regarding their request to serve alcohol during the University of Idaho/Boise State basketball game in late November at the arena. Mr. Trapp reported that since they are a private facility Board policy may not apply to them, but they were coming forward today to honor the Board’s wishes as related to alcohol service at institution sporting events. Mr. Trapp commented that during these events they do hire uniformed Boise Police officers as security, and in addition they have their own staff of four to six arena security officers that are off duty Boise Police officers. Mr. Trapp requested the Board’s support on approval of this item, commenting they hope to continue to host collegiate events and would be supportive of the Board’s wishes.

Mr. Westerberg pointed out that alcohol is not served at any of the other institution basketball events. Mr. Luna remarked that the Board has the authority to tell the institutions that they may not have sporting events in a venue that serves alcohol, but not the authority to tell a private business that they may or may not serve alcohol. Mr. Soltman pointed out that they approached the Board as a courtesy.

7. Board Governing Policy and Procedures – Bylaws – First Reading

Mr. Westerberg requested unanimous consent to return the item to committee for additional work, and to return with a new first reading. There were no objections.

Ms. Tracie Bent introduced the item, and started with proposed changes to the section regarding the Audit Committee indicating currently there is only one independent non-Board member on the Audit Committee, which is counter to Board Bylaws and the Committee Charter. Staff have had difficulty in recruiting individuals with the necessary skills to recommend to the Board for appointment to the Audit Committee. Additionally, due to the small number on the Committee, staggering the terms of the Committee members has also not been followed. Changes to the Audit Committee section of the bylaws would make help with the staff support of the Committee. Ms. Bent also pointed out one amendment under Section C, Powers and Duties of the Board, the proposed amendment would add clarification regarding Board action and time limits associated with certain actions. The amendment adds to the bylaws that any action where the motion does not specify an expiration date, would expire one year after the action is taken unless it came back to the Board for an extension, or was incorporated into Board policy.

Mr. Lewis asked with respect to the language for membership of the Audit Committee, to add the words “at least two” to the language. Ms. Bent responded it would be included in the second reading. He also asked for clarification on the intent of the change. Mr. Freeman responded that the intent is to allow members to be reappointed, not just the chair. Mr. Lewis asked if we want to enforce a rotation in the Audit Committee and expressed that Committee members should have experience in the Committee before they chair it.

Dr. Rush clarified with respect to the language on motions in Board policy, that many of the motions were made to assist with reporting requirements and to provide structure that would be maintained and monitored. Mr. Lewis felt that the thought of Board decisions having an expiration date was troubling. Dr. Rush responded that he agreed things should not disappear without notice; that actions should be brought before the Board. Mr. Lewis felt Board action should be effective until it is overridden by another Board action, commenting he felt that was the assumption of the Board. He was not in favor of attaching one-year restrictions on Board actions, remarking it would require significant tracking and repeated actions of the Board.

Mr. Lewis also asked for clarification on the last sentence of Tab 7 page 3. Ms. Bent responded that the sentence is intended to specify those things that the Board has designated as on-going would be incorporate into Board policy. There was additional discussion on reports required on a regular basis be included in Board policy. Ms. Bent responded that the recommended clarification would be made for the second reading.

Upon further discussion, this item was returned to committee for additional work.

8. Board Policy I.J. – Use of Institutional Facilities and Services – Second Reading
BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Atchley): To approve the second reading of Board Policy I.J. Use of Institutional Facilities and Services with Regard to the Private Sector as submitted. The motion carried 7-0.

Ms. Bent introduced the item and indicated there were no changes between first and second reading. She remarked that the changes which were approved in the first reading were the additions regarding using institutions facilities in competition with the private sector. Mr. Westerberg felt the changes clarify the policy.

Mr. Westerberg recommended a process change whereby when making policy changes between first and second reading, the changes are highlighted in separate colors in order to better track process.

9. Idaho Indian Education Committee – Recommendations

Bob Sobotta Jr., current Chair of the Indian Education Committee, and Johanna Jones, State Coordinator, provided a report to the Board. Mr. Sobotta thanked the Board for their collaborative efforts, along with those of the State Department of Education in working with the Indian Education Committee. He reviewed Idaho’s Indian tribes and indicated that the Committee is composed of the Kootenai, Coeur d’Alene, Nez Perce, Shoshone-Paiute, and Shoshone-Bannock tribes. He provided a handout that highlighted the impact Idaho’s tribes have on the state’s economy including number of jobs, wages, taxes, and their contribution to various counties in the state.

Mr. Sobotta reported there are 30% or more Indian students in the school districts of Blackfoot, Lapwai, Plummer-Worley and Pocatello. He commented on the number of students in special education and gifted and talented programs. Regarding composite SAT scores, 10, 11 and 12 graders are scoring at 23.89% which is concerning related to college readiness. He indicated they are working to improve that number. Mr. Sobotta identified the main areas of concern expressed by the Committee are access, opportunity, and completion.

Mr. Sobotta commented the Committee is discussing finding opportunities for Native American students to continue on into higher education. He reported this is a very exciting time and they are making positive progress for Native American students. They are looking forward to the opportunity for additional collaborative efforts throughout the state. Mr. Soltman thanked Dr. Goesling for his time in serving with the Indian Education Committee. Mr. Luna introduced Johanna Jones from the Department who gave a short introduction of herself.

10. Legislative Update

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Luna/Terrell): That the State Board of Education support House Bill 521. The motion carried 7-0.

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Goesling): That the State Board of Education support House Bill 504. The motion carried 7-0.

Mr. Freeman provided an update on the Joint Appropriations and Finance Committee (JFAC) actions to date. He indicated that JFAC set the budget for the Board and he provided a recap of that budget. Some of the items funded included a web developer position, $20K in support of educational reform committee ($30K next year), and the health education budget. Under the health education budget, funding was granted for year two of the five WWAMI seats bringing us up to 25 seats (on a four year build-out); they also approved five additional WWAMI seats (year one build out) that will bring us to 30 seats. They also approved stipends for preceptors for the University of Utah students. $200K in funding was provided for the new Kootenai health program. Mr. Freeman recapped the funding appropriated for special programs, and commented that the Division of PTE received funding for their advanced manufacturing initiative. On
March 6 JFAC will review the college and university budgets, community college budgets, and the state Superintendent’s budget.

Mr. Freeman reviewed some statewide approvals and pointed out that JFAC approved a 2% change in employee compensation; 1% on going and 1% bonus. Additionally, statewide costs for health care cost increases equated to $1,450 per FTE. Regarding EWA, Mr. Freeman reported that JFAC decided to remove that money from the funding equation. He reported that the office has tried to communicate to legislators the fact that for the formula to have integrity, it must be recognized that there was a year where no funding was provided. The problem is they are doing a $1.3M base reduction based on the three year rolling average – which included a year in which there was no funding.

Mr. Terrell asked what the Board could do in regards to communicating with the legislators, and asked if the Governmental Affairs Directors (GADs) could help. Mr. Freeman responded the Board office has had discussions with legislators and many support the Governor’s recommendation that did not recommend the $1.3M reduction. There was discussion about the funding distribution and how to communicate with JFAC on that matter. Mr. Westerberg commented that there has been significant effort by Board staff and leadership in working on this complicated issue.

Ms. Marilyn Whitney reported that all eight bills from the Board are making their way through the statehouse. She provided the Board with an update on three pending pieces of legislation; two house bills and one resolution.

House Bill 521 – Directs the school districts and public charter schools to develop a strategic plan that focuses on improving student performance. This legislation is intended to address two recommendations from the Governor’s Task Force for Improving Education: annual strategic planning, and training and development of school administrators, superintendents and local school boards.

House Bill 504 – Establishes leadership premium payments for public school educators that local school districts identify as serving in a leadership capacity. This legislation is intended to address part of the recommendation from the Governor’s Task Force for Improving Education on leadership awards. The awards would range from $850 to a maximum of $25% of the teachers base pay; they would be one time annual awards and the school districts would receive funding for these premiums. The fiscal impact of the bill is $15.8 million for FY2015.

Ms. Whitney moved on to report on a resolution that Representative Ruche is working on to call for convening a working group to develop proposals on workforce development and how the Board, Department of Commerce, and Department of Labor can work together to address some of the workforce needs for the state. Ms. Whitney reported that both the directors of Labor and Commerce are comfortable with this resolution, but most of the work related to this resolution is already being done and meetings are already occurring with many participants. There were no questions regarding Representative Ruche’s resolution.

Mr. Soltman asked about the status of the guns on campus bill. Ms. Whitney responded that there will be a hearing on the bill tomorrow morning at 8:00 a.m. in the House State Affairs Committee to hear those who have not yet had an opportunity to testify. Mr. Terrell suggested a letter from the Board should be written to the Governor encouraging him to veto the bill if it comes to his desk. Mr. Lewis responded in agreement with Mr. Terrell’s suggestion, and felt it would make sense to send a letter to legislative leadership about the Board’s position on the bill. He also felt an AG opinion should be requested on whether it is a violation of the second amendment. Mr. Terrell requested staff write a motion. Mr. Soltman responded by asking for unanimous consent to write a letter and for the request of an AG’s opinion.

Mr. Luna recommended making direct communication with the members of the House State Affairs Committee instead of making a direct request to the Governor. He felt this recommendation would have more impact than making requests of the Governor every step of the way. Mr. Westerberg also felt they should wait for a particular outcome instead of making presumptions.

Mr. Soltman requested unanimous consent to request an AG’s opinion on the Guns on Campus
Mrs. Soltman requested unanimous consent for a letter to be sent to legislators identifying the reasons the Board is opposed to the Guns on Campus legislation. There were no objections.

There was additional discussion about the request to the AG’s office and Mr. Lewis clarified what should be included in the question. Mr. Westerberg requested Board members have a chance to see both documents before they are submitted.

Mr. Freeman returned to the issue of the JFAC budget highlights to report that as part of JFAC’s statewide position, it does not include funding for what is referred to as fund shifts that would cover the change in employee compensation and change in benefit costs. That means that a tuition increase would be likely if there is no fund shift or allocation of general funds for the change in compensation and benefit costs.

11. Governor’s Task Force for Improving Education Recommendations

Mr. Westerberg provided the Board with an update on the Governor’s Task Force for Improving Education recommendations, commenting that the majority of the recommendations still need implementation work. He pointed out that the Governor’s recommendation supports the establishment of three committees to do this work under the direction of the Board, and also the allocation of $50K to set up those committees. After discussions with legislators and others, they have concluded that two committees should be established to do the implementation work and return with recommendations for legislative and/or regulatory or local action for the implementation for the remainder of the recommendations. Mr. Westerberg indicated Rod Lewis was asked to chair the committee on career ladders and tiered licensure, and Emma Atchley was asked to chair the committee on mastery and structure, along with training and collaboration issues. Mr. Westerberg indicated that JFAC appropriated supplemental funding to assist with this work and that the committees hoped to begin meeting in April. Ms. Atchley pointed out and applauded the extensive work of Mr. Westerberg on the Task Force for Improving Education.

At this time, the meeting recessed for lunch.

INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH, AND STUDENT AFFAIRS

1. Complete College Idaho (CCI) – General Education Reform

Dr. Chris Mathias from the Board office provided an update on the CCI Plan (Plan) and strategy number three, Structure for Success, in particular as related to general education reform which is a significant CCI Plan initiative designed to achieve consistency in general education across campuses. The aim is to dramatically change and remap the delivery of general education statewide through adopting new approaches and creating an outcomes-based core. This approach promotes transferability by providing a clearly articulated pathway in general education that applies to each institution. Dr. Mathias reviewed the five key strategies of the Plan and provided a brief history and timeline of reform from 2010 to February 2014.

Dr. Mathias reported that general education reform taskforce participation has been very important in moving the initiative forward. He reported on the importance of interoperability of each of the CCI strategies, particularly strategy three, and commented that the work from the general education discipline workgroups will guide the work of the remediation and assessment/placement groups. It will help in tracing a roadmap back from postsecondary to secondary education. Dr. Mathias also remarked on how dual credit will relate to general education reform in that soon high school students will be able to take dual credit courses regardless of whether they know what their major will be. Dr. Mathias remarked on the Web Portal and indicated the next item on the agenda would include an update on it.

2. Idaho Digital Learning Academy (IDLA) Web Portal

Ms. Sherawn Reberry and Mr. Ryan Gravette from IDLA provided the Board with an update on the Web Portal. Ms. Reberry reported that it has been a great pairing for the Board, IDLA and each of the
institutions to work together on this project. Their objective is the development of website and resources for prospective transferring students. Their goal is simplification of transfer across all Idaho state sponsored post-secondary institutions. Through development of the portal, their focus is on two groups: the high school student and the college student.

Mr. Gravette indicated the Web Portal is a centralized location where students can learn whether and how almost any course will transfer between Idaho’s public postsecondary institutions and how that course will impact their program completion goals. Additionally, in future phases, the Web Portal will allow high school and college students to plan their postsecondary courses. He pointed out that the system is designed to be mobile device and desktop compliant at the same time, and went on to provide a walk-through of the system. He remarked that it will become a quick and easy portal for students and parents in determining transferability and will provide comparisons between institutions; additionally a course equivalency guide shows students how courses transfer to each institution. These tools will help transfer and articulation across the state. The Web Portal is scheduled to go live during the month of March.

3. Board Policy III.G. – Program Approval and Discontinuance – First Reading

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Atchley): To approve the first reading of proposed amendments to Board Policy III.G, Postsecondary Program Approval and Discontinuance as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried 7-0.

4. Board Policy III.N. – General Education – First Reading

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Terrell): To approve the first reading of proposed new Board Policy III.N, General Education as presented. The motion carried 7-0.

Mr. Lewis asked what the requirement is presently. Dr. Mathias requested that Ms. Grace respond to the question. Ms. Grace responded that 36 credits are required in current policy.

5. Board Policy III.Y. – Advanced Opportunities – First Reading

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Atchley): To approve the first reading of proposed amendments to Board Policy III.Y. Certificates and Degrees as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried 7-0.

6. Board Policy III.E. – Certificates and Degrees – Second Reading

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Atchley): To approve the second reading of proposed amendments to Board Policy III.E, Certificates and Degrees as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried 7-0.

Mr. Westerberg pointed out there were no changes between first and second reading.

7. Board Policy III.Q. – Admission Standards – Second Reading

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Goesling): To approve the second reading of proposed amendments to Board Policy III.Q. Admission Standards as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried 7-0.

Mr. Westerberg pointed out there were no changes between first and second reading.
8. Waiver of Board Policy III.Q.4.c. – Placement Scores

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Atchley): To extend the waiver of the criteria in Board policy III.Q.4.c for placement in entry-level college courses to permit alternative placement mechanisms that are in alignment with the Complete College Idaho plan until October 2015. All alternative placement mechanisms shall be reviewed by the Chief Academic Officer and the Council on Academic Affairs and Programs (CAAP) prior to implementation. The motion carried 7-0.

Ms. Bent provided a review of the item and reported that this is a request to continue work on the project because it was incomplete. This temporary waiver will allow staff time to work with CAAP and the State Transforming Remediation Taskforce to ensure there is a consistent model for placing students. Additional time will also ensure any proposed amendments to policy are in alignment with the Board’s strategic plan, 60% statewide completion goal, and the Complete College Idaho Plan.

9. University of Idaho – Ph.D. Experimental Psychology

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Goesling): To approve the request by the University of Idaho to offer a new Ph.D. in Experimental Psychology. The motion carried 7-0.

Mr. Westerberg indicated that this item has been reviewed by CAAP and IRSA Committees and received no objections. Dr. Kathy Aiken from the University of Idaho provided remarks on this proposal to create a new Ph.D. degree in Experimental Psychology. She introduced Dr. Tracie Craig to assist in discussion. Ms. Atchley asked if the masters program was going to continue to stand alone and if it would fit with this Ph.D. program. Dr. Craig responded that they will still offer both the masters program along with the Ph.D. program.

Dr. Goesling pointed out that these are not overlapped programs with ISU. Dr. Mantle Bromley from ISU remarked that ISU is very supportive of this program and that the collaboration has been appreciated.

BUSINESS AFFAIRS AND HUMAN RESOURCES (BAHR)

Section I – Human Resources

1. Amendment to Board Policy – Section II.H. – Coaching Personnel – First Reading

M/S (Terrell/Goesling): To approve the first reading of proposed amendments to Board Policy II.H., Coaches and Athletic Directors, with all revisions as presented. The motion carried 7-0.

Mr. Freeman provided some background on the item and that two issues were brought forward to be addressed. One issue was related to annual leave and the other issue was related to payout when contracts were not renewed or were terminated. Mr. Freeman reported a lot of work was done in Committee, and the Controller’s office made a recommendation for coaches to not accrue annual leave or sick leave. Mr. Freeman pointed out that because they would not accrue sick leave, they would not have the benefit of being able to use it toward the premium for retiree health insurance.

Ms. Atchley asked if there is a limit identified on the amount of leave a coach can take. Mr. Freeman responded the cap is 240 hours for state employees, whereas if they were not accruing, there is no specified limit. He clarified that either way, they would still need to obtain athletic director approval.

Mr. Westerberg was concerned about creating a different policy for leave and there was continued discussion on the accrual of leave. Mr. Westerberg asked if this might be an issue in negotiating coach contracts. Mr. Smith from the University of Idaho responded that they did not feel it would be an issue. Mr. Lewis commented that the athletic directors were in support of the policy, and that the Athletic
Committee is also in support of the policy.

2. Supplemental Retirement 403b Plan – Current Plan

M/S (Terrell/Atchley): To approve the amendments to Appendix A of the Supplemental Retirement 403(b) Plan document set forth in Attachment 1, to declare said amendments effective March 16, 2014, and to authorize the Board’s Chief Fiscal Officer to execute the Plan document on behalf of the Board. The motion carried 7-0.

3. Supplemental Retirement 403b Plan – Closed Plan

M/S (Terrell/Atchley): To approve amendments to the Closed Supplemental Retirement 403(b) Plan document set forth in Attachment 1. The motion carried 7-0.

Mr. Freeman indicated this plan has been closed to any future contributions or plan participants upon the advice of tax counsel.

4. Boise State University – Multi-Year Employment Agreement – Head Football Coach

M/S (Lewis/Goesling): To approve the request by Boise State University to enter into a five year rolling employment agreement with Bryan Harsin as Head Football Coach, for a term commencing December 11, 2013 and expiring on January 10, 2019 with a starting annual base salary of $800,000, and such base salary increase and supplemental compensation provisions in substantial conformance with the terms of the agreement set forth in Attachment 1 and the amendments resented at the meeting. The motion carried 7-0.

Mr. Kevin Satterlee from BSU provided background and explanation on this item. Mr. Satterlee indicated that they have negotiated with Mr. Harsin and arrived at revised terms which included recommended changes by the Athletics Committee related to the academic incentive pay. Mr. Satterlee outlined the changes to the contract and indicated they feel the terms are consistent with what the Board approved in December.

Ms. Atchley felt the change to the academic incentive pay was in the right direction. Mr. Westerberg pointed out the amount of liquidated damages in this contract and also felt it was a step in the right direction. Mr. Lewis offered an amended motion.

5. Boise State University – Contract with Bryan Harsin Enterprises, LLC

M/S (Lewis/Atchley): To approve request by Boise State University to enter into a license agreement with Bryan Harsin Enterprises, LLC, in substantial conformance with the terms of the agreement set forth in Attachment 1. The motion carried 7-0.

Mr. Satterlee reviewed the item and indicated this contract is consistent in terms of length of contract with Mr. Harsin’s employment contract. Mr. Soltman asked why this is separate from his contract. Mr. Satterlee responded that it is fairly common in athletics coaching contracts that coaches are assigning their images and likenesses to private corporations and limited liability corporations so that those likenesses become licensed separately; whereby it makes it more of a business payment from the employer to the coach’s private company.

BUSINESS AFFAIRS AND HUMAN RESOURCES (BAHR)

Section II – Finance

1. Board Policy V.X. – Intercollegiate Athletics – First Reading

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Terrell/Goesling): To approve the first reading of proposed amendments to Board policy V.X.
2. **Board Policy V.R. – Establishment of Fees – Second Reading**

**BOARD ACTION**

M/S (Terrell/Atchley): To approve the second reading of proposed amendments to Board policy Section V.R., Establishment of Fees, with all revisions as presented. The motion carried 6-0. Mr. Luna was absent from voting.

Mr. Terrell remarked the proposed revisions change the Senior Citizen fee from a set dollar amount to mirror language used for the employee/spouse/dependent fees. There were no changes from first reading.

3. **Amendment to Board Policy V.U. – Entertainment and Related Expenses – Second Reading**

**BOARD ACTION**

M/S (Terrell/Westerberg): To approve the second reading of proposed amendments to Board policy V.U. Entertainment and Related Expenses, with all revisions as presented. The motion carried 6-0. Mr. Luna was absent from voting.

Mr. Freeman indicated there were some recommendations made between first and second reading and those changes were incorporated into the second reading.

4. **Intercollegiate Athletics Reports of Revenues, Expenditures, Participation**

Mr. Terrell indicated the reports were included in the agenda materials. Mr. Lewis indicated the Athletics Committee thoroughly reviewed the item.

5. **Intercollegiate Athletics – Employee Compensation Reports**

Mr. Terrell indicated the reports were included in the agenda materials. Mr. Lewis indicated the Athletics Committee thoroughly reviewed the item.

6. **Lewis-Clark State College – Dependent Fee Proposal**

**BOARD ACTION**

M/S (Terrell/Westerberg): To approve the dependent fee program proposed by Lewis-Clark State College, as outlined above. The motion carried 6-0. Mr. Luna was absent from voting.

Mr. Herbst commented that this is a request by LCSC to avail its employees of the benefit. He added it would be a great benefit and opportunity for employees, and a morale booster, and would have low fiscal impact of perhaps less than $100,000.

7. **University of Idaho – Idaho Law and Justice Learning Center Project – Tenant Improvements**

**BOARD ACTION**

M/S (Terrell/Goesling): To approve the request by the University of Idaho to implement the design and planning phase for the tenant improvements at the Idaho Law and Justice Learning Center pursuant to the estimated budget set forth in the materials as submitted at a cost not to exceed $150,000. The motion carried 6-0. Mr. Luna was absent from voting.

Mr. Ron Smith provided an update on the item which is a request to spend $150,000 in planning in conjunction with the Division of Public Works. He indicated the College of Law has raised money to fund
additional tenant improvements for this facility. The $150,000 will be used in the design and planning of
the last phase of the project. Mr. Lewis asked if this would cover a third class at UI. Mr. Smith responded
it would.

8. University of Idaho – Executive Residence Project Update

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Terrell/Atchley): To approve the request by the University of Idaho for authority to expend up
to an additional $137,000, for a total of $212,000, for design and planning for the modernization,
including potential replacement, of the executive residence. Approval includes the authority to
execute all requisite consulting, design, and vendor contracts necessary to fully implement the
planning and design phase of the project. The motion carried 5-0. Mr. Soltman voted nay; Mr. Luna
was absent from voting.

Mr. Terrell introduced the item stating that this is a request for approval to increase the authorized amount
by $137,000 for the planning and design phase related to replacing the existing Executive Residence
located on the main campus of the University of Idaho.

Mr. Westerberg asked if the additional funds come from donated dollars. Mr. Smith responded that not all
the funds are donated funds, and that the planning money will come from university funds. He added that
a contractor will also be working with the architect on this project. Mr. Westerberg felt that planning and
design costs should be about 10% of the project, and these costs were in excess of that. There was
additional discussion about the design and construction phases along with the costs.

9. Institution Specific Intellectual Property Policies

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Terrell/): To approve the Intellectual Property policies of the University of Idaho, Boise State
University and Idaho State University as submitted. Returned to committee by unanimous consent.

Mr. Terrell requested Tracie Bent to speak to the item. Ms. Bent reported that at this time the institutions
are bringing forward their institution specific intellectual property policies for Board consideration. In
going through those policies, it was felt they didn’t strictly meet the requirements of the Board, as some
required sections were not included or only had a cursory mention. Staff requested additional direction
from the Board on the amount of detail they would like contained in those policies. Mr. Westerberg
indicated that the institutions are directed in policy to develop their own intellectual property policies that
are then approved by the Board. During that process the policies are to be reviewed by committee which
has not happened in this case. He recommended in keeping with Board procedure to review the
intellectual property policies in committee before making a motion on the policy; and requested the item
be returned to committee for the additional work. He also recommended a joint task force from both the
BAHR and PPGA committees to review the intellectual property policies going forward. Mr. Westerberg
requested unanimous consent to return the item for review by a joint committee. There were no
objections to this request.

The meeting requested for a short break at this time.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

1. Superintendent’s Update

Superintendent Luna provided a brief legislative update to the Board on the status of the Department’s
pending legislation. Ms. Lucy Willits provided a presentation to the Board on the Smarter Balanced
Assessment System on how it ties into the current standards, why it is different, and how it will be
implemented. Ms. Willits provided some history on the standards movement in Idaho and the
development of a baseline and assessments. In moving from the ISAT, higher standards in math and
English language arts were adopted, and the SBAC test was piloted last year. That test will be
operational this Fall. Ms. Willits pointed out that this effort is unique in that it is state led, but also involves a consortium of states, and includes higher education representation as well as K-12 representation. This new test is geared more toward college and career readiness beyond 10th grade; and better alignment between what standards are expected in higher education and what is in K-12.

Ms. Willits reported that moving away from a multiple choice test will beneficial in student assessment and demonstrate deeper knowledge. For teachers, a digital library will provide resources to be able to understand and use assessments appropriately. Through these assessments they will be able to answer questions such as where are students in relation to learning goals for this lesson; what is the gap between students’ current learning and the goal; is there evidence of improvement? Ms. Willits reported that the summative assessment was developed with broad input from stakeholders in Idaho. It is a computer adaptive test and includes performance tasks to show students’ work. Ms. Willits reviewed the timing of the assessment tests and indicated the testing can be broken into portions so that the test isn’t consuming a long period of time of several hours, or exhausting the student by a long period of testing. She reviewed the Smarter Balanced timeline reporting that 2012-13 was the pilot, 2013-14 includes practice testing/field testing, and 2014-15 the testing is operational. Some technical issues were reported, but all have been addressed by Smarter Balanced.

Ms. Willits reported on concerns such as money, time, computer lab access, and participation accountability; stating that the cost is neutral for Idaho, the time spent will be less than 1% of annual student instructional time, computer lab access for the field test is optional for 9th and 10th grade, and the star ratings will not change regarding participation accountability. The Smarter Balanced Advisory Committee contains six superintendents, three testing coordinators, and six principals.

Ms. Willits outlined several items of what they hoped to accomplish with a quality assessment system in Idaho including full alignment with Idaho Core Standards. She reviewed the Smarter Balanced technology requirements and pointed that the operating systems for the SBAC are very similar to that of the ISAT.

Mr. Luna offered a few comments, adding that they are doing their best to address questions and concerns. He felt that once the field tests are underway, it should address many of those questions and concerns.

2. Professional Standards Commission Annual Report

Mr. Taylor Raney from the Caldwell School District provided some background on the Professional Standards Commission (PSC) and provided a very brief review of the annual report to the Board. He reported the PSC is charged with several things, most notably teacher ethics, educator preparation program reviews, and standards reviews. Program reviews are done about every seven years and standards reviews are done about every five years. Mr. Raney walked the Board through the 2012 report, indicating these reports were provided in the Board agenda materials and are an annual review of the work achieved through the Commission during the 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 academic years.


BOARD ACTION

M/S (Luna/Atchley): To accept the State Team Report, thereby granting program approval of Elementary Education, Early Childhood/Special Education Blended, Special Education, English Language Arts, Mathematics Social Studies (Foundation Standards), Economics, Geography, Government/Civics, History, Science (Foundation Standards), Biology, Chemistry, Earth and Space Science, Physics, Modern Languages, Visual/Performing Arts (Foundation Standards), Visual Arts, Music Approved – Target, Physical Education Approved – Target, Health Education, Professional Technical (Foundation Standards), Agricultural Science and Technology, Business Technology, Technology Education, Marketing Education, Administration (Foundation Standards), School Superintendent, and Special Education Director at the University of Idaho as teacher certification programs. The motion carried 7-0.
BOARD ACTION

M/S (Luna/Terrell): To accept the State Team Report, thereby granting conditional approval of the Gifted and Talented Education and Library Media Specialist programs at the University of Idaho for teacher certification. The motion carried 7-0.

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Luna/Soltman): To accept the State Team Report, thereby not approving the Reading/Literacy program at the University of Idaho for teacher certification. The motion carried 7-0.

Mr. Luna indicated that in order to maintain their state approved status and produce graduates eligible for Idaho teacher certification, UI must offer a teacher preparation program adequately aligned to both NCATE and State Standards. Mr. Taylor Raney outlined the UI program review and discussed the process. He pointed out the members of the state review team and state observers, the program evaluations and recommendations, and Idaho standards for initial certification of professional school personnel.

4. University of Idaho – 2+2 Career & Technical Education – Engineering and Technology Education Option

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Luna/Terrell): To accept the Professional Standards Commission recommendation to conditionally approve the proposed (2 + 2) program of Career & Technical Education - Engineering and Technology Education option offered through the University of Idaho and College of Southern Idaho as an approved program for teacher certification. The motion carried 7-0.

Mr. Luna indicated that the Professional Standards Commission is also recommending the conditional approval of the 2+2 Program of Career & Technical Education - Engineering and Technology Education option offered through the University of Idaho and College of Southern Idaho. He indicated the UI and CSI have developed a cutting edge approach to working together on this program. He asked Mr. Taylor Raney to provide brief comments on the item. Mr. Raney indicated UI and CSI have collaborated and agreed that under current economic times it is more feasible for students to work out of Twin Falls their first couple of years. In seeking an opportunity for a continuum of preparation, the two institutions developed a partnership that will help students in southern Idaho before going to Moscow. The location of faculty across the state allows courses to be delivered in a combination of face-to-face and on-line courses. The 2+2 partnership will provide a larger population of students with an opportunity to complete a bachelor of education program.

OTHER BUSINESS

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

M/S (Terrell/Goesling): To adjourn the meeting at 5:52 p.m. The motion carried unanimously 7-0.
COLEGE AND UNIVERSITIES

SUBJECT
FY 2015 Student Tuition & Fee Rates (Academic Year 2014-2015)

REFERENCE
February 2013  Board approved second reading for V.R. Policies regarding Board approval for New Student Orientation fees
December 2013  Board approved 1st reading for proposed amendments to Board policy V.R.
February 2014  Board approved second reading for V.R. Policies regarding Board approval for Senior Citizen Fee with eligibility determined by each institution

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY
Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies & Procedures, Section III.Y., Section V.R.
Section 33-3717A, Idaho Code

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION
Section V.R. contains the Board policy that defines fees, the process to change fees, and establishes the approval level required for the various student fees (Chief Executive Officer or the Board). The policy provides in part:

“In setting fees, the Board will consider recommended fees as compared to fees at peer institutions, percent fee increases compared to inflationary factors, fees as a percent of per capita income and/or household income, and the share students pay of their education costs. Other criteria may be considered as is deemed appropriate at the time of a fee change.”

Per board policy, Boise State University (BSU), Idaho State University (ISU), University of Idaho (UI), Lewis-Clark State College (LCSC), and Eastern Idaho Technical College (EITC) notified students of proposed fee increases and conducted public hearings. Their respective presidents are now recommending to the Board student tuition and fee rates for FY 2015.

Reference Documents
Page 9 displays information from the 2014 Sine Die Report showing the decline in the percentage of the General Fund allocated to the College & Universities over the last 22 years compared to other state budgeted programs.

Page 10 shows the percentage of total appropriation for General Funds, endowment funds and tuition and fees since 1980.
Page 11 compares the current fiscal year WICHE states’ average tuition and fees for resident and nonresident students.

Page 12 shows a summary of FY 2015 annual requested tuition and fees.

Staff has prepared charts similar to those included in each institution’s tab by aggregating the data for the 4-year institutions. The charts are described below:

Page 13 – Cost of Attending College vs. Per Capita Income

The purpose of this chart is to show the increasing cost to attend college (student fees, books and supplies, room and board, personal expenses, and transportation) compared to the per capita income from 2004 to 2013. Each institution has a similar chart showing similar information. The “cost” of attendance reflects full tuition and fees, which differs from the actual “price” of attendance which would reflect cost net of tuition discounts through financial aid and scholarships.

The average cost to attend Idaho’s 4-year institutions has grown from $13,577 in 2004 to $18,567 in 2013, or 48%, while the Idaho per capita income has increased from $27,050 to $34,481, or 28%. The increases in the cost to attend college from 2004 to 2013 are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuition &amp; Fees</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books and Supplies</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room and Board</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal and Transportation</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost to Attend</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Page 14: Cost to Deliver College

The purpose of this chart is to show the costs to deliver college, changes in student enrollment and cost per student FTE. The increases in the cost to deliver college (by major expenditure functional categories) from 2004 to 2013 are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Support</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Services</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics &amp; Auxiliaries</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant and Depreciation</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Support</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid</td>
<td>103%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Increase in Cost to Deliver College</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At the same time, student FTE (top line) has increased by 2%. Taken together, the total cost to deliver college per student FTE (bottom line) has increased by 38% from $10,245 in 2004 to $14,127 in 2013.

Page 15: Resident Fees, Consumer Price Index (CPI), Per Capita Income, and Average Annual Wage

The purpose of this chart is to show the annual percentage increase from 2004 to 2014 for resident fees, CPI, Idaho Per Capita Income, and Idaho Average Annual Wage. As the chart indicates, historically when per capita income and annual wages have increased at a higher rate than the previous year, fees have correspondingly increased at a lesser rate. The opposite is also true, when income and wages have increased at a slower rate than the previous year, fees have correspondingly increased at a faster rate. This trend changed starting in FY 2011. The Consumer Price Index for calendar year 2013 was 1.5%.

Page 16: Tuition/Fee Waivers and Discounts

The purpose of this report is to show the dollar value of tuition/fee waivers granted by each institution along with the Board policy section authorizing each type of waiver. The report also includes discounts such as staff, spouse, dependent, and senior citizen fees which are not waivers.

Institution Fee Proposals
The detailed fee proposals for each institution are contained in separate tabs (BSU, ISU, EITC, LCSC and UI), and each section includes the following:

- Narrative justification of the fee increase request and planned uses of the additional revenue.
- Schedule detailing the tuition and fee changes.
- Schedule projecting the amount of revenue generated from the tuition and fee changes. BSU, ISU, LCSC and EITC are providing net numbers in the report while UI is providing gross numbers. The institutions provided the following narratives describing the methodology used to calculate these revenues.

Boise State University/Idaho State University/Lewis-Clark State College:
The revenue changes calculate potential revenue from the proposed tuition and fee increases and the impact of the change based on the numbers of students paying full tuition and fees (i.e. net of waivers, discounts, refunds, etc.). The Count columns (Headcount or Student Credit Hours) indicate the estimated change from FY14 to FY15. The Potential Revenue Generated columns estimate the revenue changes resulting from the changes in the Counts and proposed tuition and fee increases for budgeting purposes.
University of Idaho:
The Count columns (Headcount or Student Credit Hours) indicate changes between FY14 budget and FY15 projections. The revenues shown under Changes due to Count and Fee Changes reflect gross revenues based on the change in the list price (i.e. Board-approved tuition & fees) on the “Changes to Student Fees for FY 2015” schedule. UI has added a line showing the incremental changes in budgeted discounts and waivers towards the bottom of the “Potential Student Fee Revenue Changes for FY 15” page in order to reduce the gross revenues to net revenues. This provides the fiscal impact of waivers and discounts for the Board.

- Schedule displaying a 4-year history of Board-approved fees and the FY 2015 requested fees.
- The same charts as found on pages 13-15 (and described above) at a disaggregated, institution specific level:
  - Chart: Cost of Attending College vs. Per Capita Income
  - Chart: Cost to Deliver College and Cost to Deliver Per Student FTE
  - Chart: Annual % Increase for Fees, CPI, Per Capita Income, and Average Wage

IMPACT
Starting with FY 2014, all institutions agreed that any summer per credit hour fee change will be effective the summer of the year following Board approval, consistent with the Fall/Spring/Summer academic year.

STAFF COMMENTS
Full-time resident tuition and fee increases being requested by the institutions for FY 2015 (academic year 2014-2015) are as follows (in the order they will be presented):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Fee</th>
<th>% Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boise State University</td>
<td>$6,676</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho State University</td>
<td>$6,566</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Idaho Technical College</td>
<td>$2,256</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis-Clark State College</td>
<td>$5,900</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Idaho</td>
<td>$6,832</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the last recession, Board members asked how much of the reduction in General Funds had been or would be made up by tuition and fee increases. The table on page 17 attempts to address this specific question. The table shows the changes to the General Fund and tuition between FY 2009 and FY 2015 (endowments are excluded from the analysis because they are restricted for specific purposes). Adjustments due to enrollment changes have been excluded as well as ongoing General Funds earmarked for specific projects (e.g. CAES). The analysis starts by reducing the FY 2009 general fund appropriation by the amount of one-time funds to arrive at an adjusted base. The amount of base
reductions is accumulated in lines 7-14 with the resulting decrease percentage shown on line 16. For tuition and fees, the Fee Rate Change Income shown on line 19 is based on the change in tuition and fees between FY 2009 and FY 2015 multiplied by FY 2009 counts of headcount and student credit hours. This estimate of revenues due to tuition & fee increases alone was then reduced by the amount of fringe benefits and Change in Employee Compensation (CEC) increases which were approved, but not funded, by the state between FY 2013 and FY 2015 to arrive at the total estimate fees available on line 30. The net difference between general fund reductions and the estimated increase in student fee revenue is shown on line 32.

Even with the FY 2015 appropriation, tuition revenue will remain an integral part of the institutions’ funding portfolio. The Board and the institutions must balance access and affordability on one side, and quality programming and facilities on the other. The Board also has to balance the fact that not all institutions are created equal, with different roles and missions, enrollment, student body demographics, infrastructure and physical plant needs, accreditation requirements, etc. While some of these differences are not easily quantifiable, a uniform tuition and fee increase across the system could be perceived as a lack of recognition of these institutional differences.

As reviewed in Background/Discussion above, there is a lack of consistency in how the institutions are calculating potential fee revenue changes. BSU, ISU and LCSC net out discounts and waivers in their estimate change in headcount and credit hours, while UI includes discounts and waivers by adjusting the projected revenues. Staff suggests the institutions should adopt a consistent methodology. The UI model has merit because it provides the Board with expected changes in projected headcount and credit hours, gross revenues based on list price, and the estimated dollar value of discounts and waivers.

Finally, staff has included a motion to set the dual credit fee at the current rate of $65 for FY 2015. Staff conducted a thorough cost study and presented the findings to the Board at last year’s tuition & fee hearing. Staff recommends no change to the fee.
BOARD ACTION

BOISE STATE UNIVERSITY:
I move to increase the FY 2015 annual full-time resident tuition and fees at Boise State University by ____% ($____) for a total dollar amount of $_____; and to increase the annual full-time tuition for nonresident tuition of ____ % ($____) for a total dollar amount of $______.

Moved by_____________ Seconded by_____________ Carried Yes_____ No_____

I move to approve all other fees set forth in the FY 2015 Boise State University tuition and fees worksheet which will be made part of the written minutes.

Moved by_____________ Seconded by_____________ Carried Yes_____ No_____

IDAHO STATE UNIVERSITY:
I move to increase the FY 2015 annual full-time resident tuition and fees at Idaho State University by ____% ($____) for a total dollar amount of $_____; and to increase the annual full-time tuition for nonresident tuition of ____ % ($____) for a total dollar amount of $______.

Moved by_____________ Seconded by_____________ Carried Yes_____ No_____

I move to approve all other fees set forth in the FY 2015 Idaho State University tuition and fees worksheet which will be made part of the written minutes.

Moved by_____________ Seconded by_____________ Carried Yes_____ No_____

EASTERN IDAHO TECHNICAL COLLEGE:
I move to increase the FY 2015 annual full-time resident tuition and fees at Eastern Idaho Technical College by ____% ($____) for a total dollar amount of $_____; and to increase the annual full-time tuition for nonresident tuition of ____ % ($____) for a total dollar amount of $______.

Moved by_____________ Seconded by_____________ Carried Yes_____ No_____

I move to approve all other fees in the FY 2015 Eastern Idaho Technical College tuition and fees worksheet which will be made part of the written minutes.

Moved by_____________ Seconded by_____________ Carried Yes_____ No_____
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LEWIS-CLARK STATE COLLEGE:
I move to increase the FY 2015 annual full-time resident tuition and fees at Lewis-Clark State College by ____% ($____) for a total dollar amount of $______; and to increase the annual full-time tuition for nonresident tuition of ____ % ($____) for a total dollar amount of $_______.

Moved by_____________ Seconded by_____________ Carried Yes_____ No_____

I move to approve all other fees set forth in the FY 2015 in the Lewis-Clark State College tuition and fees worksheet which will be made part of the written minutes.

Moved by_____________ Seconded by_____________ Carried Yes_____ No_____
Twenty-Two Year History of General Fund
Original Appropriations: FY 1994 to FY 2015
Millions of Dollars
Fiscal
Year

Public
Schools

College &
Universities

All Other
Education

Total
Education

Health &
Welfare

Adult & Juv
Corrections

All Other
Agencies

Total
Gen Fund

2015
2014
2013
2012
2011
2010*
2009
2008
2007*
2006
2005
2004
2003
2002
2001*
2000
1999
1998
1997
1996*
1995
1994

$1,374.6
$1,308.4
$1,279.8
$1,223.6
$1,214.3
$1,231.4
$1,418.5
$1,367.4
$1,291.6
$987.1
$964.7
$943.0
$920.0
$933.0
$873.5
$821.1
$796.4
$705.0
$689.5
$664.0
$620.5
$528.0

$251.2
$236.5
$228.0
$209.8
$217.5
$253.3
$285.2
$264.2
$243.7
$228.9
$223.4
$218.0
$213.6
$236.4
$215.0
$202.0
$192.9
$178.6
$178.0
$171.0
$164.5
$146.0

$153.7
$143.0
$138.0
$128.3
$129.9
$141.2
$175.1
$166.2
$148.4
$141.8
$138.3
$131.3
$130.4
$142.1
$121.1
$110.4
$103.5
$94.4
$94.4
$88.8
$87.8
$75.7

$1,779.5
$1,687.9
$1,645.7
$1,561.7
$1,561.7
$1,625.8
$1,878.8
$1,797.7
$1,683.7
$1,357.9
$1,326.3
$1,292.3
$1,264.0
$1,311.5
$1,209.5
$1,133.4
$1,092.8
$978.0
$961.9
$923.8
$872.8
$749.7

$637.3
$616.8
$610.2
$564.8
$436.3
$462.3
$587.3
$544.8
$502.4
$457.7
$407.6
$375.8
$359.6
$358.0
$282.1
$270.7
$252.7
$236.6
$238.5
$224.3
$226.9
$192.5

$243.3
$218.3
$205.5
$193.1
$180.7
$186.8
$215.9
$201.2
$178.0
$152.2
$142.8
$140.6
$145.0
$147.3
$123.2
$108.5
$106.4
$90.3
$78.6
$73.5
$50.3
$44.2

$276.0
$258.0
$240.7
$209.3
$205.1
$231.7
$277.3
$276.9
$229.7
$213.2
$205.5
$195.3
$199.3
$227.5
$189.2
$162.1
$159.0
$134.0
$133.7
$127.3
$114.2
$98.1

$2,936.1
$2,781.0
$2,702.1
$2,529.0
$2,383.8
$2,506.6
$2,959.3
$2,820.7
$2,593.7
$2,180.9
$2,082.1
$2,004.1
$1,967.9
$2,044.3
$1,804.0
$1,674.7
$1,610.8
$1,438.9
$1,412.7
$1,348.8
$1,264.2
$1,084.6

Percentage of Total
Fiscal
Year

Public
Schools

College &
Universities

All Other
Education

Total
Education

Health &
Welfare

Adult & Juv
Corrections

All Other
Agencies

Total

2015
2014
2013
2012
2011
2010*
2009
2008
2007*
2006
2005
2004
2003
2002
2001*
2000
1999
1998
1997
1996*
1995
1994

46.8%
47.0%
47.4%
48.4%
50.9%
49.1%
47.9%
48.5%
49.8%
45.3%
46.3%
47.1%
46.8%
45.6%
48.4%
49.0%
49.4%
49.0%
48.8%
49.2%
49.1%
48.7%

8.6%
8.5%
8.4%
8.3%
9.1%
10.1%
9.6%
9.4%
9.4%
10.5%
10.7%
10.9%
10.9%
11.6%
11.9%
12.1%
12.0%
12.4%
12.6%
12.7%
13.0%
13.5%

5.2%
5.1%
5.1%
5.1%
5.5%
5.6%
5.9%
5.9%
5.7%
6.5%
6.6%
6.6%
6.6%
7.0%
6.7%
6.6%
6.4%
6.6%
6.7%
6.6%
6.9%
7.0%

60.6%
60.7%
60.9%
61.8%
65.5%
64.9%
63.5%
63.7%
64.9%
62.3%
63.7%
64.5%
64.2%
64.2%
67.0%
67.7%
67.8%
68.0%
68.1%
68.5%
69.0%
69.1%

21.7%
22.2%
22.6%
22.3%
18.3%
18.4%
19.8%
19.3%
19.4%
21.0%
19.6%
18.8%
18.3%
17.5%
15.6%
16.2%
15.7%
16.4%
16.9%
16.6%
17.9%
17.8%

8.3%
7.8%
7.6%
7.6%
7.6%
7.5%
7.3%
7.1%
6.9%
7.0%
6.9%
7.0%
7.4%
7.2%
6.8%
6.5%
6.6%
6.3%
5.6%
5.4%
4.0%
4.1%

9.4%
9.3%
8.9%
8.3%
8.6%
9.2%
9.4%
9.8%
8.9%
9.8%
9.9%
9.7%
10.1%
11.1%
10.5%
9.7%
9.9%
9.3%
9.5%
9.4%
9.0%
9.0%

100%
100%
100%
100%
100%
100%
100%
100%
100%
100%
100%
100%
100%
100%
100%
100%
100%
100%
100%
100%
100%
100%

2010*
2007*
2001*
1996*

Moved Deaf/Blind School from "Other Education" to "Public Schools"; Historical Society and Libraries to "All Other Agencies".
Adjusted for H1 of 2006 Special Session which increased Public Schools General Fund by $250,645,700.
Moved Department of Environmental Quality and Veterans Services from H&W to "All Other Agencies".
Moved Juvenile Corrections from Health and Welfare to "Adult & Juv Corrections".
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>General Funds</th>
<th>Endowment Funds</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
<th>Tuition</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>59,600,000</td>
<td>3,165,200</td>
<td>62,765,200</td>
<td>4,873,000</td>
<td>67,638,200</td>
<td>88.1% 92.8% 7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>63,432,000</td>
<td>4,583,000</td>
<td>68,015,000</td>
<td>5,102,700</td>
<td>73,117,700</td>
<td>86.8% 93.0% 7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>64,497,400</td>
<td>5,267,200</td>
<td>69,764,600</td>
<td>10,529,800</td>
<td>80,294,400</td>
<td>80.3% 86.9% 13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>65,673,700</td>
<td>6,145,900</td>
<td>71,819,600</td>
<td>13,495,800</td>
<td>85,315,400</td>
<td>77.0% 84.2% 15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>70,000,000</td>
<td>5,769,400</td>
<td>75,769,400</td>
<td>10,529,800</td>
<td>86,299,200</td>
<td>78.8% 85.3% 14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>80,897,300</td>
<td>5,644,000</td>
<td>86,541,300</td>
<td>16,569,000</td>
<td>103,110,300</td>
<td>78.5% 83.9% 16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>88,000,000</td>
<td>5,840,800</td>
<td>93,840,800</td>
<td>16,048,000</td>
<td>109,888,800</td>
<td>80.5% 85.4% 14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>90,700,000</td>
<td>6,145,900</td>
<td>96,845,900</td>
<td>16,462,300</td>
<td>113,308,200</td>
<td>82.3% 86.7% 13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>98,000,000</td>
<td>6,547,100</td>
<td>104,547,100</td>
<td>18,374,800</td>
<td>122,921,900</td>
<td>80.1% 85.4% 14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>106,000,000</td>
<td>6,947,100</td>
<td>112,947,100</td>
<td>19,287,800</td>
<td>132,234,900</td>
<td>82.4% 86.9% 13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>115,500,000</td>
<td>7,347,100</td>
<td>122,847,100</td>
<td>20,287,800</td>
<td>143,134,900</td>
<td>83.2% 87.3% 12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>133,264,300</td>
<td>7,747,100</td>
<td>141,011,400</td>
<td>22,184,300</td>
<td>163,195,700</td>
<td>82.1% 88.0% 12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>141,444,000</td>
<td>8,147,100</td>
<td>149,591,100</td>
<td>23,628,300</td>
<td>173,219,400</td>
<td>82.4% 86.2% 13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>137,610,000</td>
<td>8,547,100</td>
<td>146,157,100</td>
<td>27,084,600</td>
<td>173,241,700</td>
<td>80.4% 84.2% 15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>146,013,700</td>
<td>8,947,100</td>
<td>154,960,800</td>
<td>29,342,800</td>
<td>184,303,600</td>
<td>82.1% 85.4% 14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>153,033,500</td>
<td>9,347,100</td>
<td>162,380,600</td>
<td>31,684,600</td>
<td>194,065,200</td>
<td>82.4% 85.4% 14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>161,840,000</td>
<td>9,747,100</td>
<td>171,587,100</td>
<td>34,042,800</td>
<td>205,629,900</td>
<td>82.7% 85.4% 14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>170,386,700</td>
<td>10,147,100</td>
<td>180,533,800</td>
<td>36,491,800</td>
<td>217,025,600</td>
<td>82.9% 85.4% 14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>179,920,000</td>
<td>10,547,100</td>
<td>190,467,100</td>
<td>38,941,800</td>
<td>229,409,900</td>
<td>83.2% 85.4% 14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>189,463,700</td>
<td>10,947,100</td>
<td>199,410,800</td>
<td>41,391,800</td>
<td>240,802,600</td>
<td>83.5% 85.4% 14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>200,000,000</td>
<td>11,347,100</td>
<td>211,347,100</td>
<td>43,841,800</td>
<td>255,188,900</td>
<td>83.8% 85.4% 14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>210,586,700</td>
<td>11,747,100</td>
<td>222,333,800</td>
<td>46,291,800</td>
<td>268,625,600</td>
<td>84.1% 85.4% 14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>221,120,000</td>
<td>12,147,100</td>
<td>232,267,100</td>
<td>48,741,800</td>
<td>280,008,900</td>
<td>84.4% 85.4% 14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>231,653,700</td>
<td>12,547,100</td>
<td>244,190,800</td>
<td>51,191,800</td>
<td>295,382,600</td>
<td>84.7% 85.4% 14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>242,186,400</td>
<td>12,947,100</td>
<td>255,133,500</td>
<td>53,641,800</td>
<td>308,775,300</td>
<td>85.0% 85.4% 14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>252,720,000</td>
<td>13,347,100</td>
<td>266,067,100</td>
<td>56,091,800</td>
<td>318,158,900</td>
<td>85.3% 85.4% 14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>263,273,700</td>
<td>13,747,100</td>
<td>276,020,800</td>
<td>58,541,800</td>
<td>334,562,600</td>
<td>85.6% 85.4% 14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>274,816,400</td>
<td>14,147,100</td>
<td>288,963,500</td>
<td>61,001,800</td>
<td>349,965,300</td>
<td>85.9% 85.4% 14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>286,369,100</td>
<td>14,547,100</td>
<td>300,916,200</td>
<td>63,451,800</td>
<td>364,368,000</td>
<td>86.2% 85.4% 14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>297,921,800</td>
<td>14,947,100</td>
<td>312,868,900</td>
<td>65,901,800</td>
<td>380,770,700</td>
<td>86.5% 85.4% 14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>310,475,500</td>
<td>15,347,100</td>
<td>323,822,600</td>
<td>68,351,800</td>
<td>389,174,400</td>
<td>86.8% 85.4% 14.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Annual Resident Undergraduate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Universities (BSU, ISU, UI)</th>
<th>Amount % of Average</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Other Institutions (LCSC)</th>
<th>Amount % of Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>12,250</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>8,554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>10,197</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>8,159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>9,904</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>8,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>9,810</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>7,477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>9,024</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>6,436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>8,654</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>6,201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>7,887</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>5,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>7,868</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>6,201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>7,524</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>5,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>6,821</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>5,292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>6,587</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>4,747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>6,533</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>4,463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>6,399</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>4,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>6,387</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>4,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>5,941</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>3,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>4,404</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>3,775</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Annual Nonresident Undergraduate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Universities (BSU, ISU, UI)</th>
<th>Amount % of Average</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Other Institutions (LCSC)</th>
<th>Amount % of Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>28,621</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>20,863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>28,578</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>19,424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>27,472</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>18,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>25,463</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>18,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>25,364</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>16,804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>24,578</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>16,096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>24,178</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>15,506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>20,812</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>14,442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>20,497</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>11,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>20,166</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>10,359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>19,056</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>9,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>19,011</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>9,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>17,958</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>9,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>14,124</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>9,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>9,950</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>9,389</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Colleges & Universities

Summary of FY 2015 Annual Student Tuition & Fees - As Requested
Board Meeting: April 17, 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>Requested Increases</th>
<th>Total Requested FY 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>% Incr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full-time Tuition &amp; Fees:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resident Tuition and Fees:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boise State University</td>
<td>$6,292.00</td>
<td>$384.00</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho State University</td>
<td>$6,344.00</td>
<td>$222.00</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Idaho</td>
<td>$6,524.00</td>
<td>$308.00</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis Clark State College</td>
<td>$5,784.00</td>
<td>$116.00</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Idaho Tech College</td>
<td>$2,122.00</td>
<td>$134.00</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average 4 year institutions</td>
<td>$6,236.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Graduate:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boise State University</td>
<td>$1,140.00</td>
<td>$44.00</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho State University</td>
<td>$1,128.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Idaho</td>
<td>$1,062.00</td>
<td>$36.00</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Graduate</td>
<td>$1,110.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nonresident Tuition and Fees:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate (In addition to the tuition and fees paid by resident students)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boise State University</td>
<td>$12,600.00</td>
<td>$252.00</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho State University</td>
<td>$12,332.00</td>
<td>$428.00</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Idaho</td>
<td>$13,076.00</td>
<td>$406.00</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis Clark State College</td>
<td>$10,312.00</td>
<td>$206.00</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Idaho Tech College</td>
<td>$5,650.00</td>
<td>$206.00</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average 4 year institutions</td>
<td>$12,080.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part-time Credit Hour Tuition &amp; Fees:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resident Fees: (per credit hour)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boise State University</td>
<td>$260.00</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho State University</td>
<td>$317.00</td>
<td>$11.00</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Idaho</td>
<td>$326.00</td>
<td>$16.00</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis Clark State College</td>
<td>$296.00</td>
<td>$6.00</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Idaho Tech College</td>
<td>$96.50</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Service Teacher Fee</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Graduate:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boise State University</td>
<td>$64.00</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho State University</td>
<td>$57.00</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Idaho</td>
<td>$59.00</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Service Teacher Fee</td>
<td>$121.00</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nonresident Tuition and Fees:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pt Tm Nonresident Cr Hr Tuition</td>
<td>(In addition to resident fees)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boise State University</td>
<td>$112.00</td>
<td>$88.00</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho State University</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
<td>$7.00</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Idaho</td>
<td>$654.00</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis-Clark State College</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>No Fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Idaho Tech College</td>
<td>$96.50</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Cost of Attendance includes the full tuition and does not reflect a student possibly receiving financial aid, scholarships, or discounts.
## Idaho 4-year Institutions
### Resident Fees, CPI, Per Capita Income, Average Annual Wage
#### % Increase from Prior Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Resident Fees</th>
<th>CPI</th>
<th>Per Capita Income</th>
<th>Average Annual Wage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY04</td>
<td>9.63%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY05</td>
<td>8.13%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>9.20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY07</td>
<td>5.70%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>5.30%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY09</td>
<td>5.27%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>6.23%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>9.07%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY12</td>
<td>6.87%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY13</td>
<td>5.15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY14</td>
<td>5.12%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Source:
- Idaho Commerce and Labor; Bureau of Economic Analysis, U.S. Department of Commerce; Division of Financial Management Economic Forecast, January 2014
### Idaho College and Universities
### Tuition/Fee Waivers & Discounts
### Fiscal Year 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Section</th>
<th>BSU</th>
<th>ISU</th>
<th>UI</th>
<th>LCSC</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Board Policy Tuition Waivers, Policy Section V.T.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Nonresident Graduate/Instructional Assistants</td>
<td>SBOE V.T.2.a</td>
<td>$1,493,967</td>
<td>$1,699,200</td>
<td>$4,732,783</td>
<td>$7,925,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Nonresident Intercollegiate Athletics</td>
<td>SBOE V.T.2.b</td>
<td>$2,280,989</td>
<td>$1,604,010</td>
<td>$2,350,693</td>
<td>$1,234,194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Nonresident Fee</td>
<td></td>
<td>$11,440</td>
<td>$11,800</td>
<td>$12,788</td>
<td>$9,914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Policy: Universities - 225, LCSC 110</td>
<td>Equivalent FTE</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Waivers Subject to 6% Limitation</td>
<td>SBOE V.T.2.c</td>
<td>$9,141,166</td>
<td>$3,764,535</td>
<td>$7,907,133</td>
<td>$433,618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Annual FTE</td>
<td>Student FTE</td>
<td>16,694</td>
<td>10,826</td>
<td>10,436</td>
<td>2,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Equivalen FTE Waivers subject to 6% Limitation</td>
<td>Nonresident Fee</td>
<td>$11,440</td>
<td>$11,800</td>
<td>$12,788</td>
<td>$9,914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Other Board Policy Exchange Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Exchange Student Waivers (1)</td>
<td>SBOE V.T.2.d</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$100,300</td>
<td>$370,878</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Western Regional Graduate Program</td>
<td>SBOE V.T.2.e</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$404,830</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Western Undergraduate Exchange (2)</td>
<td>SBOE V.R.3.a.v</td>
<td>$4,448,703</td>
<td>$1,068,657</td>
<td>$5,685,755</td>
<td>$317,237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Total Other Board Policy Exchange Programs</td>
<td>$4,448,703</td>
<td>$1,573,787</td>
<td>$6,056,633</td>
<td>$317,237</td>
<td>$12,396,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Total Board Policy Tuition Waivers</td>
<td>$17,364,825</td>
<td>$8,641,532</td>
<td>$21,047,242</td>
<td>$1,985,049</td>
<td>$49,038,648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Discounts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Staff and Spouse Fees</td>
<td>SBOE V.R.3.a.vi</td>
<td>$938,509</td>
<td>$1,743,440</td>
<td>$947,623</td>
<td>$138,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Senior Citizen Fees</td>
<td>SBOE V.R.3.a.vii</td>
<td>$447,114</td>
<td>$327,728</td>
<td>$136,175</td>
<td>$85,201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Dependent Fees</td>
<td>SBOE V.R.3.a.v</td>
<td>$324,819</td>
<td>$243,662</td>
<td>$568,481</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 In-Service Teacher Education Fee</td>
<td>SBOE V.R.3.a.viii</td>
<td>$1,077,639</td>
<td>$944,698</td>
<td>$64,896</td>
<td>$2,953,978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Staff, Spouse, Dependent Fees of other Idaho institutions</td>
<td>SBOE V.R.3.a.vi</td>
<td>$3,176</td>
<td>$392,555</td>
<td>$190,086</td>
<td>$190,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Students attending multiple Idaho sister institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,866</td>
<td>$1,866</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Idaho National Laboratory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 BYU-UI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 EDA-Nez Perce Tribe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Total Discounts</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,791,257</td>
<td>$3,408,421</td>
<td>$2,504,531</td>
<td>$399,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Total FY13 Waivers and Discounts</td>
<td></td>
<td>$20,156,082</td>
<td>$12,049,953</td>
<td>$23,551,773</td>
<td>$2,384,882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 FY13 Gross Student Fees</td>
<td>133,137,162</td>
<td>100,234,779</td>
<td>109,847,802</td>
<td>21,527,166</td>
<td>364,746,909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 FY13 Net Student Fees from Operating Revenue per audited F/S</td>
<td>106,593,359</td>
<td>73,937,311</td>
<td>82,657,950</td>
<td>14,678,929</td>
<td>277,867,549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 FY13 Scholarship Discounts &amp; Allowances per audited F/S</td>
<td>22,095,100</td>
<td>24,723,681</td>
<td>21,133,219</td>
<td>6,531,000</td>
<td>74,483,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Student Fee Revenue related to Exchange Program Discounts</td>
<td>4,448,703</td>
<td>1,573,787</td>
<td>6,056,633</td>
<td>317,237</td>
<td>12,396,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Percentage of Total Gross Tuition &amp; Fees Waived or Discounted</td>
<td>15.14%</td>
<td>12.02%</td>
<td>21.44%</td>
<td>11.08%</td>
<td>15.94%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Graduate/Instructional Assistant waivers can vary among institutions due to the difference in their respective missions.

(1) Includes only waivers for incoming exchange students.

(2) WUE is accounted for as a rate and not a waiver. The waived amount is the difference in the out-of-state rate minus the WUE rate.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base Reductions:</th>
<th>BSU</th>
<th>ISU</th>
<th>UI</th>
<th>LCSC</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY09 FY 2009 Governor's Holdback</td>
<td>($3,503,500)</td>
<td>($2,976,700)</td>
<td>($3,838,400)</td>
<td>($604,000)</td>
<td>($11,047,200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY10 FY 2010 Base Reduction</td>
<td>(2,503,800)</td>
<td>(2,127,300)</td>
<td>(2,743,200)</td>
<td>(431,700)</td>
<td>(7,895,700)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY10 5.0% Personnel Cost Reduction</td>
<td>(3,766,900)</td>
<td>(3,007,700)</td>
<td>(3,957,500)</td>
<td>(607,400)</td>
<td>(11,339,500)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY11 FY 2010 Governor's Holdback</td>
<td>(4,701,100)</td>
<td>(3,948,600)</td>
<td>(5,564,900)</td>
<td>(808,100)</td>
<td>(15,196,700)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY11 FY 2010 Base Rescission</td>
<td>(1,572,800)</td>
<td>(1,226,300)</td>
<td>(1,537,300)</td>
<td>(273,400)</td>
<td>(4,609,900)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY12 Base Reduction</td>
<td>(2,844,200)</td>
<td>(2,399,500)</td>
<td>(2,985,300)</td>
<td>(486,200)</td>
<td>(8,923,700)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Base Reduction</td>
<td>($18,892,300)</td>
<td>($15,686,100)</td>
<td>($20,626,600)</td>
<td>($3,210,800)</td>
<td>($59,012,700)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition &amp; Fees Rate Rate Change Income</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25,474,500</td>
<td>19,629,800</td>
<td>23,163,300</td>
<td>4,220,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY13 Fringe Benefits</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-961,100</td>
<td>-488,900</td>
<td>-534,000</td>
<td>-220,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY13 CEC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-971,100</td>
<td>-494,300</td>
<td>-624,700</td>
<td>-158,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY14 Fringe Benefits</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-264,900</td>
<td>-177,100</td>
<td>-200,700</td>
<td>-74,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY14 CEC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY15 Fringe Benefits</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1,006,300</td>
<td>-542,400</td>
<td>-649,500</td>
<td>-213,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY15 CEC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1,119,800</td>
<td>-551,400</td>
<td>-702,000</td>
<td>-178,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Fees required for Benefits &amp; CEC Incr</td>
<td></td>
<td>-4,323,200</td>
<td>-2,254,100</td>
<td>-2,710,900</td>
<td>-844,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Fees Available to &quot;replace&quot; Gen Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td>21,151,300</td>
<td>17,375,700</td>
<td>20,452,400</td>
<td>3,375,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Fees over/(under) Total Base Reduction</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,259,000</td>
<td>1,689,600</td>
<td>-174,200</td>
<td>165,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Fee Rate Change Income based on change in tuition and fees between FY 2009 and FY 2015 multiplied by FY 2009 counts of headcount and student credit hours.

2 The state has recently approved increases for fringe benefits and/or CEC without appropriating General Funds to fully fund the cost of those increases for all employees (including those budgeted in whole or in part on tuition revenue). This funding approach is a de facto tuition increase in order to cover those higher costs.
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Proposed Changes to Student Fees

Boise State University’s process of reviewing and analyzing tuition and fee rates is a purposeful and collaborative process involving students and multiple campus constituents. The review process focuses on the impact to students and the revenues needed in the various budgets.

The process begins with detailed analysis of current year activity and best estimates for FY 2015 activity. All units that currently have a student facility, technology or activity fee are required to review budget versus actual activity and project impacts based on estimated enrollments for the upcoming year. If changes to existing fees are requested, those requests must be carefully prepared, with justification provided, and submitted to the Executive Budget Committee. All requests for new fees or increases to existing fees are presented at the open Student Fee Hearing held in February.

The Executive Budget Committee meets subsequent to the fee hearing. The committee is comprised of several students, representatives from faculty and staff employee groups, Vice Presidents and the University’s Budget Director. The committee meets to review all materials submitted and discussion follows. The discussion is thoughtful and often lively as the committee reviews the competing and compelling needs across campus. The work session ends with a recommendation to the President.

Boise State remains committed to the guiding principles of providing access and affordability to students while at the same time maintaining quality course offerings and assuring financial viability. The university is also committed to growing student enrollments and enhancing graduation rates in order to continue progress toward the State Board of Education’s goal that 60% of Idahoans ages 25-34 will have a degree or certificate by 2020.

Of particular note in the recommendation of rate changes for FY 2015:

- Boise State is continuing the linear model. Students taking 1-12 credits would see a per credit increase of $4.00 per credit, or 1.5% over the prior year. In fall 2013, 37% of the credits generated were in the 1-12 credit range. In terms of head count, the 1.5% increase is estimated to impact 49% of the students.

- Students taking 13-17 credits would see a $192.00/semester increase, or 6.1% over the prior year. This is estimated to impact 51% of the students.

- The overall average increase for students taking 1 through 18 credits is 3.05%.
Identify and prioritize specific areas in which revenue from the requested tuition and fee increase will be used.

Boise State has a history of providing quality academic programs and growing student enrollments and numbers of degrees awarded. Boise State charges the lowest rate for full-time undergraduate student among the three universities and has a significantly lower per credit rate as the university implements the linear model.

Revenues from the tuition and fee increase will be used to fund the $3 million in fund shift not covered by state general account funds and inflation needs as submitted in FY 2015 request but unfunded by JFAC. Fund shift costs are primarily those associated with the $1,450/FTE increase in health care costs and the 2% CEC. In addition, $1 million is needed to cover faculty salary equity issues. Boise State’s faculty salaries remain near the bottom of peer institution salaries and progress has been slow due to the lack of consistent CEC adjustments.

As part of the University’s FY 2015 line item request to the State, $6.99 million was requested to fund prioritized new faculty lines and student advisor positions necessary to make progress on the 60% goal. $1.389 million was funded, leaving an unfunded need of $5.6 million. The university requests $3 million from student tuition and fee revenues to hire faculty, advisors and support staff to continue to meet the 2020 goal.

Additional funding of at least $1 million is needed to support additional compliance and safety requirements, including data security and new PCI compliance standards. Other needs include graduate and teaching assistantships, student employees, web developers, institutional research staff, data analytics software and technical support for learning management systems.

As part of the FY 15 Program Prioritization and Budget Planning Process currently in process on campus, reallocations and cost reductions are being reviewed and strongly encouraged in order to meet strategic initiatives.

How will fees address improving access?

Maintaining faculty and academic support needs will help ensure students progress towards timely completion. The specific plan related to revenues from increased tuition and fees is to use the funds to increase instructional capacity.

Limiting access to services, programs and some courses may be necessary if the increase is approved at a level less than requested. Students that are unable to enroll in courses needed (due to lack of faculty), will be negatively impacted since it will not only take them longer to graduate, but it will also ultimately cost them more to enroll in another semester or more.
How has the FY 2015 appropriation affected Boise State’s tuition/fee request:

DFM and LSO no longer allow for fund shift as an MCO item in the annual budget request. This change essentially ensures that student tuition must increase in order to absorb these additional costs not covered by the state general account. This amount equals $3 million for Boise State.

Boise State requested $6.99 million as a line item to fund the faculty, student advisors and professional staff positions needed to ensure success in the 60% goal. The legislature funded $1.379 million of this request. While this is a good start, it falls short of the compelling need. In order to make the necessary progress on this goal, additional funding will need to come from the student tuition/fee portion of the annual operating budget. The difference between the requested amount and what was funded is $5.5 million. While the proposed request will not make up this entire amount, it will provide resources to add some additional courses.

JFAC removed $219,200 from BSU’s budget. This was the FY 2015 calculated amount for EWA that was NOT included in the budget request (per guidance from DFM and LSO). Unfortunately, this was enrollment workload funding that Boise State never received and will need to be absorbed.

As always, the University will continue to identify cost savings and efficiency measures to mitigate the need for future large tuition and fee increases.
### BOISE STATE UNIVERSITY

**Annual Full-Time Fees and Part-Time Credit Hours Fees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bd</th>
<th>FY14</th>
<th>FY15</th>
<th>Requested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Fees:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appv Fees</td>
<td>Initial Notice FY15 Fees</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>Full-time Fees:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tuition</td>
<td>$4,309.20</td>
<td>$4,509.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Technology Fee</td>
<td><strong>$185.50</strong></td>
<td><strong>$195.50</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Facilities Fee</td>
<td><strong>$1,066.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,066.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Student Activity Fees</td>
<td><strong>$731.30</strong></td>
<td><strong>$781.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Total Full-time Fees</td>
<td>$6,292.00</td>
<td>$6,552.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td><strong>Part-time Credit Hour Fees:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Education Fee</td>
<td><strong>$166.25</strong></td>
<td><strong>$170.10</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Technology Fee</td>
<td>9.45</td>
<td>9.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Facilities Fee</td>
<td><strong>49.60</strong></td>
<td><strong>48.40</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Student Activity Fees</td>
<td><strong>34.70</strong></td>
<td><strong>38.65</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Total Part-time Cr Hr Fees</td>
<td>$260.00</td>
<td>$268.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td><strong>Summer Fees:</strong> (eff. Summer 2015)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Education Fee</td>
<td><strong>$170.60</strong></td>
<td><strong>$176.55</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Technology Fee</td>
<td>9.45</td>
<td>9.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Facilities Fee</td>
<td><strong>49.70</strong></td>
<td><strong>48.40</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Student Activity Fees</td>
<td><strong>22.25</strong></td>
<td><strong>25.40</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Total Summer Fees</td>
<td>$252.00</td>
<td>$260.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td><strong>Other Student Fees:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Graduate Fees:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Full-time Grad/Prof</td>
<td><strong>$1,140.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,184.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Part-time Graduate/Hour</td>
<td><strong>$64.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$67.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Nonresident Tuition:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Nonres Tuition - full time</td>
<td><strong>$12,600.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$12,852.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Nonres Fees - part-time</td>
<td><strong>$112.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$200.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Professional Fee:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Undergrad. Nursing - Con't Students</td>
<td><strong>$200.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$200.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Undergrad. Nursing - New Students</td>
<td><strong>$850.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$850.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td><strong>Other Fees:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Western Undergrad Exchange</td>
<td><strong>$3,146.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,276.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Overload fee</td>
<td><strong>$166.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$166.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>In-service Fees/Cr Hr - Undergrad</td>
<td><strong>$100.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$103.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>In-service Fees/Cr Hr - Grad</td>
<td><strong>$121.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$125.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>New Student Orientation Fee</td>
<td><strong>$160.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$175.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Self-Support Program Fees:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Business &amp; Accountancy: Twin Falls</td>
<td>$275.00</td>
<td>$286.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Master of Social Work: Twin Falls &amp; N.I.</td>
<td>$330.00</td>
<td>$380.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Bachelor of Criminal Justice: Twin Falls</td>
<td>$265.00</td>
<td>$275.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Bachelor of Social Work: Twin Falls</td>
<td>$265.00</td>
<td>$275.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Executive MBA</td>
<td>$1,117.50</td>
<td>$1,215.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td><strong>Changes to Student Activity Fees:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Full-time:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>$220.20</td>
<td>$230.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Campus Recreation</td>
<td><strong>$91.50</strong></td>
<td><strong>$103.50</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Marching Band</td>
<td>$22.30</td>
<td>$24.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Spirit Squad</td>
<td><strong>9.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Student Research (new)</td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>10.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Student ePortfolio (new)</td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>16.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td><strong>Part-time:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td><strong>$10.75</strong></td>
<td><strong>$11.35</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Campus Recreation</td>
<td><strong>$4.52</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5.12</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Marching Band</td>
<td><strong>$1.30</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1.30</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Spirit Squad</td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Student Research (new)</td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Student ePortfolio (new)</td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Student Health Insurance Premium</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*"Full Time" - useful term for Financial Aid - Fin. Aid eligibility for 12+ credits
For Tuition/Fee paying purposes, Boise State is moving to a more linear cost basis, with the intent to eventually be entirely on a per credit basis."
## Potential Student Fee Revenue Changes for FY 2015

Due to Enrollment and Fee Changes

### Projected HCSCH Count Changes due to Count Fee Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Fees:</th>
<th>FY14</th>
<th>FY15</th>
<th>Gen Educ</th>
<th>Local</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Fees:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Tuition (Unrestricted)</td>
<td>13,326</td>
<td>8,931</td>
<td>($18,938,900)</td>
<td>$3,101,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Technology Fee</td>
<td>13,326</td>
<td>8,931</td>
<td>(815,300)</td>
<td>116,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Facilities Fees</td>
<td>13,326</td>
<td>8,931</td>
<td>(4,685,100)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Student Activity Fees</td>
<td>13,326</td>
<td>8,931</td>
<td>(3,214,100)</td>
<td>211,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Full-time Fees | ($18,938,900) | (8,714,500) | 3,101,700 | 327,800 |

| Part-time Credit Hour Fees: |      |      |          |       |
| 5. Education Fee | 60,890 | 139,580 | $13,082,200 | $418,700 |
| 6. Technology Fee | 60,890 | 139,580 | 743,600 | - |
| 7. Facilities Fees | 60,890 | 139,580 | 3,903,000 | - |
| 8. Student Activity Fees | 60,890 | 139,580 | 2,730,500 | 139,600 |

| Total Part-time Cr Hr Fees: | $13,082,200 | 7,377,100 | 418,700 | 139,600 |

| Summer Fees: |      |      |          |       |
| 9. Education Fee | 31,103 | 30,795 | ($52,500) | 215,600 |
| 10. Technology Fee | 31,103 | 30,795 | (2,900) | - |
| 11. Facilities Fees | 31,103 | 30,795 | (15,300) | (40,000) |
| 12. Student Activity Fees | 31,103 | 30,795 | (6,900) | 64,700 |

| Total Summer Fees: | ($52,500) | (25,100) | 215,600 | 30,900 |

| Other Student Fees: |      |      |          |       |
| 13. Graduate Fees: |      |      |          |       |
| 14. Full-time Grad/Prof | 566 | 560 | $16,000 | $25,500 |
| 15. Part-time Graduate/Hour | 6,803 | 5,600 | (77,000) | 16,800 |
| 16. Nonresident Tuition: |      |      |          |       |
| 17. Nonres Tuition - full-time | 1,482 | 2,180 | 8,794,800 | 549,400 |
| 18. Nonres Fees - part-time | 1,938 | 3,119 | 132,300 | 274,500 |
| 19. Professional Fees: |      |      |          |       |
| 20. Undergrad. Nursing - Con't Students | 265 | 265 | - | - |
| 21. Undergrad. Nursing - New Students | 65 | 65 | - | - |
| 22. Other Fees: |      |      |          |       |
| 23. Western Undergrad Exchge | 185 | 185 | - | 35,500 |
| 24. Overload Fee | 1,750 | 1,750 | - | - |
| 25. In-service Fees/Cr Hr - Undergrad | - | - | - | - |
| 26. In-service Fees/Cr Hr - Grad | 2,050 | 2,050 | 17,600 | - |
| 27. New Student Orientation Fee | 2,770 | 2,880 | - | 43,200 |

| Total Other Student Fees | $8,866,100 | - | $901,700 | - |

| Total Additional Student Fee Revenue | $2,956,900 | ($1,362,500) | $4,637,700 | $498,300 |

### Potential Revenue Generated

| 1) Changes to Student Activity Fees: |      |      |          |       |
| 2. Full-time: |      |      |          |       |
| 3. Athletics | 13,326 | 8,931 | (967,800) | 53,600 |
| 4. Theater Arts | 13,326 | 8,931 | (402,100) | 107,200 |
| 5. Music - New | 13,326 | 8,931 | (98,000) | 15,200 |
| 6. University Fellows - New | 13,326 | 8,931 | (39,600) | 35,700 |
| 7. Career Center - New | 13,326 | 8,931 | - | - |

| Total | (1,507,500) | - | 211,700 |

| 8. Part-time: |      |      |          |       |
| 9. Athletics | 60,890 | 139,580 | 845,900 | - |
| 10. Theater Arts | 60,890 | 139,580 | 355,700 | 69,800 |
| 11. Music - New | 60,890 | 139,580 | 102,300 | - |
| 12. University Fellows - New | 60,890 | 139,580 | - | 69,800 |

| Total | 1,303,900 | 139,600 |

### Notes:

1. Flat overall enrollment number - budget to budget
2. A change in the plateau from 12-17 credits to 13-17 credits
3. An anticipated change in students behavior to enroll in the plateau range rather than staying @ 12 credits -- no change in behavior occurred.
4. Non Resident enrollment adjusted -- NR FT waivers are included as the HC is a net fee paying students
5. Assuming no significant enrollment behavior change due to further linear adjustment
6. Generally flat enrollment projected compared to Fall 2013 numbers

---
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## BOISE STATE UNIVERSITY

**4-year History of Board Approved Fees plus FY15 Requested Fees**

### Annual Full-Time Fees and Part-Time Credit Hours Fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Fees:</th>
<th>FY 2011</th>
<th>FY 2012</th>
<th>FY 2013</th>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>Request FY 2015</th>
<th>4-Year Increase</th>
<th>% Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Full-time Fees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Tuition (Unrestricted)</td>
<td>$3,555.10</td>
<td>$3,724.10</td>
<td>$3,990.60</td>
<td>$4,309.20</td>
<td>$4,656.50</td>
<td>$1,101.40</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Technology Fee</td>
<td>100.50</td>
<td>134.50</td>
<td>149.50</td>
<td>185.50</td>
<td>198.50</td>
<td>98.00</td>
<td>97.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Facilities Fees</td>
<td>1,006.00</td>
<td>1,010.00</td>
<td>1,030.00</td>
<td>1,066.00</td>
<td>1,066.00</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Student Activity Fees</td>
<td>638.40</td>
<td>697.40</td>
<td>713.90</td>
<td>731.30</td>
<td>755.00</td>
<td>116.60</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Total Full-time Fees
- $5,300.00
- $5,566.00
- $5,884.00
- $6,292.00
- $6,676.00
- $1,376.00
- 26.0%

| Percentage Increase | 9.0% | 5.0% | 5.0% | 5.7% | 6.1% |

| **2. Part-time Credit Hour Fees** |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| Education Fee | $148.72 | $151.22 | $160.47 | $166.25 | $169.25 | $20.53 | 13.8%      |
| Technology Fee | 5.15 | 6.65 | 8.65 | 9.45 | 9.45 | 4.30 | 0.0%      |
| Facilities Fees | 48.40 | 50.40 | 49.50 | 49.70 | 49.60 | 1.20 | 0.0%      |
| Student Activity Fees | 29.73 | 30.73 | 33.48 | 34.70 | 35.70 | 5.97 | 18.3%     |

#### Total Part-time Credit Hours Fees
- $232.00
- $239.00
- $252.00
- $260.00
- $264.00
- $32.00
- 13.8%

| **3. Summer Fees** |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| Education Fee | $167.07 | $160.07 | $164.97 | $170.60 | $177.60 | $10.53 | 6.3%      |
| Technology Fee | 5.40 | 6.90 | 8.65 | 9.45 | 9.65 | 4.25 | 78.7%     |
| Facilities Fees | 48.40 | 50.40 | 49.50 | 49.70 | 49.60 | 1.20 | 0.0%      |
| Student Activity Fees | 21.13 | 21.63 | 21.88 | 22.25 | 24.35 | 3.22 | 15.2%     |

#### Total Summer Fees
- $242.00
- $239.00
- $245.00
- $252.00
- $260.00
- $18.00
- 7.4%

| **4. Other Student Fees** |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| Graduate Fees: | $900.00 | $990.00 | $1,089.00 | $1,140.00 | $1,184.00 | $284.00 | 31.6%     |
| Part-time Graduate/Hour | $50.00 | $55.00 | $60.50 | $64.00 | $67.00 | $17.00 | 34.0%     |
| Nonresident Tuition: | $9,456.00 | $10,400.00 | $11,440.00 | $12,600.00 | $12,852.00 | $3,396.00 | 35.9%      |
| Nonresident Tuition - Part Time | $84.00 | $92.00 | $101.20 | $112.00 | $200.00 | $116.00 | 138.1%     |
| Professional Fees: |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| Undergrad. Nursing - Con't Students | $200.00 | $200.00 | $200.00 | $200.00 | $200.00 | $0.00 | 0.0%      |
| Undergrad. Nursing - New Students | $850.00 | $850.00 | $850.00 | $850.00 | $850.00 | $0.00 | 0.0%      |
| Self-Support Program Fees: |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| Business & Accountancy: Twin Falls | $275.00 | $275.00 | $275.00 | $275.00 | $286.00 | $11.00 | 4.0%      |
| Master of Social Work: Twin Falls & N.I. | $330.00 | $330.00 | $330.00 | $330.00 | $380.00 | $50.00 | 15.2%     |
| Bachelor of Criminal Justice: Twin Falls | $265.00 | $265.00 | $265.00 | $265.00 | $275.00 | $10.00 | 3.8%      |
| Bachelor of Social Work: Twin Falls | $265.00 | $265.00 | $265.00 | $265.00 | $275.00 | $10.00 | 3.8%      |
| Executive MBA | $1,117.50 | $1,117.50 | $1,117.50 | $1,117.50 | $1,215.00 | $97.50 | 8.7%      |
| Other Fees: | $2,650.00 | $2,650.00 | $2,942.00 | $3,146.00 | $3,338.00 | $688.00 | 26.0%     |
| Overload fee | $232.00 | $232.00 | $252.00 | $166.00 | $166.00 | ($66.00) | -28.4%     |
| In-service Fees/Cr Hr - Undergrad | $86.00 | $86.00 | $96.00 | $100.00 | $103.00 | $17.00 | 19.8%     |
| In-service Fees/Cr Hr - Grad | $101.00 | $101.00 | $115.00 | $121.00 | $125.00 | $24.00 | 23.8%     |
| New Student Orientation Fee | $0.00 | $0.00 | $160.00 | $160.00 | $175.00 | New | New |
The Cost of Attendance includes the full tuition and does not reflect a student possibly receiving financial aid, scholarships, or discounts.
Boise State University
Resident Fees, CPI, Per Capita Income, Average Annual Wage
% Increase from Prior Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Resident Fees</th>
<th>Consumer Price Index</th>
<th>Idaho Per Capita Income</th>
<th>Idaho Average Annual Wage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY04</td>
<td>8.95%</td>
<td>2.28%</td>
<td>2.22%</td>
<td>2.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY05</td>
<td>8.27%</td>
<td>2.66%</td>
<td>7.04%</td>
<td>4.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>3.39%</td>
<td>3.61%</td>
<td>3.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY07</td>
<td>7.28%</td>
<td>3.23%</td>
<td>6.90%</td>
<td>5.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>6.16%</td>
<td>2.85%</td>
<td>3.22%</td>
<td>2.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY09</td>
<td>5.03%</td>
<td>3.84%</td>
<td>-0.70%</td>
<td>0.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>5.01%</td>
<td>-0.36%</td>
<td>-3.53%</td>
<td>0.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>8.96%</td>
<td>1.66%</td>
<td>1.05%</td>
<td>2.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY12</td>
<td>5.02%</td>
<td>3.14%</td>
<td>4.37%</td>
<td>1.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY13</td>
<td>5.71%</td>
<td>5.27%</td>
<td>3.10%</td>
<td>0.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY14</td>
<td>6.93%</td>
<td>3.56%</td>
<td>1.76%</td>
<td>1.46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Idaho Commerce and Labor; Bureau of Economic Analysis, U.S. Department of Commerce; Division of Financial Management Economic Forecast, January 2014
New Student Curriculum Fee Request
Boise State University is requesting a $15.00 increase to the New Student Curriculum Fee. If approved, the increase is expected to generate approximately $60,000 annually. The fee was increased from $150 to $160 in the Fall of 2009, and has remained at $160 since that time.

The New Student Curriculum Fee is a one-time fee assessed to all first-time, undergraduate, degree-seeking students taking classes at Boise State’s main campus. The fee revenue partially supports the operations of the New Student and Family Programs office. It provides direct funding for the coordination and implementation of orientation programs to support the transition of new students and their families to the Boise State community through two day BroncoVenture Orientation for traditional aged students, orientation sessions for transfer and non-traditional aged students, a long-distance orientation program, orientation for international students, Convocation, Campus Read materials, Family and Parent outreach, the Parent & Family Association, and Parent & Family Weekend.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summer 2013 Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orientation Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent &amp; Family Weekend</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification and Use of Funds
Five dollars of the proposed increase will be used to enhance and expand targeted orientation programs:
- Improve the transfer student transition experience for the increased number of transfer students enrolling at Boise State through improved targeted orientation programming ($5,000);
- Create new high ability student outreach and programming ($5,000); and
- Increase orientation attendance for all new student populations, which increases yield of freshmen and transfer students enrolling at Boise State ($10,000).

Ten dollars of the proposed increase will be dedicated to implementing Boise State’s mandatory alcohol and drug education programming in response to the State Board of Education’s Substance Abuse Safety Action Plan. These funds will focus on mandatory alcohol education, off-campus student conduct code, information for parents, and fraternity and sorority recognition. The funds will be used to support the action plan:
- Electronic Education focusing on alcohol, marijuana, and sexual assault prevention and interventions ($20,000 subscription);
- Administrative support and overhead to implement and manage the action plan ($20,000).
The following are the Boise State Self-Support programs requesting increases to the existing rates. Most programs have not had an increase in several years. In addition, all self-support programs are required to cover the rising employer share of health care costs (a 15% increase) as well as the state mandated 2% CEC.

Business and Accountancy – Twin Falls

This program currently charges $275/credit and is proposing an increase of 4% to bring the per credit fee to $286. Enrollments are projected to be flat compared to FY 2014. The additional revenue from the fee change will be used to assist with hiring a Lecturer in Twin Falls. The Lecturer in Twin Falls will provide a consistent faculty presence there, as well as help meet accreditation standards.

Master of Social Work – Twin Falls and North Idaho

This program currently charges $330/credit and is proposing a 15% increase to bring the per credit fee to $380. Enrollments are projected to be flat compared to FY 2014. The proposed increase is necessary to ensure operating revenues are adequate to cover the anticipated expenditures for the fixed expenses. This program has evaluated competitor pricing and determined at the rate of $380 per credit it will remain an excellent value to Idaho students.

Bachelor of Criminal Justice – Twin Falls

This program currently charges $265/credit and is proposing an increase of 4% to bring the per credit fee to $275. The credit hours produced are expected to increase by 16% for the next academic year. Additional revenues from this increase ($4,200 for the year) will be reinvested in student support, academic advising, and dedicated faculty.

Bachelor of Social Work – Twin Falls

This program currently charges $265/credit and is proposing an increase of 4% to bring the per credit fee to $275. Enrollments are expected to remain stable at 300 credits per year. This increase is required to meet the cost of delivering the program in Twin Falls. The annual revenue generated from this fee change is estimated to be $3,000.

Executive MBA Program

This program currently charges $1,117.50/credit and is proposing an increase of 9% to bring the fee to $1,215/credit. The projected credit hours produced are expected to increase by 14% for the 2014/2015 academic year. The additional revenues associated with the fee increase are needed to cover rising costs due to the 2% CEC and the fixed cost of health care increase as well as rising overhead costs. The last tuition increase was fall 2011.
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Proposed Changes to Student Fees

Our recommendation for tuition and fee increases was developed by our Special Budget Consultation Committee (SBCC) which reviews all unit budget recommendations and the proposed university-wide budget. The SBCC has a diversified membership consisting of faculty, staff, and students. Both the President and Vice President of the ISU student body (ASISU) actively serve on the SBCC. The public hearings to seek testimony on the fee increases, as published in the Bengal student newspaper, were held at the Idaho Falls, Meridian and Pocatello campus Feb. 24th & 25th. The Vice President of Finance & Administration, Budget Officer, and members of the Special Budget Consultation Committee were present to answer questions.

Changes to Fees

The attached worksheet, which estimates potential tuition and fee revenue changes for FY2015, is predicated on the fee rates contained in the ISU Notice of Intent to Adopt Student Fee and Rate Increases, which was issued on February 14, 2014.

**Matriculation and Other General Education Fees**  $4,288,000.

As with previous years, student tuition and fee revenue is a necessary component of the University’s total revenue required for ongoing operations. The rate increase will provide ongoing funding for institutional priorities in relation to our strategic plan:

1. Health Insurance Increase (no fund shift)  $542,400
2. CEC & Bonus (no fund shift)  $551,400
3. EWA reduction offset by non-resident fee  $562,500
4. Student Career Path Internship (CPI) Expansion  $500,000
5. Student Financial Aid  $500,000
6. Security (SB1254) and other critical needs to be addressed in the SBCC budget recommendation process  $1,631,700

**Additional Information**

1) What could be the impact of approving a fee increase at a level less than requested (e.g. cap enrollment, reduce programmatic offerings, etc.)?

The student tuition and fee increase is only one part of the potential budget solution for ISU. If tuition & fees are not approved at the requested level, additional services for faculty, staff and students would have to be decommitted.
3) How has the FY2015 appropriation affected your fee request?

JFAC removed $562,500 from ISU’s budget. This was the FY 2015 calculated amount for EWA that was not included in the budget request (per guidance from DFM and LSO). Fee revenue (non-resident fees) will be allocated to offset this decrease.

Higher Education did not receive the “fund shift” for personnel costs associated with the health insurance and salary increases approved by the Legislature. The fiscal impact totals $1,093,800 which equates to a tuition increase of approximately 1.5%.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Fees:</th>
<th>Bd FY14</th>
<th>FY14 Fees</th>
<th>Initial Notice FY15</th>
<th>FY15 Fees</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>% Chg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full-time Fees:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Tuition</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>$4,687.02</td>
<td>$4,909.02</td>
<td>$4,909.02</td>
<td>$222.00</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Technology Fee</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>166.80</td>
<td>166.80</td>
<td>166.80</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Facilities Fees</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>510.00</td>
<td>510.00</td>
<td>510.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Student Activity Fees</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>980.18</td>
<td>980.18</td>
<td>980.18</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Full-time Fees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,344.00</td>
<td>$6,566.00</td>
<td>$6,566.00</td>
<td>$222.00</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part-time Credit Hour Fees:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Education Fee</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>$268.96</td>
<td>$279.96</td>
<td>$279.96</td>
<td>$11.00</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Technology Fee</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Facilities Fees</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Student Activity Fees</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>41.89</td>
<td>41.89</td>
<td>41.89</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Part-time Cr Hr Fees:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$317.00</td>
<td>$328.00</td>
<td>$328.00</td>
<td>$11.00</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Student Fees:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Graduate Fees:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Full-time Grad/Prof</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>$1,128.00</td>
<td>$1,168.00</td>
<td>$1,168.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Part-time Graduate/Hour</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>$57.00</td>
<td>$59.00</td>
<td>$59.00</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Nonresident Tuition:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Nonres Tuition</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>$12,332.00</td>
<td>$12,760.00</td>
<td>$12,760.00</td>
<td>$428.00</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Part-time Nonres Tuition</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
<td>$207.00</td>
<td>$207.00</td>
<td>$7.00</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Professional Fees:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 PharmD - Resident</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>$9,460.00</td>
<td>$9,678.00</td>
<td>$9,678.00</td>
<td>$218.00</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 PharmD - Nonres</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>$14,200.00</td>
<td>$14,418.00</td>
<td>$14,418.00</td>
<td>$218.00</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Phys Therapy - Resident</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>$2,640.00</td>
<td>$2,714.00</td>
<td>$2,714.00</td>
<td>$74.00</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Phys Therapy - Nonres</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>$7,516.00</td>
<td>$7,726.00</td>
<td>$7,726.00</td>
<td>$210.00</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Occu Therapy - Resident</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>$2,294.00</td>
<td>$2,320.00</td>
<td>$2,320.00</td>
<td>$26.00</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Occu Therapy - Nonres</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>$6,776.00</td>
<td>$6,850.00</td>
<td>$6,850.00</td>
<td>$74.00</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Physician Assistant - Resident</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>$18,528.00</td>
<td>$19,035.00</td>
<td>$19,035.00</td>
<td>$507.00</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Physician Assistant - Nonres</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>$20,613.00</td>
<td>$20,813.00</td>
<td>$20,813.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Nursing-BSN</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>$1,672.00</td>
<td>$1,722.00</td>
<td>$1,722.00</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Nursing-MSN</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>$2,034.00</td>
<td>$2,049.00</td>
<td>$2,049.00</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Nursing-PhD</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>$2,040.00</td>
<td>$2,102.00</td>
<td>$2,102.00</td>
<td>$62.00</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Nursing-DNP</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>$3,856.00</td>
<td>$3,766.00</td>
<td>$3,766.00</td>
<td>$110.00</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Speech Language Path MS (Cr Hr)</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$51.00</td>
<td>$51.00</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Speech Language Online PreProf (C)</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>$196.00</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 Speech Language Online MS (Cr Hr)</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>$424.00</td>
<td>$432.00</td>
<td>$432.00</td>
<td>$8.00</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 Audiology AuD (Cr Hr)</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$51.00</td>
<td>$51.00</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 Dental Hygiene BS (Junior/Senior)</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>$556.00</td>
<td>$576.00</td>
<td>$576.00</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Dental Hygiene MS-Didactic (Cr Hr)</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>$85.00</td>
<td>$89.00</td>
<td>$89.00</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 Dental Hygiene MS-Clinical (Cr Hr)</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>$337.00</td>
<td>$349.00</td>
<td>$349.00</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 Dental Hygiene MS-Thesis (Cr Hr)</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>$170.00</td>
<td>$176.00</td>
<td>$176.00</td>
<td>$6.00</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 Counseling-Graduate</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>$900.00</td>
<td>$932.00</td>
<td>$932.00</td>
<td>$32.00</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 Radiographic Science</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>$800.00</td>
<td>$824.00</td>
<td>$824.00</td>
<td>$24.00</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 Clinical Lab Science</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>$940.00</td>
<td>$940.00</td>
<td>$940.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 Paramedic Science (Note A)</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>$1,300.00</td>
<td>$1,312.00</td>
<td>$1,312.00</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 Dietetics</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>$2,700.00</td>
<td>$2,700.00</td>
<td>$2,700.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 Social Work</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 Athletic Training MS</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Idaho Dental Education (IDEP)</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>$24,254.00</td>
<td>$26,000.00</td>
<td>$25,020.00</td>
<td>$766.00</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Fees:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 Western Undergrad Exchge</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>$3,172.00</td>
<td>$3,283.00</td>
<td>$3,283.00</td>
<td>$111.00</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 In-service Fees/Cr Hr - Undergrad</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$103.00</td>
<td>$103.00</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 In-service Fees/Cr Hr - Grad</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>$121.00</td>
<td>$125.00</td>
<td>$125.00</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 New Student Orientation Fee</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Changes to Student Activity Fees:

- Full-time:
- Part-time:

Note A: Board approved professional fee June 2011

The Full-time fee & Part-time credit hour fee are effective Fall Semester 2014. Summer session fees are at the Part-time fee rate - effective Summer 2015.
### Potential Student Fee Revenue Changes for FY 15
Due to Enrollment and Fee Changes

#### Student Fees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY14</th>
<th>FY15</th>
<th>Gen Educ</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Gen Educ</th>
<th>Local</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tuition</strong></td>
<td>8,340</td>
<td>7,920</td>
<td>($1,968,500)</td>
<td>$1,758,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technology Fee</strong></td>
<td>8,340</td>
<td>7,920</td>
<td>(70,100)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facilities Fees</strong></td>
<td>8,340</td>
<td>7,920</td>
<td>(214,200)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Activity Fees</strong></td>
<td>8,340</td>
<td>7,920</td>
<td>(411,700)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Full-time Fees</strong></td>
<td>8,340</td>
<td>7,920</td>
<td>($1,968,500)</td>
<td>($696,000)</td>
<td>$1,758,200</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Part-time Credit Hour Fees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY14</th>
<th>FY15</th>
<th>Gen Educ</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Gen Educ</th>
<th>Local</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tuition</strong></td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>46,000</td>
<td>($537,900)</td>
<td>$506,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technology Fee</strong></td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>46,000</td>
<td>(12,300)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facilities Fees</strong></td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>46,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Activity Fees</strong></td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>46,000</td>
<td>(83,800)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Part-time Cr Hr Fees</strong></td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>46,000</td>
<td>($537,900)</td>
<td>($96,100)</td>
<td>$506,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Other Student Fees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY14</th>
<th>FY15</th>
<th>Gen Educ</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Gen Educ</th>
<th>Local</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Graduate Fees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Grad/Prof</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>926</td>
<td>$124,500</td>
<td>$37,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time Graduate/Hour</td>
<td>6,543</td>
<td>6,345</td>
<td>(11,300)</td>
<td>12,700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresident Tuition:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonres Tuition</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1125</td>
<td>3,853,800</td>
<td>$481,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time Nonres Tuition</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Fees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PharmD - Resident</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>(85,100)</td>
<td>55,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PharmD - Nonres</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>127,800</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phys Therapy - Resident</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>(7,900)</td>
<td>3,900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phys Therapy - Nonres</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>(37,600)</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occu Therapy - Resident</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occu Therapy - Nonres</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>61,000</td>
<td>900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physician Assistant - Resident</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>(555,800)</td>
<td>40,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physician Assistant - Nonres</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>618,400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing-BSN</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>33,400</td>
<td>11,900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing-MSN</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing-PhD</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(4,100)</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing-DNP</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>(3,700)</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Language Path MS (Cr Hr)</td>
<td>1,080</td>
<td>1,708</td>
<td>31,400</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Language Online PreProf</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>2,106</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>8,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Language Online MS (Cr Hr)</td>
<td>1,155</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>(204,400)</td>
<td>5,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audiology AuD (Cr Hr)</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>20,500</td>
<td>600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental Hygiene BS (Junior/Senior)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental Hygiene MS-Didactic (Cr Hr)</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental Hygiene MS-Clinical (Cr Hr)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental Hygiene MS-Thesis (Cr Hr)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>6,800</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling-Graduate</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radiographic Science</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Lab Science</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>16,900</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paramedic Science</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dietetics</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho Dental Education (IDEP)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Fees:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Undergrad Exchge</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-service Fees/Cr Hr - Undergrad</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-service Fees/Cr Hr - Grad</td>
<td>6,600</td>
<td>6,600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Student Orientation Fee</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Other Student Fees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,967,000</td>
<td>$21,500</td>
<td>$583,000</td>
<td>$152,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Total Additional Student Fee Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY14</th>
<th>FY15</th>
<th>Gen Educ</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Gen Educ</th>
<th>Local</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tuition</strong></td>
<td>8,340</td>
<td>7,920</td>
<td>($1,968,500)</td>
<td>$1,758,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technology Fee</strong></td>
<td>8,340</td>
<td>7,920</td>
<td>(70,100)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facilities Fees</strong></td>
<td>8,340</td>
<td>7,920</td>
<td>(214,200)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Activity Fees</strong></td>
<td>8,340</td>
<td>7,920</td>
<td>(411,700)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Full-time Fees</strong></td>
<td>8,340</td>
<td>7,920</td>
<td>($1,968,500)</td>
<td>($696,000)</td>
<td>$1,758,200</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Changes to Student Activity Fees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY14</th>
<th>FY15</th>
<th>Gen Educ</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Gen Educ</th>
<th>Local</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intramurals/Recreation/Locker</td>
<td>8,340</td>
<td>7,920</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intramurals/Recreation/Locker</td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>46,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

The Full-time fee & Part-time credit hour fee are effective Fall Semester 2014. Summer session fees are at the Part-time fee rate - effective Summer 2015.
### Student Fees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2011</th>
<th>FY 2012</th>
<th>FY 2013</th>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>Request FY 2015</th>
<th>4-Year Increase</th>
<th>% Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full-time Fees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition (Unrestricted)</td>
<td>$3,799.52</td>
<td>$4,179.52</td>
<td>$4,417.02</td>
<td>$4,687.02</td>
<td>$4,909.02</td>
<td>$1,109.50</td>
<td>29.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Fee</td>
<td>166.80</td>
<td>166.80</td>
<td>166.80</td>
<td>166.80</td>
<td>166.80</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Fees</td>
<td>486.00</td>
<td>486.00</td>
<td>510.00</td>
<td>510.00</td>
<td>510.00</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>4.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Activity Fees</td>
<td>983.68</td>
<td>983.68</td>
<td>983.68</td>
<td>983.68</td>
<td>983.68</td>
<td>16.50</td>
<td>1.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Full-time Fees</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,416.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,796.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,070.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,344.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,566.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,150.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>21.23%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Increase</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part-time Credit Hour Fees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Fee</td>
<td>$231.45</td>
<td>$248.45</td>
<td>$256.19</td>
<td>$268.96</td>
<td>$279.96</td>
<td>$48.51</td>
<td>20.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Fee</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Fees</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Activity Fees</td>
<td>35.40</td>
<td>35.40</td>
<td>41.66</td>
<td>41.89</td>
<td>41.89</td>
<td>6.49</td>
<td>18.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Part-time Cr Hr Fees</strong></td>
<td><strong>$273.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$290.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$304.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$317.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$328.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$55.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>20.15%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other Student Fees:

| Graduate Fees:         |                  |                  |                  |                  |                |                |            |
| PharmD - Resident      | $7,858.00        | $8,706.00        | $9,094.00        | $9,460.00        | $9,678.00      | $1,820.00      | 23.16%     |
| PharmD - Nonres        | $12,386.00       | $13,234.00       | $13,630.00       | $14,200.00       | $14,480.00     | $2,032.00      | 16.41%     |
| Phys Therapy - Resident| $1,960.00        | $2,270.00        | $2,380.00        | $2,640.00        | $2,714.00      | $754.00        | 38.47%     |
| Phys Therapy - Nonres  | $6,776.00        | $6,776.00        | $6,776.00        | $6,776.00        | $6,776.00      | $776.00        | 1.09%      |
| Occu Therapy - Resident| $1,960.00        | $1,960.00        | $1,960.00        | $2,294.00        | $2,320.00      | $360.00        | 18.37%     |
| Occu Therapy - Nonres  | $6,776.00        | $6,776.00        | $6,776.00        | $6,776.00        | $6,776.00      | $740.00        | 10.99%     |
| Physician Assistant - Res | $17,814.00      | $17,814.00       | $17,814.00       | $18,528.00       | $19,035.00     | $1,221.00      | 6.85%      |
| Physician Assistant - Nonres | $19,821.00      | $19,821.00       | $19,821.00       | $20,613.00       | $20,613.00     | $792.00        | 4.00%      |
| Nonres Tuition         | $10,500.00       | $11,236.00       | $11,800.00       | $12,332.00       | $12,760.00     | $2,260.00      | 21.52%     |
| Part-time Nonres Tuition | $150.00          | $161.00          | $190.00          | $200.00          | $207.00        | $57.00         | 38.00%     |
| **Professional Fees:** |                  |                  |                  |                  |                |                |            |
| PharmD - Resident      | $7,858.00        | $8,706.00        | $9,094.00        | $9,460.00        | $9,678.00      | $1,820.00      | 23.16%     |
| PharmD - Nonres        | $12,386.00       | $13,234.00       | $13,630.00       | $14,200.00       | $14,480.00     | $2,032.00      | 16.41%     |
| Phys Therapy - Resident| $1,960.00        | $2,270.00        | $2,380.00        | $2,640.00        | $2,714.00      | $754.00        | 38.47%     |
| Phys Therapy - Nonres  | $6,776.00        | $6,776.00        | $6,776.00        | $6,776.00        | $6,776.00      | $776.00        | 1.09%      |
| Occu Therapy - Resident| $1,960.00        | $1,960.00        | $1,960.00        | $2,294.00        | $2,320.00      | $360.00        | 18.37%     |
| Occu Therapy - Nonres  | $6,776.00        | $6,776.00        | $6,776.00        | $6,776.00        | $6,776.00      | $740.00        | 10.99%     |
| Physician Assistant - Res | $17,814.00      | $17,814.00       | $17,814.00       | $18,528.00       | $19,035.00     | $1,221.00      | 6.85%      |
| Physician Assistant - Nonres | $19,821.00      | $19,821.00       | $19,821.00       | $20,613.00       | $20,613.00     | $792.00        | 4.00%      |
| Nonres Tuition         | $10,500.00       | $11,236.00       | $11,800.00       | $12,332.00       | $12,760.00     | $2,260.00      | 21.52%     |
| Part-time Nonres Tuition | $150.00          | $161.00          | $190.00          | $200.00          | $207.00        | $57.00         | 38.00%     |
| **Other Fees:**        |                  |                  |                  |                  |                |                |            |
| Western Undergrad Exchge | $2,708.00        | $2,898.00        | $3,035.00        | $3,172.00        | $3,283.00      | $575.00        | 21.23%     |
| In-service Fees/Cr Hr - Undergrad | $86.00      | $92.00           | $96.00           | $100.00          | $103.00        | $17.00         | 19.77%     |
| In-service Fees/Cr Hr - Grad | $101.00         | $108.00          | $115.00          | $121.00          | $125.00        | $24.00         | 23.76%     |
| New Student Orientation Fee | $0.00           | $0.00            | $100.00          | $100.00          | $100.00        | New            | New        |

### 4-year History of Board Approved Fees plus FY15 Requested Fees

**Annual Full-Time Fees and Part-Time Credit Hours Fees**
Idaho State University
Resident Fees, CPI, Per Capita Income, Average Annual Wage
% Increase from Prior Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Resident Fees</th>
<th>Consumer Price Index</th>
<th>Idaho Per Capita Income</th>
<th>Idaho Average Annual Wage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY04</td>
<td>9.95%</td>
<td>2.28%</td>
<td>2.22%</td>
<td>2.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY05</td>
<td>7.31%</td>
<td>2.66%</td>
<td>7.04%</td>
<td>4.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>8.11%</td>
<td>3.39%</td>
<td>3.61%</td>
<td>3.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY07</td>
<td>4.75%</td>
<td>3.23%</td>
<td>6.90%</td>
<td>5.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>5.01%</td>
<td>2.85%</td>
<td>3.22%</td>
<td>2.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY09</td>
<td>6.00%</td>
<td>3.84%</td>
<td>-0.70%</td>
<td>0.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>6.52%</td>
<td>-0.36%</td>
<td>-3.53%</td>
<td>0.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>9.02%</td>
<td>1.66%</td>
<td>1.05%</td>
<td>2.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY12</td>
<td>7.02%</td>
<td>3.14%</td>
<td>4.37%</td>
<td>1.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY13</td>
<td>4.73%</td>
<td>5.27%</td>
<td>3.10%</td>
<td>0.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY14</td>
<td>4.51%</td>
<td>3.56%</td>
<td>1.76%</td>
<td>1.46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Idaho Commerce and Labor; Bureau of Economic Analysis, U.S. Department of Commerce; Division of Financial Management Economic Forecast, January 2014
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Tuition & Fees Hearing Summary

Proposed Changes to Student Fees

Eastern Idaho Technical College is proposing a 6.3% increase to the full-time resident and non-resident student enrollment fees effective Fall Semester 2014. Similarly, the College is proposing to increase the part-time resident and part-time non-resident enrollment fees by 3.1% as part of the College financial plan. Further, the proposed student enrollment fee increases will generate approximately $55,000. The College proposes to use the additional revenue to be distributed between the Institutional Development, Parking, Professional-Technical Education, Registration, Student Body, and Technology Fees to enhance educational support.
### Eastern Idaho Technical College

**Changes to Student Fees for FY 2015**

#### Annual Full-Time Fees and Part-Time Credit Hour Fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bd</th>
<th>FY14 Fees</th>
<th>FY15 Initial Notice Fees</th>
<th>FY15 Fees</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>% Chg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>Full-time Fees:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Vocational Education Fee</td>
<td>$1,440.00</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Technology Fee</td>
<td>244.00</td>
<td>250.00</td>
<td>250.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Student Activity Fees 1)</td>
<td><strong>438.00</strong></td>
<td>506.00</td>
<td>506.00</td>
<td>68.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><strong>Total Full-time Fees</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,122.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,256.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,256.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$134.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td><strong>Part-time Credit Hour Fees:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Education Fee</td>
<td><strong>$96.50</strong></td>
<td><strong>$99.50</strong></td>
<td><strong>$99.50</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td><strong>Total Part-time Cr Hr Fees:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$96.50</strong></td>
<td><strong>$99.50</strong></td>
<td><strong>$99.50</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td><strong>Additional Nonresident Tuition:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Full-time Nonresident Tuition</td>
<td><strong>$5,650.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,006.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,006.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$356.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Part-time Nonresident Tuition/Cr</td>
<td><strong>$96.50</strong></td>
<td><strong>$99.50</strong></td>
<td><strong>$99.50</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1) Changes to Student Activity Fees:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Full-time:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Bookstore</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Institutional Development</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$34.00</td>
<td>$34.00</td>
<td>$14.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>$158.00</td>
<td>$158.00</td>
<td>$158.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Registration</td>
<td>$98.00</td>
<td>$122.00</td>
<td>$122.00</td>
<td>$24.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Scholarship</td>
<td>$62.00</td>
<td>$62.00</td>
<td>$62.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Student Body</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Student Union</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$438.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$506.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$506.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$68.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Potential Student Fee Revenue Changes for FY 2015

### Due to Enrollment and Fee Changes

**Projected HC/SCH Count Changes due to Count Fee Changes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projected HC/SCH Count</th>
<th>FY14</th>
<th>FY15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual Fees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Full-time Fees:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Vocational Education Fee</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Technology Fee</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Student Activity Fees 1)</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Full-time Fees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Part-time Credit Hour Fees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part-time Credit Hour Fees:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 Education Fee</td>
<td>5,782</td>
<td>5,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Part-time Cr Hr Fees:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other Student Fees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Student Fees:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 Full-time Nonresident Tuition</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Part-time Nonresident Tuition/</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Other Student Fees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Additional Student Fee Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Additional Student Fee Revenue</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>($20,200)</strong></td>
<td>($10,600)</td>
<td>$38,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Changes to Student Activity Fees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Changes to Student Activity Fees:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21 Bookstore</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Institutional Development</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Library</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Parking</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Registration</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Scholarship</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Student Body</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Student Union</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# EASTERN IDAHO TECHNICAL COLLEGE

4-year History of Board Approved Fees plus FY15 Requested Fees

**Annual Full-Time Fees and Part-Time Credit Hour Fees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Fees</th>
<th>FY 2011</th>
<th>FY 2012</th>
<th>FY 2013</th>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>Increase</th>
<th>4-year Increase</th>
<th>% Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full-time Fees:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Vocational Education Fee</td>
<td>$1,326.00</td>
<td>$1,350.00</td>
<td>$1,440.00</td>
<td>$1,440.00</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>$174.00</td>
<td>13.12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Technology Fee</td>
<td>76.00</td>
<td>144.00</td>
<td>144.00</td>
<td>244.00</td>
<td>250.00</td>
<td>174.00</td>
<td>228.95%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Student Activity Fees 1)</td>
<td>438.00</td>
<td>438.00</td>
<td>438.00</td>
<td>438.00</td>
<td>506.00</td>
<td>68.00</td>
<td>15.53%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Full-time Fees</strong></td>
<td>$1,840.00</td>
<td>$1,932.00</td>
<td>$2,022.00</td>
<td>$2,122.00</td>
<td>$2,256.00</td>
<td>$416.00</td>
<td>22.61%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Increase</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part-time Credit Hour Fees:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Education Fee</td>
<td>$86.00</td>
<td>$90.00</td>
<td>$92.00</td>
<td>$96.50</td>
<td>$99.50</td>
<td>$13.50</td>
<td>15.70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Part-time Cr Hr Fees:</strong></td>
<td>$86.00</td>
<td>$90.00</td>
<td>$92.00</td>
<td>$96.50</td>
<td>$99.50</td>
<td>$13.50</td>
<td>15.70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Nonresident Tuition:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Full-time Nonresident Tuition</td>
<td>$4,900.00</td>
<td>$5,146.00</td>
<td>$5,146.00</td>
<td>$5,650.00</td>
<td>$6,006.00</td>
<td>$1,106.00</td>
<td>22.57%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Part-time Nonresident Tuition/Cr</td>
<td>$86.00</td>
<td>$90.00</td>
<td>$90.00</td>
<td>$96.50</td>
<td>$99.50</td>
<td>$13.50</td>
<td>15.70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Lewis-Clark State College  
Tuition & Fees Proposal

Proposed Changes to Student Fees

Lewis-Clark State College (LCSC) requests approval from the State Board to increase tuition and fees by two percent (2.0%) to sustain essential operations in FY2015.

The intent of the requested increase is to cover the portion of increased employee benefit and CEC costs for FY2015 which (in the absence of a fund shift to the General Fund) were apportioned to LCSC tuition by the Legislature in the 2014 session. LCSC’s request is the smallest annual fee request by any four-year institution going back at least to FY2001. The request for FY2015 is being limited to 2.0% in order to cushion the impact of tuition costs on access for our students and their families with limited economic means.

General Fund support for critical Maintenance of Current Operation (MCO) items (inflation) was not provided in the Legislature’s FY2015 appropriation. LCSC’s appropriation leaves a gap of $213,300 to cover the increased annual cost for employee benefits and a $89,000 gap to cover the Legislature’s approved CEC increase. The total General Fund shortfall for these two items is $302,300, equivalent to the revenue that would be generated by a 2% student fee increase.

LCSC is thankful for the receipt of $68,700 for Enrollment Workload Adjustment (EWA) in the FY2015 appropriation, but these funds—which by design cover only a fraction of the actual cost of delivering additional credit hours—are needed to help offset the increased costs of delivering increased student credit hours, and LCSC is still coping with approximately $1M in previously earned, but unfunded, EWA to sustain ongoing operations.

LCSC urgently needs its proportional share of the Legislature’s limited 60%/CCI line item appropriation to provide additional faculty, staff, and advisors to support student success and prepare additional contributors to Idaho’s workforce. In the interest of preserving access for economically-challenged students and their families, we are not asking students to fill the CCI/60% gap through increased student fees in FY2015.

LCSC did not request or receive occupancy cost funding for FY2015 or funding for research or health-related programs. LCSC received no capital project dollars in the FY2015 Permanent Building Fund (PBF) allocation; we will use PBF alteration & repair dollars to help us address ongoing and deferred maintenance needs. Again, we are not asking for a student fee increase, at this time, to help us with this ongoing need.

The predicted additional revenues generated by the requested 2% student fee increase are estimated to be $322,000, assuming that there is no decrease in student enrollment for the upcoming academic year, which would represent a breakout for the past two
years’ enrollment declines which were precipitated by changes in federal financial aid rules and disbursements.

The net impact of LCSC’s 2.0% student fee increase would be an increase of $116 per year ($58 per semester), increasing annual tuition from $5,784 to $5,900. The increased tuition rate remains well below LCSC’s peers and below the WICHE median.

Meanwhile, LCSC has worked hard to control other student costs. We have eliminated application fees, orientation fees, and graduation fees as part of our CCI/60% strategy. We are holding student parking passes at their current level of $5 per year, we have reduced course fees, and we have avoided establishing professional fees. We continue to offer residential housing options as low as $2,560 per year.

**Identify and prioritize specific areas in which revenue from your requested tuition & fee increase will be used.**

Of the projected $322,000 in new revenue generated by the increase, the following allocations are planned:

- $213,300 to cover the mandatory employee benefit cost increase placed on student funds by the Legislature.
- $89,000 to cover the unfunded portion of the Legislature’s approved CEC increase.

**How will fees address improving access, i.e., scholarship opportunities, grants, work/study, etc.?**

A primary focus of the request is to preserve access. LCSC will offer students the opportunity for a highly engaged teaching and learning environment—a small, private school approach at a very reasonable public school price. With an annual resident student tuition rate below $6,000, combined with other low student costs, LCSC is affordable. Coupled with recent increases in scholarships, financially strapped students will have less need of loans, and the most financially challenged students will be able to carry their Pell Grant dollars farther. LCSC’s low fee rates will be coupled with grant, work study, and student success initiatives to help students obtain degrees and certificates and enter productive careers.
# LEWIS-CLARK STATE COLLEGE

## Changes to Student Fees for FY 2015

### Annual Full-Time Fees and Part-Time Credit Hours Fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Fees:</th>
<th>FY14</th>
<th>FY15 Initial Notice</th>
<th>FY15 Fees</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>% Chg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full-time Fees:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Tuition Fee</td>
<td>** $4,560.00</td>
<td>$4,676.00</td>
<td>$4,676.00</td>
<td><strong>116.00</strong></td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Technology Fee</td>
<td>** 70.00</td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Facilities Fees</td>
<td>** 468.00</td>
<td>468.00</td>
<td>468.00</td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Student Activity Fees</td>
<td>** 686.00</td>
<td>686.00</td>
<td>686.00</td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Full-time Fees</strong></td>
<td>$5,784.00</td>
<td>$5,900.00</td>
<td>$5,900.00</td>
<td><strong>116.00</strong></td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part-time Credit Hour Fees:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Education Fee</td>
<td>** $251.00</td>
<td>$257.00</td>
<td>$257.00</td>
<td><strong>6.00</strong></td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Technology Fee</td>
<td>** 4.25</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Facilities Fees</td>
<td>** 13.75</td>
<td>13.75</td>
<td>13.75</td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Student Activity Fees</td>
<td>** 27.00</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Part-time Cr Hr Fees</strong></td>
<td>$296.00</td>
<td>$302.00</td>
<td>$302.00</td>
<td><strong>6.00</strong></td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summer Fees: (eff. Summer 2015)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Education Fee</td>
<td>** $200.00</td>
<td>$205.10</td>
<td>$205.10</td>
<td><strong>5.10</strong></td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Technology Fee</td>
<td>** 4.25</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Facilities Fees</td>
<td>** 13.75</td>
<td>13.75</td>
<td>13.75</td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Student Activity Fees</td>
<td>** 78.00</td>
<td>78.90</td>
<td>78.90</td>
<td><strong>0.90</strong></td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Summer Cr Hr Fees</strong></td>
<td>$296.00</td>
<td>$302.00</td>
<td>$302.00</td>
<td><strong>6.00</strong></td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Student Fees:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Nonres Tuition</td>
<td>** $10,312.00</td>
<td>$10,518.00</td>
<td>$10,518.00</td>
<td><strong>206.00</strong></td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Nonres Tuition-Asotin County</td>
<td>** $3,168.00</td>
<td>$3,232.00</td>
<td>$3,232.00</td>
<td><strong>64.00</strong></td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Professional Fees:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Western Undergrad Exchge</td>
<td>** $2,892.00</td>
<td>$2,950.00</td>
<td>$2,950.00</td>
<td><strong>58.00</strong></td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 In-service Fees/Cr Hr - Undergrad</td>
<td>** $100.00</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$103.00</td>
<td><strong>3.00</strong></td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Overload (20 cr. or more)</td>
<td>** $296.00</td>
<td>$302.00</td>
<td>$302.00</td>
<td><strong>6.00</strong></td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change to Student Activity Fees:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Health Insurance Premium</strong></td>
<td>** $1,960**</td>
<td>** $2,724**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Full-time fees & Part-time credit hour fees are effective Fall Semester 2014.**

**Summer credit hour fees are effective Summer 2015.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY14</th>
<th>FY15</th>
<th>Gen Educ</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Gen Educ</th>
<th>Local</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Fees:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full-time Fees:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matriculation Fee</td>
<td>2,247</td>
<td>2,247</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$260,700</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Fee</td>
<td>2,247</td>
<td>2,247</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Fees</td>
<td>2,247</td>
<td>2,247</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Activity Fees</td>
<td>2,247</td>
<td>2,247</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Full-time Fees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$260,700</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part-time Credit Hour Fees:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Fee</td>
<td>4,905</td>
<td>4,905</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$30,600</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Fee</td>
<td>4,905</td>
<td>4,905</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Fees</td>
<td>4,905</td>
<td>4,905</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Activity Fees</td>
<td>4,905</td>
<td>4,905</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Part-time Cr Hr Fees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$30,600</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summer Credit Hour Fees:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Fee</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$10,700</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Fee</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Fees</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Activity Fees</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Summer Cr Hr Fees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$10,700</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Student Fees:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresident Tuition:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonres Tuition</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$12,400</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonres Tuition-Asotin County</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Fees:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Fees:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Undergrad Exchge</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-service Fees/Cr Hr - Undergrad</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overload (20 cr. or more)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Other Student Fees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Additional Student Fee Revenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$322,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Change to Student Activity Fees:**

None

This schedule of student fee revenue changes calculates potential revenue from the proposed fee increases and the impact of the change in the numbers of students paying fees (net of waivers and discounts, refunds, etc.). The HC/SCH (headcount/student credit hours) columns indicate the estimated change from FY14 to FY15. The Potential Revenue Generated columns estimate the revenue changes resulting from HC/SCH changes and proposed fee increases for budgeting purposes.

Full-time fees & Part-time credit hour fees are effective Fall Semester 2014.
Summer credit hour fees are effective Summer 2015.
**LEWIS-CLARK STATE COLLEGE**  
4-year History of Board Approved Fees plus FY15 Requested Fees  
Annual Full-Time Fees and Part-Time Credit Hours Fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Fees:</th>
<th>FY 2011</th>
<th>FY 2012</th>
<th>FY 2013</th>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>Request FY 2015</th>
<th>4-Year Increase</th>
<th>% Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full-time Fees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Tuition (Unrestricted)</td>
<td>$3,794.00</td>
<td>$4,144.00</td>
<td>$4,338.00</td>
<td>$4,560.00</td>
<td>$4,676.00</td>
<td>$882.00</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Technology Fee</td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Facilities Fees</td>
<td>468.00</td>
<td>468.00</td>
<td>468.00</td>
<td>468.00</td>
<td>468.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Student Activity Fees</td>
<td>666.00</td>
<td>666.00</td>
<td>666.00</td>
<td>666.00</td>
<td>666.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Full-time Fees</strong></td>
<td>$4,998.00</td>
<td>$5,348.00</td>
<td>$5,562.00</td>
<td>$5,784.00</td>
<td>$5,900.00</td>
<td>$902.00</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage Increase</strong></td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part-time Credit Hour Fees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Education Fee</td>
<td>$210.00</td>
<td>$228.00</td>
<td>$240.00</td>
<td>$251.00</td>
<td>$257.00</td>
<td>$47.00</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Technology Fee</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Facilities Fees</td>
<td>13.75</td>
<td>13.75</td>
<td>13.75</td>
<td>13.75</td>
<td>13.75</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Student Activity Fees</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Part-time Cr Hr Fees</strong></td>
<td>$255.00</td>
<td>$273.00</td>
<td>$285.00</td>
<td>$296.00</td>
<td>$302.00</td>
<td>$47.00</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summer Credit Hour Fees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Education Fee</td>
<td>$162.99</td>
<td>$180.99</td>
<td>$190.65</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
<td>$205.10</td>
<td>$42.11</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Technology Fee</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Facilities Fees</td>
<td>13.75</td>
<td>13.75</td>
<td>13.75</td>
<td>13.75</td>
<td>13.75</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Student Activity Fees</td>
<td>74.01</td>
<td>74.01</td>
<td>76.35</td>
<td>78.00</td>
<td>78.90</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Summer Cr Hr Fees</strong></td>
<td>$255.00</td>
<td>$273.00</td>
<td>$285.00</td>
<td>$296.00</td>
<td>$302.00</td>
<td>$47.00</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Student Fees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Nonres Tuition</td>
<td>$8,908.00</td>
<td>$9,532.00</td>
<td>$9,914.00</td>
<td>$10,312.00</td>
<td>$10,518.00</td>
<td>$1,610.00</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Nonres Tuition-Asotin County</td>
<td>$3,168.00</td>
<td>$3,168.00</td>
<td>$3,168.00</td>
<td>$3,168.00</td>
<td>$3,232.00</td>
<td>$64.00</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Western Undergrad Exchange</strong></td>
<td>$2,499.00</td>
<td>$2,674.00</td>
<td>$2,781.00</td>
<td>$2,892.00</td>
<td>$2,950.00</td>
<td>$451.00</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In-service Fees/Cr Hr - Undergrad</strong></td>
<td>$87.00</td>
<td>$92.00</td>
<td>$96.00</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$103.00</td>
<td>$16.00</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overload (20 cr. or more)</strong></td>
<td>$255.00</td>
<td>$273.00</td>
<td>$285.00</td>
<td>$296.00</td>
<td>$302.00</td>
<td>$47.00</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cost of Attending College vs. Per Capita Income
Lewis-Clark State College

The Cost of Attendance includes the full tuition and does not reflect a student possibly receiving financial aid, scholarships, or discounts.
Lewis-Clark State College
Resident Fees, CPI, Per Capita Income, Average Annual Wage
% Increase from Prior Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY04</th>
<th>FY05</th>
<th>FY06</th>
<th>FY07</th>
<th>FY08</th>
<th>FY09</th>
<th>FY10</th>
<th>FY11</th>
<th>FY12</th>
<th>FY13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resident Fees</td>
<td>9.61%</td>
<td>8.51%</td>
<td>9.49%</td>
<td>4.93%</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td>4.99%</td>
<td>6.98%</td>
<td>8.75%</td>
<td>7.00%</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Price Index</td>
<td>2.28%</td>
<td>2.66%</td>
<td>3.39%</td>
<td>3.23%</td>
<td>2.85%</td>
<td>3.84%</td>
<td>-0.36%</td>
<td>1.66%</td>
<td>3.14%</td>
<td>5.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho Per Capita Income</td>
<td>2.22%</td>
<td>7.04%</td>
<td>3.61%</td>
<td>6.90%</td>
<td>3.22%</td>
<td>-0.70%</td>
<td>-3.53%</td>
<td>1.05%</td>
<td>4.37%</td>
<td>3.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho Average Annual Wage</td>
<td>2.52%</td>
<td>4.06%</td>
<td>3.01%</td>
<td>5.73%</td>
<td>2.68%</td>
<td>0.74%</td>
<td>0.86%</td>
<td>2.19%</td>
<td>1.60%</td>
<td>0.88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Idaho Commerce and Labor; Bureau of Economic Analysis, U.S. Department of Commerce; Division of Financial Management Economic Forecast, January 2014
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Proposed Changes to Student Fees

The University of Idaho collaborative fee process started in the fall with preliminary discussions between executive and student leadership about the financial prospects for the coming year and how student activity fees fit into that overall financial picture. The process resumed in January with active participation throughout the remainder of the process by the Associated Student Fee Committee (ASFC). This representative committee included student leaders from the Associated Student of the University of Idaho, the Graduate and Professional Students Association (GSPA) and the Student Bar Association representing the law school. All units currently receiving dedicated fees or requesting a new dedicated fee submitted narrative and financial data to the ASFC and a public meeting of the ASFC was held on January 29, 2014, wherein each unit requesting an increased or new fee presented their fee request. Auxiliary units and others requesting dedicated fee support presented requests for program maintenance and expansion and new programs and activities. The meeting was attended by students and university community members.

The ASFC committee met several times in February to discuss the fee requests from each unit as well as to review existing activity fees. A comprehensive fee proposal was developed by student leaders and presented to executive leadership on February 19th. This fee proposal included the elimination of the New Student Orientation activity fee which the committee felt should be charged only to first-time undergraduate students which resulted in an overall $10.24 increase in the dedicated activity fee. The entire $10.24 increase in fees is required in order to cover the increased cost of medical benefits as well as the proposed 2% CEC for FY15 for employees paid from student activity fee revenue. The formal University Notice of Intent to Adopt Student Tuition and Fee Changes was issued on March 5th as required by Board Policy. The period of public comment is open until April 15th and will include a public presentation and open forum on proposed student fees on March 27th. During this period, students and interested citizens may provide comment, in writing, regarding the proposed fee increases. Written comments will be forwarded to the Regents and notes from the March 27th open forum will be available.

Fee Request Overview

The University of Idaho respectfully requests an increase in full-time student tuition and fees of $308 from $6,524 per year in FY14 to $6,832 per year in FY15 combined with an increase to full-time non-resident tuition from $13,076 to $13,482 per year. This will bring the total full-time non-resident tuition and fee package to $20,314 per year. It is the University’s intent to hold the total full-time non-resident tuition and fee package at $20,314 for FY15. Therefore if the full-time tuition and fees are approved at an amount less than the above $6,832 the University requests approval to increase the non-
resident fee to keep the total package amount at $20,314. Undergraduate part-time student fees for academic year participation are increasing from $326 in FY14 to $342 per credit in FY15 and summer rates for the summer of 2015 from $326 to $342 per credit. This general student fee increase is a critical part of a bundle of fee increases aimed at meeting our essential missions of education, research and outreach as well as implementing the institution’s strategic plan. In addition the University plans to increase graduate tuition by 3.4% (from $1,062 to $1,098).

The Associated Student Fee Committee has recommended a small increase in student activity fees, and has done so, in large part, to provide the administration with maximum financial flexibility while at the same time keeping the tuition and fee increases to a minimum. Student leadership recognizes tuition revenue as the most flexible revenue resource available to meet critical financial needs, to maintain program quality and to move the institution toward its goals.

The University of Idaho general fee increase request is structured to provide a reasonable likelihood of covering obligated cost increases that exceed the level of new state support and enabling the institution and its students to continue some movement forward in achieving strategic goals – particularly a goal of becoming more competitive with respect to faculty and staff salaries which are falling dangerously far from peer and local market averages. In making this overall fee increase, the University has been mindful of the comparative costs of attending peer institutions, the overall rate of fee increases at those comparable institutions and the impact any such fee increase might have on access to institutional programs. University and student leadership have also given thought to the negative financial consequences of a smaller fee increase, which would result in being stalled at current operational levels and eliminating the ability to move the institution forward to provide improved instruction and student retention.

In that context, the specific components of the fee increase are as follows:

**Undergraduate Tuition**

The University of Idaho is requesting an increase to the undergraduate tuition of $297.76 per full-time student per year.

**Facilities Fee**

The University of Idaho is not requesting an increase in the facility fee for FY15. This reflects our continuing overall strategy of focusing our resources on tuition revenue which provides the flexibility necessary to meet any and all of the operating issues in the General Education budget, including critical needs in the area of facility maintenance. The current Facility fee is $790.50 per fulltime student per year and the revenue from this fee primarily goes towards debt service obligations.
Technology Fee

The University of Idaho is not requesting an increase in the technology fee for FY15. Once again, this is consistent with our strategy of focusing our resources on tuition which provides us the flexibility necessary to meet any and all of the operating issues in the General Education budget, including any critical needs in the area of technology support. The current Technology fee is $125.40 per fulltime student per year and the revenue from this fee goes towards covering three major technology service areas:

- Internet Bandwidth
- Wireless Networking
- Internet Security

Activities Fees

The University of Idaho is requesting an increase of $10.24 per fulltime student per year in activities fees for FY15. The Associated Student Fee Committee continued their work on evaluating existing fees which led to the elimination of the existing $8.00 per year New Student Orientation fee which the students felt should be a separate one-time fee charged only to first-time undergraduate students. This $8.00 was reallocated to Campus Recreation, Counseling and Testing Center, Minority Student Programs and Idaho Commons/Student Union Building. In addition the students recommended that the Marching Band activity fee be reduced by $2.00 per year which represents the amount used to fund band scholarships. This $2.00 was moved to tuition and band scholarships will now be a part of the overall scholarship program funded through the General Education budget. Other increases included funding for Change in Employee Compensation and benefit rate increases for ASUI, Campus Recreation, Idaho Commons/Student Union Building, Kibbie Center operations, Memorial Gym, Student Health Services, Counseling and Testing Center, Early Childhood Center and Swim Center.

New Student Orientation

As indicated above the University of Idaho currently charges $8.00 per academic year for New Student Orientation as part of its full-time activity fee package. The University is requesting approval to eliminate this activity fee and replace it with a separate one-time fee of $100 to first time undergraduate students. This ensures that the fee is charged only to those students who have the opportunity to utilize the benefits this fee covers. An in-depth explanation is included on pages 89-90.
### Changes to Student Fees for FY 2015

#### Annual Full-Time Fees and Part-Time Credit Hours Fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Fees:</th>
<th>Bd</th>
<th>FY14 Fees</th>
<th>Initial Notice</th>
<th>FY15 Fees</th>
<th>Requested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full-time Fees:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Tuition **</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,534.30</td>
<td>$4,832.06</td>
<td>$4,832.06</td>
<td>$297.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Technology Fee **</td>
<td></td>
<td>125.40</td>
<td>125.40</td>
<td>125.40</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Facilities Fee **</td>
<td></td>
<td>790.50</td>
<td>790.50</td>
<td>790.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Student Activity Fees **</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,073.80</td>
<td>1,084.04</td>
<td>1,084.04</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total full-time fees (See Note A)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,524.00</td>
<td>6,832.00</td>
<td>6,832.00</td>
<td>$308.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part-time credit hour fees:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Undergraduate Tuition and Fees **</td>
<td></td>
<td>$326.00</td>
<td>$342.00</td>
<td>$342.00</td>
<td>$16.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total part-time cr hr fees:</strong> *</td>
<td></td>
<td>$326.00</td>
<td>$342.00</td>
<td>$342.00</td>
<td>$16.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other student fees:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. New student orientation (see note C)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>New fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Undergraduate tuition and fees</td>
<td></td>
<td>119.20</td>
<td>121.00</td>
<td>121.00</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Technology fee</td>
<td></td>
<td>125.40</td>
<td>125.40</td>
<td>125.40</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Facilities fee</td>
<td></td>
<td>790.50</td>
<td>790.50</td>
<td>790.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Student activity fees</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,073.80</td>
<td>1,084.04</td>
<td>1,084.04</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Other student fees</strong>:</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,017.40</td>
<td>2,130.44</td>
<td>2,130.44</td>
<td>$123.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Note A: The university is requesting a total package for non-resident undergraduate students of $20,314 per academic year. Therefore if the tuition and fee package is approved at lower than $6,832 the non-resident fee will be increased to maintain the $20,314 total package.

#### Note B: The University is exploring the ability to charge increased tuition to Non-Residents for Summer Session but not to exceed full Non-Resident Tuition.

#### Note D: Includes Alumni Association, Campus Card, Fine Arts, Mem Gym, Swim Center, Marching Band, Native American Center, Performing Arts, Sales Tax, Student Health Services, and Sustainability Center.

#### Changes to Student Activity Fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>FY14 Fees</th>
<th>Initial Notice</th>
<th>FY15 Fees</th>
<th>Requested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UI Student Groups (ASU / GPSA / SBA)</td>
<td>192.00</td>
<td>193.72</td>
<td>193.72</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Student Orientation (see note C)</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(8.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercollegiate Athletics</td>
<td>255.92</td>
<td>255.92</td>
<td>255.92</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Recreation</td>
<td>133.10</td>
<td>136.24</td>
<td>136.24</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Union Operations</td>
<td>184.50</td>
<td>189.24</td>
<td>189.24</td>
<td>4.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kibbie Center Operations</td>
<td>55.76</td>
<td>57.66</td>
<td>57.66</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirit Squad</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>78.30</td>
<td>84.36</td>
<td>84.36</td>
<td>6.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (see note D)</td>
<td>160.22</td>
<td>160.90</td>
<td>160.90</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Other student fees</strong>:</td>
<td>1,073.80</td>
<td>1,084.04</td>
<td>1,084.04</td>
<td>10.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Note E: The university is requesting a total package for non-resident undergraduate students of $20,314 per academic year. Therefore if the tuition and fee package is approved at lower than $6,832 the non-resident fee will be increased to maintain the $20,314 total package.
**UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO**  
**Due to Enrollment and Fee Changes**  
**Projected HC/SCH Count Changes due to Count Fee Changes**

### Student Fees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY14</th>
<th>FY15</th>
<th>Gen Educ</th>
<th>Local</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full-time Fees:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition</td>
<td>7,556</td>
<td>7,366</td>
<td>($861,500)</td>
<td>$2,193,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Fee</td>
<td>7,556</td>
<td>7,366</td>
<td>($861,500)</td>
<td>$2,193,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Fees</td>
<td>7,556</td>
<td>7,366</td>
<td>($861,500)</td>
<td>$2,193,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Activity Fees</td>
<td>7,556</td>
<td>7,366</td>
<td>($861,500)</td>
<td>$2,193,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Full-time Fees:</strong></td>
<td>($861,500)</td>
<td>($718,000)</td>
<td>$2,193,200</td>
<td>$75,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Part-time Credit Hour Fees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY14</th>
<th>FY15</th>
<th>Gen Educ</th>
<th>Local</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Tuition and Fees</td>
<td>9,265</td>
<td>3,065</td>
<td>($1,658,500)</td>
<td>$49,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Part-time Cr Hr Fees:</strong></td>
<td>($1,658,500)</td>
<td>($362,700)</td>
<td>$49,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other Student Fees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY14</th>
<th>FY15</th>
<th>Gen Educ</th>
<th>Local</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Year Graduate Fees:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Tuition/Fees</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>$188,200</td>
<td>$82,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Grad/Prof Fee</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>$188,200</td>
<td>$82,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time Tuition/Fees</td>
<td>1,284</td>
<td>1,956</td>
<td>204,300</td>
<td>39,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time Grad/Prof Fee</td>
<td>3,316</td>
<td>1,956</td>
<td>204,300</td>
<td>39,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Full-time Grad/Prof Fee:</strong></td>
<td>($188,200)</td>
<td>($188,200)</td>
<td>$188,200</td>
<td>$188,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Other Student Fees:</strong></td>
<td>($1,841,400)</td>
<td>($149,800)</td>
<td>$2,066,700</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Additional Student Fee Revenue:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY14</th>
<th>FY15</th>
<th>Gen Educ</th>
<th>Local</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue Increase/(Decrease):</strong></td>
<td>$(60,800)</td>
<td>$(805,100)</td>
<td>$(190,800)</td>
<td>$(190,800)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Waiver (Increase)/Decrease:</strong></td>
<td>388,600</td>
<td>($8,700)</td>
<td>389,300</td>
<td>$(8,700)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Net Revenue Increase/(Decrease):</strong></td>
<td>$327,800</td>
<td>$(813,800)</td>
<td>$327,800</td>
<td>$(813,800)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Changes to Student Activity Fees

#### Full-time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY14</th>
<th>FY15</th>
<th>Gen Educ</th>
<th>Local</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UI Student Groups (ASUI / GPF)</td>
<td>7,556</td>
<td>7,366</td>
<td>($36,500)</td>
<td>12,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Student Orientation</td>
<td>7,556</td>
<td>7,366</td>
<td>($36,500)</td>
<td>12,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercollegiate Athletics</td>
<td>7,556</td>
<td>7,366</td>
<td>($36,500)</td>
<td>12,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Recreation</td>
<td>7,556</td>
<td>7,366</td>
<td>($36,500)</td>
<td>12,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commons/Union Operations</td>
<td>7,556</td>
<td>7,366</td>
<td>($36,500)</td>
<td>12,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kibbie Center Operations</td>
<td>7,556</td>
<td>7,366</td>
<td>($36,500)</td>
<td>12,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirit Squad</td>
<td>7,556</td>
<td>7,366</td>
<td>($36,500)</td>
<td>12,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>7,556</td>
<td>7,366</td>
<td>($36,500)</td>
<td>12,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Fees:</strong></td>
<td>7,556</td>
<td>7,366</td>
<td>($36,500)</td>
<td>12,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other Fees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY14</th>
<th>FY15</th>
<th>Gen Educ</th>
<th>Local</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overload Fee (&gt;18 credits)</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>($1,900)</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Undergrad Exchange</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>($826,900)</td>
<td>58,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-service Fees/CR Hr - UG</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>35,500</td>
<td>1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-service Fees/CR Hr - UG Sur &amp; 116</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-service Fees/CR Hr - Grad</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>23,500</td>
<td>3,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-service Fees/CR Hr - Grad St.</td>
<td>927</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>($29,400)</td>
<td>$2,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Other Student Fees:</strong></td>
<td>($1,841,400)</td>
<td>($149,800)</td>
<td>$2,066,700</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Additiional Student Fee Revenue:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY14</th>
<th>FY15</th>
<th>Gen Educ</th>
<th>Local</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Additional Student Fee Revenue:</strong></td>
<td>($4,361,400)</td>
<td>($890,500)</td>
<td>$4,308,900</td>
<td>$85,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Changes to Student Activity Fees

#### Full-time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY14</th>
<th>FY15</th>
<th>Gen Educ</th>
<th>Local</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UI Student Groups (ASUI / GPF)</td>
<td>7,556</td>
<td>7,366</td>
<td>($36,500)</td>
<td>12,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Student Orientation</td>
<td>7,556</td>
<td>7,366</td>
<td>($36,500)</td>
<td>12,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercollegiate Athletics</td>
<td>7,556</td>
<td>7,366</td>
<td>($36,500)</td>
<td>12,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Recreation</td>
<td>7,556</td>
<td>7,366</td>
<td>($36,500)</td>
<td>12,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commons/Union Operations</td>
<td>7,556</td>
<td>7,366</td>
<td>($36,500)</td>
<td>12,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kibbie Center Operations</td>
<td>7,556</td>
<td>7,366</td>
<td>($36,500)</td>
<td>12,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirit Squad</td>
<td>7,556</td>
<td>7,366</td>
<td>($36,500)</td>
<td>12,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>7,556</td>
<td>7,366</td>
<td>($36,500)</td>
<td>12,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Fees:</strong></td>
<td>7,556</td>
<td>7,366</td>
<td>($36,500)</td>
<td>12,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ridley & Price

The count figures indicate changes between FY14 budget and FY15 projections, and the revenues shown under Changes Due to Count and Fee Changes reflect gross revenues based on the change in the list price and the count difference. The waivers are calculated at the same percentage as the change in the student fee base. The third column shows the percentage change due to count. The bottom page presents additional fees and charges that impact net revenue.
UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO
4-year History of Board Approved Fees plus FY15 Requested Fees
Annual Full-Time Fees and Part-Fime Credit Hours Fees

Student Fees:
1 Full-time Fees

2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Tuition (Unrestricted)
Technology Fee
Facilities Fees
Student Activity Fees

Total Full-time Fees
Percentage Increase

FY 2011

FY 2012

FY 2013

FY 2014

Request
FY 2015

4-Year
Increase

%
Increase

$3,425.44
125.40
790.50
1,060.66
5,402.00
9.5%

$3,874.18
125.40
790.50
1,065.92
5,856.00
8.4%

$4,230.18
125.40
790.50
1,065.92
6,212.00
6.1%

$4,534.30
125.40
790.50
1,073.80
6,524.00
5.0%

$4,832.06
125.40
790.50
1,084.04
6,832.00
4.7%

$1,406.62
0.00
0.00
23.38
1,430.00

41.06%
0.00%
0.00%
2.20%
26.47%

$270.00
$270.00

$293.00
$293.00

$311.00
$311.00

$326.00
$326.00

$342.00
$342.00

$72.00
$72.00

26.67%
26.67%

$5,402.00
$718.00
$270.00
$36.00

$5,856.00
$826.00
$293.00
$41.00

$6,212.00
$950.00
$311.00
$48.00

$6,524.00
$1,062.00
$362.50
$59.00

$6,832.00
$1,098.00
$380.00
$61.00

$1,430.00
$380.00
$110.00
$25.00

26.47%
52.92%
40.74%
69.44%

$5,402.00
$270.00
$5,402.00
$718.00
$270.00
$36.00

$5,856.00
$293.00
$5,856.00
$826.00
$293.00
$41.00

$6,212.00
$311.00
$6,212.00
$950.00
$311.00
$48.00

$6,524.00
$326.00
$6,524.00
$1,062.00
$362.50
$59.00

$6,832.00
$342.00
$6,832.00
$1,098.00
$380.00
$61.00

$1,430.00
$72.00
$1,430.00
$380.00
$110.00
$25.00

26.47%
26.67%
26.47%
52.92%
40.74%
69.44%

$271.00
$271.00
$271.00
$271.00
$36.00

$293.00
$293.00
$293.00
$293.00
$41.00

$311.00
$311.00
$311.00
$311.00
$48.00

$326.00
$326.00
$362.50
$362.50
$59.00

$342.00
$342.00
$380.00
$380.00
$61.00

$71.00
$71.00
$109.00
$109.00
$25.00

26.20%
26.20%
40.22%
40.22%
69.44%

$11,592.00
$580.00
$11,592.00
$580.00

$12,520.00
$626.00
$12,520.00
$626.00

$12,788.00
$639.00
$12,788.00
$639.00

$13,076.00
$654.00
$13,076.00
$726.00

$13,482.00
$674.00
$13,482.00
$749.00

$1,890.00
$94.00
$1,890.00
$169.00

16.30%
16.21%
16.30%
29.14%

$6,820.00
$341.00
$341.00
$938.00
$47.00
$47.00
$47.00
$47.00
$1,000.00
$50.00
$50.00

$7,358.00
$368.00
$368.00
$986.00
$49.00
$49.00
$49.00
$49.00
$1,050.00
$53.00
$53.00

$7,874.00
$394.00
$394.00
$986.00
$49.00
$49.00
$49.00
$49.00
$1,050.00
$53.00
$53.00

$8,188.00
$455.00
$455.00
$1,026.00
$51.00
$51.00
$57.00
$57.00
$1,050.00
$53.00
$53.00

$8,598.00
$478.00
$478.00
$1,068.00
$53.00
$53.00
$59.00
$59.00
$1,050.00
$53.00
$53.00

$1,778.00
$137.00
$137.00
$130.00
$6.00
$6.00
$12.00
$12.00
$50.00
$3.00
$3.00

26.07%
40.18%
40.18%
13.86%
12.77%
12.77%
25.53%
25.53%
5.00%
6.00%
6.00%

$37,000.00
$0.00
$0.00
$0.00

$37,000.00
$30,000.00
$0.00
$16,000.00

$37,000.00
$30,000.00
$18,000.00
$16,000.00

$37,000.00
$30,000.00
$18,540.00
$16,480.00

$37,000.00
$30,000.00
$20,394.00
$18,128.00

$0.00
$30,000.00
$20,394.00
$18,128.00

0.00%
New
New
New

$211.50
$2,701.00
$86.00
$86.00
$101.00
$101.00

$234.50
$2,928.00
$92.00
$92.00
$108.00
$108.00

$252.50
$3,106.00
$96.00
$96.00
$115.00
$115.00

$267.50
$3,262.00
$100.00
$100.00
$121.00
$121.00

$283.50
$3,416.00
$103.00
$103.00
$125.00
$125.00

$72.00
$715.00
$17.00
$17.00
$24.00
$24.00

34.04%
26.47%
19.77%
19.77%
23.76%
23.76%

Part-time Credit Hour Fees
Undergraduate Tuition and Fees

Total Part-time Cr Hr Fees
Other Student Fees
Academic Year Graduate Fees:
Full-Time Tuition/Fees
Full-Time Grad/Prof Fee
Part-Time Grad Tuition/Fees
Part-Time Grad/Prof Fee
Academic Year Outreach Programs:
Full-Time Undergrad Tuition/Fees
Part-Time Undergrad Tuition/Fees
Full-Time Graduate Tuition/Fees
Full-Time Grad/Prof Fee
Part-Time Graduate Tuition/Fees
Part-Time Grad/Prof Fee
Summer Session (2015)
Part-Time Undergrad Tuition/Fees
Part-Time Undergrad Outreach
Part-Time Graduate Tuition/Fees
Part-Time Graduate Outreach
Part-Time Grad/Prof Fee
Nonresident Tuition (See Notes A & B)
Nonres Tuition FT Undergrad
Nonres Tuition PT Undergrad
Nonres Tuition FT Grad
Nonres Tuition PT Grad
Professional Fees:
Law College FT
Law College PT
Law College PT Summer
Art & Architecture FT UG & GR
Art & Architecture PT Undergrad
Art & Architecture PT Summer UG
Art & Architecture PT Grad
Art & Architecture PT Summer GR
Bioregional Planning FT
Bioregional Planning PT
Bioregional Planning PT Summer

Self-Support Program Fees:
Executive MBA (2 years)
Professional Practices Doctorate (3 yrs)
Masters of Science Athletic Trainng (1 yr)
Doctorate Athletic Training (1 yr)
Other Fees:
Overload Fee
Western Undergrad Exchge
In-service Fees/Cr Hr - UG
In-service Fees/Cr Hr - UG Summer
In-service Fees/Cr Hr - Grad
In-service Fees/Cr Hr - Grad Summer

BAHR - SECTION II
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The Cost of Attendance includes the full tuition and does not reflect a student possibly receiving financial aid, scholarships, or discounts.
Cost to Deliver College
University of Idaho

Cost to Deliver per FTE
Student FTE

Cost to Deliver per FTE

Tuition and Fees  Page 74
University of Idaho
Resident Fees, CPI, Per Capita Income, Average Annual Wage
% Increase from Prior Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Resident Fees</th>
<th>Consumer Price Index</th>
<th>Idaho Per Capita Income</th>
<th>Idaho Average Annual Wage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY04</td>
<td>9.99%</td>
<td>2.28%</td>
<td>2.22%</td>
<td>2.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY05</td>
<td>8.48%</td>
<td>2.66%</td>
<td>7.04%</td>
<td>4.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>9.25%</td>
<td>3.39%</td>
<td>3.61%</td>
<td>3.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY07</td>
<td>5.85%</td>
<td>3.23%</td>
<td>6.90%</td>
<td>5.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td>2.85%</td>
<td>3.22%</td>
<td>2.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY09</td>
<td>5.03%</td>
<td>3.84%</td>
<td>-0.70%</td>
<td>0.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>6.48%</td>
<td>-0.36%</td>
<td>-3.53%</td>
<td>0.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>9.53%</td>
<td>1.66%</td>
<td>1.05%</td>
<td>2.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY12</td>
<td>8.40%</td>
<td>3.14%</td>
<td>4.37%</td>
<td>1.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY13</td>
<td>6.08%</td>
<td>5.27%</td>
<td>3.10%</td>
<td>0.88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Idaho Commerce and Labor; Bureau of Economic Analysis, U.S. Department of Commerce; Division of Financial Management Economic Forecast, January 2014
Memorandum

Date: March 17, 2014

To: Katherine Aiken, Provost & Executive Vice President
    Ron Smith, Vice President for Finance & Administration
    Keith Ickes, Executive Director, Planning & Budget
    Trina Mahoney, Director, Budget Office

From: Mike Satz, Interim Dean, College of Law

Re: Amended Law Student Dedicated Professional Fee Request for FY 2015

This memorandum amends the previous request by the College of Law for an increase in the Law School Dedicated Professional fee. This amendment is being submitted because the student leadership at the College of Law agreed to an increase of up-to 5% after initial consultation (documentation attached). The College of Law, therefore, requests an increase of $410 per year in the law student dedicated professional fee in Fiscal Year 2015. This dollar amount represents an increase of 5% over the current level of $8,188.00 per year to $8,598.00 per year. The FY 2014 charge per credit hour will be $478, which reflects the 5.1% tuition increase, or $23 per credit hour.

This requested increase is the same increase approved last year by the Board of Regents for FY 2014, but is less than the 7.0% and 7.9% increases for the previous two years. Additionally, this year’s requested fee increase is significantly below the annual increases approved by the Board pursuant to requests made under a five-year plan for Fiscal Years 2007 through 2011.

Although Fiscal Years 2007-2011 fee increases were associated with a strategic five year plan, the College of Law presently engages in a process to identify critical areas of funding needs, in consultation with student leaders, in order to develop appropriately targeted fee increases. Given funding and enrollment uncertainties and the planned expansion of College of Law operations in Boise, this method allows the College to think strategically about each individual funding request. As these uncertainties become more predictable in the future, the College will engage in a strategic planning process that will allow the College to present a long term fee increase plan.

The professional fee component of total fees and tuition paid by law students is dedicated to the College of Law. This fee is not, nor should it be perceived as, a substitute for other funding for the University or from any other source as that perception will lead to the ultimate privatization of the College of Law, which would be exceptionally detrimental to legal education in the State of Idaho. Out of necessity, the fee has been used by the College of Law to preserve the quality of legal education under the enormous pressures of the recent period of financial difficulty. The fee is an additional investment by law students
themselves in the legal education which is the foundation of their future success as professionals.

The law student professional fee has been used to preserve accreditation by the College of Law by hiring and retaining mission-essential personnel and position required by our accrediting body whose salary lines were either removed in response to reduced appropriated funds to the University or whose positions were necessitated by changing best practices in legal education and the expansion of the College’s presence in Boise. The fee has also supported library operations, interdisciplinary programs, technology upgrades, student organization space renovations, and other items, personnel, or activities essential to the operation of the College.

The current FY 2015 requested increase will be used in the following areas: 1) To address salary equity issues in the Student Services Office, the front line staff that ensures the academic success of our students, and provides critical support in student recruiting and job placement. 2) To address salary equity issues in the College’s Legal Research and Writing faculty area, which provides the most fundamental skills training our student need. 3) Funding for our newly required Student Professionalism Program that teaches the College’s students the practical skills to engage with clients, other professionals, and the community as professional attorneys. All three of these areas, in addition to directly impacting the quality of education for our students and positioning the College of Law to excel as an institution of legal education, are areas of deficiency that have been identified as requiring improvement by our accreditation bodies, the American Bar Association and the Association of American Law Schools. Finally, residual funds, if any, will be channeled into additional student services support and programming targeted towards students.

These proposed uses for the fee increase are supported by the law student leadership. I have met with the Student Bar Association president who has met with his colleagues in the SBA. After reviewing the anticipated needs of the College and exchanging ideas and questions the SBA president met with his executive leadership team and has informed me that there is agreement for the proposed increase. It was clear to me that it is important to the College’s students that the College of Law remain competitively priced while still taking reasonable steps to ensure that needed programming and other fiscal requirements are met. The 4% fee increase reflects that meeting of the minds, though the College’s overall funding needs are greater.

History of recent law school professional fee increases:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>$450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>$500 (Adjusted by the State Board downward to $420 because the requested purpose had not yet been approved)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>$550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>$600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>$538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>$516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>$314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY 15</strong></td>
<td><strong>$410</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusion:
The FY 2015 fee increase of 5%, or $410, reflects a continuation of the more modest approach started in FY2014. It is designed to address critical needs at the College of Law while remaining mindful of maintaining our College’s cost-competitive edge in American legal education and to assist our students in controlling their educational debts.
Good morning Dean Satz,

After our conversation yesterday about the professional fee increase, I spoke with the VP and treasurer of the SBA. We all agreed that a fee increase of 4-5% was reasonable, especially since the revenue would be used for student career services, the LRW program, and the professionalism program, among other things. In the event there is a surplus, the SBA asks that they be consulted on how the remainder will be spent. Thank you for getting in touch with me about this matter.

All the best,
Ivar Gunderson
February 24, 2014

Idaho State Board of Education
P.O. Box 83720
Boise, ID 83720-0037

Re: Student Professional Fees
   College of Art & Architecture
   University of Idaho

To Members of the Board:

With this memo I am requesting a 4% increase in the College of Art and Architecture professional fee from $513.00 to $534.00 per semester. This increase will help defray the rising costs of equipment in the computer studios and technical shop (model shop). In addition, I have added current information about professional fee distribution to programs and their uses.

In October, 2005, the State Board of Education reinstated the College of Art & Architecture under the premise that student professional fees would support the College infrastructure. The academic year 2013/2014 marks the 7th year since that time. In 6 of those years, students have agreed to a 5% increase in this fee. We did not request an increase in the fee for academic year 2011/2012.

In spring 2010, the SBOE voted to incrementally include art and design students in payment of the professional fees. In fall, 2014 semester, all students in the College of Art & Architecture will pay 100% of the professional fee. With this implementation, we are affecting a more equitable assessment and use of fees, additionally supported by our reorganization into one department/one College and subsequent steps to more fully integrate our disciplines. This was a major step forward for the College of Art & Architecture.

I am happy to respond to any questions regarding this information. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Mark Elson Hoversten, PhD
Dean
Date: February 24, 2014

To: Idaho State Board of Education (SBOE)

From: Student Congress of Art & Architecture (SCAA)
       College of Art & Architecture
       University of Idaho

We, the student leaders of the College of Art & Architecture at the University of Idaho are writing you to acknowledge that we have been informed through meetings and dialogue of the new increase in our student professional fees. While have currently gone one year without a fee increase we understand the need for professional fees to assist our College in its operation. We accept the new fee increase for the upcoming academic year knowing it will be used with our best interest in mind. We feel this way because reactivation of the College was based on the premise that Student Professional Fees would be used to support the administrative functions of the College of Art & Architecture, in addition to providing many services directly to students. The Student Congress of Art & Architecture (SCAA) represents all students in the College.

Sincerely,

Dylan Matthew Agnes
President

cc: SCAA members
    College of Art & Architecture

Joshua Hoffer, Secretary
Robert Hernandez, Vice President
Shayda Sanii, Public Relations
Sofia Cardoso, Treasurer
College of Art & Architecture
Professional Fees for Fiscal Year 2014
For the Period ending 02-26-14 and Estimated for Spring Semester ending May, 2014

College of Art and Architecture Total Budget 3,439,637.00
Revenue from Professional Fees - FY 2014 596,079.00

Professional Fees Percentage of Total Budget 17.31%
College of Art & Architecture  
Professional Fees for Fiscal Year 2014  
For the Period ending 02-26-14 and Estimated for Spring Semester ending May, 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College of Art and Architecture Total Budget</td>
<td>3,439,637.00</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean's Office</td>
<td>313,535.00</td>
<td>9.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch &amp; ID</td>
<td>45,000.00</td>
<td>1.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>45,000.00</td>
<td>1.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art &amp; Design</td>
<td>45,000.00</td>
<td>1.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VTD</td>
<td>25,000.00</td>
<td>0.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDC</td>
<td>25,000.00</td>
<td>0.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Studio</td>
<td>45,000.00</td>
<td>1.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Remaining Budget</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,966,102.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>86.23%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Blue shaded area is the College's permanently budgeted salaries  
Professional fees cover essential CAA operations
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section II</th>
<th>Budgeted Revenue</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Spring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Original Budget</td>
<td>$278,285.00</td>
<td>$285,800.00</td>
<td>$372,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Carryforward</td>
<td>(284.87)</td>
<td>222,749.52</td>
<td>11,663.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Carryforward</td>
<td>(6,543.91)</td>
<td>237,708.10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Received</td>
<td>$509,164.32</td>
<td>$508,549.52</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNK</td>
<td>$224,160.16</td>
<td>$216,128.70</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNK</td>
<td>$241,487.70</td>
<td>$229,170.60</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>$440,288.86</td>
<td>$470,658.30</td>
<td>$30,369.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>$499,111.10</td>
<td>$28,452.80</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$352.00</td>
<td>$352.00</td>
<td>$387.00</td>
<td>$406.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Decrease in fees FY13, and FY14*
Wednesday, March 05, 2014

Re: DAT and MSAT Fees

Dear Members of the Board,

In 2011, the Doctor of Athletic Training and Master of Science in Athletic Training were approved by the State Board of Education. The first doctoral class was admitted in June 2011 and the first master's class was admitted in May of 2013. The purpose of this memo is to request a one-time increase in fees (10%) that is greater than what was proposed in our Full Academic Proposals (3% annually for both programs).

There are 6 main reasons for the requested one-time fee increase of 10%:

1) The DAT program has required more faculty resources than were initially predicted which has led to the program admitting a more modest number of students in each cohort. Since the DAT is a first of its kind (in the country) program, this type of recalibration is expected.
2) The annual fees that are associated with the professional fees (e.g., books, technology) have increased significantly since the initial proposal and outpaced our initially proposed 3% annual increase.
3) Educational delivery costs have increased nationally and outpaced our 3% annual fee increase. The MSAT and DAT increase in the past 3 years, is less than half of what has been seen as necessary for the university as a whole (i.e., fee increase of at least 6% each year)
4) Cost of national accreditation has risen significantly.
5) Internal administrative costs have increased significantly from the original proposal (due to higher than expected administrative time associated with each program).
6) Since 2011, there has only been one, 3% increase for the DAT and MSAT.

In conclusion, we are requesting the following actions be approved by the Idaho State Board of Education:

1) A one-time 10% increase for both the MSAT and DAT programs for FY 15

Please also find attached our FY12 to FY15 actuals and projections.

Sincerely,

Corinne Mantle-Bromley, Dean
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAT (Doctor of Athletic Training)</th>
<th>FY 12 (Actuals)</th>
<th>FY 13 (Actuals)</th>
<th>FY 14 (Actuals/Projections)</th>
<th>FY 15 (Projections) based on 30 student enrollment</th>
<th>FY 15 (Projections) based on 30 student enrollment w/10% increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Original Budget (actual course fee plus carry forward)</td>
<td>$112,000.00</td>
<td>$277,335.00</td>
<td>$485,029.38</td>
<td>$495,000.00</td>
<td>$544,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01-Salaries</td>
<td>$60,913.24</td>
<td>$132,577.57</td>
<td>$139,205.38</td>
<td>$170,269.00</td>
<td>$170,269.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-Fringe</td>
<td>$6,487.92</td>
<td>$19,003.16</td>
<td>$24,383.95</td>
<td>$70,765.00</td>
<td>$70,765.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03-Irrregular Help</td>
<td>$1,720.00</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04-Travel</td>
<td>$3,312.62</td>
<td>$7,309.01</td>
<td>$13,402.17</td>
<td>$17,500.00</td>
<td>$17,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-Other Expense</td>
<td>$10,803.38</td>
<td>$73,301.60</td>
<td>$55,505.56</td>
<td>$90,500.00</td>
<td>$90,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-5k &gt; Capital Outlay</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-5k &lt; Capital Outlay</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-Trustee Benefits</td>
<td>$47,813.00</td>
<td>$35,192.00</td>
<td>$49,335.00</td>
<td>$29,400.00</td>
<td>$29,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Transfers</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$49,500.00</td>
<td>$49,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total Expenses</td>
<td>$131,050.16</td>
<td>$267,433.34</td>
<td>$382,832.08</td>
<td>$527,934.00</td>
<td>$527,934.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALANCE</td>
<td>-$19,050.16</td>
<td>$9,901.66</td>
<td>$102,187.32</td>
<td>-$32,934.00</td>
<td>$16,568.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MSAT (Master's Athletic Training)</th>
<th>FY 12 (Actuals)</th>
<th>FY 13 (Actuals)</th>
<th>FY 14 (Actuals/Projections)</th>
<th>FY 15 (Projections) based on 30 student enrollment</th>
<th>FY 15 (Projections) based on 30 student enrollment w/10% increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Original Budget (actual course fee plus carry forward)</td>
<td>$84,000.00</td>
<td>$263,979.65</td>
<td>$545,906.00</td>
<td>$610,500.00</td>
<td>$610,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01-Salaries</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$1,333.50</td>
<td>$59,342.00</td>
<td>$216,014.00</td>
<td>$216,014.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-Fringe</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$133.63</td>
<td>$16,923.64</td>
<td>$63,000.00</td>
<td>$63,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03-Irrregular Help</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04-Travel</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$2,600.48</td>
<td>$15,225.47</td>
<td>$17,500.00</td>
<td>$17,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-Other Expense</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$19,507.09</td>
<td>$60,808.94</td>
<td>$83,250.00</td>
<td>$83,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-5k &gt; Capital Outlay</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td>$102,200.00</td>
<td>$102,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-5k &lt; Capital Outlay</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-Trustee Benefits</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$12,445.65</td>
<td>$12,600.00</td>
<td>$63,000.00</td>
<td>$63,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Transfers</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$54,000.00</td>
<td>$54,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total Expenses</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$36,020.35</td>
<td>$274,273.65</td>
<td>$598,964.00</td>
<td>$598,964.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALANCE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$47,979.65</td>
<td>-$10,294.00</td>
<td>-$53,058.00</td>
<td>$11,536.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUBJECT

Approval of Institution, Agency, and Special/Health Programs Strategic Plans

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY


BACKGROUND/ DISCUSSION

The State of Idaho requires the institutions, agencies and special/health programs under the oversight of the board submit an updated strategic plan each year in July. The plans must encompass at a minimum the current year and four years going forward. The Board planning calendar schedules these plans to come forward annually at the April meeting. This timeline allows the Board to review the plans and ask questions in April, and if needed have them brought back to the Regular June Board meeting with changes for final approval while still meeting the States timeline. Attached you will find the strategic plans for the institution’s, agencies and special/health programs for Board approval. In addition to those requirements set out in Idaho Code, Board Policy I.M.1. requires each institution and agency develop and maintain five-year strategic plans that are created in accordance with Board guidelines. The policy goes one to further state that the plans must contain a comprehensive mission and vision statement, general goals and objectives, and key external factors. Performance measures are required to be developed and updated annually for Board approval, and tied to the strategic plan. At one time this was a separate process, approximately six (6) years ago the Board moved the performance measure approval into the strategic plan approval process in an attempt to make sure the performance measures were better tied to the strategic plans.

The current guidelines set by the Board office follow the Division of Financial Management (DFM) and section 67-1901 through 67-1903, Idaho Code requirements. Each strategic plan must include, by code and Board policy:

* **Vision and Mission Statement:** Provide a comprehensive outcome-based statement covering major division and core functions of the agency. For the institutions, under the direct governance of the Board, the mission statement is the Board approved mission statement.

* **Goals:** A goal is a planning element that describes the broad condition or outcome that an agency or program is trying to achieve.

* **Objective:** The objective is a planning element that describes how the agency plans to achieve a goal.

* **Performance Measures:** Performance measures assess the progress the agency is making in achieving a goal (quantifiable indicator).

* **Benchmarks:** Benchmarks are performance targets for each performance measure for at a minimum the next fiscal year (and an explanation of how the benchmark level was established which can mean an industry standard or agency research of circumstances that impact performance capabilities).
Unless otherwise stated, benchmarks are a target that is expected to be reached by the completion of the time-frame covered by the strategic plan.  

*External Factors:* Identify external factors that are beyond the control of the agency that affect the achievement of goals.

Each of these components is a standard strategic plan component. Nationally some entities use Key Performance Indicators, rather than Performance Measures. Strategic planning, in general, is considered a good business practice, whether in the private or public sector.

In accordance with the Board’s planning calendar, the Board will be presented with the institutions, agencies and special/health programs performance measure data at the October 2014 Regular Board meeting. The performance measures presented will be those measures approved by the Board through the institutions, agencies and special/health programs strategic plans.

**IMPACT**

Review of the institutions, agencies and special/health programs at this time will allow the Board to ask questions and or request changes or additions to the strategic plans.

**ATTACHMENTS**

**Agencies**
Attachment 01 – State Department of Education/Public Schools Page 5  
Attachment 02 – Idaho Division of Vocational Rehabilitation Page 8  
Attachment 03 – Idaho Public Television Page 28  
Attachment 04 – Idaho Division of Professional Technical Education Page 38

**Institutions**
Attachment 05 – Eastern Idaho Technical College Page 47  
Attachment 06 – University of Idaho Page 58  
Attachment 07 – Boise State University Page 73  
Attachment 08 – Idaho State University Page 81  
Attachment 09 – Lewis-Clark State College Page 104

**Community Colleges**
Attachment 10 – College of Southern Idaho Page 124  
Attachment 11 – College of Western Idaho Page 139  
Attachment 12 – North Idaho College Page 146

**Health/Special Programs**
Attachment 13 – Agricultural Research and Extension Page 153  
Attachment 14 – Forest Utilization Research Page 162  
Attachment 15 -- Idaho Geological Survey Page 176  
Attachment 16 – WIMU (WI) Veterinary Medicine Page 182  
Attachment 17 – WWAMI Medical Education Page 196  
Attachment 18 - Family Medicine Residency (ISU) Page 208  
Attachment 19 – Small Business Development Center Page 213
STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

At the October 2011 Board meeting the Board requested the institutions include the following performance measures in their strategic plans:

- **Remediation** (number of first-time freshman who graduate from and Idaho High school in the previous year requiring remedial education). *Measures quality/alignment of education at the secondary level. Due to this a meaningful benchmark cannot be set by the institutions. This measure will be included in the cases served section on the annual Performance Measure Report."

- **Retention** (number of full-time and part-time freshmen returning for a second year or program completion if professional-technical program of less than one year)

- **Dual Credit** (total credits and # of students)

- **Total certificates and degrees conferred** (number of undergraduate certificate and degree completions per 100 (FTE) undergraduate students enrolled)

- **Cost per credit hour** to deliver education

- **Efficiency** - Certificate (of at least one year in expected length) and degree completions per $100,000 of education and related spending by institutions (Education & Related spending is defined as the full cost of instruction and student services, plus the portion of institutional support and maintenance assigned to instruction) *This measures is currently reported to IPEDS by each institution.*

For this planning cycle the institutional research staff from each of the institutions met with Board staff to discuss the system wide performance measures and to make sure there was a common understanding of the definitions for these measures and how they were to be reported. As a result of this work the system wide performance measures were amended as follows:

- **Graduation Rate:**
  a) Total degree production (split by undergraduate/graduate).
  b) Unduplicated headcount of graduates and percent of graduates to total unduplicated headcount (split by undergraduate/graduate).

- **Retention Rate:**
  Total full-time new and transfer students that are retained or graduate the following year (excluding death, military service, and mission).

- **Cost of College (to determine financials):**
  The audited financial statements are used for this measure (meaning a 1-year lag). The total Cost-of-College step 4 for financials is used for the 4-year institutions. The Community Colleges do not produce a Cost-of-College report and will work with Board staff to come up with a uniform measure.
  a) Cost per credit hour – Financials divided by total weighted undergraduate credit hours from the EWA report.
b) Efficiency – Certificates (of at least 1-year or more) and degree completions per $100,000 of financials.

- **Remediation:**
  Number and percentage of first-time freshmen who graduated from an Idaho high school in the previous year requiring remedial education as determined by institutional benchmarks.

- **Dual Credit:**
  Total credit hours earned and the unduplicated headcount of participating students.

The “Remediation” performance measures is not a measure of the institutions performance, but that of the secondary schools the freshmen are coming from. It is included in the list of performance measures and is reported by the institutions, however, it is reported on the performance measure report under “Cases Served.”

The performance measures are approved at the same time as the strategic plans, if the Board has any concerns with the measures included in the plans or if they wish to see any additional performance measures, those changes can be made at this meeting, the strategic plans would then be brought back for final approval at the April Board meeting.

During the 2013 Strategic Plan approval process the Board requested that going forward, at a minimum, the baseline information used to calculate the benchmarks be provided with the strategic plans so that a comparison could be made to the current progress in relation to those benchmarks so that a determination could be made in regard to the viability of those benchmarks as well as whether or not the benchmarks were “stretch” benchmarks to encourage growth or status quo benchmarks. Additional information has been provided by the institutions and agencies to that end. The institutions were allowed to provide the information either as a supplemental or incorporate it into their plans. The Board may want to provide further direction on which method is the most helpful to the Board for future years.

**BOARD ACTION**


Moved by __________ Seconded by __________ Carried Yes _____ No ______
Idaho State Department of Education  
Public Schools Strategic Plan  
2014-2018

Vision Statement

To establish an innovative and flexible education system that focuses on results, inspires all students and prepares them to be successful in meeting today’s challenges and tomorrow’s opportunities.

Mission Statement

The Idaho State Department of Education is accountable for the success of all Idaho students. As leaders in education, we provide the expertise and technical assistance to promote educational excellence and highly effective instruction.

Indicators of a High-Quality Education System

- High student achievement
- Low dropout rate
- High percentage of students going on to postsecondary education
- Closed achievement gap
- All decisions based on current accurate data
- Efficient use of all resources
- Individualized education through technology

Guiding Principles

- Every student can learn and must have a highly effective teacher in every classroom.
- Market forces must drive necessary change.
- Current and new resources must focus on the 21st Century Classroom.

With these indicators and guiding principles as our focus, the Idaho State Department of Education will increase student achievement by focusing on the following areas:
• Maintain and continue to improve Idaho’s new system of increased accountability which focuses on student academic growth for all students, provides multiple measures of school and student success based on outcomes, and provides for meaningful teacher and principal evaluations.

• Expanding student learning by creating a 21st century classroom that is not limited by walls, bell schedules, availability of courses, and geography. Every student and all teachers will have equal access to the latest technology no matter where they live.

• Continuing to work with districts on accurate and timely submissions of data to the Idaho System for Education Excellence (ISEE) and ensure the quality of submissions.

• Implementing Phase 2 of Idaho System for Education Excellence (ISEE) in which every teacher in Idaho will have access to timely and relevant information on student achievement, digital content, and formative assessments through a statewide item bank and end-of-course assessments.

• Increasing choice options for students including charter, magnet, and alternative schools as well as course offerings through digital learning, including the Idaho Education Network.

The State Department of Education partners with independent school districts to ensure all students receive an education that prepares students for successful post-secondary education, employment and life.

**Goal 1: Ensure students have the skills and knowledge necessary to succeed from kindergarten to high school graduation and post-secondary education.**

Objective 1: Increase of the number of students proficient or advanced on the ISAT (prior to the implementation of higher standards)

Performance Measures: Percent of students who score proficient or advanced on the ISAT.

Benchmark: 90 percent of students proficient on reading, 82 percent of students proficient of math, 77 of students proficient in language arts.

*Objective 2. Implement higher standards in English Language Arts and Mathematics.*

Performance Measures: Percentage of students who pass the new Idaho Standards Achievement Tests (ISAT) based on higher English Language Arts and Mathematics standards.
Benchmark: Sixty percent of students in grades 3-8 will achieve proficiency on the new ISAT in math and English language arts after it is first administered in Spring 2015.

**Objective 3: Improve access to postsecondary education while in high school.**

Performance Measures: Percentage of students completing an advanced opportunity.

Benchmark: Sixty percent of students completing a dual credit, AP course or Tech Prep.

Objective 4: Every high school junior will take a college readiness exam.

Performance Measure: Percentage of students who score college- and career-ready in areas of exam: reading, writing and math.

Benchmark: 40 percent of high school students score college and career ready on a college readiness exam.

**Goal 2: Implement a longitudinal data system where teachers, administrators and parents have accurate student achievement data for a child’s educational career.**

**Objective 1:** Create reports with longitudinal statistics to guide system-level improvement efforts.

Performance Measure: Development of aggregate-level longitudinal data for individualized student growth expectations.

Benchmark: Every Idaho student who takes the ISAT has a growth report available to his/her teacher and parents/guardians.

**Objective 2:** Improve data quality in ISEE uploads to ensure accuracy.

Performance Measure: Random district audits of data quality including enrollment, attendance, and achievement tied students and staff.

Benchmark: Audits matching data submitted within a less than 10 percent margin of error.
Idaho Division of Vocational Rehabilitation

2015 - 2019
Content and Format

The Plan is divided into four sections. The first three sections describe the programs administered under the Idaho Division of Vocational Rehabilitation (IDVR). Each of the programs described, Vocational Rehabilitation, Extended Employment Services, and the Council for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing, outline specific goals, objectives, performance measures and benchmarks for achieving their stated goals. The final section addresses external factors impacting IDVR.

Since Federal and Idaho State governments operate according to different fiscal years, and since IDVR is accountable to Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA) on a federal year basis (October 1 – September 30), the agency will use federal year statistics for reporting the Vocational Rehabilitation program portion of IDVR. Any comparisons noted in benchmarks will reflect the most complete FFY data available. Since the Extended Employment Services and the Council for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing programs are state funded only, all reporting will be based on a state fiscal year. This Plan will cover fiscal years (SFY) 2015 through 2019.
Vocational Rehabilitation

Vocational Rehabilitation Program Vision Statement

“Your success at work means our work is a success.”

Vocational Rehabilitation Program Mission Statement

“Preparing individuals with disabilities for employment and community enrichment.”
Vocational Rehabilitation Program Goals

Goal #1 – To provide excellent and quality customer service to individuals with disabilities while they prepare to obtain, maintain, or regain competitive employment and long term supported employment.

1. **Objective:** To provide customers with effective job supports including adequate job training to increase employment stability and retention.

   **Performance Measure:** To enhance the level of job preparedness services to all customers.

   **Benchmark:** Increase the number of successful rehabilitations in FFY 2015 to meet or exceed FFY 2014 performance.

   **Benchmark:** The average hourly wage of all successful rehabilitations in FFY 2015 will exceed FFY2014 year’s average hourly wage.

   **Benchmark:** Identify and provide workforce development opportunities for customers specifically in the area of “soft skills” development

2. **Objective:** To increase employment successes for transition age youth.

   A. **Performance Measure:** To work with Idaho school districts, Special Education Directors, and the State Board of Education to identify and assist transition age youth both internal and external to School-Work Transition projects.

      **Benchmark:** The number of transition age youth exiting the IDVR program who achieved an employment outcome in FFY 2015 will exceed FFY 2014 performance.

      **Benchmark:** The number of applications for transition aged youth entering the IDVR program in FFY 2015 will exceed FFY 2014 performance.

   B. **Performance Measure:** To provide increased work opportunities while in high school.

      **Benchmark:** Evaluate potential mechanisms to support internships and mentorships for customers transitioning from high school.
3. **Objective**: To increase customer engagement in the VR process.

   **Performance Measure**: Increase customer awareness of vocational information and the decision making process through informed choice.

   **Benchmark**: The number of first time approved plans in FFY 2015 will exceed FFY2014.

   **Benchmark**: The rehabilitation rate of individuals exiting the IDVR program in FFY 2015 will meet or exceed the Federal performance standard of 55.8%.

4. **Objective**: To offer benefit planning to all customers receiving SSI and/or SSDI entering, during and exiting the IDVR process to include Partnership Plus.

   **Performance Measure**: To provide information and referral material to customers initiating and completing the IDVR program, specifically Partnership Plus and Medicaid for Workers with Disabilities.

   **Benchmark**: Increase Social Security reimbursements to VR in FFY 2015 from FFY 2014 performance.

   **Benchmark**: Increase the number of referrals to the WIPA program for benefits counseling in FFY 2015 from FFY 2014 referrals.

### Goal #2 - To provide organizational excellence within the agency.

1. **Objective**: To increase the focus of customer service within the IDVR delivery system.

   A. **Performance Measure**: Provide all customers who have reached planned services, satisfaction surveys when exiting the IDVR program.

      **Benchmark**: Maintain a customer satisfaction rate of at least 95% as demonstrated by “agree” to “strongly agree” ratings on customer surveys in FFY2015.

   B. **Performance Measure**: Provide all customers who have been determined eligible, satisfaction surveys at time of plan implementation or at closure if prior to plan implementation by the end of FFY 2015.

      **Benchmark**: The customer satisfaction rate will demonstrate an overall “strongly agree” rating on customer surveys in FFY2015.
2. **Objective**: To comply with State and Federal regulations.

   **Performance Measure**: Enhance the quality of a statewide program and evaluation system.

   **Benchmark**: Demonstrate compliance with state and federal regulation through both internal and external audits with zero findings in FFY 2015.

3. **Objective**: Utilize training to its maximum capacity for effective staff performance.

   A. **Performance Measure**: Provide all IDVR staff training on policy and procedural changes throughout the agency.

      **Benchmark**: Zero audit findings on State and Federal reviews in FFY 2015.

   B. **Performance Measure**: Provide all IDVR Vocational Rehabilitation Counselors and Vocational Rehabilitation Specialists training on how to communicate and develop effective relationships with employers.

      **Benchmark**: Increase the number of successful rehabilitations in FFY 2015 to meet or exceed FFY 2014 performance.

4. **Objective**: IDVR will maintain a comprehensive system of personnel development (CSPD) standard for IDVR counselors.

   **Performance Measure**: Evaluate and track annually IDVR counselors’ maintenance of CSPD or progress toward achieving CSPD.

   **Benchmark**: Vocational Rehabilitation Counselors will maintain all CSPD standards for their position annually. All Vocational Rehabilitation Specialist staff will continue to work toward and/or achieve CSPD in FFY 2015.
Goal #3 - To have strong relationship with our stakeholder and partners engaged in the mission of Vocational Rehabilitation.

1. **Objective**: For IDVR to be recognized as the expert in the workforce needs of the business community for individuals with disabilities.

   A. **Performance Measure**: To develop a Business Relations position.

      **Benchmark**: Implement a Business Relations position in FFY 2015 that will be a resource to employers statewide.

   B. **Performance Measure**: To enhance a business network with employers to include involvement with the Idaho Association of Business and Industry, the Rotary Club, Chamber of Commerce, and human resource organizations.

      **Benchmark**: Increase the number of different occupational areas hiring IDVR customers in FFY 2015 from FFY 2014.

   C. **Performance Measure**: To enhance relationships with the Regional Business Specialist from the Department of Labor.

      **Benchmark**: Increase the number of different occupational areas hiring IDVR customers in FFY 2015 from FFY 2014.

2. **Objective**: To have an outcome based payment system of services with Community Rehabilitation Programs (CRP).

   **Performance Measure**: Evaluate and develop a milestone process.

   **Benchmark**: Implementation of a milestone program for CRPs by the end of FFY 2015.

3. **Objective**: Provide ongoing opportunities to stakeholders and partners for effective input and feedback in the IDVR process.

   **Performance Measure**: Enhance the number of stakeholders and partners meeting to improve communication and understanding of each programs’ system.

   **Benchmark**: Increase the number of applicants entering the IDVR process in FFY 2015 from FFY 2014 performance outcome.
4. **Objective:** Provide information to partners and stakeholders regarding the VR process and comprehensive referral information when applicable.

*Performance Measure:* Enhance the delivery system of VR general information and referral-specific information to partners and stakeholders.

*Benchmark:* Increase the number of applicants entering the IDVR process in FFY 2015 from FFY 2014 performance outcome.

*Benchmark:* Increase the number of successful rehabilitations in FFY 2015 to meet or exceed FFY 2014 performance.
Extended Employment Services

Mission

Idahoans with significant disabilities are some of the state’s most vulnerable citizens. The Extended Employment Services (EES) Program provides people with significant disabilities employment opportunities either in a community supported or workshop setting.

Vision

Provide meaningful employment opportunities to enable Idaho’s Most Severely Disabled to seek, train-for and retain real work success.

Goal #1 – Continually improve the quality and quantity of Extended Employment with Vocational Rehabilitation Services available to eligible Idahoans with severe physical and mental disabilities and to assist them to prepare for, obtain or regain gainful employment opportunities.

1. Objective: Develop and emphasize customer centered programs offering increased choice, flexibility and opportunities for meaningful employment.

   Performance Measure: Increase the availability of customer centered employment services through employment, training, and job opportunities funded through the Vocational Rehabilitation Extended Employment Services.

   Benchmark: Five percent reduction in program waitlisted customers.

   Benchmark: Increase customer choice.

   Benchmark: Transparency in customer centered allocations.
Council for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing (CDHH)

Role of IDVR

CDHH is an independent agency. This is a flow-through council for budgetary and administrative support purposes only with no direct programmatic implication for IDVR. The following is the Council for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing’s Strategic Plan.

Mission

Dedicated to making Idaho a place where persons, of all ages, who are deaf or hard of hearing have an equal opportunity to participate fully as active, productive and independent citizens.

Vision

To ensure that individuals who are deaf, hard of hearing, or hearing impaired have a centralized location to obtain resources and information about services available.

Goal #1 – Work to increase access to employment, educational and social-interaction opportunities for persons who are deaf or hard of hearing.

1. **Objective**: Continue to provide information and resources.

   *Performance Measure*: Track when information and resources are given to consumers.

   *Benchmark*: Create and maintain brochures and other information about employment, education and social-interaction.

Goal #2 – Increase the awareness of the needs of persons who are deaf and hard of hearing through educational and informational programs.

1. **Objective**: Continue to increase the awareness.

   *Performance Measure*: Give presentations to various groups through education and social media.

   *Benchmark*: Present to various organizations including corrections, courts, schools, and businesses about the needs of persons who are deaf and hard of hearing.
Goal #3 – Encourage consultation and cooperation among departments, agencies, and institutions serving the deaf and hard of hearing.

1. **Objective**: Continue encouraging consultation and cooperation.

   **Performance Measure**: Track when departments, agencies, and institutions are cooperating (such as Department of Corrections and Health and Welfare.)

   **Benchmark**: Present to various agencies about the need for cooperation providing services needed for deaf and hard of hearing individuals.

Goal #4 – Provide a network through which all state and federal programs dealing with the deaf and hard of hearing individuals can be channeled.

1. **Objective**: The Council’s office will provide the network.

   **Performance Measure**: Track when information is provided.

   **Benchmark**: The Council will continue to maintain a network through their website, brochures, telephone calls, video phone calls and personal communication.

Goal #5 – Determine the extent and availability of services to the deaf and hard of hearing, determine the need for further services and make recommendations to government officials to insure that the needs of deaf and hard of hearing citizens are best served.

1. **Objective**: The Council will determine the availability of services available.

   **Performance Measure**: The Council will facilitate meetings to determine the needs.

   **Benchmark**: The Council facilitated a Mental Health Task Force to determine the needs for mental health services for the deaf and hard of hearing. The Council facilitated town hall style meetings throughout the state to determine the needs of deaf and hard of hearing individuals throughout the state.

   **Benchmark**: The Council will facilitate an Interpreter License Task Force to determine the need for legislation to regulate the practice of interpreting on behalf of consumers who are hearing, deaf, hard of hearing, deaf-blind, or speech disabled by licensing and provisionally licensing the providers of sign language interpreting services and establishing and monitoring sign language interpreting standards in the State.
Goal #6 – To coordinate, advocate for, and recommend the development of public policies and programs that provide full and equal opportunity and accessibility for the deaf and hard of hearing persons in Idaho.

1. **Objective**: The Council will make available copies of policies concerning deaf and hard of hearing issues.

   **Performance Measure**: Materials that are distributed about public policies.

   **Benchmark**: The Executive Director of the Council for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing will facilitate meetings with different agencies including Health and Welfare, Corrections, schools and businesses to create public policy, including Interpreter standards.

Goal #7 – To monitor consumer protection issues that involves the deaf and hard of hearing in the state of Idaho.

1. **Objective**: The Council will be the “go to” agency for resolving complaints from deaf and hard of hearing consumers concerning the Americans with Disabilities Act.

   **Performance Measure**: Track how many complaints are received regarding the ADA.

   **Benchmark**: The Council will provide information and create brochures regarding all aspects of the ADA that affect persons with hearing loss.

Goal #8 – Submit periodic reports to the Governor, the legislature, and departments of state government on how current federal and state programs, rules, regulations, and legislation affect services to persons with hearing loss.

1. **Objective**: The Council will submit reports.

   **Performance Measure**: Reports will be accurate and detailed.

   **Benchmark**: The Council for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing will create a periodic report to provide to the Governor’s office. The Council will present a needs assessment report to certain departments/agencies as needed.
External Factors Impacting IDVR

The field of Vocational Rehabilitation is dynamic due to the nature and demographics of the customers served and the variety of disabilities addressed. Challenges facing the Division include:

**Adequate Supply of Qualified Personnel**

IDVR is dedicated to providing the most qualified personnel to address the needs of the customers they serve. Challenges in recruitment have been prevalent over the past several years. Recruiting efforts have been stifled by low wages as compared to other Idaho state agencies as well as neighboring states. IDVR has identified the need to develop relationships with universities specifically offering a Master’s Degree in Rehabilitation Counseling. Furthermore, IDVR has identified universities offering coursework for other degree programs that will meet eligibility for the Certification in Rehabilitation Counseling (CRC). Lastly, IDVR has collaborated with the University of Idaho to advance the profession of rehabilitation counseling.

**State and Federal Economic and Political Climate**

While Idaho has seen some improvement in its economic growth over the past year there are a variety of influences which can affect progress. Influences can vary from natural disasters to international conflicts. Individuals with disabilities have historically experienced much higher unemployment rates, even in strong economic times. Furthermore, Idaho has the highest percentage per capita of worker in the country making minimum wage. IDVR recognizes this and strives to develop relationships within both the private and public sectors in an effort to increase employment opportunities and livable wages for its customers.

The political elements are by far the most difficult for IDVR to overcome. At the state level, the Division is subject to legislative action regarding annual budget requests including service dollars and personnel expansion. Any legislation pertaining to service provision either by public or private sectors will have a definite impact on Division services and service providers.

IDVR is also affected by decisions made at the federal level. The outcome of the new Affordable Care Act is not yet clearly understood, but will undoubtedly have an influence on IDVR customers and services provided. Also, the direction Congress chooses regarding reauthorization of the Rehabilitation Act will impact the future of Vocational Rehabilitation in Idaho. Federal funding decisions, e.g., training grants, block grants, funding reductions, program deletions, merging of programs, changes in health care and employment standards and practices are areas that would impact the Division’s planning process. Funding decisions and allocations on a state level have a direct impact on the amount of federal dollars the agency is able to capture.

Funding reductions on both the State and Federal level have and will continue to impact partnerships and comparable benefits available to the IDVR. For example, reduced budgets to school districts have impacted collaborative agreements. These agreements have allowed the IDVR to use nonfederal funds to match federal dollars, therefore increasing the amount of dollars available to IDVR. It is uncertain at this time the full impact in which sequestration will have on
the IDVR, partners and programs. It is anticipated that some programs in which comparable benefits are available will be reduced or eliminated, therefore increasing the economic impact to IDVR on the delivery of vocational services.

**Adequate Availability of Services**

Due to the rural nature of Idaho, there are isolated pockets of the state with limited vendor option. This can directly impact customer informed choice. Furthermore, a vendor’s inability to meet required credentialing under IDAPA will significantly reduce or eliminate a customer’s options. Lastly, changes to other program criteria will eliminate services to customers. A change in Health and Welfare’s criteria for the HCBS Medicaid Waiver is one example affecting program services.

**Technological Advances in Both Assistive Rehabilitation Products and Information Technology**

IDVR recognizes the importance of both information and assistive technology advances as intricate to the success of the division as well as the customers it serves. The cost and rapid changes in these technologies influence the overall program success. IDVR is dedicated to keeping current of the latest trends in both assistive rehabilitation technology and information technology, and in training Vocational Rehabilitation Counselors and staff. IDVR employs an Information Technology staff to develop innovative ways to utilize technology in carrying out its mission. IDVR also collaborates with the Idaho Assistive Technology Project through the University of Idaho with center locations throughout the state.

All staff of the Idaho Division of Vocational Rehabilitation takes pride in providing the most effective, efficient services available to individuals with disabilities seeking employment. Management is committed to continued service to the people of Idaho. The goals and objectives outlined in the IDVR Strategic Plan are designed to maximize the provision of services to Idahoans with disabilities as well as promote program accountability.
The following is a supplement to the SFY 2015-2019 Strategic Plan. It highlights the Vocational Rehabilitation and Extended Employment Service performance measure and accompanying benchmark(s). The Vocational Rehabilitation Program is primarily a federally funded program that assesses performance on a Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) basis (October 1-September 30); therefore input and data is based on the FFY. The Extended Employment Services Program is State funded only, therefore input and data will be based on the SFY.

It should be noted that the Council for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing (CDHH) is an independent agency. This is a flow-through council for budgetary and administrative support purposes only with no direct programmatic implication for IDVR. Idaho code authorizes the Governor to assign the Council to a department within the state government. The Council reports directly to the Governor appointed CDHH board of directors. The CDHH board oversees the requests, functions and priorities of the Council.

**Vocational Rehabilitation:**

**Performance Measure:** To enhance the level of job preparedness services to all customers.

**Benchmark:** Increase the number of successful rehabilitations in FFY 2015 to meet or exceed FFY 2014 performance.

FFY 2013= 1827 successful rehabilitations. To meet or exceed the previous year’s performance

**Benchmark:** The average hourly wage of all successful rehabilitations in FFY 2015 will exceed FFY2014 year’s average hourly wage.

FFY 2013 Average hourly wage, VR customers (post services): $10.98/hour.

**Benchmark:** Identify and provide workforce development opportunities for customers specifically in the area of “soft skills” development

Based on the completion of IDVR's Comprehensive Statewide Needs Assessment in FFY2013, it was identified that employers specifically want workers to have strong “soft skills” coming into employment. No work done at this time.

**Performance Measure:** To work with Idaho school districts, Special Education Directors, and the State Board of Education to identify and assist transition age youth both internal and external to School-Work Transition projects.

**Benchmark:** The number of transition age youth exiting the IDVR program who achieved an employment outcome in FFY 2015 will exceed FFY 2014 performance.

553 transition age youth achieved an employment outcome in FFY 2013.
**Benchmark:** The number of applications for transition aged youth entering the IDVR program in FFY 2015 will exceed FFY 2014 performance.

Number of applications for transition aged youth in FFY2013: 1595

**Performance Measure:** To provide increased work opportunities while in high school.

**Benchmark:** Evaluate potential mechanisms to support internships and mentorships for customers transitioning from high school.

Based on the completion of IDVR’s Comprehensive Statewide Needs Assessment in FFY2013, it was identified that internships and mentorships could be valuable to assist in the transition of a student from secondary to post-secondary or to successful employment. No work completed at this time.

**Performance Measure:** Increase customer awareness of vocational information and the decision making process through informed choice.

**Benchmark:** The number of first time approved plans in FFY 2015 will exceed FFY2014.

Number of first time approved plans in FFY 2013: 3134

**Benchmark:** The rehabilitation rate of individuals exiting the IDVR program in FFY 2015 will meet or exceed the Federal performance standard of 55.8%.

The Percentage of Individuals Receiving Services under an Individualized Plan for Employment Who Achieve Employment Outcomes (Successful closures after plan divided by the total of Successful and nonsuccessful closures after plan). This percentage will meet or exceed 55.8%.

**Performance Measure:** To provide information and referral material to customers initiating and completing the IDVR program, specifically Partnership Plus and Medicaid for Workers with Disabilities.

**Benchmark:** Increase Social Security reimbursements to VR in FFY 2015 from FFY 2014 performance.

FFY 2013 Reimbursement $646,200.

**Benchmark:** Increase the number of referrals to the WIPA program for benefits counseling in FFY 2015 from FFY 2014 referrals.

FFY 2013, 98 referrals were identified in the IDVR case management system.
Performance Measure: Provide all customers who have reached planned services, satisfaction surveys when exiting the IDVR program.

Benchmark: Maintain a customer satisfaction rate of at least 95% as demonstrated by “agree” to “strongly agree” ratings on customer surveys in FFY2015.

The customer satisfaction rate for FFY 2013 was 95.8%.

Performance Measure: Provide all customers who have been determined eligible, satisfaction surveys at time of plan implementation or at closure if prior to plan implementation by the end of FFY 2015.

Benchmark: The customer satisfaction rate will demonstrate an overall “strongly agree” rating on customer surveys in FFY2015.

No established benchmark. Specific customer survey to be developed.

Performance Measure: Enhance the quality of a statewide program and evaluation system.

Benchmark: Demonstrate compliance with state and federal regulation through both internal and external audits with zero findings in FFY 2015.

Zero findings.

Performance Measure: Provide all IDVR staff training on policy and procedural changes throughout the agency.

Benchmark: Zero audit findings on State and Federal reviews in FFY 2015.

Zero findings.

Performance Measure: Provide all IDVR Vocational Rehabilitation Counselors and Vocational Rehabilitation Specialists training on how to communicate and develop effective relationships with employers.

Benchmark: Increase the number of successful rehabilitations in FFY 2015 to meet or exceed FFY 2014 performance.

FFY 2013 = 1827 successful rehabilitations. To meet or exceed the previous year’s performance.
Performance Measure: Evaluate and track annually IDVR counselors’ maintenance of CSPD or progress toward achieving CSPD.

Benchmark: Vocational Rehabilitation Counselors will maintain all CSPD standards for their position annually. All Vocational Rehabilitation Specialist staff will continue to work toward and/or achieve CSPD in FFY 2015.

VRC’s will maintain CSPD standard and VRS’ will work toward/ or achieve standard based on Agency’s policy.

Performance Measure: To develop a Business Relations position.

Benchmark: Implement a Business Relations position in FFY 2015 that will be a resource to employers statewide.

This has been identified from IDVR’s Comprehensive Statewide Needs Assessment and input from our Public Forums in FFY2013. No work completed at this time.

Performance Measure: To enhance a business network with employers to include involvement with the Idaho Association of Business and Industry, the Rotary Club, Chamber of Commerce, and human resource organizations.

Benchmark: Increase the number of different occupational areas hiring IDVR customers in FFY 2015 from FFY 2014.

FFY2013 Data:

Service Occupations 846 =46%
Prod, Const, Operating, Maint & Material Handling 459=25%
Professional, Paraprofessional and Technical 265= 16%
Clerical and Administrative Support 106=.06%
Sales and Related Occupations 74=.04%
Managerial and Administrative 42=.02%
Agricultural, Forestry, Fishing and Related 21=.01%
Production Occupations 4=.002%
Computer and Mathematical Occupations 3=.002%
Education, Training, and Library Occupations 2=.001%
Healthcare Support Occupations 2=.001%
Community and Social Service Occupations 2=.001%
RSA Special Occupations and Miscellaneous 1=>.001%

**Performance Measure:** To enhance relationships with the Regional Business Specialist from the Department of Labor.

**Benchmark:** Increase the number of different occupational areas hiring IDVR customers in FFY 2015 from FFY 2014.

See above

**Performance Measure:** Evaluate and develop a milestone process.

**Benchmark:** Implementation of a milestone program for CRPs by the end of FFY 2015 To be evaluated.

**Performance Measure:** Enhance the number of stakeholders and partners meeting to improve communication and understanding of each programs’ system.

**Benchmark:** Increase the number of applicants entering the IDVR process in FFY 2015 from FFY 2014 performance outcome.

Number of applicants entering VR in FFY2013: 5250

**Extended Employment Services:**

**Performance Measure:** Increase the availability of customer centered employment services through employment, training, and job opportunities funded through the Vocational Rehabilitation Extended Employment Services.

Between SFY 2012 and SFY 2013 the EES Program increased the number of customers served by 5.5% while maintaining approximately the same level of funding. Additionally, the EES Program increased the percentage of program customers employed in competitive community employment (as opposed to subminimum wage positions) by 3%. These gains were made by fostering close working relationships with our Community Rehabilitation Partners and by developing methods of tailoring the programs limited available funding to customers’ needs rather than overarching CRP based allocations.

**Benchmark:** Five percent reduction in program waitlisted customers.

Baseline from end of SFY 2013 = 686 waitlisted
**Benchmark:** Increase customer choice.

By developing new program protocols that allowed money to “Follow the Person” rather than assigning program allocations only to existing providers; for the first time ever, EES Customers had the ability to change providers if their needs could be better served elsewhere. Furthermore, this change in process created the opportunity for new providers to enter regional markets across the state and allowed customers to choose these new vendors without fear of losing their EES funding.

**Benchmark:** Transparency in customer centered allocations.

Previous yearly EESAllocations were controlled by community rehabilitation providers and the funding available for any specific customer was not clearly identified. In SFY 2013, all EES customers had an individual budget allocation assigned to them and the customer, provider and support team members were aware of a customer’s budget allocation for the year.

Quarterly analysis was provided at the individual customer level to each community rehabilitation provider and regional funding levels were available publically for all program participants.
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Idaho Public Television is an integral part of the State Board of Education’s overall plan and process for the delivery of quality education throughout Idaho. This Plan describes the primary vision, needs, concerns, goals, and objectives of the staff and administration toward achieving those goals. The mission and vision of our agency reflect an ongoing commitment to meet the needs and reflect the interests of our varied audiences.

Idaho Public Television’s services are in alignment with the guiding goals & objectives of the State Board of Education (SBoE). This Plan displays SBoE goals alongside the Agency’s Strategic Planning Issues.

Ron Pisaneschi
General Manager
Idaho Public Television

VISION STATEMENT

Inspire, enrich and educate the people we serve, enabling them to make a better world.

MISSION STATEMENT

The mission of Idaho Public Television is to meet the needs and reflect the interests of its varied audiences by:

- Establishing and maintaining statewide industry-standard delivery systems to provide television and other media to Idaho homes and schools;

- Providing quality educational, informational and cultural television and related resources;

- Creating Idaho-based educational, informational and cultural programs and resources;

- Providing learning opportunities and fostering participation and collaboration in educational and civic activities; and

- Attracting, developing and retaining talented and motivated employees who are committed to accomplishing the shared vision of Idaho Public Television.

3/13/2014
Idaho Public Television
STRATEGIC PLAN FY 2015-2019

SBoE Goal 1: A WELL-EDUCATED CITIZENRY
The educational system will provide opportunities for individual advancement.

IdahoPTV Objectives:

1) Progress toward digital implementation as a statewide infrastructure in cooperation with public and private entities.
   • Performance Measures:
     • Number of DTV translators.
       ○ Benchmark: FY15 - 47 of 49
       ○ Benchmark: FY19 - 49 of 49
       (established by industry standard)
     • Number of cable companies carrying our prime digital channel.
       ○ Benchmark: FY15 - 28
       ○ Benchmark: FY19 - 28
       (established by industry standard)
     • Number of Direct Broadcast Satellite (DBS) providers carrying our prime digital channel.
       ○ Benchmark: FY15 - 8
       ○ Benchmark: FY19 - 8
       (established by industry standard)
     • Percentage of Idaho’s population within our DTV signal coverage area.
       ○ Benchmark: FY15 - 98.5%
       ○ Benchmark: FY19 - 98.5%
       (established by industry standard)

2) Nurture and foster collaborative partnerships with other Idaho state entities to provide services to the citizens of Idaho.
   • Performance Measure:
     • Number of partnerships with other Idaho state entities.
       ○ Benchmark: FY15 - 20
       ○ Benchmark: FY19 - 25
       (established by agency research)

3) Operate an efficient statewide delivery/distribution system.
   • Performance Measure:
     • Total FTE in content delivery and distribution.
       ○ Benchmark: FY15 - less than 30
       ○ Benchmark: FY19 - less than 25
       (established by industry standard)
4) Provide access to IdahoPTV television content that accommodates the needs of the hearing and sight impaired.
   • Performance Measures:
     - Percentage of broadcast hours of closed captioned programming (non-live, i.e. videotaped) to aid visual learners and the hearing impaired.
       - Benchmark: FY15 - 97.5%
       - Benchmark: FY19 - 100%
         (established by industry standard)
     - Percentage of online hours of closed captioned programming (non-live, i.e. videotaped) to aid visual learners and the hearing impaired.
       - Benchmark: FY15 - 10%
       - Benchmark: FY19 - 15%
         (established by industry standard)
     - Number of service hours of descriptive video service provided via the second audio program to aid those with impaired vision.
       - Benchmark: FY15 - 12,000
       - Benchmark: FY19 - 12,000
         (established by agency research)

5) Provide access to IdahoPTV new media content to citizens anywhere in the state, which supports citizen participation and education.
   • Performance Measures:
     - Number of visitors to our websites.
       - Benchmark: FY15 - 1,200,000
       - Benchmark: FY19 - 1,400,000
         (established by agency research)
     - Number of visitors to IdahoPTV/PBS video player.
       - Benchmark: FY15 - 25,000
       - Benchmark: FY19 - 30,000
         (established by agency research)

6) Broadcast educational programs and provide related resources that serve the needs of Idahoans, which include children, ethnic minorities, learners, and teachers.
   • Performance Measure:
     - Number of broadcast hours of educational programming.
       - Benchmark: FY15 - 28,000
       - Benchmark: FY19 - 28,500
         (established by agency research)

7) Contribute to a well-informed citizenry.
   • Performance Measure:
     - Number of broadcast hours of news, public affairs and documentaries.
       - Benchmark: FY15 - 12,500
       - Benchmark: FY19 - 12,500
         (established by agency research)
8) Provide relevant Idaho-specific information.
   • Performance Measure:
     ▪ Number of broadcast hours of Idaho-specific educational and informational programming.
       o Benchmark: FY15 - 1,800
       o Benchmark: FY19 - 1,800
       (established by research)

9) Provide high-quality, educational television programming and new media content.
   • Performance Measure:
     ▪ Number of awards for IdahoPTV media and services.
       o Benchmark: FY15 - meet or exceed 35
       o Benchmark: FY19 - meet or exceed 50
       (established by industry standard)

10) Be a relevant, educational and informational resource to all citizens.
     • Performance Measure:
       ▪ Full-day average weekly cume (percentage of TV households watching) as compared to peer group of PBS state networks.
         o Benchmark: FY15 - 21.3%
         o Benchmark: FY19 - 21.3%
         (established by industry standard)

11) Operate an effective and efficient organization.
    • Performance Measure:
      ▪ Successfully comply with FCC policies/PBS programming, underwriting and membership policies/and CPB guidelines.
        o Benchmark: FY15 - yes/yes/yes
        o Benchmark: FY19 - yes/yes/yes
        (established by industry standard)

SBoe GOAL 2: CRITICAL THINKING AND INNOVATION
The educational system will provide an environment for the development of new ideas, and practical and theoretical knowledge to foster the development of individuals who are entrepreneurial, broadminded, think critically, and are creative.

IdahoPTV Objectives:

1) Nurture and foster collaborative partnerships with other Idaho state entities to provide services to the citizens of Idaho.
   • Performance Measure:
     ▪ Number of partnerships with other Idaho state entities.
       o Benchmark: FY15 - 20
       o Benchmark: FY19 - 25
       (established by agency research)
2) Provide access to IdahoPTV new media content to citizens anywhere in the state, which supports citizen participation and education.
   • Performance Measures:
     - Number of visitors to our websites.
       o Benchmark: FY15 - 1,200,000
       o Benchmark: FY19 - 1,400,000
       (established by agency research)
     - Number of visitors to IdahoPTV/PBS video player.
       o Benchmark: FY15 - 25,000
       o Benchmark: FY19 - 30,000
       (established by agency research)

3) Broadcast educational programs and provide related resources that serve the needs of Idahoans, which include children, ethnic minorities, learners, and teachers.
   • Performance Measure:
     - Number of broadcast hours of educational programming.
       o Benchmark: FY15 - 28,000
       o Benchmark: FY19 - 28,500
       (established by agency research)

4) Contribute to a well-informed citizenry.
   • Performance Measure:
     - Number of broadcast hours of news, public affairs and documentaries.
       o Benchmark: FY15 - 12,500
       o Benchmark: FY19 - 12,500
       (established by agency research)

5) Provide relevant Idaho-specific information.
   • Performance Measure:
     - Number of broadcast hours of Idaho-specific educational and informational programming.
       o Benchmark: FY15 - 1,800
       o Benchmark: FY19 - 1,800
       (established by agency research)

6) Provide high-quality, educational television programming and new media content.
   • Performance Measure:
     - Number of awards for IdahoPTV media and services.
       o Benchmark: FY15 - 35
       o Benchmark: FY19 - 50
       (established by agency research)

7) Be a relevant, educational and informational resource to all citizens.
   • Performance Measure:
     - Full-day average weekly cure (percentage of TV households watching) as compared to peer group of PBS state networks.
       o Benchmark: FY15 - 21.3%
       o Benchmark: FY19 - 21.3%
       (established by industry standard)
8) Operate an effective and efficient organization.
   • Performance Measure:
     ▪ Successfully comply with FCC policies/PBS programming, underwriting and membership policies/and CPB guidelines.
       o Benchmark: FY15 – yes/yes/yes
       o Benchmark: FY19 – yes/yes/yes
       (established by industry standard)

SBoE GOAL 3: EFFECTIVE AND EFFICIENT DELIVERY SYSTEMS
Ensure educational resources are used efficiently.

IdahoPTV Objectives:

1) Progress toward digital implementation as a statewide infrastructure in cooperation with public and private entities.
   • Performance Measures:
     ▪ Number of DTV translators.
       o Benchmark: FY15 – 47 of 49
       o Benchmark: FY19 – 49 of 49
       (established by industry standard)
     ▪ Number of cable companies carrying our prime digital channel.
       o Benchmark: FY15 – 28
       o Benchmark: FY19 – 28
       (established by industry standard)
     ▪ Number of Direct Broadcast Satellite (DBS) providers carrying our prime digital channel.
       o Benchmark: FY15 – 8
       o Benchmark: FY19 – 8
       (established by industry standard)
     ▪ Percentage of Idaho’s population within our DTV signal coverage area.
       o Benchmark: FY15 – 98.5%
       o Benchmark: FY19 – 98.5%
       (established by industry standard)

2) Nurture and foster collaborative partnerships with other Idaho state entities to provide services to the citizens of Idaho.
   • Performance Measure:
     ▪ Number of partnerships with other Idaho state entities.
       o Benchmark: FY15 – 20
       o Benchmark: FY19 – 25
       (established by agency research)

3) Operate an efficient statewide delivery/distribution system.
   • Performance Measure:
     ▪ Total FTE in content delivery and distribution.
       o Benchmark: FY15 – less than 30
       o Benchmark: FY19 – less than 25
       (established by industry standard)
4) Provide access to IdahoPTV new media content to citizens anywhere in the state, which supports citizen participation and education.
   • Performance Measures:
     ▪ Number of visitors to our websites.
       o Benchmark: FY15 – 1,200,000
       o Benchmark: FY19 – 1,400,000
       (established by agency research)
     ▪ Number of visitors to IdahoPTV/PBS video player.
       o Benchmark: FY15 – 25,000
       o Benchmark: FY19 – 30,000
       (established by agency research)

5) Provide high-quality, educational television programming and new media content.
   • Performance Measure:
     ▪ Number of awards for IdahoPTV media and services.
       o Benchmark: FY15 – 35
       o Benchmark: FY19 – 50
       (established by industry standard)

6) Be a relevant, educational and informational resource to all citizens.
   • Performance Measure:
     ▪ Full-day average weekly cume (percentage of TV households watching) as compared to peer group of PBS state networks.
       o Benchmark: FY15 – 21.3%
       o Benchmark: FY19 – 21.3%
       (established by industry standard)

7) Operate an effective and efficient organization.
   • Performance Measure:
     ▪ Successfully comply with FCC policies/PBS programming, underwriting and membership policies/and CPB guidelines.
       o Benchmark: FY15 – yes/yes/yes
       o Benchmark: FY19 – yes/yes/yes
       (established by industry standard)
Key External Factors
(Beyond the control of Idaho Public Television):

IdahoPTV provides numerous services to various state entities.

Funding:
Idaho Public Television's current strategic goals and objectives are based on a sustainable level of all funding sources: State of Idaho, Corporation for Public Broadcasting, and private contributions.

We are starting to see the impact of state entities passing on significant costs of operational expenses such as endowment land leases. This also includes the Idaho Bureau of Homeland Security (after 2019) that IdahoPTV has partnered with to provide data connectivity for broadcast signal distribution.

Much of the content that Idaho Public Television airs comes from program distributors or producers, both nationally and regionally. If these program production funding sources change (up or down), it could have an impact on IdahoPTV’s ability to meet its goals and objectives targets.

Legislation/Rules:
Recent state statute and rule changes typically have not impacted Idaho Public Television. We are monitoring, to the degree we can, the effectiveness and sunset of the expanded Idaho education tax credit that is set to expire December 31, 2015.

Federal Government:
Various aspects of IdahoPTV’s program functions fall under federal oversight, including the Federal Communications Commission, United States Department of Commerce, United States Department of Agriculture, Federal Aviation Administration, United States Department of Homeland Security, Internal Revenue Service, etc. Any change of federal rules and funding by any of these entities could also affect our ability to fulfill this strategic plan.

The FCC is currently engaged in auctioning frequencies to non-broadcast providers that have traditionally been used by broadcasters including Idaho Public Television. In doing so, the FCC is requiring stations to move to their transmitters and translators to different frequencies “repacking” them into fewer more congested frequencies. This has the potential of costing stations significant funds, and in some cases losing service to particular communities when available frequencies don’t exist.

As viewers increasingly obtain their video content via new devices (computers, iPads, smartphones, broadband delivered set-top-boxes, etc.) in addition to traditional broadcast, cable and satellite, Idaho Public Television must invest in the technology to meet our viewers’ needs. The ability of public television stations to raise private contributions and other revenue via these new platforms continues to be a significant challenge.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>FY 2013 Data</th>
<th>FY 2015 Benchmark</th>
<th>FY 2019 Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of DTV translators.</td>
<td>44 of 49</td>
<td>47 of 49</td>
<td>49 of 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of cable companies carrying our prime digital channel.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Direct Broadcast Satellite (DBS) providers carrying our prime digital channel.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Idaho’s population within our DTV signal coverage area.</td>
<td>98.2%</td>
<td>98.5%</td>
<td>98.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of partnerships with other Idaho state entities.*</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total FTE in content delivery and distribution.</td>
<td>18.31</td>
<td>less than 30</td>
<td>less than 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of broadcast hours of closed captioned programming (non-live) to aid visual learners and the hearing impaired.</td>
<td>97.35%</td>
<td>97.5%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of online hours of closed captioned programming (non-live) to aid visual learners and the hearing impaired.</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of service hours of descriptive video service provided via the second audio program to aid those with impaired vision.</td>
<td>11,503</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of visitors to our websites.</td>
<td>1,196,428</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td>1,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of visitors to IdahoPTV/PBS video player.</td>
<td>22,395</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of broadcast hours of educational programming.</td>
<td>27,778</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>28,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of broadcast hours of news, public affairs and documentaries.</td>
<td>12,272</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>12,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of broadcast hours of Idaho-specific educational and informational programming.</td>
<td>1,798</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of awards for IdahoPTV media and services.</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-day average weekly cume (percentage of TV households watching) as compared to peer group of PBS state networks.*</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successfully comply with FCC policies/PBS programming, underwriting and membership policies/and CPB guidelines.</td>
<td>yes/yes/yes</td>
<td>yes/yes/yes</td>
<td>yes/yes/yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*New performance measure beginning FY 2015.
Strategic Plan

2015-2019
Legal Authority

This strategic plan has been developed by the Division of Professional-Technical Education (DPTE) in compliance with Idaho Code, Title 67, Chapter 19, Sections 67-1901 through 67-1905, as amended. It supersedes all previous DPTE strategic plans.

Statutory authority for and definition of professional-technical education (PTE) is delineated in Idaho Code, Chapter 22, Sections 33-2201 through 33-2212. IDAPA 55 states the role of DPTE is to administer professional-technical education in Idaho and lists specific functions.

Mission

The mission of the Professional-Technical Education system is to provide Idaho’s youth and adults with the technical skills, knowledge, and attitudes necessary for successful performance in a highly effective workplace.

Vision

The economic and social vitality of a society is dependent on citizens properly equipped for career success: people equipped with the necessary skills, knowledge and attitudes required to perform their job responsibilities with a high degree of capability, precision, integrity, and safety while balancing responsibilities to the family and the community. Such a highly qualified and skilled workforce is essential to the competitiveness of Idaho’s businesses and industries and the overall well-being, health, safety, and security of Idaho’s citizens. Professional-technical education addresses this need.

All facets of the Idaho PTE system are complementary and contribute to fulfillment of the mission and Strategic Plan in a synchronized fashion. Division staff support the delivery system to ensure quality and return on the state’s investment.

Core Functions

A. Administration
B. Programs
C. Technical assistance
D. Fiscal oversight
E. Research, planning, and performance management
External Factors

A. Labor market and general economic conditions
B. Perceptions and stigma regarding professional-technical education
C. Availability of funds
D. Policies, practices, legislation, and governance external to the Division
E. Ability to attract and retain qualified instructors
F. Local autonomy and regional distinctions including technical college institutional priorities/varied missions
Goals and objectives

Given the mission of the Division and in light of the goals of the State Board of Education, Goal 1 best aligns with that mission. In support of this goal, objectives are stated regarding the desired condition of the agency and system, with measures and critical success activities to determine whether or not progress is achieved toward the desired system condition. Both long term and short term benchmarks are set for each measure and activity where appropriate.

Goal 1. Effective and efficient delivery system resulting in a highly skilled workforce for Idaho

Objective A. Synchronized system | A coordinated, coherent system that demonstrates responsiveness and effectiveness in addressing Idaho's workforce needs

Performance measures

i. Define and/or validate student learning outcomes and program standards for all program areas with industry participation and endorsement, including career and workplace readiness

Benchmarks

- FY2019: 100% of programs
- FY2015: 20% of programs

ii. Create effective and reliable assessment strategy for authentication of student learning outcomes and adherence to program standards

Benchmarks

- FY2019: 100% of programs
- FY2015: 20% of programs

iii. Number of postsecondary technical credits earned via Advanced Learning Opportunity that satisfy graduation requirements for postsecondary technical program

Benchmarks

- FY2019: 1.5% year-over-year increase
- FY2015: Determine baseline and data collection methodology

Critical Success Activities

Long term

- Centralized database of PTE program standards and outcomes aligned across the system

Short term

- Distribute updated gap analysis report to stakeholders (see Objective G)
Objective B. **Industry engagement** | Business and industry are fully engaged and integrated into system operations

**Performance measures**

i. Program standards and outcomes have industry endorsement (1.A.i. above)

*Benchmarks*

- FY2019: 100% programs
- FY2015: 20% of programs

ii. Program standards include industry engagement requirements

*Benchmarks*

- FY2019: 100% of programs
- FY2015: 20% of programs

**Critical Success Activities**

*Long term*

- Statewide Industry Advisory Council to the Administrator

*Short term*

- Create strategic plan for industry engagement, including improvement of technical advisory committees
- Finalize revisions to Technical Advisory Committee Member Handbook and update DPTE policy

Objective C. **Accessible system** | Students have economical access to programs and services, including advanced learning opportunities and adult re-integration

**Performance measures**

i. Percentage of high school students enrolled in PTE Advanced Learning Opportunity (Tech Prep)¹

*Benchmark*

- 27% students per year enrolled

ii. Number of Integrated Transition and Retention Programs (ABE-ITRP) in the technical colleges¹

*Benchmarks*

- FY2019: 18
- FY2015: 10

iii. Number of Workforce Training Network (WTN) enrollments including Fire and Emergency Services training ¹

¹ State Board of Education measure
Benchmarks
- FY2019: 65,000
- FY2015: 45,000

iv. Expansion of postsecondary PTE Distributed Hybrid Programs

Benchmarks
- FY2019: 4 programs
- FY2015: 1 programs

Critical Success Activities

Long term
To ensure course transferability, develop basic technical certificates to be offered as a component of every postsecondary professional-technical credit program in the state

Short term
- Create a welding basic technical certificate

Objective D. Student success | Systems, services, resources, and operations support high performing students in high performing programs transitioning to employment

i. Postsecondary student completion rate

Benchmarks
- 68%

ii. Secondary and postsecondary student pass rate for Technical Skill Assessment (TSA)

Benchmarks
- Secondary: 75%
- Postsecondary: 90%

iii. Percentage of ABE clients within the cohort who transition to postsecondary education²

Benchmarks
- FY2019: 50%
- FY2015: 27%

iv. Number of postsecondary degrees and certificates awarded

Benchmark
- FY2019: 2,100
- FY2015: 1,955

² The data collection methodology for this population changed in FY13.
v. Positive placement rate of secondary and postsecondary program completers

*Benchmark*
- 90.5%

vi. Training-related placement rate of program completers

*Benchmark*
- Secondary FY2019: 18%
- Secondary FY2015: 14.5%
- Postsecondary FY2019: 70%
- Postsecondary FY2015: 55%

vii. Rate of secondary program completers who transition to postsecondary education

*Benchmark*
- Exceed most recent available NCHEMS overall transition ("go-on") rate for Idaho

Objective E. **Data-informed improvement** | Quality and performance management practices contribute to system improvement, including current research, data analysis, and strategic and operational planning

i. Percentage of programs reviewed for quality and performance on an annual basis

*Benchmarks*
- FY2019: 100% of programs
- FY2015: 20% of programs (5 year rotation)

Critical Success Activities

*Long term*
- PTE information portal for summary SLDS reports

*Short term*
- Current Strategic Plan and attendant performance measures assessed to create threshold for mission fulfillment/system performance to establish
- Finalize design of DPTE Quality Management System and related procedures for implementation
- Establish and implement Program Review schedule to include postsecondary system and Perkins requirements
- Establish performance measures for postsecondary system including WTN
Objective F.  **Highly qualified staff** | Program instructors, school administrators, and support staff demonstrate high levels of achievement and adherence to quality standards

**Performance measures**

i.  Percentage of system faculty and administrators holding appropriate PTE credentials  

*Benchmark*

- FY2019: 100%
- FY2015: 95%

ii. Placement rate of teacher education programs into Idaho PTE system  

*Benchmark*

- Equal to or greater than postsecondary training-related placement rate (1.D.vi) for the reporting year

**Critical Success Activities**

*Long term*

- Form and implement Teacher Education Advisory Committee  
- Reform Administrator Credential requirements  
- Reform current Leadership Institute

*Short term*

- Develop strategic plan for PTE Teacher Education

Objective G.  **Effective use of resources** | Resources are committed to highest potential areas, impact of opportunity, and mission fulfillment

**Performance measures**

i.  Audit exceptions  

*Benchmark*

- 0

ii.  Gap analysis report alignment of postsecondary program enrollments and labor market

**Critical Success Activities**

*Long term*

- Development of return on investment (ROI) report for DPTE

*Short term*

- Distribute updated gap analysis demonstrating labor market alignment with program offerings
Objective H. **Indispensable leadership, technical assistance, and advocacy**

Division office staff provide timely and effective support for the delivery system

**Performance measures**

i. Stakeholder satisfaction survey

*Benchmark*

- FY2015: Develop definition and establish baseline

**Critical Success Activities**

*Short term*

- Develop and implement stakeholder satisfaction survey
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Vision

Our vision is to be a superior professional-technical college. We value a dynamic environment as a foundation for building our College into a nationally recognized technical education role model. We are committed to educating all students through progressive and proven educational philosophies. We will continue to provide high quality education and state-of-the-art facilities and equipment for our students. We seek to achieve a comprehensive curriculum that prepares our students for entering the workforce, articulation to any college and full participation in society. We acknowledge the nature of change, the need for growth, and the potential of all challenges.

Mission

Eastern Idaho Technical College provides superior educational services in a positive learning environment that champions student success and regional workforce needs.

GOAL 1: A WELL EDUCATED CITIZENRY

The educational system will provide opportunities for individual advancement.

Objective A: Access - (measured elsewhere in this plan)

Objective B: Higher Level of Educational Attainment – Increase the educational attainment of Idahoans through participation and retention in Idaho’s educational system.

Method 1: Monitor labor market needs and review the need for new occupational training programs and community education/workforce training courses.

- Performance Measure: The number of occupational training programs and workforce training courses identified as needed to respond to labor market needs.
- Benchmark: Identify at least one (1) occupational training program and at least five (5) workforce training courses to respond to labor market needs.

Method 2: Determine the feasibility of developing one (1) new occupational training program and five (5) workforce training courses identified in Method 1 as needed to respond to labor market needs.

- Performance Measure: Completion of feasibility analysis for one (1) new occupational training program and five (5) community education/workforce training courses.
- Benchmark: Feasibility analyses will be completed for one (1) new academic program and five (5) community education/workforce training courses. Development of new occupational training program(s) and workforce training courses deemed feasible possible.

Objective C: Adult Learner Re-Integration – Improve the processes and increase the options for re-integration of adult learners into the education system.
Method 1: Increase the academic outcomes of students enrolled in Adult Basic Education (ABE) classes to: assist individuals become more capable and productive community members; improve individual skills in reading, math, writing, and English as a second language; and prepare students to successfully complete the GED and/or COMPASS tests as appropriate.

Performance Measure: Academic gains of students.
Benchmark: Meet the State NRS targets for academic gains at all levels.

Method 2: Increase the reach of the Center for New Directions (CND) to individuals seeking to make positive life changes.

- Performance Measure: Number of potential students receiving pre-enrollment counseling.
- Benchmark: Increase number of students served, during each academic year, by at least one percent (1%).

Method 3: Development of new occupational training program(s) and workforce training courses deemed feasibly possible.

- Performance Measure: Development of feasibly possible program(s) and community education/workforce training courses.
- Benchmark: All feasibly possible academic program(s) and community education/workforce training courses will be developed.

Method 4: Monitor remedial needs in English and Math

- Performance Measure: Number and percentage of students successfully completing remedial English and Math (ENG 90 and MAT 100, respectively)
- Benchmark: Successful completers shall exceed 80%

Method 5: Ensure continuing services of the Tutoring Center by augmenting federal grant dollars through additional local or appropriated funding.

- Performance Measure: Funding level adjusted to student demand based on contact hours.
- Benchmark: Total funding for the Tutoring Center will be \( \frac{\text{FY 2012 funding}}{\text{FY 2012 contact hours}} \times \text{projected contact hours for budget year} \)

Method 6: Percentage of post-secondary students who are retained in degree and certificate professional-technical programs.

- Performance Measure: Number of full-time students returning for a second year (fall to fall) for programs over one year.
- Benchmark: Returning students shall exceed 70%

- Performance Measure: Number of full-time students who completed programs of less than one year
Objective D: Transition – Improve the ability of the educational system to meet educational needs and allow students to efficiently and effectively transition into the workforce.

- Performance Measure: Number of certificate and degree completions per 100 FTE
- Benchmark: Maintain award percentage over 35%

Objective E: Encourage collaboration with college service area’s labor market.

- Performance Measure: Number of times EITC is mentioned in the public media or EITC-distributed brochures as a resource for workforce training.
- Benchmark: Increase number of times by at least three (3) per year from FY 2013 levels.

GOAL 2: CRITICAL THINKING AND INNOVATION

The educational system will provide an environment for the development of new ideas, and practical and theoretical knowledge to foster the development of individuals who are entrepreneurial, broadminded, think critically, and are creative.

Objective A: Critical Thinking, Innovation and Creativity – (Not currently measured)

Objective B: Quality Instruction – Implement faculty improvements based upon feedback from faculty evaluations by faculty, peers, students and division managers.

- Performance Measure: Number of newly implemented improvements suggested by students via faculty evaluations.
- Benchmark: Implement at least one (1) new idea, identified via feedback of students through faculty evaluations.

GOAL 3: EFFECTIVE AND EFFICIENT DELIVERY SYSTEMS

Ensure educational resources are used efficiently.

Objective A: Cost Effective and Fiscally Prudent – Increased productivity and cost-effectiveness.

Method 1: Increase reach of the EITC Tutoring Center and the services provided by the Tutoring Center.

- Performance Measure: Number of student contact hours.
- Benchmark: Increase number of student hours, during each academic year, by at least one percent (1%).

Method 2: Monitor cost to deliver educational resources

- Performance Measure: Total cost per credit hour
- Benchmark: Maintain cost per credit hour within 20% of IPEDS peers
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- Performance Measure: Total cost of certificate or degree completions (one year or longer) per $100,000 of campus spending (e.g. cost of instruction, maintenance, operations)
- Benchmark: Maintain completion costs within 20% of peers

- Performance Measure: Institutional reserves comparable to best practice.
- Benchmark: A minimum target reserve of 5% of operating expenditures.

**Objective B: Data-informed Decision Making** - Increase the quality, thoroughness, and accessibility of data for informed decision-making and continuous improvement of Idaho’s educational system.

- Performance Measure: Provide data to workforce longitudinal data system with the ability to access timely and relevant data.
- Benchmark: Completed by end of 2015.

**GOAL 4: Provide high quality admission and student support.**

**Objective A:** Provide multiple opportunities to obtain feedback from students and implement improvements and changes based on student feedback.

Performance Measure: Students have the opportunity to respond to current procedures and experiences during their educational education at EITC. Students have the opportunity to fill out Faculty evaluations/surveys each semester and Noel Levitz yearly. Each of these surveys target student services, library, financial aid and overall campus experiences.

Benchmark: Implement three (3) changes or solutions identified by the current surveys.

**Objective B:** Promote a continuing safe environment.

- Performance Measure: Ongoing review of Emergency Response Plan with appropriate changes made to plan.
- Benchmark: Throughout the year, at quarterly meetings, the Safety Committee will review the components of the Emergency Response Plan and modify it as appropriate to support a safe learning environment.

- Performance Measure: Ongoing use of formal on-line safety training
- Benchmark: 100% completion of safety training by all full time faculty and staff.

- Performance Measure: Safety briefings to faculty and staff
- Benchmark: Incorporate safety training into each in-service meeting at start of terms

**GOAL 5: ACHIEVE ACCREDITATION OBJECTIVES**

**Objective A:** Be supportive by providing a safe, clean, inviting, and functional campus setting. EITC provides comprehensive student support from pre-enrollment through employment (admissions, financial aid, placement, library, business office, Center for New Directions, Adult Basic Education, etc.)
Method 1: EITC students and staff feel safe and secure.

- Performance Measure: Safety and Security measure on annual survey.
- Benchmark:
  - Students report less than a 1.0 gap between importance of safety and security and level of agreement.
  - Faculty and staff report less than a 1.0 gap between importance of safety and security and level of agreement.

Method 2: EITC provides effective support services.

- Performance Measure: Student perception of the value of services offered through the EITC Tutoring Center.
- Benchmark: Student satisfaction of services offered through the EITC Tutoring Center will be 3.0 or higher on student survey.

- Performance Measure: EITC admissions services meet the expectations of students.
- Benchmark: Student satisfaction ratings report less than a 1.0 gap between importance and level of agreement.

- Performance Measure: EITC admissions services meet the expectations of faculty and staff.
- Benchmark: Faculty and staff satisfaction ratings report less than a 1.0 gap between importance and level of agreement.

- Performance Measure: EITC financial aid services meet the expectations of students.
- Benchmark: Student satisfaction ratings report less than a 1.0 gap between importance and level of agreement.

- Performance Measure: EITC financial aid services meet the expectations of faculty and staff.
- Benchmark: Faculty and staff satisfaction ratings report less than a 1.0 gap between importance and level of agreement.

- Performance Measure: EITC library services meet the expectations of faculty and staff.
- Benchmark: Faculty and staff satisfaction ratings report less than a 1.0 gap between importance and level of agreement.

Objective B: Provide an atmosphere that fosters communication and growth.

Communication includes both external communication with community, state, and other stakeholders and internal communication among staff and faculty. Growth includes student growth (addressed elsewhere) and professional growth of staff and faculty.

Method 1: Communicate effectively with the community

- Performance Measure: Publish and distribute college newsletter
- Benchmark: 6 issues per year minimum
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- Performance Measure: Conduct forums to foster creativity
  Benchmark: President will hold 2 forums per year to collect innovative ideas from the campus community. Maintain document to include ideas collected and acted upon.

- Performance Measure: Maintain a variety of campus committees and measure activity at critical committees
  Benchmark: 90% attendance by members

Method 2: Encourage relevant professional development

- Performance Measure: Provide funds for faculty and staff professional development
  Benchmark: Maintain or increase level of available funds

- Performance Measure: Percent of faculty that participate in professional development
  Benchmark: 80% of full-time faculty will participate in professional development annually

- Performance Measure: Percent of staff that participate in professional development
  Benchmark: 80% of full-time staff will participate annually

- Performance Measure: Provide opportunities for professional development on campus
  Benchmark: Provide a minimum of 2 professional development activities on campus annually.

Method 3: Develop and maintain partnerships with stakeholders

- Performance Measure: Provide customized training to local industries
  Benchmark: Increase headcount yearly

- Performance Measure: Conduct employer follow-up
  Benchmark: Annual survey to collect satisfaction

- Performance Measure: Maintain labor market awareness
  Benchmark: Review DOL labor data annually

Objective C: Be accountable and a good steward of the funds entrusted to it through state appropriations, grants, student fees and other sources; seek to become increasingly effective in the application of those funds and the thorough reporting and justification of how funds were spent.

Method 1: Gather and utilize data for informed decision making,

- Performance Measure: Annual program graduate placement survey
  Benchmark: 85% training related placement

- Performance Measure: Fall to spring semester/fall to fall retention study
  Benchmark: 85% retention goal

- Performance Measure: Graduation rate study
  Benchmark: 50% graduation rate
• Performance Measure: Program enrollment reports
• Benchmark: Maintain semester/annual enrollments based on documented needs

Method 2: Regularly review and update programs

• Performance Measure: Annual program learning outcomes assessment
• Benchmark: Continuous improvement of students meeting expected learning outcomes

• Performance Measure: Maintain active program advisory committees
• Benchmark: 2 meetings per year

Method 3: Utilize resources efficiently

• Performance Measure: Room utilization
• Benchmark: Increasing room utilization factors

• Performance Measure: Energy and water consumption
• Benchmark: Annually decrease consumption

Objective D: Be a place of learning where students learn and develop workplace skills; use the most appropriate learning methods and provide instruction that is not only academically rigorous but is also tailored to the needs of the community

Method 1: Incorporate the use of most appropriate technologies

• Performance Measure: Percentage of faculty using learning management system
• Benchmark: Increase percentage annually to reach 100%

• Performance Measure: Number of courses via hybrid/on-line technology
• Benchmark: Increase percentage annually

Method 2: Provide rigorous and relevant instruction

• Performance Measure: Active program advisory committees
• Benchmark: 2 meetings per year

• Performance Measure: Performance on certification exams
• Benchmark: Student performance meets or exceeds 80% success rates

• Performance Measure: Performance on Technical Skills Assessments
• Benchmark: Performance meets or exceeds State’s agreed upon standards

• Performance Measure: Student perception of instructional effectiveness
• Benchmark: Students report positive perception on annual assessment
Key External Factors

(beyond the control of Eastern Idaho Technical College)

**Funding:**

Most State Board of Education strategic goals and objectives assume on-going and sometimes significant additional levels of State legislative appropriations. Availability of state revenues (for appropriation), gubernatorial, and legislative support for some Board initiatives can be uncertain.

**Legislation/Rules:**

Beyond funding considerations, many education policies are embedded in State statute or rule and not under Board control. Changes to statute and rule desired by the Board of Education are accomplished according to State guidelines. Rules require public notice and opportunity for comment, gubernatorial support, and adoption by the Legislature. Proposed legislation must be supported by the Governor, gain approval in the germane legislative committees and pass both houses of the Legislature.

**Federal Government:** A great deal of education funding for Idaho public schools is provided by the federal government. Funding is often tied to specific federal programs and objectives and therefore can greatly influence education policy in the State.
## Performance Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>FY2010</th>
<th>FY2011</th>
<th>FY2012</th>
<th>FY2013</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase reach of EITC Tutoring Center (Goal III, Objective 2)</td>
<td>5,406</td>
<td>4,870</td>
<td>5,195</td>
<td>6000</td>
<td>5247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Increase reach of Adult Basic Education Division (Goal IV, Objective 1)</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Increase reach of Center for New Directions (Goal IV, Objective 2)</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Increase the academic outcomes of students enrolled in Adult Basic Education Division (ABE)</td>
<td>ABE 1 54%</td>
<td>ABE 1 64%</td>
<td>ABE 1 41%</td>
<td>ABE 1 33%</td>
<td>ABE 1 55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ABE 2 50%</td>
<td>ABE 2 53%</td>
<td>ABE 2 57%</td>
<td>ABE 2 50%</td>
<td>ABE 2 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ABE 3 46%</td>
<td>ABE 3 52%</td>
<td>ABE 3 54%</td>
<td>ABE 3 46%</td>
<td>ABE 3 46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ABE 4 33%</td>
<td>ABE 4 37%</td>
<td>ABE 4 36%</td>
<td>ABE 4 36%</td>
<td>ABE 4 36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ABE 5 31%</td>
<td>ABE 5 33%</td>
<td>ABE 5 41%</td>
<td>ABE 5 41%</td>
<td>ABE 5 41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ESL 1 43%</td>
<td>ESL 1 45%</td>
<td>ESL 1 45%</td>
<td>ESL 1 56%</td>
<td>ESL 1 56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ESL 2 33%</td>
<td>ESL 2 39%</td>
<td>ESL 2 39%</td>
<td>ESL 2 53%</td>
<td>ESL 2 53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ESL 3 32%</td>
<td>ESL 3 47%</td>
<td>ESL 3 47%</td>
<td>ESL 3 50%</td>
<td>ESL 3 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ESL 4 26%</td>
<td>ESL 4 47%</td>
<td>ESL 4 47%</td>
<td>ESL 4 33%</td>
<td>ESL 4 33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ESL 5 6%</td>
<td>ESL 5 37%</td>
<td>ESL 5 37%</td>
<td>ESL 5 32%</td>
<td>ESL 5 32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ESL 6 21%</td>
<td>ESL 6 29%</td>
<td>ESL 6 29%</td>
<td>ESL 6 20%</td>
<td>ESL 6 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*5</td>
<td>Retention Rate: Total full-time new and transfer students that are retained or graduate the following year (excluding death, military service, and mission).</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*6</td>
<td>Dual Credit: Total credit hours earned, and the unduplicated headcount of participating students.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4, 1</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Total certificates and degrees conferred - Number of undergraduate certificate and degree completions per 100 (FTE) undergraduate students enrolled</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Cost per credit hour</td>
<td>$496</td>
<td>$503</td>
<td>$531</td>
<td>$579</td>
<td>Maintain cost per credit hour within 20% of IPEDS peers List</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Efficiency - Certificates (of at least 1 year or more) and Degree Completions per $100,000 of Education and Related Spending</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>Declining Cost</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Graduation Rate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>Graduate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Total degree production</td>
<td>a. 237</td>
<td>a. 261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. 15%</td>
<td>b. 18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Unduplicated headcount of graduates and percent of graduates to total unduplicated headcount</td>
<td>a. 243</td>
<td>a. 232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. 18%</td>
<td>b. 19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*New System-wide added measures
TBD = To Be Determined

---

**For More Information Contact**

Marina Meier  
Eastern Idaho Technical College  
1600 S. 25th E.  
Idaho Falls, ID 83404  
Phone: (208) 524-3000 x3425  
E-mail: marina.meier@my.eitc.edu
Leading Idaho:

The University of Idaho
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INTRODUCTION

The University of Idaho is the first choice for student success and statewide leadership. We are the premier land-grant research university in our state. We lead in teaching and engaged student learning in our undergraduate, graduate, and professional programs. We excel at interdisciplinary research, service to businesses and communities, and in advancing diversity, citizenship, and global outreach. Through our growing residential and networked university and strong alumni connections, we develop leaders who will guide Idaho to global economic success, create a sustainable American West, and address our nation’s most challenging problems.

As Idaho’s land-grant institution, our students, faculty, and staff are engaged in a vast network of powerful partnerships through statewide locations, laboratories, research and extension centers, outreach programs, and a base of loyal alumni worldwide. These resources provide connections to individuals, businesses, and communities that strive to improve the quality of life of all Idaho citizens and secure the economic progress of the world.

We are committed to a student-centered, engaged learning environment. Our unique geography, intimate setting, residential campus, and dedicated faculty provide aspiring leaders with the skills and abilities to challenge themselves and learn by doing.

Our leadership position in research and creative activity presents opportunities to interact and innovate with world-class faculty. Our students gain firsthand experience addressing global challenges, and bring contemporary knowledge and experience into their careers and lives.

Students, faculty, and staff at the University of Idaho are dedicated to advancing a purposeful and just community that respects individuality and provides access and inclusion for all cultures to create a climate that is civil and respectful. Innovative, productive collaborations that foster community and build morale are encouraged.

Over the past five years, the university community has implemented a strategic plan to further the vision and mission of the university. This 2015-19 Strategic Plan fulfills the promise of a 21st century land-grant institution to lead and inspire Idaho, the nation, and the world. To achieve this, all units will develop strategic actions that advance the overall strategic direction, vision, and values of the institution.

MISSION

The University of Idaho is the state’s land-grant research university. From this distinctive origin and identity comes our commitment to enhance the scientific, economic, social, legal, and cultural assets of our state, and to develop solutions for complex problems facing society. We deliver on this commitment through focused excellence in teaching, research, outreach, and engagement in a collaborative environment at our residential main campus, regional centers, extension offices, and research facilities throughout the state. Consistent with the land-grant ideal, our outreach activities serve the state at the same time they strengthen our teaching as well as scholarly and creative capacities.

Our teaching and learning includes undergraduate, graduate, professional, and continuing education offered through both resident instruction and extended delivery. Our educational programs are enriched by the knowledge, collaboration, diversity, and creativity of our faculty, students, and staff.

Our scholarly and creative activities promote human and economic development, global understanding, and progress in professional practice by expanding knowledge and its applications in the natural and applied sciences, social sciences, arts, humanities, and the professions.
ROLE

Our commitment to focused excellence includes developing and delivering pre-eminent statewide programs. These programs are delivered in the Morrill Act-mandated primary emphases areas in agriculture, natural resources, and engineering; and sustaining excellence in architecture, law, liberal arts, sciences, education, business and economics, and programs in medical and veterinary medical education, all of which shape the core curriculum and give meaning to the concept of a land-grant research university.

PRINCIPLES AND VALUES

- Learn, create, and innovate
- Preserve and transmit knowledge
- Act with integrity
- Treat others with respect
- Celebrate excellence
- Change lives
- Welcome and include everyone
- Take responsibility for the future

Goal 1: Teaching and Learning Goal: Enable student success in a rapidly changing world.

Context: Our graduates live, work, compete, and prosper in a constantly changing environment. Consequently, curricula, co-curricular activities, pedagogy, and assessment must be quickly adaptable as the environment changes. Learning experiences drawn from our disciplinary and interdisciplinary strengths will help students develop the ability to identify and address complex problems and opportunities.

Objective A: Build adaptable, integrative curricula and pedagogies.

Strategies:

1. Streamline policies and practices to enable creative program revision and course scheduling.
2. Implement general education requirements that emphasize integrative learning throughout the undergraduate experience.
3. Use external and internal assessments to keep teaching and learning vital.
4. Build curricula to support timely degree completion.
5. Expand opportunities for professional education.
6. Apply emerging technologies to increase access and respond to the needs of local and global learners.
7. Develop increased learning opportunities for underserved or underrepresented communities.
8. Employ active learning pedagogies to enhance student learning where appropriate.

Performance Measure: The average time to complete a Bachelor’s degree.
Benchmark: Four and one-half (4.50) years (using the Complete College Idaho methodology).
Rationale: Timely degree completion, along with high graduation rates, results from and reflects efficient curricula, good advising and student centered teaching. Allowing 4.5 years gives students time to take fewer credits in some terms, take a few extra elective courses, and/or change majors.

Performance Measure: Retention rates (percent of full-time and part-time freshmen returning for a second year or full-time and part-time new transfers returning or completing their program).
Benchmark: The median of our official peer institutions, which we have most recently calculated as 83%. We have not recently computed the retention/success rate for new transfers at our peer institutions.
Rationale: Required by SBOE.

Performance Measure: Graduation rate (percent of full-time and part-time freshmen graduating in six years).
Benchmark: The median of our official peer institutions (most recently 62% for full-time, part-time peer median not yet compiled for peers).
Rationale: Required by SBOE.

Performance Measure: Dual Credit (total credits and # of students)
Benchmark: Consistent annual increases to market saturation.
Rationale: Required by SBOE.

Performance Measure: Total undergraduate degrees conferred (number of undergraduate degree completions per 100 FTE undergraduate students enrolled).
Benchmark: The median of our official peer institutions.
Rationale: Required by SBOE.

Objective B: Develop integrative learning activities that span students’ entire university experience.

Strategies:

1. Increase educational experiences within the living and learning environments.
2. Engage alumni and stakeholders as partners in student mentoring.
3. Increase student participation in co-curricular activities.
4. Integrate curricular and co-curricular activities.
5. Increase opportunities for student interaction and interdisciplinary collaboration.

Performance Measure: Number and percent of students participating in Study Abroad and National Student Exchange programs.
Benchmark: Five percent of the full-time undergraduate degree-seeking student body.
Rationale: Enabling students to not only progress through their academic career but also to do so while learning in diverse settings provides them with greater perspective.
Goal 2: Scholarly and Creative Activity Goal: Promote excellence in scholarship and creative activity to enhance life today and prepare us for tomorrow.

Context: Our quality of life today and in the future depends on the merit of our scholarship and creative endeavors. Many of the most pressing issues facing society cut across disciplines and require solutions that do the same. At the University of Idaho we are committed to helping address society's pressing issues by continuing to support strong disciplinary and interdisciplinary activities that emphasize quality, innovation, critical thinking, and collaboration. We intend to improve the quality of life of all Idaho citizens and secure the economic progress of our world.

Objective A: Strengthen all scholarly and creative activities consistent with the University’s strategic missions and signature areas.

Strategies:

1. Engage accomplished scholars to provide mentoring and leadership for key research and creative initiatives.
2. Increase the number of endowed faculty positions and postdoctoral, graduate, and undergraduate fellowships.
3. Support faculty, student, and staff entrepreneurial activity to develop new areas of excellence.
4. Implement university-wide mechanisms to provide attractive start-up packages for faculty and reward systems that recruit and retain world class faculty and staff.
5. Leverage the skills of non-tenure track faculty to promote research growth.
6. Increase the application of and public access to the results of scholarly and creative activities.

Performance Measure: The number of grant applications supporting or requiring interdisciplinary activities in which two or more faculty from different departments are listed as Co-Principal Investigators.

Benchmark: 20%
Rationale: Increased from 10% in FY2009 to 25% in FY2013; sustainable growth is our goal.

Performance Measure: Funding from competitive federally funded grants per full-time instruction and research faculty.

Benchmark: $150,000
Rationale: Increased from $128k to $153k from FY2010 through FY2013; sustainable growth is our goal.

Objective B: Enable faculty, student, and staff engagement in interdisciplinary scholarship and creative activity.

Strategies:

1. Expand opportunities for ongoing interactions among faculty, students, and staff to identify areas of common interest.
2. Increase support for graduate and undergraduate interdisciplinary research and
creative activity.
3. Develop clear criteria for evaluating engaged scholarship.
4. Increase the national and international visibility of the University’s contributions to interdisciplinary activities.
5. Partner with other educational institutions, industry, not-for-profits, and public agencies to expand resources and expertise.
6. Facilitate the submission of large, interdisciplinary proposals to obtain funding and to sustain successful projects.

Performance Measure: Percent of undergraduate degrees conferred in STEM fields.
Benchmark: Peer median (most recent value was 32%)
Rationale: Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics fields are essential in our highly technological society; these degree recipients contribute disproportionately to the Idaho economy.

Goal 3: Outreach and Engagement Goal: Meet society’s critical needs by engaging in mutually beneficial partnerships.

Context: As the state’s land-grant institution, the University of Idaho is uniquely positioned to expand its impact in Idaho and beyond. We seek to achieve that end through engagement—working across disciplines; integrating teaching, research, and outreach; and partnering with constituents for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources.

Objective A: Develop processes, systems, and rewards that foster faculty, staff, and student outreach and engagement.

Strategies:
1. Increase the internal visibility of our outreach and engagement activities to facilitate interaction and develop synergies across the university.
2. Develop clear criteria for evaluating outreach and engagement.
3. Recognize and reward engagement with communities, businesses, non-profits, and agencies.
4. Develop an infrastructure and streamline administrative processes to coordinate outreach and engagement efforts.
5. Communicate best practices for development and implementation of outreach and engagement projects.

Performance Measure: Evidence of an institutional commitment to supporting faculty outreach and engagement activities in each strategic area noted above.
Benchmark: Qualitative and quantitative evidence indicating progress in each area.
Rationale: Demonstrating progress in this area requires a mixed-methods approach, which will include noting establishment of distinct organizational structures, changes in annual position descriptions, promotion and tenure policies, recognition from national agencies (e.g. Carnegie Classification for Engagement, US Presidential Higher Education Community Service Honor Role, Magrath and Kellogg Foundation Engagement Awards).
Objective B: Strengthen and expand mutually beneficial partnerships with stakeholders in Idaho and beyond.

Strategies:

1. Increase opportunities for faculty and students to connect with external constituents. Develop new partnerships with others who are addressing high priority issues.
2. Increase student participation in defining and delivering experiential learning opportunities.
3. Increase the external visibility of our outreach and engagement activities.
4. Coordinate plans to increase external funding for outreach and engagement.

Performance Measure: Percentage of students participating in service learning activities, as reported by the University of Idaho Service Learning Center and the ASUI Volunteerism Center.

Benchmark: One-third of the total student body (approximately 3200 students) will engage in community service activities.

Rationale: Over the course of the 2012-2013 academic year approximately 33% of University of Idaho students participated in 98 service-learning activities and provided more than 150,000 hours of service to more than 160 community organizations throughout Idaho.

Goal 4: Community and Culture Goal: Be a purposeful, ethical, vibrant, and open community.

Context: Our community is characterized by openness, trust, and respect. We value all members for their unique contributions, innovation, and individuality. Our community and culture must adapt to change, seek multiple perspectives, and seize opportunity. We are committed to a culture of service, internally and externally. We value a diverse community for enhanced creativity, cultural richness, and an opportunity to apply our full intellectual capacity to the challenges facing Idaho, the nation, and the world.

Objective A: Be a community committed to access and inclusion.

Strategies:

1. Recruit and retain a diverse student body.
2. Recruit and retain diverse faculty and staff.
3. Expand opportunities for cultural competency training.
4. Build extended community partnerships to enhance an environment that values diversity.

Performance Measure: Percentage of disadvantaged minority students, faculty and staff.

Benchmark: Meet or exceed peer medians (most recently 13% of students, 5% of faculty and 7% of staff).

Rationale: The diversity of our campus should be compared with our land-grant, high research peer institutions’ diversity.

Objective B: Be a community committed to civility and respect.
Strategies:

1. Promote civil and respectful dialogue and debate both in and out of the classroom.
2. Increase systematic, consistent, and productive responses to behaviors that are destructive to the community.
3. Promote a sense of concern for and accountability to others.

Performance Measure: Percentages of faculty, staff and students who report positive experiences on surveys conducted periodically to assess the culture and climate. These include the every-third-year HERI/UCLA Faculty and UI Staff surveys, and the annual Graduating Senior Survey.

Benchmark: Peer medians when available, prior results if not (95% for students, 75% for faculty and 88% for staff).

Rationale: The periodic surveys listed above provide historical data suitable for trend analyses. The UI Diversity Task Force is also in the process of studying these issues and developing additional measures.

Objective C: Be a community committed to productivity, sustainability, and innovation.

Strategies:

1. Reward individuals and units that aim high, work across boundaries, and capitalize on strengths to advance the overall strategic direction, vision, and values of the institution.
2. Develop and promote activities to increase collaboration with new and unique partners.
3. Energize the community and foster commitment to university-wide endeavors by communicating our successes.
4. Create efficiencies through innovative collaboration, shared goals, and common experiences.
5. Invigorate the community by promoting attitudes of leadership and excellence.
6. Steward our financial assets, infrastructure, and human resources to optimize performance.

Performance Measure: For finances, the institution primary reserve ratio.

Benchmark: The institution primary reserve ratio, as reported by UI Business Systems and Accounting Services, should be comparable to the advisable level of reserves established by NACUBO, which was most recently 40%.

Rationale: This benchmark is based on NACUBO recommendations.

External Factors

State Board of Education (SBOE): Achievement of strategic goals and objectives assumes SBOE support and commitment to UI’s unique role and mission.
Funding: Economic conditions will play an important role in the perceived value and effectiveness of higher education in the coming years. On-going and appropriate levels of funding from state and federal sources will be critical for the success of our strategic plan.
Part 1 – Agency Profile

Agency Overview
The University of Idaho is a high research activity, land-grant institution committed to undergraduate and graduate-research education with extension services responsive to Idaho and the region's business and community needs. The University is also responsible for regional medical and veterinary medical education programs in which the state of Idaho participates.

As designated by the Carnegie Foundation, the University of Idaho is a high research activity, land-grant institution committed to undergraduate and graduate-research education with extension services responsive to Idaho and the region's business and community needs. The University is also responsible for medical and veterinary medical education programs in which the state of Idaho participates; WWAMI – Washington-Wyoming-Montana-Alaska-Idaho for medical education; WI – Washington-Idaho for veterinary medical education. The primary and continuing emphasis in agriculture, natural resources and metallurgy, engineering, architecture, Law, foreign languages, teacher preparation and international programs, business, education, liberal arts, physical, life and social sciences. Some of which also provide the core curriculum or general education portion of the curriculum.

The institution serves students, business and industry, the professional and public sector groups throughout the state and nation as well as diverse and special constituencies. The University also has specific responsibilities in research and extension programs related to its land-grant functions. The University of Idaho works in collaboration with other state postsecondary institutions in serving these constituencies.

Core Functions/Idaho Code
Recognizing that education was vital to the development of Idaho, the legislature set as a major objective the establishment of an institution that would offer to all the people of the territory, on equal terms, higher education that would excel not only in the arts, letters, and sciences, but also in the agricultural and mechanic arts. The federal government's extensive land grants, particularly under the Morrill Act of 1862, provided substantial assistance in this undertaking. Subsequent federal legislation provided further for the teaching function of the institution and for programs of research and extension. In all, approximately 240,000 acres were allocated to the support of Idaho’s land-grant institution.

After selecting Moscow as the site for the new university, in part because Moscow was located in the “center of one of the richest and most populous agricultural sections in the entire Northwest” and the surrounding area was not subject to the “vicissitudes of booms, excitement, or speculation,” the University of Idaho was founded January 30, 1889, by an act of the 15th and last territorial legislature. That act, commonly known as the university’s charter, became a part of Idaho’s organic law by virtue of its confirmation under article IX, section 10, of the state constitution when Idaho was admitted to the union. As the constitution of 1890 provides, “The location of the University of Idaho, as established by existing laws, is hereby confirmed. All the rights, immunities, franchises, and endowments heretofore granted thereto by the territory of Idaho are hereby perpetuated unto the said university. The regents shall have the general supervision of the university and the control and direction of all the funds of, and appropriations to, the university, under such regulations as may be prescribed by law.” Under these provisions, the University of Idaho was given status as a constitutional entity.
### University of Idaho Revenue and Expenditures¹:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>FY 2010</th>
<th>FY 2011</th>
<th>FY 2012</th>
<th>FY 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approp: General Funds</td>
<td>$107,249,600</td>
<td>$103,804,200</td>
<td>$100,824,500</td>
<td>$105,645,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approp: Federal Stimulus</td>
<td>$5,329,056</td>
<td>$1,454,304</td>
<td>$367,641</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approp: Endowment Funds</td>
<td>$6,164,400</td>
<td>$6,164,400</td>
<td>$6,164,400</td>
<td>$6,466,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approp: Student Fees</td>
<td>$47,923,505</td>
<td>$58,158,895</td>
<td>$65,528,071</td>
<td>$68,472,665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Student Fees</td>
<td>$17,174,415</td>
<td>$20,467,224</td>
<td>$12,810,386</td>
<td>$14,185,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Grants &amp; Contracts</td>
<td>$75,913,834</td>
<td>$92,730,000</td>
<td>$89,897,206</td>
<td>$85,949,538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Grants &amp; Contracts</td>
<td>$5,051,659</td>
<td>$4,748,152</td>
<td>$5,171,783</td>
<td>$5,203,701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Gifts, Grants &amp; Contracts</td>
<td>$4,500,246</td>
<td>$4,947,987</td>
<td>$3,750,735</td>
<td>$3,881,344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales &amp; Serv of Educ Act</td>
<td>$10,130,640</td>
<td>$9,791,049</td>
<td>$10,178,009</td>
<td>$10,235,562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales &amp; Serv of Aux Ent</td>
<td>$29,563,701</td>
<td>$33,440,256</td>
<td>$34,042,490</td>
<td>$35,453,721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Costs/Other</td>
<td>$42,368,253</td>
<td>$40,568,173</td>
<td>$21,562,931</td>
<td>$32,218,097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>$351,369,345</td>
<td>$376,274,640</td>
<td>$350,298,154</td>
<td>$367,912,379</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>FY 2010</th>
<th>FY 2011</th>
<th>FY 2012</th>
<th>FY 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>$89,235,643</td>
<td>$86,639,313</td>
<td>$94,332,305</td>
<td>$107,843,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>$67,917,142</td>
<td>$75,413,369</td>
<td>$73,787,474</td>
<td>$72,900,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service</td>
<td>$30,531,632</td>
<td>$31,133,657</td>
<td>$27,841,836</td>
<td>$30,107,395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>$4,000,300</td>
<td>$4,093,600</td>
<td>$4,297,332</td>
<td>$4,736,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>$10,368,449</td>
<td>$11,798,205</td>
<td>$11,949,353</td>
<td>$13,733,579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Plant</td>
<td>$45,429,993</td>
<td>$45,018,045</td>
<td>$47,841,115</td>
<td>$47,883,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Support</td>
<td>$30,114,735</td>
<td>$27,590,583</td>
<td>$25,207,537</td>
<td>$20,231,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Support</td>
<td>$12,241,169</td>
<td>$11,594,229</td>
<td>$12,237,329</td>
<td>$14,283,458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>$9,339,948</td>
<td>$11,003,975</td>
<td>$12,184,103</td>
<td>$13,025,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary Enterprises</td>
<td>$26,673,577</td>
<td>$27,774,298</td>
<td>$27,424,058</td>
<td>$26,308,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships/Fellowships</td>
<td>$18,030,738</td>
<td>$22,147,967</td>
<td>$11,944,669</td>
<td>$10,425,552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditure</td>
<td>$343,883,326</td>
<td>$354,207,241</td>
<td>$349,061,111</td>
<td>$361,479,707</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹These amounts conform to our audited financial statements.

*Graphs added later by DFM*
## Profile of Cases Managed and/or Key Services Provided

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases Managed and/or Key Services Provided</th>
<th>FY 2010</th>
<th>FY 2011</th>
<th>FY 2012</th>
<th>FY 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual (unduplicated) Enrollment Headcount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Non-Degree and Early College</td>
<td>1,749</td>
<td>1,448</td>
<td>1,624</td>
<td>2,281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Undergraduate</td>
<td>9,414</td>
<td>9,760</td>
<td>9,883</td>
<td>9,652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Graduate</td>
<td>2,423</td>
<td>2,581</td>
<td>2,577</td>
<td>2,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Professional</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13,926</td>
<td>14,164</td>
<td>14,472</td>
<td>14,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Credit Hours Taught</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Undergraduate</td>
<td>265,802</td>
<td>276,658</td>
<td>279,969</td>
<td>276,431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Graduate</td>
<td>31,039</td>
<td>32,515</td>
<td>31,943</td>
<td>29,149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Professional</td>
<td>10,828</td>
<td>11,517</td>
<td>12,226</td>
<td>11,691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>307,669</td>
<td>320,690</td>
<td>324,138</td>
<td>317,271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Enrollment FTE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Undergraduate</td>
<td>8,860</td>
<td>9,222</td>
<td>9,332</td>
<td>9,214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Graduate</td>
<td>1,293</td>
<td>1,355</td>
<td>1,331</td>
<td>1,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Professional</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10,522</td>
<td>10,971</td>
<td>11,083</td>
<td>10,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees Awarded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Undergraduate (Bachelors only)</td>
<td>1,644</td>
<td>1,688</td>
<td>1,761</td>
<td>1,981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Graduate (Masters, Specialists and Doctorates)</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Professional (J.D, Ed.D., and D.A.T.)</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,351</td>
<td>2,469</td>
<td>2,592</td>
<td>2,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates – Unduplicated Headcount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Undergraduate (Bachelors only)</td>
<td>1,577</td>
<td>1,586</td>
<td>1,665</td>
<td>1,889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Graduate (Masters, Specialists and Doctorates)</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Professional (J.D, Ed.D., and D.A.T.)</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,280</td>
<td>2,366</td>
<td>2,493</td>
<td>2,756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Graduates to Unduplicated Headcount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Undergraduate</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Graduate</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Professional</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Credit hours taught</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Total Annual Credit Hours</td>
<td>1,806</td>
<td>1,709</td>
<td>2,923</td>
<td>5,034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Total Annual Student Headcount</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>1,303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate students participating in Study Abroad and National Student Exchange programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Number</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Percent</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remediation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Number of New Frosh from Idaho who need remediation in English/Reading</td>
<td>106 / 1189</td>
<td>121 / 1060</td>
<td>151 / 1096</td>
<td>117 / 1092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Percent</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of undergraduate students participating in research programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEM</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-STEM</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number and Percent of UG degrees conferred in STEM fields</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- UI Number / Percent</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Percent</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Percent of students participating in service learning opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2010</th>
<th>FY 2011</th>
<th>FY 2012</th>
<th>FY 2013</th>
<th>Benchmarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>3,424</td>
<td>3,151</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Percent disadvantaged minority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2010</th>
<th>FY 2011</th>
<th>FY 2012</th>
<th>FY 2013</th>
<th>Peer median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time faculty</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time staff</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time students</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Part II – Performance Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>FY 2010</th>
<th>FY 2011</th>
<th>FY 2012</th>
<th>FY 2013</th>
<th>Benchmarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UI Goal 1, Objective A</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate average years-to-degree 1</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UI Goal 1, Objective A</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate certificates and degrees awarded per 100 undergraduate student FTE</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UI Goal 1, Objective B</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-year New Frosh Retention Rate 2</td>
<td>1284 / 1665 =77%</td>
<td>1416 / 1757 =81%</td>
<td>1368 / 1718 =80%</td>
<td>1213 / 1585 =77%</td>
<td>83% Peer median</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time: Number / Percent</td>
<td>14 / 43 =33%</td>
<td>10 / 23 =44%</td>
<td>8 / 35 =23%</td>
<td>15 / 46 =33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time: Number / Percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UI Goal 1, Objective B</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-year New Transfer Retention Rate 2</td>
<td>482 / 614 =79%</td>
<td>504 / 640 =79%</td>
<td>540 / 696 =76%</td>
<td>441 / 565 =78%</td>
<td>Peer median</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time: Number / Percent</td>
<td>74 / 119 =62%</td>
<td>69 / 115 =60%</td>
<td>62 / 107 =58%</td>
<td>50 / 100 =50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time: Number / Percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UI Goal 1, Objective B</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six-Year Graduation Rate 2 UI Rate</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>62% Peer Median</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UI Goal 2, Objective A</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant applications supporting or requiring interdisciplinary activities 3</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Number</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UI Goal 2, Objective A</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures from competitive grants &amp; contracts per full-time instruction and research faculty 5</td>
<td>$81,532,000 / 634 = 128,599</td>
<td>$87,207,000 / 632 = $145,570</td>
<td>$96,229,000 / 581 = $165,627</td>
<td>$97,227,000 / 635 = $153,113</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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UI Goal 4: Objective B
Survey data support a positive experience with culture and climate
Students – Satisfied with overall experience 6
96% Not Surveyed
Faculty – Satisfied with job overall 7
60% Not Surveyed
Staff – Are treated with consideration and respect 8
97% Not Surveyed

UI Goal 4, Objective C
Institution primary reserve ratio comparable to the advisable level of reserves 9
27% 36% 30% 33% 40%

UI Goal 4, Objective C
Cost per undergraduate credit hour 10
$ 186 $ 172 $ 176 NA $ 200

UI Goal 4, Objective C
Degree completions per $100,000 in Education and Related expenditures 11
1.89 2.03 2.00 NA 2.00

Footnotes for Profile of Cases Managed and/or Key Services Provided
1 Summer, Fall and Spring, as reported to SBOE on the PSR-1 Annual Student Enrollment Report. Previous years’ values have been adjusted to incorporate the new reporting guidelines (omitting Study Abroad, National Student Exchange, Professional Development and COOP only students).
2 Based on SBOE PSR-1. FTE = Annual Credits divided by 30 for Undergraduate, 24 for Graduate, 28 for Law. WWAMI is student headcount.
3 Degrees Awarded counts here do not include our less-than-one-year Academic Certificates.
4 Only those postsecondary credits are counted which were also counted for credit at the high school level.
5 Study Abroad and National Student Exchange are coded in the course subject fields.
6 From UI Remediation report submitted annually to SBOE. (Note: UI does not offer remedial Math).
7 From the UI web-based, Graduating Senior Survey.
8 Bachelor’s degrees only, as reported to IPEDS. STEM fields using CCA definitions, previous years’ values have been adjusted to reflect changing STEM definition.
9 Number of participating students, as reported by UI Career Center/Service Learning Center, divided by full-time degree seeking student headcount. Prior years’ numbers have been adjusted to include all program levels.
10 Fall Census, US Citizen and Permanent Residents who indicated Hispanic, Black, Native American, Alaskan or Pacific Islander. All four years’ data have been revised to conform to the new reporting standards.

Performance Measure Explanatory Notes:
1 As reported to Complete College America (CCA), average time in years for first-time full-time undergraduates to complete their bachelor’s degree, for those who finish in ten years or less (98% do so).
2 As reported to IPEDS. Each year’s rates reflect the percent graduating or returning the fall of the FY specified.
3 From UI Office of Sponsored Programs, based on an interdisciplinary grant application tracking system.
4 As reported to NSF annually by the UI Office of Research and Economic Development. Data is for the year prior to the FY indicated, as that is when we report the research dollars and they are not available until late fall.
5 As reported to IPEDS, for the previous year in order to match the research dollars.
6 From the UI web-based, Graduating Senior Survey.
7 From UCLA/HERI National Faculty Survey which is conducted every third or fourth year.
8 From UI Staff Survey, which is conducted every third year.
9 As reported by UI Business and Accounting Services, Benchmark based on NACUBO recommendations. Prior years’ values have been revised upon review of computations. Values represent calculations for prior fiscal year.
Performance Highlights:

1. High 77% 1st year retention rate for new frosh, which is the highest in the state.

2. Nearly $100 million in funding from competitive externally funded grants and contracts. This represents more than $150,000 per full-time instructional and research faculty member.

3. High percentage of undergraduate degrees awarded in STEM fields, 33% in FY2013, highest in the state. STEM=Science, Technology, Engineering & Math – defined according the Complete College America taxonomy.

For More Information Contact:
Keith Ickes, Executive Director of Planning and Budget
U of Idaho, Administration Bldg. Room 201
Moscow, ID 83844-3163
Phone: (208) 885-2003 E-mail: kickes@uidaho.edu
Focus on Effectiveness
Mission Statement

Boise State University is a public, metropolitan research university offering an array of undergraduate and graduate degrees and experiences that foster student success, lifelong learning, community engagement, innovation and creativity. Research and creative activity advance new knowledge and benefit students, the community, the state and the nation. As an integral part of its metropolitan environment the university is engaged in professional and continuing education programming, policy issues, and promoting the region’s economic vitality and cultural enrichment.

Core Themes


*Undergraduate Education.* Our university provides access to high quality undergraduate education that cultivates the personal and professional growth of our students and meets the educational needs of our community, state, and nation. We engage our students and focus on their success.

*Graduate Education.* Our university provides access to graduate education that addresses the needs of our region, is meaningful in a global context, is respected for its high quality, and is delivered within a supportive graduate culture.

*Research and Creative Activity.* Through our endeavors in basic and applied research and in creative activity, our researchers, artists, and students create knowledge and understanding of our world and of ourselves, and transfer that knowledge to provide societal, economic, and cultural benefits. Students are integral to our faculty research and creative activity.

*Community Commitment.* The university is a vital part of the community, and our commitment to the community extends beyond our educational programs, research, and creative activity. We collaborate in the development of partnerships that address community and university issues. The community and university share knowledge and expertise with each other. We look to the community to inform our goals, actions, and measures of success. We work with the community to create a rich mix of culture, learning experiences, and entertainment that educates and enriches the lives of our citizens. Our campus culture and climate promote civility, inclusivity and collegiality.

Vision for Strategic Plan 2012-2017

Boise State University aspires to be a research university known for the finest undergraduate education in the region, and outstanding research and graduate programs. With its exceptional faculty, staff and student body, and its location in the heart of a thriving metropolitan area, the university will be viewed as an engine that drives the Idaho economy, providing significant return on public investment.
Focus on Effectiveness:
A Strategic Plan for Boise State University 2012-2017

Goal 1: Create a signature, high-quality educational experience for all students.

Strategies:
- Develop the Foundational Studies Program into a memorable centerpiece of the undergraduate experience.
- Provide bountiful opportunities within and across disciplines for experiential learning.
- Facilitate respect for the diversity of human cultures, institutions, and experiences in curricular and co-curricular education.
- Cultivate intellectual community among students and faculty.
- Invest in faculty development, innovative pedagogies, and an engaging environment for learning.

### Goal 1: Key Performance Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NSSE benchmark measures of student perception of quality of educational experience (as % of urban peer rating; for seniors only):</th>
<th>Recent data</th>
<th>Performance Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of academic challenge</td>
<td>97.1%</td>
<td>97.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active and collaborative learning</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>102.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-faculty interaction</td>
<td>93.4%</td>
<td>96.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enriching educational experience</td>
<td>99.4%</td>
<td>96.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive campus environment</td>
<td>93.6%</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% students achieving University Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Recent data</th>
<th>Performance Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt;Written &amp; oral communication (ULOs 1-2)</td>
<td>New program: Fall 2012</td>
<td>New program: Assessment structure is being implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;Critical inquiry, innovation, teamwork (ULOs 3-4)</td>
<td>New program: Fall 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;Civic &amp; Ethical foundations (ULOs 5-6)</td>
<td>New program: Fall 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of Idaho HS students naming Boise State as #1 choice (on ACT test; of those who listed Boise State in top 6)</th>
<th>Recent data</th>
<th>Performance Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1% of graduating undergraduates who achieve a competency of "exemplary" or "good" for each of ULOs 1-6 (Intellectual foundations and Civic & ethical foundations) and for ULO 7-11 (Disciplinary areas). The ULOs are based on the "LEAP" program of the AAC&U, and are incorporated into our Foundational Studies Program.
Goal 2: Facilitate the timely attainment of educational goals of our diverse student population.

Strategies:
- Identify and remove barriers to graduation.
- Bring classes to students using advanced technologies and multiple delivery formats.
- Design and implement innovative policies and processes that facilitate student success.
- Connect students with university services that address their individual needs.
- Ensure that faculty and staff understand their roles and responsibilities in facilitating student success.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 2: Key Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Recent data</th>
<th>Performance Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY 2009-10</td>
<td>FY 2010-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number degree graduates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;Baccalaureate</td>
<td>2,094</td>
<td>2,411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;Master’s and Doctoral</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate graduates per 100 FTE enrolled¹</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual enrollment ³</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;# credits produced</td>
<td>7,648</td>
<td>9,435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;# students served</td>
<td>1,602</td>
<td>2,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eCampus (Distance Education)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;Student Credit Hours</td>
<td>47,491</td>
<td>52,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;Distinct Students Enrolled</td>
<td>8,381</td>
<td>9,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY2004 cohort</td>
<td>FY2005 cohort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success and Progress Rate (at six years)⁴</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;First-time, Full-time Freshmen</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;Transfer students</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 year graduation of first-time full-time freshman</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY2009 cohort</td>
<td>FY2010 cohort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-year retention, first-time full-time freshmen⁵</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSSE student rating of administrative offices (as % of urban peer average score)</td>
<td>98.4%</td>
<td>94.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Student FTE is based on degree seeking undergraduate students. Beginning with FY2011-12 the FTE data is based on Fall census data, using FT students plus 1/3 PT students to calculate. Note that the change in FY2011-12 number is due to this date change.
³ Dual enrollment credits and students are measures of activity that occur over the entire year at multiple locations using various delivery methods. When providing measures of this activity, counts over the full year (instead of by term) provide the most complete picture of the number of unduplicated students that are enrolled and the number of credits earned.
⁴ “Success and Graduation Rate” is used by the Voluntary System of Accountability to provide a more comprehensive view of progress and attainment than can be provided by measures such as the 6-year graduation rate or the 1-year retention rate. The rate equals the total percent of students who fall into one of the following groups: graduated from or are still enrolled at Boise State, graduated elsewhere, or are still enrolled elsewhere.
⁵ Retention for the Fall 2009 cohort is measured as the percent of the Fall 2009 cohort of first time, full-time baccalaureate-seeking freshmen that return to enroll in Fall of 2010.
Goal 3: Gain distinction as a doctoral research university.

Strategies:

- Recruit, retain, and support highly qualified faculty, staff, and students from diverse backgrounds.
- Identify and invest in select areas of excellence with the greatest potential for economic, societal, and cultural benefit.
- Build select doctoral programs with a priority in professional and STEM disciplines.
- Build infrastructure to keep pace with growing research and creative activity.
- Design systems to support and reward interdisciplinary collaboration.

### Goal 3: Key Performance Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 3: Key Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Recent data</th>
<th>Performance Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Research &amp; Development Expenditures</strong> (as reported to the National Science Foundation)</td>
<td>FY 2009-10: $18.7M, FY 2010-11: $24.2M, FY 2011-12: $27.5 M</td>
<td>Not available at this time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New doctoral programs</strong></td>
<td>No new doctoral programs</td>
<td>Fall 2012 start: PhD Biomolecular Science; PhD Material Science &amp; Engineering; EdD Educational Technology; Fall 2013 start: Doctor of Nursing Practice; PhD in Public Policy; PhD in Ecology, Evolution, &amp; Behavior; EdD Athletic Training Program Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of peer-reviewed publications over 5-year period</strong></td>
<td>CY 2006-10: 1,079, CY 2007-11: 1,176, CY 2008-12: 1,228, CY 2009-13: 1,351</td>
<td>For CY 2010-14: 1,485, For CY 2014-17: 1,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual total citations of publications by Boise State authors</strong></td>
<td>CY2010: 3,874, CY2011: 4,662, CY2012: 4,762, CY2013: 6,662, CY2014: 7,000</td>
<td>For CY 2017: 7,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

5 # of publications over five year span with Boise State listed as an address for one or more authors; from Web of Science.
6 Annual total citations of peer-reviewed publications, published in any year, with Boise State listed as an address for at least one author; From Web of Science. http://library.boisestate.edu/researchindicators/index.php

---

Boise State University
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Goal 4: Align university programs and activities with community needs.

**Strategies:**
- Include community impact in the creation and assessment of university programs and activities.
- Leverage knowledge and expertise within the community to develop mutually beneficial partnerships.
- Collaborate with external partners to increase Idaho students’ readiness for and enrollment in higher education.
- Increase student recruitment, retention, and graduation in STEM disciplines.
- Evaluate our institutional impact and effectiveness on a regular basis and publicize results.

### Goal 4: Key Performance Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Recent data</th>
<th>Performance Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY 2009-10</td>
<td>FY 2010-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of graduates</strong></td>
<td><strong>High demand disciplines</strong> (bachelor’s, master’s, doctoral)**</td>
<td>861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of STEM graduates</strong> (includes bachelor’s, STEM education, master’s, doctoral)**</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong># of employers listing career-level jobs with BroncoJobs</strong></td>
<td>581</td>
<td>623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Students Participating in Courses with Service Learning Component</strong></td>
<td>2,414</td>
<td>2,577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong># of students requiring remedial coursework</strong></td>
<td>282</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Carnegie Foundation Community Engagement Classification</strong> recognizing community partnerships and curricular engagement</td>
<td>Boise State was one of 76 recipients of the 2006 inaugural awarding of this designation</td>
<td>Renewal based on application to be submitted April 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

8 Defined as distinct number of graduates in those disciplines appropriate for the top 25% of jobs listed by the Idaho Department of Labor, based on projected # of openings 2008-2018.

9 STEM refers to Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math. We define STEM disciplines as being included in either or both of the NSF-defined list of STEM disciplines and the NCES-defined list of STEM disciplines. We also include STEM secondary education graduates.

10 Measure will be adjusted for economic conditions.

11 Includes all new Idaho students who have been out of high school 1 year or less needing to complete remedial coursework.
Goal 5: Transform our operations to serve the contemporary mission of the university.

**Strategies:**
- Reinvent our academic and business practices to improve service and efficiency.
- Simplify or eliminate policies and regulations that waste effort and resources.
- Invest in faculty and staff to develop key competencies and motivate top performance.
- Break down silos that inhibit communication, collaboration and creativity.
- Provide widespread and timely access to reliable and understandable data, and use it to drive decision-making across the university.
- Build an infrastructure to encourage and accommodate external funding, philanthropic support, private-sector relationships, and a diversity of funding models.
- Develop and implement a model for resource allocation that supports strategic goals and promotes innovation, effectiveness, and responsible risk-taking.

### Goal 5: Key Performance Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 5: Key Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Recent data</th>
<th>Performance Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY 2011</td>
<td>FY 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of education (resident undergraduate with 15-credit load; tuition &amp; fees per semester)</td>
<td>$2,650</td>
<td>$2,783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Investment per EWA Weighted Credit Hour(^{12})</td>
<td>$155.46</td>
<td>$154.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Investment per EWA Weighted Credit Hour(^{13})</td>
<td>$98.25</td>
<td>$100.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Investment per Degree Graduate(^{12}) (bachelor’s and above)</td>
<td>$50,779</td>
<td>$46,931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Investment per Degree Graduate(^{12}) (bachelor’s and above)</td>
<td>$32,091</td>
<td>$30,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per EWA Weighted Undergraduate Credit Hour(^{13})</td>
<td>$239</td>
<td>$236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificates and Degrees Awarded per $100,000(^{14})</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree Graduates per $100,000(^{15})</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{12}\) Cost data from audited financial reports. Operational Cost includes costs for instruction, academic support (including libraries), and institutional support (including student services); excludes research and other non-instructional and support costs.

\(^{13}\) Cost data from step 4 of Cost of College Report, reflecting undergraduate-associated costs only.

\(^{14}\) Total costs reflect “Total Allocable Costs” from Cost of College Report, and include both graduate and undergraduate-associated costs. Total count of certificates and degrees awarded reflects duplicated counts of graduates.

\(^{15}\) Total costs reflect “Total Allocable Costs” from Cost of College Report, and include both graduate and undergraduate-associated costs. Total degree graduates reflect unduplicated counts.
Project Portfolio: University-wide Projects

Implementation of the university’s strategic plan Focus on Effectiveness 2012-2017 involves University-wide projects and Divisional and unit-level projects.

One of the nine university-wide projects that were proposed and approved for funding was “Adopt Leading-Edge Pedagogy and Learning Environments at the Program Level.” A request for proposals yielded twelve proposals, and four were chosen to receive funding totaling $300,000.

- “Transform first year STEM Learning” is focusing on first year math, physics, and engineering courses and the acquisition of critical skills: the ability to learn to solve problems, to network with other students, to seek help, to manage time, and to accomplish out of class work. For example, the traditional lecture-driven pedagogy of first and second semester calculus courses is being replaced by a mix of short lectures and group problem solving; the content of those courses will be focused to a greater extent on applications.

  - Importantly, this project was leveraged into a $2,000,000, 3-year grant from NSF’s WIDER program (Widening Implementation & Demonstration of Evidence-Based Reforms); the grant is entitled “Promoting Educational Reform through Strategic Investments in Systemic Transformation.”

- “Engaging Students across the Mechanical Engineering Curriculum” is transforming the way in which the Department of Mechanical & Biomedical Engineering is educating its 600+ bachelor’s degree majors. Pedagogy in 12 of 14 courses core to the major is being transformed by the incorporation of three categories of activities: (i) activities that focus on engaging students in the curriculum, including active learning techniques, student presentation of lectures, and use of everyday examples of engineering, (ii) activities that provide alternatives to traditional lectures, such as hybrid course delivery and remedial online resources, and (iii) activities that focus on development of professional engineering skills, such as team design projects, and problem/project based learning.

- The “Master of Community and Regional Planning” initiative is introducing a strong applied research component into the curriculum, bringing the professional planning community into the classroom for active dialog with students. The initiative is also (i) restructuring the curriculum of the program around four core themes (planning approaches, place & perspective, implementation & forecasting, and strategic planning), (ii) using “integration” courses and capstone courses to tie those themes together and to address broad issues relevant to professional planners such as professional ethics, social justice, data and research, leadership, and professionalism.

- “Mathematics Consulting Teacher Endorsement Graduate Certificate Program Transformation” is scaling up the capacity and the geographical reach of the program to meet the needs of the hundreds of individuals from across the state that have indicated interest in the program. Two solutions are being used to accomplish this scale up. First, a hybrid delivery platform is being developed that will maintain the socio-cognitive pedagogical approach that is central to the content and structure of the program while at the same time making it convenient for teachers beyond the Treasure Valley to participate. Second, two highly-trained course instructors are being developed through an intensive apprenticeship model; the goal is that those individuals would eventually be hired as clinical faculty members to teach, manage, and further develop the program.
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Vision: Leading in Opportunity and Innovation

Mission

The mission of Idaho State University is to advance scholarly and creative endeavor through the creation of new knowledge, cutting-edge research, innovative artistic pursuits and high-quality academic instruction; to use these achievements to enhance technical, undergraduate, graduate, and professional education, health care services, and other services provided to the people of Idaho and the nation; and to develop citizens who will learn from the past, think critically about the present, and provide leadership to enrich the future in a diverse, global society.

Idaho State University is a public research institution which serves a diverse population through its broad educational programming and basic, translational, and clinical research. Idaho State University serves and engages its communities with health care clinics and services, professional technical training, early college opportunities, and economic development activities. The University provides leadership in the health professions and related biomedical and pharmaceutical sciences, as well as serving the region and the nation through its environmental science and energy programs.

STRATEGIC PLAN GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Goal 1: LEARNING AND DISCOVERY – Idaho State University promotes an environment that supports learning and discovery through the many synergies that exist among teaching, learning, research and scholarly activities.

Objective 1.1 ISU provides a rich learning environment, in and out of the classroom.

Performance Measures
1.1.1 Number of online course sections offered.
1.1.2 Number of students participating in Career Path Internships.
1.1.3 Number of high school students participating in ISU dual credit courses.

Benchmarks:
1.1.1 900 course sections
1.1.2 600 CPI students
1.1.3 1,800 dual credit students

Objective 1.2 ISU provides a dynamic curriculum to ensure programs are current, relevant, and meet student and workforce needs.
Performance Measure:
1.2.1 Number of certificate and degree programs begun/expanded/revised; and number of certificate and degree programs discontinued.

Benchmark:
1.2.1 Number of new programs approximately equal to number of programs discontinued.

Objective 1.3 Undergraduate and graduate students participate in undergraduate teaching.

Performance Measures
1.3.1 Number of graduate assistantships and fellowships with teaching responsibilities.
1.3.2 Number of students employed as English, math, and content area tutors.

Benchmarks:
1.3.1 Increase graduate teaching assistants by 10 over the next 3 years.
1.3.2 Maintain adequate numbers of tutors to meet student need.

Objective 1.4 Undergraduate and graduate students engage in research and creative/scholarly activity.

Performance Measures
1.4.1 Number of students employed to work with a faculty member on research/creativity activities.
1.4.2 Number of students who participate each year in ISU’s research symposia.

Benchmarks:
1.4.1 Increase by 3% per year for next five years.
1.4.2 Increase to 250 students per year.

Objective 1.5 The core faculty is actively engaged in research and creative/scholarly activity.

Performance Measures
1.5.1 Faculty scholarly productivity, as demonstrated by the number of publications, juried shows, exhibits, performances, and other scholarly activities.
1.5.2 Number of proposals submitted for external funding, number funded, and total amount of funding received.

Benchmarks:
1.5.1 This is a new performance measure; data will be obtained from Activity Insight, to be implemented fall 2013 (this is an electronic curriculum vitae and workload program).
1.5.2 Increase the number of proposals submitted, number funded and total amount of funding by 3% per year for next 5 years.

Objective 1.6 Graduates of ISU’s programs are well prepared to enter the workforce and/or continue their education at the graduate and professional levels.

Performance Measures
1.6.1 Pass rates on professional licensure and certification exams.
1.6.2 Placement rates of graduates from academic, professional, and professional-technical programs.

Benchmarks:
1.6.1 Maintain pass rates at or above the national averages for each program where national data are available.
1.6.2 Maintain placement rates at or above the national averages for each program where national data are available.
ISU FY 2015-2019 Strategic Plan (Rev. 03-17-14)

Goal 2: ACCESS AND OPPORTUNITY – Idaho State University provides diverse opportunities for students with a broad range of educational preparation and backgrounds to enter the University and climb the curricular ladder so that they may reach their intellectual potential and achieve their educational goals.

Objective 2.1 Support services provided to enhance retention are utilized by students.

Performance Measures
2.1.1 Number of face-to-face advising contacts provided to undergraduate students by the central academic advising office.
2.1.2 Number of full-time freshmen students who participate in First Year Seminar and ACAD courses.
2.1.3 Average amount of need-based and merit-based financial aid/scholarships awarded to students.
2.1.4 Number of hours the content area tutoring, math and writing centers are utilized.

Benchmarks:
2.1.1 Maintain sufficient access to Central Academic Advising.
2.1.2 Increase to 50% over the next 3 years.
2.1.3 To be determined (based on changes in federal and state financial aid/scholarship programs).
2.1.4 To be determined (based on SBOE changes to the remedial education delivery models).

Objective 2.2 Students’ progression from initial enrollment to graduation is monitored, and efforts to increase enrollment, retention and completion are in place (e.g., targeted recruitment, optimal scheduling of courses, early warning system to help students in need, etc.).

Performance Measures (red text indicates 2013-2014 SBOE-required measures for all institutions)
2.2.1 Average time to degree completion by college for full-time and part-time students.
2.2.2 Retention rates from freshman to sophomore and sophomore to junior years, for full-time and part-time students.
2.2.3 Cost per weighted credit hour to deliver undergraduate education.
2.2.4 Completion of undergraduate certificates (1 year or greater) and degrees per $100,000 of education and related spending (i.e., full cost of instruction and student services, plus the portion of institutional support and maintenance assigned to instruction).
2.2.5 Total degree production (split by undergraduate/graduate).
2.2.6 Unduplicated headcount of graduates and percent of graduates to total unduplicated headcount (split by undergraduate/graduate).
2.2.7 Total full-time new and transfer students that are retained or graduate the following year (excluding death, military service, and mission).

Benchmarks:
2.2.1 Positively impact time to degree by 5% over next 3 years.
2.2.2 Positively impact retention rates by 5% over next 3 years.
2.2.3 Positively impact by 5% over next 3 years.
2.2.4 Positively impact this ratio by 5% over next 3 years.
2.2.5 Increase undergraduate and graduate awards by 5% over the next 3 years.
2.2.6 Positively impact this ratio by 5% over next 3 years.
2.2.7 Increase retention rate to 75% over the next 3 years.
Objective 2.3 Students who require remedial coursework are successful in completing their certificate or degree programs.

Performance Measures
2.3.1 Percent of students who successfully complete required remedial courses.
2.3.2 Retention rates (fall to fall) of students who complete remedial courses.

Benchmarks:
2.3.1 To be determined based on changes to be made by the SBOE on remediation delivery models.
2.3.2 Increase retention rate to 70% over the next 3 years.

Objective 2.4 Students who enter with college credits earned while in high school (dual credit) are successful in completing their certificate or degree programs.

Performance Measures
2.4.1 Total number of students enrolled in ISU’s Early College program, and total number of credits earned.

Benchmark:
2.4.1 Increase total number of students (unduplicated headcount) to 1,800, and increase total student credit hours generated to 10,800 over the next 3 years.

Objective 2.5 Students participate in community and service learning projects and activities, student organizations, and learning communities.

Performance Measures
2.5.1 Number of student organizations, and annual number of students participating in those organizations.

Benchmarks:
2.5.1 Increase number of students participating in student organizations to 4,500 over next 3 years.

Goal 3 THREE: LEADERSHIP IN THE HEALTH SCIENCES – Idaho State University values its established leadership in the health sciences with primary emphasis in the health professions. We offer a broad spectrum of undergraduate, graduate, and postgraduate training. We deliver health-related services and patient care throughout the State in our clinics and postgraduate residency training sites. We are committed to meeting the health professions workforce needs in Idaho. We support professional development, continuing education, and TeleHealth services. We are active in Health Sciences research.

Objective 3.1 A broad array of health professions certificate and degree programs are offered, many statewide.

Performance Measures
3.1.1 Number of certificate and degree programs offered, and number of students enrolled, in ISU’s health professions programs.
3.1.2 Percent of graduates of ISU health professions programs who obtain employment in Idaho.
3.1.3 Pass rates on clinical licensure and certification exams in the health professions.

Benchmarks:
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3.1.1 Maintain number of health professions programs offered, and maintain enrollments at or near program capacity.
3.1.2 To be determined (Data to be obtained in the future from the State Longitudinal Data System (SLDS)).
3.1.3 Maintain pass rates at or above the national averages, where national data is available.

Objective 3.2 ISU serves the State, the public, and its health professions students through its clinics and other community health venues.

Performance Measures
3.2.1 Number of patient visits to ISU clinics and clinical services.
3.2.2 Number of people served by ISU’s community health fairs and screening events.

Benchmarks:
3.2.1 Number of patient visits will increase by 5% over the next 3 years.
3.2.2 Number of people attending these events will increase by 5% over the next 3 years.

Objective 3.3 ISU faculty and students engage in basic, translational, and clinical research in the health sciences.

Performance Measures
3.3.1 Number of faculty engaged in research in the health and biomedical sciences.
3.3.2 Amount of external funding received for health-related and biomedical research.
3.3.3 Number of students participating in clinical research/scholarly activity as part of their degree program.

Benchmarks:
3.3.1 Increase to 40 faculty over the next 3 years.
3.3.2 Funding will increase by 3% per year over the next 3 years.
3.3.3 Increase to 750 students over the next 3 years.

Goal 4: COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT AND IMPACT – Idaho State University, including its outreach campuses and centers, is an integral component of the local communities, the State and the intermountain region, and benefits the economic health, business development, environment, and arts and culture in the communities it serves.

Objective 4.1 ISU directly contributes to the economic well-being of the State, region, and communities it serves.

Performance Measure:
4.1.1 Total economic impact of the University.

Benchmark:
4.1.1 Total economic impact will increase by 5% over the next 5 years.

Objective 4.2 Campus resource conservation efforts have been initiated; and students and faculty conduct research in the areas of environment and in energy to benefit the State.

Performance Measure:
4.2.1 Resource conservation efforts initiated.

Benchmark:
4.2.1 ISU’s efforts to conserve campus resources will continue to be developed.
Objective 4.3 ISU participates in formal and informal partnerships with other entities and stakeholders.

Performance Measure:
4.3.1 Number of active ISU partnerships, collaborative agreements, and contracts with public agencies and private entities.

Benchmark:
4.3.1 Number of partnerships, collaborative agreements, and contracts will increase by 5% over the next 5 years.

Goal 5: STEWARDSHIP OF INSTITUTIONAL RESOURCES – The University has policies and procedures in place to ensure the effective and efficient use of its internal resources to address its infrastructure requirements and to meet the needs of its various constituent groups.

Objective 5.1 The institutional reserves meet the Board’s expectations based on best practices.

Performance Measures:
5.1.1 Level of Institutional reserves as a percent of total operating budget.

Benchmark:
5.1.1 The institution maintains or exceeds reserves of 5% of total budget.

Objective 5.2 The institution continually assesses and periodically reviews its utilization of resources.

Performance Measure:
5.2.1 Number of academic, co-curricular, and non-academic program/unit reviews completed each year.

Benchmark:
5.2.1 All academic, co-curricular, and non-academic programs/units will be reviewed at least once every five years.
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Key External Factors  
(beyond direct control of Idaho State University)

Funding

Many Idaho State University strategic goals and objectives assume on-going and sometimes substantive additional levels of State legislative appropriations. Availability of state revenues, upon which appropriation levels depend, can be uncertain from year to year. Similarly, while gubernatorial and legislative support for ISU efforts are significant, priorities set by those bodies vary from year to year, affecting planning for institutional initiatives and priorities. When we experience several successive years of deep reductions in state appropriated funding, as has occurred in the recent past, it makes it increasingly difficult to plan for and implement strategic growth.

Legislation/Rules

Beyond funding considerations, many institutional and SBOE policies are embedded in state statute or rule and are not under institutional control. Changes to statute and rule desired by the institution are accomplished according to state guidelines. As with SBOE rules, rules require public notice and opportunity for comment, gubernatorial support, and adoption by the Legislature. Proposed legislation, including both one-time and ongoing requests for appropriated funding, must be supported by the Governor, gain approval in the germane legislative committees, and pass both houses of the Legislature.

The recent directives related to creation of the Student Longitudinal Data System, revision of general education and remedial education, common core standards, Smarter Balance Assessment, Complete College America/Idaho, the 60% Goal, zero-based budgeting, performance-based funding, and the additional financial and institutional research reporting requirements have required the reallocation of staff resources and time and effort to comply.

Institutional and Specialized Accreditation Standards

The Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU), our regional accreditation body, recently initiated a new 7-year review cycle and a set of new standards. Similarly, the specialized accrediting bodies for our professional programs periodically make changes to their accreditation standards and requirements, which we must address.

ISU has the largest number of degree programs with specialized accreditation among the state institutions, which significantly increases the workload in these programs due to the requirements for data collection and preparation of periodic reports. The programs in the health professions are reliant on the availability of clerkship sites in the public and private hospitals, clinics, and medical offices within the state and region. The potential for growth in these programs is dependent on maintaining the student to faculty ratios mandated by the specialized accrediting bodies, as well as the availability of a sufficient number of appropriate clerkship sites for our students.
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Federal Government

A great deal of educational and extramural research funding for ISU and the SBOE is provided by the federal government. Funding is often tied to specific federal programs and objectives, and therefore can greatly influence both education policy and extramurally-funded research agendas at the state and the institutional levels. The recent decrease in funding for Pell Grants has had a negative impact on need-based financial aid for our students. The impact of the sequestration-mandated federal budget reductions initiated in early 2013 will likely have a negative impact on higher education.

Local/Regional/National/Global Economic Outlook

Conventional wisdom has long tied cyclic economic trends to corresponding trends in higher education enrollments. While some recent factors have caused this long relationship to be shaken in terms of funding students have available for higher education, in general the perceived and actual economic outlooks experienced by students continues to affect both recruitment into our colleges and universities as well as degree progress and completion rates. A greater proportion of our students must work and therefore are less able to complete their education in a timely manner.
# ISU Strategic Plan Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOAL 1: A WELL EDUCATED CITIZENRY</th>
<th>Learning and Discovery</th>
<th>Access and Opportunity</th>
<th>Leadership in the Health Sciences</th>
<th>Community Engagement and Impact</th>
<th>Stewardship of Institutional Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Set policy and advocate for increasing access for individuals of all ages, abilities, and economic means to Idaho's P-20 educational system.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Postsecondary student enrollment by race/ethnicity/gender as compared against population.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase the educational attainment of all Idahoans through participation and retention in Idaho’s educational system.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Percent of high school students enrolled and number of credits earned in dual credit.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Percent of first-year full-time freshmen returning for second year.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Number of postsecondary unduplicated students receiving awards (Associate, bachelor’s, master’s, doctoral degrees) each year.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the processes and increase the options for re-integration of adult learners into the education system.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Number of bridge programs.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Number of adults enrolled in upgrade and customized training.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Percent of first-year part-time freshmen returning for second year.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the ability of the educational system to meet educational needs and allow students to efficiently and effectively transition into the workplace.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Number of degrees conferred in STEM fields.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Percent of students participating in internships.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Percent of students participating in undergraduate research.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

✓ Indicates the specific SBOE’s Goals and Objectives that are supported by ISU’s Strategic Plan.
## ISU STRATEGIC PLAN GOALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Learning and Discovery</th>
<th>Access and Opportunity</th>
<th>Leadership in the Health Sciences</th>
<th>Community Engagement and Impact</th>
<th>Stewardship of Institutional Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal 2: Critical Thinking and Innovation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase research and development of new ideas into solutions that benefit society.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Institution expenditures from competitive Federally funded grants.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Institution expenditures from competitive industry funded grants.</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Number of sponsored projects involving the private sector.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Total amount of research expenditures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase student performance through the development, recruitment and retention of a diverse and highly qualified workforce of teachers, faculty, and staff.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Percent of first-time students from public institution teacher training programs that pass the Praxis II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 3: Effective and Efficient Delivery Systems</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase productivity and cost-effectiveness.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Cost per successfully completed weighted student credit hour.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Average net cost to attend public 4 year institution.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Average number of credits earned at completion of a degree program.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Institutional reserves comparable to best practice.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase the quality, thoroughness, and accessibility of data for informed decision-making and continuous improvement of Idaho’s educational system.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Develop P-20 workforce longitudinal data system with the ability to access timely and relevant data.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

✓ Indicates the specific SBOE’s Goals and Objectives that are supported by ISU’s Strategic Plan.
Strategic Plan Performance Measure Data FY 2009 – FY 2013

*Notes: Data are presented where available. The university implemented a new enterprise resource planning (ERP) system in 2010. Comparable data from the legacy system may not be available for some measures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal 1: Learning &amp; Discovery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 ISU provides a rich learning environment</td>
<td># online course sections</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>900 course sections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># students in CPI program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>241</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>600 CPI students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># dual credit students</td>
<td>1,434</td>
<td>1,559</td>
<td>1,434</td>
<td>1,668</td>
<td>1,914</td>
<td>1,800 dual credit students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 ISU provides a dynamic curriculum</td>
<td># new, expanded programs/degrees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># programs/degrees discontinued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New programs / degrees: 10 Terminated programs/degrees: 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New programs / degrees: 3 Terminated programs/degrees: 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New programs / degrees: 2 Terminated programs/degrees: degrees: 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New programs / degrees: 8 Terminated programs/degrees: degrees: 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># new/expanding programs/ degrees in balance with # of programs/degrees closed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Students participate in undergraduate teaching</td>
<td># teaching GTAs/Fellowships</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>112</td>
<td></td>
<td>Increase by 10 over next 3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># English, math, content area student tutors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maintain adequate number of student tutors to meet need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Students engage in research/creative activities</td>
<td># students employed to work with faculty on research projects</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>372</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increase by 3% per year for next 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># students participating in research symposia</td>
<td># students participating in research symposia</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>250 students per year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Core faculty engaged in research/creative activity</td>
<td># Faculty scholarly productivity output</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>177 publications, 541 presentations, 147 artistic performances and exhibits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># proposals submitted for funding</td>
<td>398 Proposals</td>
<td>377 Proposals</td>
<td>378 Proposals</td>
<td>360 Proposals</td>
<td>Increase amount of funding by 3% per year for next 5 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># proposals funded</td>
<td>282 Funded $37.1M Awarded</td>
<td>244 Funded $36.3M Awarded</td>
<td>287 Funded $30.6M Awarded</td>
<td>217 Funded $23.9M Awarded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 Graduates prepared to enter workforce or advanced education</td>
<td># of student contacts with a central advisor</td>
<td>7,327</td>
<td>7,737</td>
<td>7,171</td>
<td>8,436</td>
<td>Maintain sufficient access to Central Academic Advising</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of full-time freshmen participating in First Year Seminar, and/or ACAD courses</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Increase to 50% or more over the next 3 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average amount of need-based and merit-based financial aid/scholarships awarded</td>
<td>Average grant aid $4,086 / Average loan amount $5,511</td>
<td>Average grant aid $4,951 / Average loan amount $6,608</td>
<td>Average grant aid $5,011 / Average loan amount $6,242</td>
<td>Average grant aid $5,226 / Average loan amount $6,033</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To be determined (with changes in federal and state financial aid programs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># of hours of content area tutoring, math and writing centers</td>
<td>21,409</td>
<td>22,576</td>
<td>20,683</td>
<td></td>
<td>To be determined (impact of SBOE changes to remedial delivery models unknown)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 2: Access and Opportunity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Support services provided to enhance retention are utilized by students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># of student contacts with a central advisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Student’s progression to graduation</td>
<td>Average time to degree for full-time and part-time undergraduate students by college</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See Appendix C</td>
<td>Positively impact by 5% over next 3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention rates from freshman to sophomore, and sophomore to junior years, for full-time and part-time students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See Appendix D</td>
<td>Positively impact retention rates by 5% over next 3 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per weighted credit hour to deliver undergraduate education</td>
<td>$208.50</td>
<td>$185.94</td>
<td>$184.02</td>
<td>$187.67</td>
<td>$197.44</td>
<td>Positively impact by 5% over next 3 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of undergraduate certificates/degrees per $100,000 of education and related spending</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>Positively impact this ratio by 5% over next 3 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total degree production (split by undergraduate/graduate)</td>
<td>UG: 1,531 GR: 504 Total: 2,035</td>
<td>UG: 1,574 GR: 571 Total: 2,145</td>
<td>UG: 1,608 GR: 547 Total: 2,155</td>
<td>UG: 1,644 GR: 635 Total: 2,279</td>
<td>UG: 1,709 GR: 634 Total: 2,343</td>
<td>Increase undergraduate and graduate awards by 5% over the next 3 years.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unduplicated headcount of graduates and percent of graduates to total unduplicated headcount (split by undergraduate/graduate)</td>
<td>Undergraduate: 1,559 : 10.8% Graduate: 548 : 19.9%</td>
<td>Undergraduate: 1,577 : 9.8% Graduate: 631 : 20.2%</td>
<td>Undergraduate: 1,626 : 10.0% Graduate: 631 : 22.7%</td>
<td>Positively impact this ratio by 5% over next 3 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total full-time new and transfer students that are retained or graduate the following year.</td>
<td>Total: 1,819 Retained: 1,172 64.4%</td>
<td>Total: 1,987 Retained: 1,266 63.7%</td>
<td>Total: 1,826 Retained: 1,262 69.1%</td>
<td>Increase retention rate to 75% over the next 3 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Students who require remedial coursework are successful in completing their degree</td>
<td>% of students who successfully complete required remedial courses</td>
<td>58.2%</td>
<td>63.1%</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
<td>To be determined (based on changes to be made by the SBOE on remediation delivery models)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention rate of students who complete remedial courses (fall-to-fall)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>68.5%</td>
<td>69.8%</td>
<td>Increase retention rate to 70% over the next 3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Students who enter college with dual credit are successful</td>
<td># students enrolled in ISU’s early college program; # credits earned while in high school</td>
<td>1,434 students</td>
<td>1,588 students</td>
<td>1,434 students</td>
<td>1,669 students</td>
<td>1,914 students</td>
<td>Increase to 1,800 students and 10,800 credits in the next 3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Students participate in community and service learning projects, activities, etc.</td>
<td># student organizations, and # students participating in those organizations</td>
<td>140 organizations</td>
<td>137 organizations</td>
<td>142 organizations</td>
<td>143 organizations</td>
<td>148 organizations</td>
<td>Increase participation to 4,500 students over the next 3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 3: Leadership in the Health Sciences</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 A broad array of health professions programs offered</td>
<td># certificate and degree programs offered, and # of students enrolled</td>
<td>Programs: 30</td>
<td>Programs: 34</td>
<td>Programs: 34</td>
<td>Programs: 34</td>
<td>Maintain number of health professions programs offered, and maintain enrollments at or near program capacity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of graduates who are employed in Idaho</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Data to be obtained in the future from the State Longitudinal Data System (SLDS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass rates on professional licensure and certification exams in the health professions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pass rates at or above national averages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 ISU serves the State, public, and health professions students through its clinics and other community health venues</td>
<td># of patient visits to ISU clinics and clinical services</td>
<td>35,597</td>
<td>41,486</td>
<td>51,817</td>
<td>54,234</td>
<td>49,394 (this number has decreased slightly due to the transition with Family Medicine and Health West)</td>
<td># of patient visits will increase by 5% over next 3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># people attending ISU’s community health fairs and screening events</td>
<td>1,131</td>
<td>1,277</td>
<td>1,159</td>
<td>1,208</td>
<td>1,088</td>
<td># of people attending ISU’s health fairs and screening events will increase by 5% over next 3 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Faculty and students engage in basic, translational, and clinical research in the health sciences</td>
<td># of faculty engaged in health sciences/biomedical research *Principal Investigators (PIs) and co-PIs:</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Increase to 80 over the next 3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of external funding received for health-related and biomedical research</td>
<td>$2.3M</td>
<td>$5.3M</td>
<td>$3.6M</td>
<td>$4.0M</td>
<td>$6.2M</td>
<td>Funding will increase by 3% per year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># students participating in clinical/applied research as part of their degree program</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>706</td>
<td>Increase to 750 students over the next 3 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 4: Community Engagement and Impact</td>
<td>Total economic impact of the University</td>
<td>baseline established by the 2011 ISU Economic Impact Study: $312 million</td>
<td>A new economic impact study will be conducted in 2016</td>
<td>Total economic impact will increase by 5% over next 5 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 ISU directly contributes to the economic well-being of the State, region, and communities it serves</td>
<td># resource conservation efforts initiated</td>
<td>See Appendix E</td>
<td>Efforts to conserve campus resources will continue to be developed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Campus resource conservation efforts initiated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ISU Strategic Plan Goals and Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ISU participates in partnerships with other entities and stakeholders</td>
<td># of active partnerships, collaborative agreements, and contracts with public and private entities</td>
<td>836</td>
<td>1,066</td>
<td>1,071</td>
<td>1,008</td>
<td>ISU is in the process of building an electronic workflow tracking system and database for all contracts with public and private entities. This project will be completed in the summer of 2014. # of partnerships will increase by 5% over next 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 5: Stewardship of Institutional Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Institutional reserves comparable to best practice</td>
<td>The institution maintains or exceeds reserves of 5% of total budget - (Formula: Unrestricted Net Asset Balance - &quot;Reserves&quot;)/Operating Expenses</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>Maintain a minimum target reserve of 5% of total budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Institution continually assesses and periodically reviews its utilization of resources.</td>
<td># of academic, non-academic and co-curricular program reviews conducted each year.</td>
<td>14 academic</td>
<td>4 academic</td>
<td>2 academic</td>
<td>13 academic</td>
<td>6 academic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A

Idaho State University - Pass rates for required licensing & certification exams

*Notes: This is not an exhaustive list of pass rates. Rates for Nursing, Pharmacy, Physician Assistant programs etc. are provided as examples; pass rates for graduates of all academic health professions programs consistently meet or exceed the national pass rates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FY 2009</th>
<th>FY2010</th>
<th>FY2011</th>
<th>FY2012</th>
<th>FY2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nursing (RN) – ISU pass rate</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing (RN) – National pass rate</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing (FNP AANPCP Certification) - ISU pass rate</td>
<td></td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing (FNP AANPCP Certification) - National pass rate</td>
<td></td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing (ACNS ANCC Certification - ISU pass rate</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing (ACNS ANCC Certification) - National pass rate</td>
<td></td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy – ISU pass rate</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy – National pass rate</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physician Assistant – ISU pass rate</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physician Assistant – National pass rate</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRAXIS-II Subject Area Tests required for Teacher Certification - All Program Completer for ISU</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Therapy NBCOT - ISU first-time test takers (2010-2012)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

Idaho State University - Placement rates for selected programs

*Notes: This is not an exhaustive list of placement rates. ISU intends to utilize the State Longitudinal Database System (SLDS) as soon as Idaho Department of Labor data is available to assist with placement rates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FY 2009</th>
<th>FY2010</th>
<th>FY2011</th>
<th>FY2012</th>
<th>FY2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College of Technology - All Professional Technical Education</td>
<td>77.75%</td>
<td>83.33%</td>
<td>85.68%</td>
<td>87.20%</td>
<td>87.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Preparation Program (based on self-reported survey of graduates of all teacher preparation programs (2013 response rate: 63%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radiographic Science (self-reported on a survey)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Therapy (self-reported on a survey)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy (self-reported on survey)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C

Idaho State University –

Performance Measure 2.2.1 - Average Time to Complete Degree in Years

*Notes: This is methodology counts the number of years between the year a student first enters the university and the year the student is awarded a degree. The methodology is impacted by “stop-outs” between when the student first enters the university and when the student receives their degree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Type</th>
<th>FY11</th>
<th>FY12</th>
<th>FY13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical Certificate</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate's</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>7.66</td>
<td>5.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td>8.27</td>
<td>8.02</td>
<td>8.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>6.42</td>
<td>5.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>6.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D

Idaho State University – Retention Rates from Freshmen to Sophomore and Sophomore to Junior (fall-to-fall retention)

*Notes: The methodology used is all full-time and part-time degree-seeking freshmen and the number that re-enroll the next fall term. All full-time and part-time degree-seeking sophomores enrolled and the number that re-enroll the next fall term. The student classification (freshmen, sophomore, junior, and senior) is not considered on re-enrollment the next fall term, only if the student returned in the fall. Students that are awarded a degree between the fall-to-fall time period are counted as retained.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class level</th>
<th>FY11</th>
<th>FY12</th>
<th>FY13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshman to Sophomore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>61.2%</td>
<td>62.2%</td>
<td>67.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
<td>46.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore to Junior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>76.6%</td>
<td>77.2%</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E

Idaho State University – Conservation and Energy Reducing Projects

*Notes: This is not an exhaustive list of conservation and energy reducing projects. The university has completed other projects like window replacements and HVAC upgrades/repair/replacement that makes ISU more energy efficient.

1. **2008-9:** Purchased 5 electric vehicles for the grounds operations.
   - Replaced fuel consumption of 5 gasoline powered pick-up trucks with electricity.
   - Improved air quality surrounding academic buildings.
   - Reduced noise pollution around surrounding residential and academic buildings.
   - Saves on average 15.95 gal/day of gasoline.

2. **2010:** Stopped burning coal at the heat plant.
   - Eliminated transportation of 3000 tons of coal to the heat plant.
   - Reduced emissions of sulfur dioxide, carbon monoxide, nitrogen oxide and many other volatile organic compounds (VOC) in to the environment by switching to natural gas.
   - The heat plant runs more efficient on cleaner burning natural gas.
   - Deleting the use of coal as a heating fuel has eliminated a problem of fugitive dust in the facility.

3. **2011:** Bio-diesel production and increased recycling sustainability.
   - Bio-diesel production begins with the idea to make recycling more sustainable by operating the recycling pick up vehicle on a clean renewable fuel.
   - Processing waste cooking oil, produced by campus kitchens, into bio-diesel reduces emissions as compared to burning petroleum fuel.
   - Bio-diesel is one of the EPA's preferred clean burning fuels, and is also a carbon neutral energy source.
   - Facilities in partnership with the college of Technology's, Energy Systems Technology & Education Center (ESTEC) operate the production process together.
   - Besides providing a clean source of power, the bio-diesel program is a marketing tool for attracting and retaining students. The processing unit is located in an enclosed mobile trailer that can be transported to high schools for demonstrating the science and opportunities at ISU.
Appendix E - continued

- Currently 5 to 10 gallons of waste cooking oil per week are collected from one kitchen, and processed into bio-diesel during the school sessions. The potential to collect oil from the other three kitchens are in the future plans.
- To date bi-diesel production has saved the purchase of approximately 160 gallons of petroleum fuel.

4. 2011-12: The greater part of recycling is operated by the custodial department.

- Recycling reports 208 tons of recyclable material recovered around campus to date.
- Custodial is phasing in waterless urinals that use only one gallon of water every 3 months.

5. 2011-12: Maintenance and operations.

- The maintenance department reports installation of 17 new water fountains that have the ability to re fill reusable water bottles.
- Has reduced the plastic waste steam comparable to 48,871 plastic water bottles.


- Eight projects totaling 338,039 KWH in energy use reduction.
- Reduction in utility billing totaling $19,872.00 annually.


- Quad Lighting project phase II, will reduce electrical energy by an additional 30,590 KWH.
- Custodial is piloting high-efficiency hand dryers which will eliminate the need for paper towels in restrooms.
- LED retro-fit kits for standard florescent lighting are being installed and tested for suitability.


- 100,000 watts of energy savings for changing wall packs and flood lights on exterior of buildings to LED lighting.
- 27,000 watts of energy savings for changing emergency exit signs to LED lighting.
- LED retrofit projects will save electricity at approximately 4 amps @ 120V per 4-tube fixture. Retro-fit work will continue as a stock of fixtures remains.
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VISION

Lewis-Clark State College (LCSC) will fulfill the Idaho State Board of Education’s vision of a seamless public education system by integrating traditional baccalaureate programs, professional-technical training programs, and community college and community support programs within a single institution, serving diverse needs within a single student body, and providing outstanding teaching and support by a single faculty and administrative team.

The college’s one-mission, one-team approach will prepare citizens from all walks of life to make the most of their individual potential and will contribute to the common good by fostering respect and close teamwork among all Idahoans. Sustaining a tradition that dates back to its founding as a teacher training college in 1893, LCSC will continue to place paramount emphasis on effective instruction—focusing on the quality of the teaching and learning environment for traditional and non-traditional academic classes, professional-technical education, and community instructional programs.

As professed in the college’s motto, “Connecting Learning to Life,” instruction will foster powerful links between classroom knowledge and theory and personal experience and application. Accordingly, LCSC will:

- Actively partner with the K-12 school system, community service agencies, and private enterprises and support regional economic and cultural development
- Strive to sustain its tradition as the most accessible four-year higher-education institution in Idaho by rigorously managing program costs, student fees, housing, textbook and lab costs, and financial assistance to ensure affordability
- Vigorously manage the academic accessibility of its programs through accurate placement, use of student-centered course curricula, and constant oversight of faculty teaching effectiveness
- Nurture the development of strong personal values and emphasize teamwork to equip its students to become productive and effective citizens who will work together to make a positive difference in the region, the state, the nation, and the world.

MISSION

Lewis-Clark State College is a regional state college offering instruction in the liberal arts and sciences, professional areas tailored to the educational needs of Idaho, applied technical programs which support the local and state economy and other educational programs designed to meet the needs of Idahoans.

Core Theme One: Connecting Learning to Life Through Academic Programs
The first segment of the three part mission of Lewis-Clark State College is fulfilled under aegis of Academic Programs. This theme guides the offering of undergraduate instruction in the liberal arts and sciences and professional programs tailored to the educational needs of Idaho.

Core Theme Two: Connecting Learning to Life Through Professional-Technical Programs
The second segment of the three part mission of Lewis-Clark State College is fulfilled under the aegis of Professional-Technical Programs. LCSC functions under this theme by offering an array of credit and non-credit educational experiences to prepare skilled workers in established and emerging occupations that serve the region’s employers.

Core Theme Three: Connecting Learning to Life Through Community Programs
The third and last theme of Lewis-Clark State College is fulfilled through Community Programs. The primary function of Community Programs is to provide quality delivery of outreach programs and services to students, customers, and communities throughout Region II as well as degree completion programs in Region I.
Goal 1
Sustain and enhance excellence in teaching and learning.

Objective 1A.
Strengthen courses, programs, and curricula consonant with the mission and core themes of the institution.

Courses and programs will be assessed. The college will identify opportunities for improvement, expansion, and/or elimination of courses and programs; will foster closer collaboration and integration with the K-12 system; and will engage the local community and business leadership in the planning of current and future program offerings. The college will explore initiatives to improve student preparation and readiness to succeed in college level courses.

Timeline: FY 2014-2018 ongoing
Action: President, Provost and Vice Presidents, Director of Institutional Planning, Research and Assessment, Assessment Coordination Committee, Functional Area Assessment Committees, Division/Unit Assessment Groups

Progress: The college is actively engaged in the State Board of Education (SBOE) mandated Program Prioritization process which allows for a comprehensive review of all instructional (and non-instructional) programs. This will lead to identifying programs which may benefit from expansion and further support, those which may need an infusion of resources and those best consolidated or reconfigured. Programs across campus continue to benefit from the insights and suggestions of local community and business leaders serving on our advisory boards. One outcome of industry-college collaboration aimed at meeting the needs of regional employers is the proposed AAS degree in Electronics Engineering Technology slated to begin Fall 2014.

Performance Measure(s):

Assessment submission
Benchmark: All units of the college will submit assessment documents that reflect genuine analysis and accurate reporting
Performance: 97% of units completed assessment (FY 2014)

First-time licensing/certification exam pass rates for professional programs
Benchmark: Meet or exceed national average
Performance: RN: LCSC 92%/National 91%, PN: 100%/85%, ARRT 92%/90% (FY 2013)

Percentage of responding LCSC graduates with positive placement
Benchmark: 90% of responding LCSC graduates will have positive placement
Performance: 92% (FY 2013)

Number of Idaho teachers who are certified each year by specialty and meet the Federal Highly Qualified Teacher definition
Benchmark: The percentage of first-time students passing the PRAXIS II will exceed 90%
Performance: 93% (FY 2013)
Objective 1B.
Ensure the General Education Core achieves its expected learning outcomes.

The alignment of the General Education Core with institutional General Education goals and statewide General Education standards will be assessed. Cross-disciplinary communication and collaboration will improve faculty design and delivery of General Education Core courses. The college will ensure faculty with teaching assignments within the General Education Core understand institutional General Education goals.

Timeline: FY 2015
Action: Provost, Dean of Academic Programs, General Education Committee

Progress: The college has been an active participant in the state-wide general education reform effort which culminated in a new state policy presented to the SBOE in February 2014. A campus-wide presentation on general education reform was delivered on March 5, 2014, by Academic Dean Mary Flores and the LCSC General Education Committee. Once the policy is formally approved, and faculty across campus have provided input, those teaching general education courses will work together to align courses to the new state-wide competencies. Graduating seniors and other students will complete the ETS Proficiency Profile (successor to the MAPP exam) test this spring as one assessment of our general education goals and outcomes.

Performance Measure(s):

ETS Proficiency Profile critical thinking construct
Benchmark: LCSC will score at the 80th percentile or better of comparison participating institutions (Carnegie Classification-Baccalaureate Diverse) on the ETS Proficiency Profile critical thinking construct.
Performance: 88th percentile (FY 2011)

College BASE results for math and science
Benchmark: The Division of Natural Science and Mathematics will improve College Base construct scores in math and science tests
Performance: TBD

Objective 1C.
Optimize technology-based course delivery, resources, and support services for students, faculty, and staff.

Equipment, software, and technological capabilities will be current and sufficient for student, faculty, and staff needs. Training in effective online course design and instruction for faculty will be strengthened.
Timeline: FY 2014-2015
Action: Provost, Chief Technology Officer, Director of e-Learning Services, Data Advisory Committee, Instructional Technology Advisory Committee

Progress: The college is working with the Office of State Board of Education (OSBE) staff and other schools to move to a managed hosting model for the online teaching platform, Blackboard. To better serve students and instructors, the additional Help Desk feature is also under consideration. The e-Learning Services department continues to provide online training modules for faculty and one-on-one personalized instruction as needed.

Performance Measure(s):
Annual end-of-term duplicated headcount for students enrolled in web, hybrid, and lecture/web-enhanced courses
Benchmark: 8,000
Performance: 7,726 (FY 2014)

Objective 1D.
Maximize direct faculty and student interactions inside and outside the classroom.

LCSC will maintain appropriate student-to-faculty ratios by providing adequate numbers of sections for high-demand courses and by keeping course capacities at appropriate levels. The college will seek to increase student participation and engagement in academic and non-curricular activities.

Timeline: FY 2016
Action: Provost, Vice President for Student Affairs, Director of Institutional Planning, Research and Assessment

Progress: PG 14-19, Demand-based Course Scheduling, was formed to explore options to achieve a schedule of course offerings which meets the needs of students for completing degree requirements and makes the best use of campus facilities and faculty resources. A direct outcome of the committee’s work was scheduling more late-afternoon and evening classes for Fall 2014. Recommendations include looking at the feasibility of offering intense weekend sections of core classes including English 101 and Communication 204.

Performance Measure(s):
Student to teacher ratio
Benchmark: LCSC will maintain a 16 to 1 student teacher ratio
Performance: 16 to 1 (FY 2014)

Number of students participating in undergraduate research
Benchmark: 290
Performance: 268 (FY 2014)
The number of presentations at the LCSC Senior Research Symposium
Benchmark: 230
Performance: 262 (FY 2013)

Objective 1E.
Recruit and retain a highly qualified and diverse faculty and staff.

The college will work to provide fair and competitive compensation for faculty and staff and will support increased opportunities for faculty and staff development. All faculty and staff pay will meet or exceed the median reported from peer institutions. Faculty development opportunities will be increased. Adjunct faculty pay will be increased.

Timeline: FY 2014-2018
Action: President, Provost and Vice Presidents, Deans

Progress: College administration supported the SBOE’s FY 2015 line item request for increased compensation for faculty and staff. A 2% change in employee compensation (CEC: 1% ongoing, 1% one-time) was approved by the legislature. Beginning Fall 2013, adjunct faculty salaries were increased and aligned cross campus. The college Compensation Review Committee meets regularly to consider issues of employee compensation, both monetary and non-monetary.

Performance Measure(s):

Classified Staff:
State of Idaho Classified Staff Pay Schedule
Benchmark: Classified Staff pay will be 90% of Policy
Performance: 17% of staff meet or exceed 90% of policy

Professional Staff (Administrative):
College and University Professional Association for Human Resources (C.U.P.A.) - Administrative Salary Survey
Benchmark: Compensation for professional staff (Administrative) will be 90% of the average C.U.P.A. Administrative Salary Survey median for institutions in the same budget quartile as Lewis-Clark State College
Performance: 46% of staff meet or exceed 90% of policy

Professional Staff (Mid-level and Professional):
C.U.P.A. Mid-Level and Professional Salary Survey
Benchmark: Compensation for professional staff (mid-level and professional) will be 90% of average C.U.P.A. Mid-Level and Professional Survey median for institutions in the same budget quartile as Lewis-Clark State College
Performance: 60% of staff meet or exceed 90% of policy

Instructional Personnel:
Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), Human Resources Report
Benchmark: Compensation for instructional personnel will be 90% of the average of peer institutions by academic rank as reported by IPEDS
Performance: Mean faculty salaries are 86% of that averaged over peer institutions
Objective 1F.  
Provide a safe, healthy, and positive environment for teaching and learning.

The college will increase the accessibility and safety of campus facilities and processes, expand wellness and healthy lifestyle participation, and foster a positive learning and working environment.

Timeline: FY 2013 ongoing  
Action: Vice President for Finance and Administration

Progress: Access improvements in FY 2013 and FY 2014 included construction of a handicap ramp for Spalding Hall and modification of the door system for the Disability Services Office. Replacement of deteriorating brick sections (tripping hazard) of the campus walkway system commenced in FY 2014, and wheel-chair access sidewalk cuts have been constructed to improve access to the north campus bus stop, Activity Center, and five other locations. The LCSC Safety Committee helped identify traffic hazards (need for additional street lighting, signage, and tree trimming where drivers’ views were obstructed) which were subsequently eliminated by Physical Plant, Security, and the city of Lewiston. Good progress was made on the Presidential Planning Guidance wellness initiative (PG-65) which included implementation of LCSC’s fresh air (smoke free) campus beginning in Fall 2013. The third annual employee health screening event took place in March 2014.

Performance Measure(s):

ADA compliance  
Benchmark: Zero ADA-related discrepancies noted in annual Division of Building Safety (DBS) campus inspection (and prompt action to respond to any such discrepancies if benchmark not achieved)  
Performance: Benchmark achieved—no ADA-related write-ups in 2013 DBS inspection

Wellness Programs  
Benchmark: Provide information and updates to all College employees on wellness activities at least 10 times each Fiscal Year  
Performance: 12 wellness updates provided to each employee in FY2013

Goal 2  
Optimize student enrollment and promote student success.

Objective 2A.  
Marketing efforts will focus on clearly identified populations of prospective students.

The college will establish a brand identity for advertising and marketing. It will expand outreach to students seeking a residential college experience and to potential students who do not think they need college, do not think they can succeed in college, or do not think they can afford college. The college will increase its recruiting efforts for non-traditional students, strengthen its support of community college transfer students, and establish enrollment targets for out-of-state and international students. The college will leverage dual credit and Tech Prep programs as a means to connect with high school students and invest in scholarships to strategically grow enrollment.

Timeline: FY 2013 ongoing  
Action: Vice President for Student Affairs, Director of College Communications, Director of New Student Recruitment, Director of International Programs
Progress: An advertising calendar was developed in August 2013 and a marketing committee has been formed. Community college and non-traditional recruitment strategies are being vetted with the campus community.

Performance Measure(s):

(SBOE system-wide performance measure)
Dual credit hours earned and the unduplicated headcount of participating students
Benchmark: 2700; 460
Performance: 3,328; 554 (FY 2013)

High school students participating in concurrent enrollment programs (headcount and total credit hours)
Benchmark: Annual Enrollment - 1,500 Annual Total Credit Hours - 7,000
Performance: 1,797; 8312 (FY 2013)

Scholarship dollars awarded per student FTE
Benchmark: $1,950
Performance: $1831 (FY 2013)

Objective 2B.
Retain and graduate a diverse student body.

LCSC will implement a student success course to enhance academic skills, impart post-secondary values and expectations, and coach students during their first semester. The course will supplement other curricular and advising reforms targeted towards students who place into Math and English courses below core levels.

Timeline: FY 2014
Action: Provost, Vice President for Student Affairs, Dean of Academic Programs

Progress: With funding from the Albertson Foundation, pilot sections of the student success course were taught in Fall 2013. A course designated as ID 140 has been proposed to the Faculty Senate.

The college will continue the implementation of a centralized advising model to serve incoming freshmen and implement an advising assessment tool that students will complete during the course registration process. Student Affairs will develop pre-admission programs, including financial literacy, to help prospective students and their families prepare for college.

Timeline: FY 2014
Action: Vice President for Student Affairs

Progress: Centralized Advising has been implemented and is serving over 700 students. The program has been assessed via student surveys and feedback from faculty. Pre-admission programs include new correspondence intended better explain the financial aid, scholarship, and fee payment processes.
Performance Measures:

(SBOE system-wide performance measure)
Total degree production (undergraduate)
Benchmark: 680
Performance: 688 (FY 2013)

(SBOE system-wide performance measure)
Unduplicated headcount of graduates and percent of graduates to total unduplicated headcount (split by undergraduate/graduate).
Benchmark: 650; 11% (FY 2013)
Performance: 680; 11% (FY 2013)

(SBOE system-wide performance measure)
Total full-time new and transfer students that are retained or graduate the following year (excluding death, military service, and mission)
Benchmark: 364/569=64% (FY 2013)
Performance: 64% (FY 2013)

First-year/ full-time cohort retention rate
Benchmark: 60%
Performance: 60% (FY 2013)

The number of degrees and certificates awarded per 100 FTE undergraduate students enrolled
Benchmark: 20
Performance: 22 (FY 2013)

First-year/ full-time cohort 150% graduation rate
Benchmark: 30%
Performance: 30% (FY 2013)

LCSC will establish a Center for Teaching and Learning in order to support and share improvements in teaching, assessment, and curriculum development.

Timeline: FY 2015
Action: Provost, Vice President for Student Affairs

Progress: The President established Program Guidance Initiative PG-66 and appointed a committee, co-chaired by the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Vice President for Student Affairs. The committee met throughout fall semester to develop ideas about what services/resources a center can or should offer. A survey was distributed to faculty in late February. Recommendations will be made to the President in late March.
Objective 2C.
Maximize student satisfaction and engagement.

The college will conduct student satisfaction surveys on an annual basis and participate in the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) every three years. The college will also conduct an internal analysis to identify areas for improvement in the student enrollment cycle and academic cycle. The college will expand infrastructure to entice students to reside on campus and, with the input and guidance of student government, will support a wide variety of social and academic student activities.

Timeline: FY 2014-2015
Action: Vice President for Student Affairs, Director of Institutional Planning, Research and Assessment

Progress: A Student Involvement and Engagement Committee consisting of students and staff has been formed. The committee issues periodic surveys asking students about the type of activities they are interested in and then either develops those activities or informs the students about scheduled activities that match their interests.

Performance Measure(s):

National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)
Benchmark: 90% of LCSC students will be satisfied
Performance: 88% (FY 2011)

Goal 3
Strengthen and expand collaborative relationships and partnerships.

Objective 3A.
Increase volunteer, internship, and career placement opportunities.

The college will foster, promote and track student internship opportunities within each division, determine local business and industry needs through periodic surveys or professional forums, and leverage campus expertise to build and maintain relationships with local business and industry. All matriculated students will serve as volunteers and/or interns as part of their educational program.

Timeline: FY 2017
Action: Provost, Deans

Progress: In October 2013, the college hosted an internship showcase in which students presented professional posters detailing their experiences and learning outcomes. Students were accompanied by their division chairs, instructors and in some cases, their internship mentor. Next steps include standardizing definitions for internship-like activities and developing a plan for embedding internships or volunteer activities into every educational program. With the AmeriCorp grant not funded for this year, Service Learning services have been reduced.
Performance Measure(s):

Number of students participating in internships
Benchmark: 800
Performance: 654 (FY 2014)

Objective 3B.
Collaborate with relevant businesses, industries, agencies, practitioners, and organizations for the beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources.

The college will develop an inventory of faculty expertise that committees and boards of local organizations may draw upon. Faculty and staff will actively participate in statewide development of processes and systems to strengthen K-20 partnerships. LCSC will foster, promote, and support student, faculty, and staff research or other projects that benefit the community and region. LCSC will increase Workforce Training efforts.

Timeline: FY 2015
Action: Provost, Dean of Community Programs and Governmental Relations, Director of Grants and Contracts

Progress: Faculty in the Teacher Education Preparation program are actively engaged in partnerships with our K-12 community school partners. External grant dollars are used to facilitate professional development opportunities with our K-12 partners related to math and science education. In addition, further collaboration between LCSC faculty and local school districts has focused on the integration of mobile technologies (i.e. iPads) into classroom learning. The Research Symposium which provides a forum for the dissemination of student and faculty research continues to be a successful event on the campus as well as at the Coeur d’Alene Outreach Center.

Performance Measure(s):

Number of adults enrolled in customized training (including statewide fire and emergency services training programs).
Benchmark: 4,000
Performance: 3,659 (FY 2013)

Objective 3C.
Increase cooperation and engagement of alumni for the advancement of the college.

LCSC will invite alumni to participate in ongoing networking activities and campus events, create an alumni mentorship program for students, and incorporate alumni presence and testimonials in institutional advertising campaigns and recruiting efforts.

Timeline: FY 2017
Action: Director of College Advancement, Director of Alumni and Community Relations, President of the LCSC Alumni Association

Progress: There are four active alumni chapters across the state, the newest in Eastern Idaho. The LCSC Alumni Association facilitates student-alumni activities aimed at encouraging students to remain involved with the college after graduating. A new initiative for Fall 2014, the Warrior Mentoring Program, pairs current students with a Warrior alum in a yearlong program where alumni have the opportunity to provide support and influence their mentee’s personal and professional development.
Performance Measure(s):

Number of Alumni Association members
Benchmark: 15,000
Performance: 13,904 (FY14)

Objective 3D.
Advance the college with community members, business leaders, political leaders, and current and future donors.

The college will invite local community and business leaders to participate in college activities and arrange for current students and alumni to meet with key individuals to promote the benefits of higher education and the needs of LCSC. LCSC will create opportunities for business and political leaders and future donors to engage in learning sessions with current students.

Timeline: Ongoing
Action: President, Provost and Vice Presidents, Deans, Director of College Advancement, President of the LCSC Foundation

Progress: TBD

Performance Measure(s)
LCSC will continue to strengthen its relationship to the local community through promotion of the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics Champions of Character student-athlete program
Benchmark: Annually meet National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics (NAIA) Five Star Champions of Character criteria
Performance: Met criteria (FY 2014)

Timeline: FY 2017
Action: Athletic Director

Goal 4
Leverage resources to maximize institutional strength and efficiency.

Objective 4A.
Allocate and reallocate funds to support priorities and program areas that are significant in meeting the role and mission of the institution.

Budget and assessment instruments will provide clear links to the strategic plan. Information regarding existing and expected financial resources and targeted priorities will be readily available.

Timeline: FY 2014
Actions: President, Provost and Vice Presidents, Deans, Chair of Faculty Senate

Progress: Presidential Planning Guidance (PGs) and Unit Action Plan templates and procedures were revamped prior to the Fall 2013 planning and budgeting cycle to reflect the new LCSC strategic plan and incorporate Zero-Base Budgeting (ZBB) and Program Prioritization (PP) procedures. Unit Action Plan proposals were directly tied to the new strategic plan. A new Institutional Assessment Plan was developed to reflect the strategic plan, and ZBB and PP
guidelines were embedded in an expanded program assessment process. All planning and assessment reference materials and plans/reports were posted on the LCSC intranet for the Fall 2013 and Spring 2014 planning, budgeting, and assessment cycles. Strategic Plan priorities and budget plans were briefed by the President to faculty, staff, students and other key stakeholders. Budgets, strategic plan documents, annual performance measures reports, and assessment documents—directly linked to the overall strategic plan—are readily available.

**Performance Measure(s):**

(SBOE system-wide performance measure)
Cost per credit hour – Financials divided by total weighted undergraduate credit hours from the EWA report
Benchmark: $290
Performance: $293 (FY 2014)

**Objective 4B.**
Assess and modify organizational structure and institutional processes to ensure the most effective use of resources.

LCSC will review current organizational structure and implement modifications to streamline processes and enhance communication.

Timeline: FY 2016
Action: President, Provost and Vice Presidents, Faculty Senate, Professional Staff Organization, Classified staff Organization

**Progress:** The college acted promptly to explore suggestions emanating from the February 2012 strategic planning retreat and subsequent strategic plan steering committee suggestions. LCSC’s proposal to re-establish a Vice President for Student Affairs—to focus efforts on strategic enrollment planning and student success—was approved by the SBOE, and committee structures across the institution have been adjusted accordingly. President’s Council procedures were realigned to focus on implementation of strategic plan goals. Program assessment and Program Prioritization are now addressed in a revitalized Division/Department Assessment Committee and Functional Area Assessment Committee process which engages units and personnel across the college.

**Performance Measure(s):**

(SBOE system-wide performance measure)
Efficiency – Certificates (of at least 1-year or more) and degree completions per $100,000 of financials
Benchmark: 2.5
Performance: 1.7 (FY 2013)

**Objective 4C.**
Continuously improve campus buildings, grounds, and infrastructure to maximize environmental sustainability and learning opportunities.
The college will assess and update the Campus Facilities Master Plan on an annual basis, with priority given to classrooms and teaching. The college will implement building maintenance initiatives to increase energy efficiency, use of green technology, and recycling.

Timeline: FY 2014
Action: Provost, Vice President for Finance and Administration

**Progress Report:** A new Campus Facilities Master Plan was developed to reflect the new LCSC strategic plan and went into effect in July 2013. Classroom refurbishing and carpeting projects continued during FY 2013 and FY 2014. Renovation of the Fine Arts Building (subsequently renamed Thomas Jefferson Hall) was completed in 2014. $2.8M in alteration and repair funding was provided for a record number of facilities projects in FY 2014, including a campus-wide Energy Survey and Analysis project. Green space was expanded and funding was provided for Wi-Fi for an outdoor learning laboratory/classroom. FY 2015 funds have been identified to support LCSC’s Teaching and Learning Center initiative (PG-66).

**Objective 4D.**
Create a timetable for the sustainable acquisition and replacement of instruments, machinery, equipment, and technologies and ensure required infrastructure is in place.

LCSC will create an inventory schedule of campus physical resources that includes lifespans, maintenance contracts, and estimated replacement dates, and will update the schedule on an annual basis. The college will develop a campus-wide funding plan for maintenance and replacement of resources.

Timeline: FY 2014
Action: Provost, Vice President for Finance and Administration

**Progress:** LCSC’s capital equipment has been inventoried and, using the value of these assets and the depreciation schedules based on the useful life spans of the various equipment categories, the college submitted capital replacement requests to the Legislature for the FY 2014 and FY 2015 state budgets. The Budget Office and Information Technology department developed a $250K annual budget to finance high-cost institutional technology equipment and $136K to fund annual upgrades to classroom technology. The college also has set aside a standing reserve to cover unplanned contingencies for central technology systems and classroom technology. A capital equipment replacement funding mechanism has also been established within the Student Union operating budget to address planned or emergency replacement of high-cost equipment used by dining services.

**Objective 4E.**
Identify and secure public and private funding to support strategic plan priorities.

Faculty and staff capacity to secure external funding will be strengthened by supporting grant writing efforts at both the departmental and institutional level. LCSC will collaborate with public and private stakeholders to generate the resources necessary to expand facilities and programs and will broaden communication and outreach to connect the entire college community to the LCSC Foundation and evolving fundraising initiatives.

Timeline: Ongoing
Action: President, Provost and Vice Presidents, Director of College Advancement, President of the LCSC Foundation, Director of Grants and Contracts
**Progress:** LCSC’s total General Education and Professional-Technical budget increased from FY 2013 to FY 2014 by over $1.5M to $31,768,096, despite austere funding from the State of Idaho. The Grants Office was reorganized to combine all grant pre-award and post-award activities within a single shop. Training of new grant writers and unit supervisors continues. At the end of FY 2013, the college had over 80 active grants worth over $8M, despite the negative impacts of federal sequestration on key LCSC programs and elimination of Congressional earmarks. In the College Advancement arena, the $12M goal for the ongoing Campaign LCSC will be met and surpassed by the end of April 2014. The LCSC Foundation’s total assets reached an all-time high of over $7.4M at the end of calendar year 2013.

**Performance Measure(s):**

Institution funding from competitive grants  
**Benchmark:** $2.0M  
**Performance:** $2.3M  

Institutional reserves comparable to best practice.  
**Benchmark:** A minimum target reserve of 5% of operating expenditures  
**Performance:** 5.1%  

LCSC Capital Campaign  
**Benchmark:** $12M  
**Performance:** $11.7M (to date)
### Goal 1 - Sustain and enhance excellence in teaching and learning

#### Performance Measure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 1A: Strengthen courses, programs and curricula consonant with the mission and core themes of the institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment submission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-time licensing/certification exam pass rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCLEX RN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCLEX PN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARRT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of LCSC graduates with positive placement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Idaho teachers who are certified each year by specialty and meet the Federal Highly Qualified Teacher definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRAXIS II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of credits earned at completion of certificate or degree program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Objective 1B: Ensure the General Education Core achieves its expected outcomes.

ETS Proficiency Profile Critical Thinking Construct 1

| | 88% | 80% or better of comparison participating institutions |

#### Objective 1C: Optimize technology-based course delivery, resources, and support services for students, faculty, and staff.

Fall end of term duplicated headcount for student enrolled in web and hybrid courses

| FY 2010 | FY 2011 | FY 2012 | FY 2013 |
| 6,878 | 7,431 | 7,945 | 7,726 |

#### Objective 1D: Maximize direct faculty and student interactions inside and outside the classroom.

Student to teacher ratio

| FY 2010 | FY 2011 | FY 2012 | FY 2013 |
| 18:1 | 16:1 | 16:1 | 16:1 |

Number of students participating in undergraduate research

| FY 2010 | FY 2011 | FY 2012 | FY 2013 |
| 205 | 243 | 237 | 268 |

Number of presentations at the LCSC Senior Research Symposium

| FY 2010 | FY 2011 | FY 2012 | FY 2013 |
| 122 | 153 | 200 | 262 |

#### Objective 1E: Recruit and retain a highly qualified and diverse faculty and staff.

State of Idaho Classified Staff Pay Schedule 2

| FY 2010 | FY 2011 | FY 2012 | FY 2013 | Benchmark |
| 23% | 19% | 17% | 17% | 90% of Policy |

Professional Staff (Administrative) - College and University Professional Association 3

| FY 2010 | FY 2011 | FY 2012 | FY 2013 | Benchmark |
| 79% | 31% | 46% | 14% | 90% of Average C.U.P.A Administrative Salary Survey Median |

Professional Staff (Mid-Level and Professional) - College and University Professional Association 4

| FY 2010 | FY 2011 | FY 2012 | FY 2013 | Benchmark |
| 66% | 49% | 60% | 61% | 90% of Average C.U.P.A Mid-Level and Professional Salary Survey Median |

Instructional Personnel - Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) Data Feedback Report 5

<p>| FY 2010 | FY 2011 | FY 2012 | FY 2013 | Benchmark |
| 89% | 87% | 86% | 89% | 90% of Average of Peer Institutions by Academic Rank |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 2 - Optimize student enrollment and promote student success</th>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>FY 2010</th>
<th>FY 2011</th>
<th>FY 2012</th>
<th>FY 2013</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective 2A: Marketing efforts will focus on clearly identified populations of prospective students.</td>
<td>Credit hours of high school students participating in dual credit programs*</td>
<td>1,682</td>
<td>2,268</td>
<td>2,865</td>
<td>3,328</td>
<td>2,657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Headcount of high school students participating in dual credit programs*</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Credit hours of high school students participating in concurrent enrollment programs</td>
<td>5,134</td>
<td>6,103</td>
<td>6,972</td>
<td>8,312</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Headcount of high school students participating in concurrent enrollment programs</td>
<td>1,241</td>
<td>1,488</td>
<td>1,805</td>
<td>1,797</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scholarship dollars per FTE</td>
<td>$1,722</td>
<td>$1,624</td>
<td>$1,728</td>
<td>$1,831</td>
<td>$1,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 2B: Retain and graduate a diverse student body.</td>
<td>Total degree production (undergraduate)*</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unduplicated headcount of graduates and percent of graduates to total unduplicated headcount (split by undergraduate and graduate)*</td>
<td>560/11%</td>
<td>573/10%</td>
<td>712/12%</td>
<td>652/11%</td>
<td>650/11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total full-time new and transfer students that are retained or graduate the following year (exclude death, military service, and mission)*</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First-time full-time degree-seeking freshman retention rate</td>
<td>50% (N=586)</td>
<td>54% (N=599)</td>
<td>57% (N=596)</td>
<td>51% (N=577)</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total certificates and degrees conferred and number of undergraduate certificate and degree completions per 100 (FTE) undergraduate students enrolled</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First-time/full-time cohort 150% graduation rate</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 2C: Maximize student satisfactions and engagement.</td>
<td>NSSE-National Survey of Student Engagement*</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>90% of LCSC Students will be satisfied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 3 - Strengthen and expand collaborative relationships and partnerships</td>
<td>Objective 3A: Increase volunteer, internship, and career placement opportunities.</td>
<td>Number of students participating in internships</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Objective 3B: Collaborate with relevant businesses, industries, agencies, practitioners, and organizations for the beneficial exchange of knowledge.</td>
<td>Number of adults enrolled in customized training (including statewide fire and emergency services training programs)</td>
<td>3,289</td>
<td>2,921</td>
<td>3,627</td>
<td>3,659</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Goal 4 - Leverage resources to maximize institutional strengths and efficiency

**Objective 4A:** Allocate and reallocate funds to support priorities and program areas that are significant in meeting the role and mission of the institution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost per credit hour - Financials divided by total weighted undergraduate credit hours from the EWA report.*</th>
<th>$294</th>
<th>$289</th>
<th>$261</th>
<th>$293</th>
<th>$290</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Objective 4B:** Assess and modify organizational structure and institutional processes to ensure the most effective use of resources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Efficiency - Certificates (of at least 1-year or more) and degree completions per $100,000 of financials*</th>
<th>1.6</th>
<th>1.6</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1.7</th>
<th>2.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

* Indicates SBOE System-wide performance measures

Notes:

1. This test is administered every 3 years. LCSC achieved an 86 percentile in the FY2008 (MAPP) administration.
2. These values represent the percentage of individuals in this class who are making 90% of policy.
3. The percentages for faculty represent LCSC’s weighted average 9-month equivalent salary divided by the weighted average 9-month equivalent salary of LCSC’s peer institutions.
4. Reflects the overall percentage of students satisfied with LCSC. This survey is administered every 3 years.
Statutory Authority

The College of Southern Idaho Strategic Plan has been approved by the CSI Board of Trustees. The statutory authority and the enumerated general powers and duties of the Board of Trustees of a junior (community) college district are established in Sections 33-2101, 33-2103 to 33-2115, Idaho Code.

Approved by the College of Southern Idaho Board of Trustees on 03/26/2012
Mission Statement

The College of Southern Idaho, a comprehensive community college, provides quality educational, social, cultural, economic, and workforce development opportunities that meet the diverse needs of the communities it serves. CSI prepares students to lead enriched, productive, and responsible lives in a global society.

Vision

College of Southern Idaho shapes the future through its commitment to student success, lifelong learning, and community enrichment.

Core Values

The following core values, principles, and standards guide our vision and conduct:

- **People**
  Above all, we value our students, employees, and community. We celebrate individual uniqueness, worth, and contributions while embracing diversity of people, backgrounds, experiences, and ideas. We are committed to the success of our students and employees.

- **Learning**
  We are committed to student learning and success. We value lifelong learning, informed engagement, social responsibility, and global citizenship.

- **Access and Opportunity**
  We value affordable and equitable access to higher education. We make every effort to eliminate or minimize barriers to access and support student success and completion of educational goals. We create opportunities for educational, personal, and economic success.

- **Quality and Excellence**
  We strive for excellence in all of our endeavors. We offer high-quality educational programs and services that are of value to our constituents. We are committed to high academic and professional standards, and to the continuous improvement of our educational programs, services, processes, and outcomes.

- **Creativity and Innovation**
  We value and support innovative and creative ideas and solutions that foster improvement and allow us to better serve our students and our community. We encourage entrepreneurial spirit.

- **Responsibility and Accountability**
  We value personal, professional, and institutional integrity, responsibility, and accountability. We believe in serving our constituents responsibly in order to preserve the public’s trust. We strive to develop a culture of meaningful assessment and continuous improvement. We value inspired, informed, transparent, and responsible leadership and decision-making at all levels of the College. We value our environment and the conservation of our natural resources.

- **Collaboration and Partnerships**
  We value collaboration and actively pursue productive and mutually beneficial partnerships among people, institutions, organizations, and communities to share diverse ideas, talents, and resources.
Core Themes*

1. Transfer Education
2. Professional-Technical Education
3. Basic Skills Education
4. Community Connections

Strategic Initiatives • 2014 - 2019

I. Student Learning and Success
II. Responsiveness
III. Performance and Accountability

Strategic Goals • 2014 - 2019

1. Demonstrate a continued commitment to and shared responsibility for student learning and success
2. Meet the diverse and changing needs and expectations of our students and the community we serve
3. Support employee learning, growth, wellness, and success
4. Commit to continuous improvement and institutional effectiveness

* Core Themes were developed as part of the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU) accreditation process (Standard One). Merging Core Themes and Strategic Initiatives into one document allows the College to focus its planning efforts while meeting Idaho Code, SBOE and DFM guidelines, as well as NWCCU accreditation standards.
Core Themes and Objectives*

Core Theme 1: Transfer Education

Objective: To prepare students intending to transfer and who earn an Associate of Arts, Associate of Science, or Associate of Engineering degree for success at the baccalaureate level.

Core Theme 2: Professional-Technical Education

Objective: To prepare students for entry into a job or profession related to their field of preparation and study.

Core Theme 3: Basic Skills Education

Objective: To provide developmental courses in math, reading, writing, grammar, vocabulary, spelling, and English as a second language to assist students who need to raise existing skills to college-level competency.

Core Theme 4: Community Connections

Objectives: To meet the economic development and non-credit educational, social, cultural, and community support needs of the eight-county service region by making the college’s human and physical resources available, including facilities and the expertise of faculty and staff.

*Each Objective under the Core Themes has Indicators of Achievement defined. These Indicators of Achievement can be found in the Core Theme planning documents.
Strategic Initiatives, Goals, Objectives, Performance Measures, and Benchmarks

Strategic Initiative I: Student Learning and Success

1. Goal: Demonstrate continued commitment to and shared responsibility for student learning and success

Objectives:

1.1. Provide quality educational programs and experiences that prepare students to reach their educational and career goals
1.2. Maintain high standards for student learning, performance, and achievement – academic rigor and integrity
1.3. Continually improve the quality and effectiveness of teaching and support services
1.4. Identify and reduce barriers to student learning, and develop clear pathways to student success
1.5. Develop students’ intellectual curiosity and subject matter competence, as well as communication, critical thinking, creative problem-solving, interpersonal, and leadership skills
1.6. Encourage meaningful engagement and social responsibility
1.7. Ensure that our students gain the knowledge, skills, perspectives, and attitudes necessary to thrive in a global society and become responsible global citizens
1.8. Continue to improve educational attainment (persistence, retention, degree/certificate completion, transfer) and achievement of educational and career goals
1.9. Maintain a healthy, safe, and inviting learning environment that is conducive to learning
1.10. Develop and maintain mutually beneficial partnerships with K-12 schools, community colleges, four-year institutions, employers, industry, and other public and private entities that will allow us to help our students reach their educational and career goals

Performance Measure: Student engagement

Benchmark: Academic challenge - CCSSE\(^1\) survey results will demonstrate academic challenge ratings at or above the national comparison group
Student effort - CCSSE survey results will demonstrate student effort ratings at or above the national comparison group
Active and collaborative learning - CCSSE survey results will demonstrate active and collaborative learning ratings at or above the national comparison group

\(^1\) CCSSE – Community College Survey of Student Engagement
Performance Measure: Retention/persistence rates
Benchmark: CSI’s first-time full-time retention rate will be at or above the median for its IPEDS\(^2\) peer group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th></th>
<th>2012</th>
<th></th>
<th>2011</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CSI</td>
<td>NII CC Peer Colleges</td>
<td>CSI</td>
<td>NII CC Peer Colleges</td>
<td>CSI</td>
<td>NII CC Peer Colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Challenge</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Effort</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active and Collaborative Learning</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Retention Rate
Full Time Students
First-time, full-time, degree/certificate seeking students who are still enrolled or who completed their program as of the following fall (IPEDS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th></th>
<th>2012</th>
<th></th>
<th>2011</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSI</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td></td>
<td>54%</td>
<td></td>
<td>57%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPEDS Comparison Group</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td></td>
<td>54%</td>
<td></td>
<td>56%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011 Cohort</td>
<td>(574 / 1005)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(623 / 1148)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(611 / 1076)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Performance Measure: Technical skills attainment
Benchmark: At least 92% of PTE concentrators will pass a state approved Technical Skill Assessment (TSA) during the reporting year

Performance Measure: Licensure and certification pass rates
Benchmark: Maintain licensure and certification rates at or above state or national rates for all programs with applicable exams (and where the national/state rates are available)

Performance Measure: Employment status of professional-technical graduates
Benchmark: At least 95% of PTE completers will achieve a positive placement in the second quarter after completing the program

Performance Measure 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical Skills Attainment</td>
<td>92.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensure and Certification Pass Rates</td>
<td>92.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Status of PTE Graduates</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^2\) IPEDS – Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System
Performance Measure: Graduation rates

Benchmarks: CSI’s first-time full-time graduation rate will be at or above the median for its IPEDS peer group
The number of degrees and certificates awarded will increase by 3% per year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CSI</td>
<td>IPEDS</td>
<td>CSI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>Comparison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation Rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-time, full-time, degree/certificate seeking students (IPEDS)</td>
<td>19% (200 / 1062)</td>
<td>21% Fall 2009 Cohort</td>
<td>17% (165 / 949)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Performance Measure: Transfer rates

Benchmarks: CSI’s transfer-out rate will be at or above the median for its IPEDS peer group
The number of students transferring with a CSI degree will increase by 2% per year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CSI</td>
<td>IPEDS</td>
<td>CSI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>Comparison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-time, full-time, degree/certificate seeking students (IPEDS)</td>
<td>14% (144 / 1062)</td>
<td>20% Fall 2009 Cohort</td>
<td>15% (138 / 949)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strategic Initiative II: Responsiveness

2. Goal: Meet the diverse and changing needs and expectations of our students and the community we serve

Objectives:

2.1. Meet the diverse and changing needs and expectations of our students
   2.1.1. Offer quality educational programs and support services that meet the needs of students with diverse backgrounds, preparation levels, abilities, and educational objectives
   2.1.2. Maintain access and support student success
   2.1.3. Provide university parallel curriculum for transfer students, state-of-the-art programs of professional-technical education, as well as
appropriate developmental education, continuing education, and enrichment programs.

2.2. Meet the diverse and changing needs and expectations of employers in the area
   2.2.1. Provide workforce training and development, and industry certifications
   2.2.2. Ensure that the curricula provide the skills, knowledge, and experiences most needed by employers

2.3. Meet the diverse and changing needs and expectations of the community we serve
   2.3.1. Provide lifelong learning opportunities
   2.3.2. Serve as an engine for economic, social, and cultural development

Performance Measure: Enrollment and Full-Time Equivalency (FTE) - end-of-term unduplicated headcount, end-of-term total FTE, end-of-term academic FTE, end-of-term professional-technical FTE, annual unduplicated dual credit enrollment, annual dual credit FTE, end-of-term unduplicated developmental enrollment, end-of-term developmental FTE, annual non-credit workforce training enrollment, annual continuing education enrollment

Benchmark: Overall headcount will increase by 2% a year
Overall FTE will increase by 1% a year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>FY 2010</th>
<th>FY2011</th>
<th>FY2012</th>
<th>FY 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual (unduplicated) Enrollment Headcount ¹</td>
<td>13,203</td>
<td>13,740</td>
<td>12,915</td>
<td>12,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Technical Transfer (PSR Annual Enrollment)</td>
<td>2,392</td>
<td>1,869</td>
<td>1,578</td>
<td>1,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,811</td>
<td>11,871</td>
<td>11,337</td>
<td>10,688</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Enrollment FTE ¹</td>
<td>5,276.3</td>
<td>5,535.54</td>
<td>5,182.73</td>
<td>4,934.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Technical Transfer (PSR Annual Enrollment)</td>
<td>1,013.9</td>
<td>1,111.57</td>
<td>1,031.13</td>
<td>961.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,262.4</td>
<td>4,423.97</td>
<td>4,151.60</td>
<td>3,973.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Credit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Unduplicated Headcount</td>
<td>2,460</td>
<td>2,412</td>
<td>2,685</td>
<td>2,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Enrollments</td>
<td>4,936</td>
<td>4,576</td>
<td>4,742</td>
<td>5,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Total Credit Hours</td>
<td>14,804</td>
<td>13,241</td>
<td>14,187</td>
<td>14,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SBOE Dual Credit Enrollment Report)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Performance Measure: Affordability - tuition and fees
Benchmark: Maintain tuition and fees, both in-state and out-of-state, at or below that of our peer institutions (defined as community colleges in Idaho)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>2013 - 14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuition and Fee Charges</td>
<td>CSI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-State</td>
<td>$110/credit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-State</td>
<td>$280/credit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Charges vary slightly by credit level; numbers reflect 12 credit load.
Performance Measure: Student satisfaction rates

Benchmarks: Student satisfaction – CCSSE survey results will demonstrate that over 90% of students would recommend CSI to a friend. Student satisfaction – CCSSE survey results will demonstrate that over 90% of students will evaluate their entire experience at CSI “Excellent” or “Good”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent would recommend this college to a friend or family member</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent would evaluate their entire educational experience at this college as either “Excellent” or “Good”</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Performance Measure: Employer satisfaction with PTE graduates

Benchmark: Survey results will demonstrate an overall (80% or higher) employer satisfaction with PTE graduates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employer satisfaction with PTE graduates</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strategic Initiative III: Performance and Accountability

3. Goal: Support employee learning, growth, wellness, and success

Objectives:

3.1. Recruit and retain faculty and staff who are committed to student learning and success
3.2. Support employees by providing the necessary information, resources, tools, training, and professional development needed to do their jobs effectively
3.3. Expect and reward competence, performance, excellent customer service, and contributions to the attainment of the institution’s mission, goals, and objectives
3.4. Maintain competitive faculty and staff compensation that is comparable to that of our peer institutions
3.5. Improve the health and well-being of employees through health education and activities that support positive lifestyle changes, thereby resulting in improved morale, productivity, and healthcare cost savings

Performance Measure: Student-faculty interaction - CCSSE survey results will demonstrate student-faculty interaction ratings at or above the national comparison group
Support for learners - CCSSE survey results will demonstrate ratings for learner support at or above the national comparison group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CSI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-Faculty Interaction</td>
<td>52.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for Learners</td>
<td>50.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Employee compensation competitiveness
CSI employee salaries will be at the median or above for comparable positions in the Mountain States Community College survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>FY 14</th>
<th>FY 13</th>
<th>FY 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee Salaries: Percentage of Median for CSI vs. Mountain States Community Colleges</td>
<td>93.4%</td>
<td>95.2%</td>
<td>94.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **Goal:** Commit to continuous improvement and institutional effectiveness

**Objectives:**

4.1. Ensure that the College’s mission, vision, Core Themes, and Strategic Plan drive decision-making, resource allocation, and everyday operations
4.2. Continually assess and improve the quality, relevancy, efficiency, and effectiveness of our systems, programs, services, and processes
4.3. Implement Lean Higher Education (LHE) principles and practices
4.4. Employ meaningful and effective measures, methodologies, and technologies to accurately and systematically measure and continually improve institutional performance and effectiveness
4.5. Maintain the trust of our constituents through transparency, accountability, and responsible stewardship
4.6. Allocate, manage, and invest resources prudently, effectively, and efficiently
4.7. Aggressively pursue new revenue sources and grant opportunities
4.8. Implement cost-saving strategies while maintaining the quality of programs and services
4.9. Utilize appropriate information technologies that support and enhance teaching and learning, improve the accessibility and quality of services, and increase the effectiveness and efficiency of operations
4.10. Develop and implement facilities, systems, and practices that are environmentally sustainable and demonstrative responsible stewardship of our natural resources
Performance Measure: Alignment
Benchmark: Individual Development Plans (IDP) and Unit Development Plans (UDP) will be aligned with the College’s mission, Core Themes, and Strategic Plan

The College’s IDP and UDP process is in alignment with its mission, core themes and strategic plan.

Performance Measure: Outcomes assessment
Benchmark: Every course and program will demonstrate effective use of outcomes assessment strategies to measure student learning outcomes and for continuous improvement

As a requirement according to NWCCU (our regional accrediting agency), CSI’s most recent evaluation indicated that the institution meets and/or exceeds this benchmark as indicated by a recent commendation regarding the institutional outcomes assessment protocol. Courses in all programs at CSI are required to enumerate outcomes and to measure them at the end of each course. These outcomes are then used to measure attainment of program outcomes which are reported in Program Outcomes Assessment reports on December 1st of each year.

Performance Measure: Lean Higher Education (LHE)
Benchmark: Implement at least two LHE projects per year

Current year LHE projects include: 1) Student placement scores are available online and are no longer distributed via paper forms unless requested, and 2) academic suspension contracts are not printed, but instead scanned and indexed to the student file.

Performance Measure: Total yearly dollar amount generated through external grants
Benchmark: Submit a minimum of $2,500,000 yearly in external grant requests with a 33% success rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total yearly dollar amount generated through external grants</td>
<td>$3,809,117</td>
<td>$3,740,814</td>
<td>$4,066,363</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Performance Measure: Cost of instruction per FTE
Benchmark: Maintain the cost of instruction per FTE as reported through IPEDS at or below that of our peer institutions (defined as community colleges in Idaho)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instruction Expense per FTE:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Southern Idaho</td>
<td>$ 3348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Western Idaho</td>
<td>$ 3573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Idaho College</td>
<td>$ 4715</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Original Performance Measure Benchmark separated academic and PTE instructional costs into distinct measures, but this has been combined since this disaggregated data is not currently available. This measure is currently being refined.
External Factors

Various external factors outside CSI’s control could significantly impact the achievement of the specific goals and objectives outlined in the Strategic Plan:

- Changes in the economic environment
- Changes in national or state priorities
- Significant changes in local, state, or federal funding levels
- Changes in market forces and competitive environment
- Circumstances of and strategies employed by our partners (e.g. K-12, higher education institutions, local industry)
- Supply of and competition for highly qualified faculty and staff
- Legal and regulatory changes
- Changes in technology
- Demographic changes
- Natural disasters, acts of war/terrorism

CSI will make every effort to anticipate and manage change effectively, establish and implement effective risk management policies and practices, and minimize the negative impacts of factors beyond the institution’s control.
### Part II. State Performance Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retention Rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CSI’s retention rate will be at or above the median for its IPEDS peer group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-time, full-time, degree/certificate seeking students who are still enrolled or who completed their program as of the following fall (IPEDS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention Rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CSI’s retention rate will be at or above the median for its IPEDS peer group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-time, part-time, degree/certificate seeking students who are still enrolled or who completed their program as of the following fall (IPEDS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per credit hour</td>
<td>$277.23</td>
<td>$271.13</td>
<td>$227.97</td>
<td>$232.44</td>
<td>Maintain the cost of instruction per FTE at or below that of our peer institutions (defined as community colleges in Idaho).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(IPEDS Finance and 12-Month Enrollment)</td>
<td>($37,874,900 / 136,619)</td>
<td>($542,411,664 / 156,427)</td>
<td>($37,642,948 / 165,122)</td>
<td>($538,130,642 / 164,045)</td>
<td>(2011-12 year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>1.906</td>
<td>1.804</td>
<td>2.277</td>
<td>2.733</td>
<td>Maintain degree production per $100,000 instructional expenditures at or above that of our peer institutions (defined as community colleges in Idaho).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(IPEDS Finance and Completions)</td>
<td>(722 / $378.75)</td>
<td>(765 / $424.12)</td>
<td>(857 / $376.43)</td>
<td>(1042 / $381.31)</td>
<td>(2011-12 Year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition and fees</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>$1,260</td>
<td>$1,320</td>
<td>$1,320</td>
<td>Maintain tuition and fees, both in-state and out-of-state, at or below that of our peer institutions (defined as community colleges in Idaho).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time</td>
<td>$100/credit</td>
<td>$105/credit</td>
<td>$110/credit</td>
<td>$110/credit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation Rate</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>CSI’s first-time full-time graduation rate will be at or above the median for its IPEDS peer group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-time, full-time, degree/certificate seeking students (IPEDS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Rate</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>CSI’s transfer-out rate will be at or above the median for its IPEDS peer group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-time, full-time, degree/certificate seeking students (IPEDS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Compensation</td>
<td>92.2%</td>
<td>93.5%</td>
<td>94.1%</td>
<td>95.2%</td>
<td>CSI employee salaries will be at the mean or above for comparable positions in the Mountain States Community College Survey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Yearly Dollar Amount Generated Through External Grants</td>
<td>$6,058,548</td>
<td>$4,066,363</td>
<td>$3,740,814</td>
<td>$3,809,117</td>
<td>Will submit a minimum of $2,750,000 yearly in external grant requests with a 33% success rate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Costs are derived from instructional, student services, academic support and institutional support expenses identified in the IPEDS Finance report divided by the annual credit hours in the IPEDS 12-Month Enrollment report for the corresponding year. This cost calculation formula is currently under review.
2 Certificates (of at least 1 year or more) and Degrees awarded per $100,000 of Education and Related Spending (as defined by the IPEDS Finance expense categories of instruction, student services, academic support and institutional support) for the corresponding year. This Education and Related Spending calculation formula is currently under review.
3 Each year a number of community colleges participate in the Mountain States Community College Survey. Information regarding full time employee salaries for reported positions is collected and listed in rank order. A mean and median range is determined for positions. In calculating this performance measure the College of Southern Idaho mean salary is divided by the Mountain States mean. The resulting percentage demonstrates how College of Southern Idaho salaries compare with other institutions in the Mountain States region.
## Part III. Profile of Cases Managed and/or Key Services Provided

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases Managed and/or Key Services Provided</th>
<th>FY 2010</th>
<th>FY2011</th>
<th>FY2012</th>
<th>FY 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual (unduplicated) Enrollment Headcount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Technical Transfer</td>
<td>13,203</td>
<td>13,740</td>
<td>12,915</td>
<td>12,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(PSR Annual Enrollment)</td>
<td>2,392</td>
<td>1,869</td>
<td>1,578</td>
<td>1,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10,811</td>
<td>11,871</td>
<td>11,337</td>
<td>10,688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Enrollment FTE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Technical Transfer</td>
<td>5,276.3</td>
<td>5,535.54</td>
<td>5,182.73</td>
<td>4,934.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(PSR Annual Enrollment)</td>
<td>1,013.9</td>
<td>1,111.57</td>
<td>1,031.13</td>
<td>961.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4,262.4</td>
<td>4,423.97</td>
<td>4,151.60</td>
<td>3,973.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees/Certificates Awarded</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>822</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>1,129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(IPEDS Completions)</td>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>2011-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total degrees/certificates awarded per 100 FTE students enrolled</td>
<td>17.26</td>
<td>17.03</td>
<td>20.41</td>
<td>21.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(IPEDS Completions and IPEDS Fall FTE)</td>
<td>(766 / 44.37)</td>
<td>(822 / 48.28)</td>
<td>(993 / 48.66)</td>
<td>(1,129 / 51.37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce Training Headcount</td>
<td>4,861</td>
<td>5,218</td>
<td>4,426</td>
<td>3,368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Credit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Unduplicated Headcount</td>
<td>2,460</td>
<td>2,412</td>
<td>2,685</td>
<td>2,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Enrollments</td>
<td>4,936</td>
<td>4,576</td>
<td>4,742</td>
<td>5,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Total Credit Hours</td>
<td>14,804</td>
<td>13,241</td>
<td>14,187</td>
<td>14,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SBOE Dual Credit Enrollment Report)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remediation Rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-Time, First-Year Students Attending Idaho High School within Last 12 Months</td>
<td>74.7%</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
<td>69.5%</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SBOE Remediation Report)</td>
<td>(1095 / 1466)</td>
<td>(923 / 1273)</td>
<td>(892 / 1284)</td>
<td>(820 / 1250)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 There have been enrollment processing and reporting changes over the period of this report. A new PSR Annual Enrollment report was developed as of FY12 with some minor differences in enrollment calculations from prior reports. In addition, CSI continues to revise the process for determining a student’s headcount affiliation (Transfer vs. PTE).
Strategic Plan 2015 - 2019

MISSION
The College of Western Idaho is a public, open-access, and comprehensive community college committed to providing affordable access to quality teaching/learning opportunities to the residents of its service area in Western Idaho.

VISION
The College of Western Idaho provides affordable, quality teaching and learning opportunities for all to excel at learning for life

CORE THEMES
Professional technical programs
General education courses/programs
   Basic skills courses
   Community outreach

CORE VALUES
Acting with integrity
Serving all in an atmosphere of caring
Sustaining our quality of life for future generations
Respecting the dignity of opinions
Innovating for the 21st Century
Leaving a legacy of learning

STATUTORY AUTHORITY
This plan has been developed in accordance with Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU) and Idaho State Board of Education standards. The statutory authority and the enumerated general powers and duties of the Board of Trustees of a junior (community) college district are established in Sections 33-2101, 33-2103 to 33-2115, Idaho Code.
## STRATEGIC PRIORITIES, OBJECTIVES, and MEASURES

### Institutional Priority 1: Student Success
CWI values its students and is committed to supporting their success (in reaching their educational and/or career goals).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 1</th>
<th>CWI will improve student retention and persistence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measures</td>
<td>• Course Completion rates will meet or exceed 80% by 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Semester-to-Semester Persistence rates will meet or exceed 80% by 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Fall-to-Fall Retention Rates will meet or exceed 55% by 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Establish VFA reporting cohorts effective FA14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 2</th>
<th>CWI will improve student degree and certificate completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measures</td>
<td>• CWI will grant 750 AA, AS, and AAS degrees annually by 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• CWI will grant 250 technical certificates annually by 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• CWI will grant 9,300 certificates of completion annually by 2019 through BP/WD non-credit programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 3</th>
<th>CWI will provide support services that improve student success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measures</td>
<td>• Prospect to enrolled matriculation rate will meet or exceed 20% by 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Persistence Rate first to second semester of enrollment for “1st time college attenders will meet or exceed 77% by 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Completion Rate within 150% of program/major requirements will meet or exceed the CC national average of 19.6% by 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Students completing program/major with less than 90% of average loan debt by 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• An E&amp;SS composite score on its annual survey increase to 95% by 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Utilization of Tutoring Services/Student Success Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• CWI will provide tutoring support services that result in a penetration rate of 40% by 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 4</th>
<th>CWI will develop educational pathways and services to improve accessibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measures</td>
<td>• By 2019, 60% of Students who complete college prep course work will earn a C or better in the corresponding gateway course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Dual credits awarded to high school students will increase to 17,000 credits by 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Annual online enrollment will reach 20,000 (seats filled) by 2019.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Institutional Priority 2: Employee Success
CWI values its employees and is committed to a culture of individual, team, and institutional growth which is supported and celebrated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Employees will have the resources, information, and other support to be successful in their roles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measures</td>
<td>• &gt;=65% of IT Help Desk tickets are resolved upon initial contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• FTE/Benefited positions 90% filled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Average time to fill open job requisitions &lt;= 5 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• &gt;= 80 % agree/strongly agree on annual Employee Survey questions listed below:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• CWI does a good job of meeting the needs of staff / faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I have the information I need to do my job well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• My department has the budget needed to do its job well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• My department has the staff needed to do its job well</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>CWI will provide employees with professional development, training and learning opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measures</td>
<td>• Each employee, on average, completes at least 24 hours of development each year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• CWI offers &gt;=2 training/development offerings each month (in addition to CWI classes offered to students)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• &gt;= 80 % agree/strongly agree on annual Employee Survey questions listed below:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I have adequate opportunities for training to improve my skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I have adequate opportunities for professional development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Provide clear expectations for job performance and growth opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measures</td>
<td>• &gt;=80% agree/strongly agree on annual Employee Survey questions listed below:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• My job description accurately reflects my job duties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• My responsibilities are communicated clearly to me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• My department or work unit has written, up-to-date objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I have adequate opportunities for advancement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Promote a culture to recognize employee excellence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measures</td>
<td>• &gt;=75% of our annual recognition budget is awarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• &gt;= 80 % agree/strongly agree on annual Employee Survey questions listed below:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• CWI consistently follows clear processes for recognizing employee achievements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The work I do is appreciated by my supervisor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Institutional Priority 3: Fiscal Stability

The College of Western Idaho will operate within its available resources and implement strategies to increase revenue, while improving operating efficiencies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 1</th>
<th>CWI will operate using an annual balanced budget, will actively manage expenditures, and create operational efficiencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Measures    | • Develop and implement at least 2 metrics each year to more actively identify revenue & expense characteristics  
• Conduct 3 intensive and 3 less-intensive college business activities analyses each year to reduce inefficiencies and waste.  
• Incorporate student fees for strategic reserve, into annual operating budget |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 2</th>
<th>CWI will maintain the integrity of existing revenue streams and will actively seek out new forms of revenue consistent with the College’s mission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Measures    | • Be responsive to the requirements of funding agencies to ensure the integrity of our existing revenue  
• Advocate for additional state funding to achieve parity with other Idaho Community Colleges by 2019  
• Seek out at least 5 additional grant opportunities each year  
• Reapply for all applicable ongoing grants with greater than 90% renewal each year  
• Increase amount of monetary awards through grants by 10% each year  
• Reduce the number of students sent to collections by 5% each year  
• Increase annual revenue growth in BP/WD by 10% each year |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 3</th>
<th>CWI will work to maintain and enhance its facilities &amp; technology and actively plan for future space and technology needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Measures    | • Maximize facility utilization rates to a threshold of 90% by 2019  
• >=75% completion of technology work-plan each year |
Institutional Priority 4: Community Connections
The College of Western Idaho will implement a variety of educational and developmental programs to bring the college into the community in meaningful ways.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 1</th>
<th>CWI creates and delivers educational programs and services to the community through short-term training programs which foster economic development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measures</td>
<td>• Increase the number of people served through Business Partnerships/Workforce Development by 10% each year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Business Partnerships/Workforce Development participant survey reflects at least 85 percent positive satisfaction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 2</th>
<th>CWI engages in educational, cultural, and organizational activities that enrich our community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measures</td>
<td>• Increase the number of hours CWI facilities are used by non-CWI organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Participate in at least 50 events that support community enrichment each year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increase Basic Skills Education to the 8 non-district counties in southwest Idaho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• CWI student-to-community engagement will exceed 6000 hours annually</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 3</th>
<th>Expand CWI’s community connections within its service area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measures</td>
<td>• Every Professional Technical Education program has a Technical Advisory Committee with local business and industry members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Active engagement with all high schools in CWI service area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increase the number of community organizations reached each year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increase number of business partnerships</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Institutional Priority 5: Institutional Sustainability

The College of Western Idaho (CWI) finds strength through its people and viability in its operations and infrastructure; therefore the institution will continually evaluate the colleges’ health to ensure sustainability.

### Objective 1
CWI will promote the college’s health and wellbeing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- On annual Employee Survey questions listed below:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- &gt;= 70% agree/strongly agree on Overall Employee Satisfaction by 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- &lt;=25% disagree/strongly disagree to “There are effective lines of communication between departments by 2019”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Objective 2
CWI will have effective and efficient infrastructure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- CWI will consolidate locations &amp; target development of 2 major campuses in Ada &amp; Canyon Counties by 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- &lt;= 20% disagree/strongly disagree to “CWI has clearly written and defined procedures” by 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- CWI will reduce utility consumption (units consumed) by 10% by 2019 on college owned properties</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- CWI will optimize its’ Core Information &amp; Technology (IT) Network by achieving an annual target of 99.99% network availability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EXTERNAL FACTORS

There are a number of key external factors that can have significant impact on our ability to fulfill our mission and institutional priorities in the years to come. Some of these include:

- Continued revenue. Over a quarter of CWI’s revenue comes from State of Idaho provided funds (general fund, PTE, etc.) Achieving parity with the state’s other community colleges is a stated objective within our strategic plan. Ongoing state funding is vital to the continued success of CWI.

- Enrollment. CWI is actively engaged in recruiting and retention efforts in all of its facets. With nearly 50% of revenue generated by active enrollments, it is critical that CWI reach out in meaningful ways to its service area to support ongoing learning opportunities for the community and maintain fiscal stability for the college.

- Economy. Recent years have shown that the state and national economy have significant impacts on the success of higher education.
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Mission
North Idaho College meets the diverse educational needs of students, employers, and the northern Idaho communities it serves through a commitment to student success, educational excellence, community engagement, and lifelong learning.

Vision
As a comprehensive community college, North Idaho College strives to provide accessible, affordable, quality learning opportunities. North Idaho College endeavors to be an innovative, flexible leader recognized as a center of educational, cultural, economic, and civic activities by the communities it serves.

Accreditation Core Themes
The college mission is reflected in its three accreditation core themes:

- Student Access and Achievement
- Effective Teaching and Learning
- Commitment to Community

Key External Factors
- Changes in the economic environment
- Changes in local, state, or federal funding levels
- Changes in local, state, or national educational priorities
- Changes in education market (competitive environment)

Values
North Idaho College is dedicated to these core values which guide its decisions and actions.

Goal 1 – Student Success: A vibrant, lifelong learning environment that engages students as partners in achieving educational goals to enhance their quality of life

Objectives
1) Provide innovative, progressive, and student-centered programs and services.
2) Engage and empower students to take personal responsibility and to actively participate in their educational experience.
3) Promote programs and services to enhance access and successful student transitions.

Performance Measures

- Percentage of full-time, first-time and new transfer-in students who a) were awarded a degree or certificate, b) transferred without an award to a 2- or 4-year institution, c) are still enrolled, and d) left the institution within six years.

  Benchmark: To be determined after Year One submission of the VFA
• Total number of employers (out of total respondents) who indicate satisfaction with overall preparation of completers
  *Benchmark: 80% of employers indicate satisfaction with preparation of completers*
• Career Program Completers, percent employed in related field
  *Benchmark: 65% employed*
• Fall to Spring Persistence Rate, credit students
  *Benchmark: 84% persist*
• First-time, full-time, student retention rates
  *Benchmark: 63%*
• First-time, part-time, student retention rates
  *Benchmark: 45%*

**Goal 2 - Educational Excellence:** High academic standards, passionate and skillful instruction, professional development, and innovative programming while continuously improving all services and outcomes

**Objectives**
1) Evaluate, create and adapt programs that respond to the educational and training needs of the region.
2) Engage students in critical and creative thinking through disciplinary and interdisciplinary teaching and learning.
3) Strengthen institutional effectiveness, teaching excellence and student learning through challenging and relevant course content, and continuous assessment and improvement.
4) Recognize and expand faculty and staff scholarship through professional development.

**Performance Measures**
• Student Learning Outcomes Assessment goals achieved in general education
  *Benchmark: 80% percent or more of annual assessment goals are consistently met over 3-year plan*
• Full-time to Part-time faculty ratio
  *Benchmark: 1.3 to 1.0 ratio*
• NIC is responsive to faculty and staff professional development needs
  *Benchmark: Maintain or increase funding levels available for professional development*
• Licensure pass rates at or above national pass rates
  *Benchmark: Maintain or improve current pass rates*
• Dual Credit students who enroll at NIC as degree-seeking postsecondary students as a percentage of total headcount
  *Benchmark: Sustain or increase*
• All instructional programs submit annual summary reports documenting program improvements
  *Benchmark: 20% of total programs per year over five years until fully implemented*

**Goal 3 - Community Engagement:** Collaborative partnerships with businesses, organizations, community members, and educational institutions to identify and address changing educational needs

**Objectives**
1) Advance and nurture relationships throughout our service region to enhance the lives of the citizens and students we serve.
2) Demonstrate commitment to the economic/business development of the region.
3) Promote North Idaho College in the communities we serve.
4) Enhance community access to college facilities.
Performance Measures

- Distance Learning proportion of credit hours
  Benchmark: Increase by 2% annually for a total of 25%
- Dual Credit annual credit hours in the high schools
  Benchmark: Increase by 5% annually
- Dual Credit annual credit hours taught via distance delivery
  Benchmark: Increase by 5% annually
- Market Penetration (Credit Students): Unduplicated headcount of credit students as a percentage of NIC’s total service area population
  Benchmark: 3.60%
- Market Penetration (Non-Credit Students): Unduplicated headcount of non-credit students as a percentage of NIC’s total service area population
  Benchmark: 3%
- Percentage of student evaluations of community education courses reflect a satisfaction rating of above average
  Benchmark: 85% of total number score a satisfaction rating of above average

Goal 4 – Diversity: A learning environment that celebrates the uniqueness of all individuals and encourages cultural competency

Objectives
1) Foster a culture of inclusion.
2) Promote a safe and respectful environment.
3) Develop culturally competent faculty, staff and students.

Performance Measures

- Number of students enrolled from diverse populations
  Benchmark: Maintain a diverse, or more diverse population than the population within NIC’s service region
- Participation in sponsored events that promote diversity awareness
  Benchmark: To be defined in 2015
- Number of course outcomes related to multiculturalism, pluralism, equity, and diversity
  Benchmark: Maintain or Increase
- Students who respond “quite a bit or very much” to CCSSE survey question: “Does the college encourage contact among students from different economic, social and racial or ethnic backgrounds?”
  Benchmark: Increase by 2% annually until the national average is met or exceeded

Goal 5 – Stewardship: Economic and environmental sustainability through leadership, awareness, and responsiveness to changing community resources

Objectives
1) Exhibit trustworthy stewardship of resources.
2) Demonstrate commitment to an inclusive and integrated planning environment.
3) Explore, adopt, and promote initiatives that help sustain the environment.

Performance Measures

- Dollars secured through the Development Department via private donations and grants
  Benchmark: $2,000,000
College-wide replacement schedule for personal computers  
**Benchmark:** 100% of the computers are replaced within the 42 month window

Improved consumption and emissions result in dollars saved  
**Benchmark:** Sustain or Increase

Tuition and Fees for full-time, in-district students (full academic year)  
**Benchmark:** Maintain greater than 60% against comparator institutions

The following system wide performance measures were requested by the Idaho State Board of Education:

- **Graduation Rate - Total degree production**  
  **Benchmark:** To compare favorably (at or below the mean) to that of our peer institutions  
  **Status:** 1,083 awards

- **Graduation Rate - Unduplicated headcount of graduates & percent of graduates to total unduplicated headcount**  
  **Benchmark:** To compare favorably (at or below the mean) to that of our peer institutions  
  **Status:** 12.46% graduation rate (based on 1,038 graduates and 8,329 total unduplicated headcount)

- **Retention Rate - Total first-time, full-time and new transfer-in students that are retained or graduate the following year**  
  **Benchmark:** To be determined after Year One submission of the VFA  
  **Status:** 57.8%

- **Cost of College – Cost per credit hour to deliver education**  
  *(This measure is tentative pending further review (per Carson Howell, SBOE))*  
  **Benchmark:** To compare favorably (at or below the mean) to that of our peer institutions  
  **Status:** $237.83 (based on $40,368,009 and 169,731.6 credits)

- **Efficiency - Certificate (of at least one year or more) and degree completions per $100,000 of education and related spending by institutions**  
  *(This measure is tentative pending further review (per Carson Howell, SBOE))*  
  **Benchmark:** To compare favorably (at or below the mean) to that of our peer institutions  
  **Status:** 2.12 (based on $40,368,009 and 856 awards)

- **Dual Credit – Total annual credit hours**  
  **Benchmark:** This measure is an input from the K-12 system and is not benchmarkable, per SBOE  
  **Status:** 10,039

- **Dual Credit – Unduplicated Annual Headcount**  
  **Benchmark:** This measure is an input from the K-12 system and is not benchmarkable, per SBOE  
  **Status:** 888
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**Student Success Performance Measures**

- Percentage of full-time, first-time and new transfer-in students who a) were awarded a degree or certificate, b) transferred without an award to a 2- or 4-year institution, c) are still enrolled, and d) left the institution within six years.
  
  *Benchmark:* To be determined after Year One submission of the VFA
  
  *Status:* a) 20.8%  b) 26%  c) 5.7%  d) 47.5%

- Total number of employers (out of total respondents) who indicate satisfaction with overall preparation of completers
  
  *Benchmark:* 80% of employers indicate satisfaction with preparation of completers
  
  *Status:* 98.48%

- Career Program Completers, percent employed in related field
  
  *Benchmark:* 65% employed
  
  *Status:* 54.95%

- Fall to Spring Persistence Rate, credit students
  
  *Benchmark:* 84% persist
  
  *Status:* 81.9%

- First-time, full-time, student retention rates
  
  *Benchmark:* 63%
  
  *Status:* 54.8%

- First-time, part-time, student retention rates
  
  *Benchmark:* 45%
  
  *Status:* 37.5%

---

**Educational Excellence Performance Measures**

- Student Learning Outcomes Assessment goals achieved in general education
  
  *Benchmark:* 80% percent or more of annual assessment goals are consistently met over 3-yr plan
  
  *Status:* 75%

- Full-time to Part-time faculty ratio
  
  *Benchmark:* 1.3 to 1.0 ratio
  
  *Status:* 1.36 to 1.0

- NIC is responsive to faculty and staff professional development needs
  
  *Benchmark:* Maintain or increase funding levels available for professional development
  
  *Status:* $82,000 in current funding

- Licensure pass rates at or above national pass rates
  
  *Benchmark:* Maintain or improve current pass rates
  
  *Status:* 85% or above for all programs

- Dual Credit students who enroll at NIC as degree-seeking postsecondary students as a percentage of total headcount
  
  *Benchmark:* Sustain or Increase
  
  *Status:* 3.1%
• All instructional programs submit annual summary reports documenting program improvements
  
  Benchmark: 20% of total programs per year over five years until fully implemented
  Status: This is a new measure; no status available

Community Engagement Performance Measures

• Distance Learning proportion of credit hours
  
  Benchmark: Increase by 2% annually for a total of 25%
  Status: 21.42%

• Dual Credit annual credit hours in the high schools
  
  Benchmark: Increase by 5% annually
  Status: 2,028

• Dual Credit annual credit hours taught via distance delivery
  
  Benchmark: Increase by 5% annually
  Status: 3,460

• Market Penetration (Credit Students): Unduplicated headcount of credit students as a percentage of NIC’s total service area population
  
  Benchmark: 3.60%
  Status: 3.86%

• Market Penetration (Non-Credit Students): Unduplicated headcount of non-credit students as a percentage of NIC’s total service area population
  
  Benchmark: 3.0%
  Status: 2.05%

• Percentage of student evaluations of community education courses reflect a satisfaction rating of above average
  
  Benchmark: 85% of total number score a satisfaction rating of above average
  Status: 85%

Diversity Performance Measures

• Number of students enrolled from diverse populations
  
  Benchmark: Maintain a diverse, or more diverse population than the population within NIC’s service region
  Status: 82% white, 9% other, 9% unknown

• Participation in sponsored events that promote diversity awareness
  
  Benchmark: To be defined in 2015
  Status: This is a new measure; no status available

• Number of course outcomes related to multiculturalism, pluralism, equity, and diversity
  
  Benchmark: Maintain or Increase
  Status: This is a new measure; no status available

• Students who respond “quite a bit or very much” to CCSSE survey question: “Does the college encourage contact among students from different economic, social and racial or ethnic backgrounds?”
  
  Benchmark: Increase by 2% annually until the national average is met or exceeded
  Status: 41.7% (compared to national average of 51.7%)

Stewardship Performance Measures

• Dollars secured through the Development Department via private donations and grants
  
  Benchmark: $2,000,000

March 14, 2014
Status: $3,082,828

- College-wide replacement schedule for personal computers
  Benchmark: 100% of the computers are replaced within the 42 month window
  Status: 94.64%

- Improved consumption and emissions result in dollars saved
  Benchmark: Sustain or Increase
  Status: >$100k

- Tuition and Fees for full-time, in-district students (full academic year)
  Benchmark: Maintain greater than 60% against comparator institutions
  Status: $2,846 (rank = 72.7% against comparator institutions)

**Idaho State Board of Education System-Wide Performance Measures**

- Graduation Rate - Total degree production
  Benchmark: To compare favorably (at or below the mean) to that of our peer institutions
  Status: 1,083 awards

- Graduation Rate - Unduplicated headcount of graduates & percent of graduates to total unduplicated headcount
  Benchmark: To compare favorably (at or below the mean) to that of our peer institutions
  Status: 12.46% graduation rate (based on 1,038 graduates and 8,329 total unduplicated headcount)

- Retention Rate - Total first-time, full-time and new transfer-in students that are retained or graduate the following year
  Benchmark: To be determined after Year One submission of the VFA
  Status: 57.8%

- Cost of College – Cost per credit hour to deliver education
  *This measure is tentative pending further review (per Carson Howell, SBOE)*
  Benchmark: To compare favorably (at or below the mean) to that of our peer institutions
  Status: $237.83 (based on $40,368,009 and 169,731.6 credits)

- Efficiency - Certificate (of at least one year or more) and degree completions per $100,000 of education and related spending by institutions
  *This measure is tentative pending further review (per Carson Howell, SBOE)*
  Benchmark: To compare favorably (at or below the mean) to that of our peer institutions
  Status: 2.12 (based on $40,368,009 and 856 awards)

- Dual Credit – Total annual credit hours
  Benchmark: This measure is an input from the K-12 system and is not benchmarkable, per SBOE
  Status: 10,039

- Dual Credit – Unduplicated Annual Headcount
  Benchmark: This measure is an input from the K-12 system and is not benchmarkable, per SBOE
  Status: 888
MISSION STATEMENT
The College of Agricultural and Life Sciences fulfills the intent and purpose of the land-grant mission and serves the food-industry, people and communities of Idaho and our nation:

- through identification of critical needs and development of creative solutions,
- through the discovery, application, and dissemination of science-based knowledge,
- by preparing individuals through education and life-long learning to become leaders and contributing members of society,
- by fostering the healthy populations as individuals and as a society,
- by supporting a vibrant economy, benefiting the individual, families and society as a whole.

VALUES STATEMENT
The College of Agricultural and Life Sciences values:

- excellence in creative discovery, instruction and outreach,
- open communication and innovation,
- individual and institutional accountability,
- integrity and ethical conduct,
- accomplishment through teamwork and partnership,
- responsiveness and flexibility,
- individual and institutional health and happiness.

VISION STATEMENT
We will be the recognized state-wide leader and innovator in meeting the state's current and future challenges to create healthy individuals, families and communities, and enhance sustainable food systems respected regionally and nationally through focused areas of excellence in teaching, research and outreach with extension serving as a critical knowledge bridge between the University of Idaho, College of Agricultural and Life Sciences, and the people of Idaho.
Goals

Teaching and Learning: Enable student success in a rapidly changing world through transformed teaching and learning.

Objective:
1. Build adaptable, integrative curricula and pedagogies.
   *Performance Measure*: Approved ISEM 301 course listed in spring 2014 course catalog.
   *Benchmark*: Approved ISEM 301 course listed in spring 2014 course catalog.

2. Increase the number of course offerings via distance learning.
   *Performance Measure*: Exploration of additional course offerings to meet students’ curricular needs to support timely degree completion for on-campus and off-campus programs.
   *Benchmark*: 10% increase in distance course offerings from CALS

Scholarly and Creative Activity: Promote excellence in scholarship and creative activity to enhance life today and prepare us for tomorrow.

Objectives:

1. Increase grant submissions and awards from agencies, commissions, foundations, and private industry by all tenure and non-tenure track faculty, staff, and administration for scholarship and creative activities in research, extension, and teaching.
   *Performance Measure*: Number of grant proposals submitted per year, number of grant awards received per year, and amount of grant funding received per year
   *Benchmark*: Five percent increase per year in the number of grants submitted.

2. Increase grants awarded to faculty by hiring grant specialists to assist in identifying funding opportunities and grant writers to assist in proposal development
   *Performance Measures*: Availability and use of grant specialists and grant writers, number of grants identified by grant specialists and, number of grants submitted using the services of a grant writer
   *Benchmark*: Attain an average of $20 million in extramural funding across research, extension, and teaching scholarship during the 2015-2017 time period

3. Allocate resources preferentially to defined college Programs of Distinction and departmental areas of excellence, and to emerging Programs of Distinction and areas of excellence
Performance Measures: Funds or in-kind donations acquired through development, endowments, and collaborations with public and private organizations
Benchmark: Attain $40 million by 2016 as aligned with UI campaigns

4. Facilitate the formation of Programs of Distinction teams and other interdisciplinary teams to identify and address key research problems and opportunities
Performance Measures: Number of interdisciplinary teams formed
Benchmark: Formation of four or more interdisciplinary teams that will develop Programs of Distinction by December 2014

5. Provide competitive funding for planning and reward faculty participation in interdisciplinary programs by providing necessary incentives and training to improve competitiveness of center- or team-based grant proposals.
Performance Measures: Number of competitive grant proposals submitted and awarded
Benchmark: Be awarded 4 to 5 large, longer term competitive grants that are led by faculty by 2016

Outreach and Engagement: Meet society’s critical needs by engaging in mutually beneficial partnerships.

1. Actively participate in identifying, developing, and implementing Programs of Distinction and areas of excellence.
Performance Measures: Programs of Distinction identified, work plans created, and measures of effectiveness established for each Program of Distinction by 2014; measures assessed annually thereafter
Benchmark: Twenty percent of faculty working effectively in Programs of Distinction and engaged with clientele and stakeholders

2. Redirect internal resources and recruit industry and agency funding for student internships and student service learning projects that support outreach and engagement in priority areas.
Performance Measures: Amount of funding redirected and recruited annually; number of students engaged in internships and in service learning projects during their undergraduate or graduate programs
Benchmark: By 2017, funding for internships and student projects doubled (2013 baseline); number of students involved in internships doubled (2013 baseline);
and number of students involved in service learning projects doubled (2013 baseline)

3. Recognize faculty for outreach and engagement accomplishments as part of annual evaluation, promotion and tenure
   
   **Performance Measures:** Unit administrators recognize, value, and reward significant outreach and engagement outcomes and impacts
   
   **Benchmark:** Unit administrators can clearly communicate outcomes and impacts resulting from outreach and engagement accomplishments of their faculty

4. Expand the role of all advisory boards by utilizing the networking capabilities of advisory board members to enhance partnership development
   
   **Performance Measures:** Partnerships developed through collaborative efforts with advisory board members, Development, and administration
   
   **Benchmark:** Outreach and engagement programming enhanced through partnerships with key agencies, organizations, and foundations

5. Market outcomes of Programs of Distinction and areas of excellence through college publications, popular press articles, and presentations to decision makers and stakeholders.
   
   **Performance Measures:** Number of articles featuring outcomes and impacts of Programs of Distinction and areas of excellence; number of major presentations featuring Programs of Distinction and areas of excellence outcomes and impacts
   
   **Benchmark:** Outcomes of Programs of Distinction and areas of excellence have been documented and reported to stakeholders and decision makers by 2017

**Organization, Culture and Climate:** Be a purposeful, ethical, vibrant and open community.

1. Include an emphasis on diversity by providing multi-cultural events and training opportunities or by participating in University sponsored activities.
   
   **Performance Measures:** Number of faculty and staff who complete a multi-cultural competency training in addition to increased faculty, staff, and student participation in multi-cultural events or UI sponsored activity.
   
   **Benchmark:** Increased diversity awareness among faculty, staff, and students.
2. Seek private and public funding for scholarships to increase enrollment by underrepresented groups
   
   **Performance Measures:** Amount of funding raised
   **Benchmark:** Double the scholarships over 5 years.

3. Utilize established university policies and procedures to address problematic behaviors
   
   **Performance Measures:** Number of reported incidences and investigations
   **Benchmark:** Reduce the number of reported incidences and investigations relative to the average of the previous five years

4. Encourage faculty and staff participation in conflict resolution and/or management training offered by UI Professional Development & Learning office.
   
   **Performance Measures:** Number of participants completing conflict resolution and/or management training
   **Benchmarks:** 100% participation

**External Factors:**

- **Loss of essential personnel:** Comparisons of salary and benefits with peer institutions limits our ability to hire and retain highly qualified individuals within the Agricultural Research and Extension Service.

- **Cultivation of Partnerships:** We continue to cultivate partnerships to maintain the agricultural research and extension system. Although to date these efforts have been successful, these efforts are very time consuming and take many months to reach agreement and produce revenue streams to help maintain this system and meet our land grant mission.

- **Statewide Infrastructure Needs:** Our ability to fund infrastructure maintenance and improvements to maintain our research intensive facilities remains limited. As mentioned in previous years, this clearly impacts our ability to obtain external grant funding and develop collaborative partnerships with state, federal, and private entities and other institutions.
Part 1 – Agency Profile

Agency Overview
The Agricultural Research and Extension Service (ARES) is part of the Land-Grant system established by the Morrill Act of 1862. The University of Idaho Cooperative Extension System, established in 1915 under the Smith-Lever Act of 1914, conducts educational outreach programs to improve the quality of life for Idaho citizens by helping them apply the latest scientific technology to their communities, businesses, lives and families. The Idaho Agricultural Experiment Station, established in 1892 under the Hatch Act of 1887, conducts fundamental and applied research to solve problems and meet the needs in Idaho’s agriculture, natural resources, youth and family and related areas.

Core Functions/Idaho Code
Conduct educational outreach programs through the University of Idaho Cooperative Extension system. Conduct fundamental and applied research programs through the Idaho Agricultural Experiment Station.

Ag Research and Extension

Revenue and Expenditures:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beginning Fund Balance</th>
<th>FY 2010</th>
<th>FY 2011</th>
<th>FY 2012</th>
<th>FY 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>FY 2010</th>
<th>FY 2011</th>
<th>FY 2012</th>
<th>FY 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>$23,490,500</td>
<td>$22,559,000</td>
<td>$22,559,000</td>
<td>$23,604,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Grant</td>
<td>3,919,138</td>
<td>4,369,246</td>
<td>3,909,353</td>
<td>5,333,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc Revenue</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted Equine Education</td>
<td>5,220</td>
<td>4,444</td>
<td>24,014</td>
<td>14,557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenue</td>
<td>$27,414,858</td>
<td>$ 26,932,690</td>
<td>$26,492,367</td>
<td>$28,952,223</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>FY 2010</th>
<th>FY 2011</th>
<th>FY 2012</th>
<th>FY 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Costs</td>
<td>$25,275,336</td>
<td>$22,504,806</td>
<td>$21,946,299</td>
<td>$22,381,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenditures</td>
<td>1,881,705</td>
<td>3,149,265</td>
<td>3,554,785</td>
<td>4,413,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td>263,631</td>
<td>657,726</td>
<td>969,866</td>
<td>2,208,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustee/Benefit Payments</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,109</td>
<td>2,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditure</td>
<td>$27,420,672</td>
<td>$26,311,807</td>
<td>$26,475,059</td>
<td>$29,005,599</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ending Fund Balance</th>
<th>FY 2010</th>
<th>FY 2011</th>
<th>FY 2012</th>
<th>FY 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Profile of Cases Managed and/or Key Services Provided

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases Managed and/or Key Services Provided</th>
<th>FY 2010</th>
<th>FY 2011</th>
<th>FY 2012</th>
<th>FY 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Youth Participating in 4-H</td>
<td>36,383</td>
<td>33,175</td>
<td>33,163</td>
<td>34,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Individuals/Families Benefiting from Outreach Programs</td>
<td>412,489</td>
<td>366,275</td>
<td>338,523</td>
<td>358,227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Technical Publications (research results) Generated/Revised</td>
<td>155 (CES)</td>
<td>341 (170 CES)</td>
<td>187 (CES)</td>
<td>179 (CES)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Part II – Performance Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>FY 2010</th>
<th>FY 2011</th>
<th>FY 2012</th>
<th>FY 2013</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Seminar (ISEM) courses listed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of courses or sections of distance course offerings</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>10% Annual Increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value and number of grant proposals submitted</td>
<td>$59.3M</td>
<td>$53.7M</td>
<td>$36.3M</td>
<td>$32M</td>
<td>$20M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value and number of grants awarded</td>
<td>$18.2M</td>
<td>$21.9M</td>
<td>$11.7M</td>
<td>$15.6M</td>
<td>$20M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of long-term competitive grants awarded</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value of donations received</td>
<td>$5.8M</td>
<td>$5.1M</td>
<td>$6.1M</td>
<td>$6.7M</td>
<td>$10M Annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary teams formed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of faculty working in Programs of Distinction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students involved in internships and student projects</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>Double in 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dollar Value of External Funds Generated Through Partnerships to Support Agricultural Research Centers</td>
<td>$528K</td>
<td>$554K</td>
<td>$624K</td>
<td>$566K</td>
<td>$1M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of faculty and staff completing multi-cultural competency training</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For More Information Contact
University of Idaho
Forest Utilization Research and Outreach (FUR)

STRATEGIC PLAN
2015-2019
Forest Utilization Research and Outreach (FUR)

MISSION

The Forest Utilization Research and Outreach (FUR) program is located in the College of Natural Resources at the University of Idaho. Its purpose is to increase the productivity of Idaho’s forests and rangelands by developing, analyzing, and demonstrating methods to improve land management and related problem situations such as post-wildfire rehabilitation using state-of-the-art forest and rangeland regeneration and restoration techniques. Other focal areas include sustainable forest harvesting and livestock grazing practices, including air and water quality protection, as well as improved nursery management practices, increased wood use, and enhanced wood utilization technologies for bioenergy and bioproducts. In addition the Policy Analysis Group follows a legislative mandate to provide unbiased factual and timely information on natural resources issues facing Idaho’s decision makers. Through collaboration and consultation FUR programs promote the application of science and technology to support sustainable lifestyles and civic infrastructures of Idaho’s communities in an increasingly interdependent and competitive global setting.

OUTCOME-BASED VISION STATEMENT

The scholarly, creative, and educational activities related to and supported by Forest Utilization Research and Outreach (FUR) programs will lead to improved capabilities in Idaho’s workforce to address critical natural resource issues by producing and applying new knowledge and developing leaders for land management organizations concerned with sustainable forest and rangeland management, including fire science and management, and a full range of forest and rangeland ecosystem services and products. This work will be shaped by a passion to integrate scientific knowledge with natural resource management practices. All FUR programs will promote collaborative learning partnerships across organizational boundaries such as governments and private sector enterprises, as well as landowner and non-governmental organizations with interests in sustainable forest and rangeland management. In addition, FUR programs will catalyze entrepreneurial innovation that will enhance stewardship of Idaho’s forest and rangelands, natural resources, and environmental quality.
GOALS & OBJECTIVES

Goal 1: Scholarship and Creativity

Achieve excellence in scholarship and creative activity through an institutional culture that values and promotes strong academic areas and interdisciplinary collaboration among them.

Objective A: Promote an environment that increases faculty, student, and constituency engagement in disciplinary and interdisciplinary scholarship.

Strategies:

1. Upgrade and development of university human resource competencies (faculty, staff and students) to strengthen disciplinary and interdisciplinary scholarship that advances the college’s strategic themes and land-grant mission directly linked to FUR.

2. Establish, renew, remodel, and reallocate facilities to encourage funded collaborative disciplinary and interdisciplinary inquiry in alignment with FUR programs in forest operations and nursery management as well as the UI Experimental Forest, Rangeland Center, and Policy Analysis Group.

Performance Measure:

- Funding from non-FUR sources leveraged by FUR-funded laboratories, field facilities, and research, outreach, and teaching programs. benchmarks.

Benchmark:

3:1 ratio, which means every one dollar of FUR appropriated funds leverages at least three dollars of non-FUR funds attained from other sources (Table 1).

Objective B: Emphasize scholarly and creative outputs that reflect our research-extensive and land-grant missions, the university and college’s strategic themes, and stakeholder needs, especially when they directly support our academic programming in natural resources.

Strategies:

1. Enhance scholarly modes of discovery, application and integration that address issues of importance to the citizens of Idaho that improve forest and rangeland productivity, regeneration, and rehabilitation, including nursery management practices, fire science and management, and a full range of ecosystem services and products, including environmental quality.

2. Create new products, technologies, protocols and processes useful to private sector natural resource businesses — such as timber harvesting and processing, regeneration and rehabilitation firms, working livestock ranches, as well as governmental and non-governmental enterprises and operating units.

3. Conduct research and do unbiased policy analyses to aid decision-makers’ and citizens’ understanding of natural resource and land use policy issues.
Performance Measures:
- Number of research project cases managed and/or services provided by each FUR program segment (Table 2);
- Number of new research projects each year that will lead to scholarship and creativity products (Table 1);
- Number of research studies completed per year (Table 1); and
- Number of publications each year (Table 1); including research reports, refereed journal articles, and other publications, as well as licensed and/or patented products given credibility by external review processes.

Benchmark:
Number of ongoing and new research projects either averaged over a selected period of time or established as FUR program segment operational targets, with an ongoing objective for benchmarks to stay the same or increase based on investment levels in different FUR program segments.

Goal 2: Outreach and Engagement
Engage with the public, private and non-profit sectors through mutually beneficial partnerships that enhance teaching, learning, discovery, and creativity.

Objective A: Build upon, strengthen, and connect the College of Natural Resources with other parts of the University to engage in mutually beneficial partnerships with stakeholders to address areas targeted in FUR program segments and deliver products and services.

Strategies:
1. Enhance the capacity of the College of Natural Resources to engage with communities by involving faculty and students in programs relevant to local and regional issues associated with forest and rangeland management and the maintenance of environmental quality.
2. Engage with communities, governmental and non-governmental organizations through flexible partnerships that share resources and respond to local needs and expectations.
3. Foster key industry and business relationships that benefit entrepreneurship and social and economic development through innovation and technology transfer that will increase the productivity of Idaho’s forests and rangelands while enhancing air and water quality.

Performance Measures:
- Number of service project cases managed and/or key services provided to communities in the state and region, government agencies, non-governmental organizations, private businesses and landowners (Table 2).
- Number of workshops and other outreach and engagement activities conducted (Table 1).
Benchmark:
Number of outreach and engagement activities with audiences identified above either averaged over a selected period of time or established as FUR program segment operational targets.

Goal 3: Teaching and Learning

Engage students in a transformational experience of discovery, understanding, and global citizenship.

Objective A: Develop effective integrative learning activities to engage and expand student minds.

Strategies:
1. Provide undergraduate and graduate students, as well as professionals, with education and research opportunities in nursery management, wood utilization technologies including bioenergy and bioproducts, forest and rangeland regeneration and restoration, fire science and management, and other ecosystem services and products.
2. Integrate educational experiences into ongoing FUR and non-FUR research programs at CNR outdoor laboratories, including the University of Idaho Experimental Forest, the Forest Nursery complex, and McCall campus.
3. Engage alumni and stakeholders as partners in research, learning, and outreach.

Performance Measure:
- Number of teaching projects, courses, and other teaching activities which use FUR funded projects, facilities, or equipment for educational purposes, including, as appropriate, professionals as well as undergraduate and graduate students (Table 2).

Benchmark:
Number of teaching and learning activities conducted over a selected period of time or established as FUR program segment operational targets.

KEY EXTERNAL FACTORS

The key external factors likely to affect the ability of FUR programs to fulfill the mission and goals are as follows: (1) the availability of funding from external sources to leverage state-provided FUR funding; (2) changes in human resources due to retirements or employees relocating due to better employment opportunities; (3) continued uncertainty relative to global, national and regional economic conditions; (4) uncertainty associated with the State of Idaho’s commitment to retaining high quality programs associated with the mission of the nation’s land grant universities; and (5) changing demand for the state and region’s ecosystem services and products.
Table 1. Performance Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leverage ratio of non-FUR funds to FUR appropriated funds</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>3:1</td>
<td>3:1</td>
<td>3:1</td>
<td>3:1</td>
<td>3:1</td>
<td>3:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 1, Objective A, Strategy 1, 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of New Research Projects Per Year:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Forest</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Operations</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Analysis Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitkin Forest Nursery</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangeland Center</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 1, Objective A, Strategy 1, 2, 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 3, Objective A, Strategy 1, 2, 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Research Studies Completed/Published Per Year:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Forest</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Operations</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Analysis Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitkin Forest Nursery</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangeland Center</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 1, Objective B, Strategy 1, 2, 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 2, Objective B, Strategy 1, 2, 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Publications:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Forest</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Operations</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Analysis Group</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitkin Forest Nursery</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangeland Center</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 1, Objective B, Strategy 1, 2, 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 2, Objective A, Strategy 1, 2, 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Workshops Conducted:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Forest</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Operations</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Analysis Group</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitkin Forest Nursery</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangeland Center</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 2, Objective A, Strategy 1, 2, 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Although this measure was identified in previous Strategic Plans, it had not been reported until now.

(b) Prior to FY 2014 the Forest Operations segment of FUR programs did not receive any FUR funds.

(c) Prior to FY 2011 the Rangeland Center segment of FUR programs did not exist.
Table 2. Profile of Cases Managed and/or Key Services Provided

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases Managed and/or Key Services Provided</th>
<th>Historic (actual)</th>
<th>Future (estimate)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Private Landowners Assisted:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitkin Forest Nursery</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Seedling Industry Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitkin Forest Nursery</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Projects:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Forest</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Operations</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Analysis Group</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitkin Forest Nursery</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangeland Center</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Projects:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Forest</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Operations</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Analysis Group</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitkin Forest Nursery</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangeland Center</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Projects:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Forest</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Operations</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Analysis Group</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitkin Forest Nursery</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangeland Center</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Prior to FY 2014 the Forest Operations segment of FUR programs did not receive any FUR funds.

(b) Prior to FY 2011 the Rangeland Center segment of FUR programs did not exist.
Part I – Agency Profile

Agency Overview
Research mission – investigation into forestry and rangeland resource management problems, forest nursery production, and related areas. Part of the College of Natural Resources, Forest Utilization Research also includes the Rangeland Center with a legislative mandate for interdisciplinary research, education and outreach as suggested by a partner advisory council to fulfill the University’s land grant mission (Idaho Code § 38-715), and the Policy Analysis Group with a legislative mandate to provide objective data and analysis pertinent to natural resource and land-use issues as suggested by an advisory committee of Idaho’s natural resource leaders (Idaho Code § 38-714).

Core Functions/Idaho Code
The duty of the Experiment Station of the University of Idaho’s College of Natural Resources is to institute and conduct investigations and research into the forestry, wildlife and range problems of the lands within the state. Such problems specifically include forest and timber growing, timber products marketing, seed and nursery stock production, game and other wildlife, and forage and rangeland resources. Information resulting from cooperative investigation and research, including continuing inquiry into public policy issues pertinent to resource and land use questions of general interest to the people of Idaho, is to be published and distributed to affected industries and interests. (Idaho Code §§ 38-701, 38-703, 38-706, 38-707, 38-708, 38-709, 38-711, 38-712, 38-713, 38-714)

Revenue and Expenditures:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>FY 2010</th>
<th>FY 2011</th>
<th>FY 2012</th>
<th>FY 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>$517,500</td>
<td>$511,400</td>
<td>$490,000</td>
<td>$504,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$517,500</td>
<td>$511,400</td>
<td>$490,000</td>
<td>$504,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>FY 2010</th>
<th>FY 2011</th>
<th>FY 2012</th>
<th>FY 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Costs</td>
<td>$437,700</td>
<td>$465,244</td>
<td>$442,400</td>
<td>$454,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenditures</td>
<td>79,800</td>
<td>48,156</td>
<td>47,570</td>
<td>48,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustee/Benefit Payments</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$517,500</td>
<td>$511,400</td>
<td>$490,000</td>
<td>$504,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Profile of Cases Managed and/or Key Services Provided:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases Managed and/or Key Services Provided</th>
<th>FY 2010</th>
<th>FY 2011</th>
<th>FY 2012</th>
<th>FY 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Private Landowners Assisted:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitkin Forest Nursery</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>1400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Seedling Industry Research Projects:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitkin Forest Nursery</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Projects:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Forest</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Analysis Group</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitkin Forest Nursery</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangeland Center</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Projects:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Forest</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Analysis Group</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitkin Forest Nursery</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangeland Center</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Projects:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Forest</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Analysis Group</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitkin Forest Nursery</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangeland Center</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The Rangeland Center was created in FY2011 and authorized in Idaho Code § 38-715 during FY2012.

Performance Highlights:

Experimental Forest:

Highlights:

Research – 11 research projects were established, including a pre-commercial thinning study in collaboration with Potlatch Corp., a statewide weight-scaling study in collaboration with Idaho Dept. of Lands, and a cable logging safety study.

Education – Classroom involvement included 9 faculty, 12 different class courses, 24 field trips, 20 follow up lab sessions, involving more than 300 students with hands-on experience.

Internships – 9 student interns gained hands-on field experience in timber management, including developing critical thinking and problem-solving skills in the field. Student interns are exposed to a wide array of land management experiences involving multiple resources and the challenge of addressing regulatory policies with scientific information.

Outreach – 9 outreach and engagement activities include school teachers, loggers, professional foresters, non-industrial private forest land owners, and interested Idaho citizens. Hosted activities on a pair of active and completed harvest sites, where multiple objectives are achieved via management activities.

The centerpiece of the University of Idaho Experimental Forest (UIEF) is the 8,247 acres of forest land on Moscow Mountain that are adjacent to both industrial and non-industrial private forest lands surrounded by dry land farming in Latah County. Most of these lands were a gift from Potlatch Corp. in the 1930s. Today all but 450 acres are managed as working forests, balancing education, research, and demonstration with production of timber, clean water, fire hazard mitigation, smoke particulate management, and wildlife and fisheries habitat. The UIEF also manages 398 acres on two parcels in Kootenai County, and has a life estate of 1,649 acres in Valley County that eventually will come under
UIEF management. As noted in the highlights above and details below, these lands provide many research, education and outreach opportunities.

Research conducted on the UIEF in FY2013 included studies by College of Natural Resources faculty, collaborators in the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, and the USDA Forest Service Rocky Mountain Research Station. During the year Dr. Robert Keefe was hired as Assistant Professor of Forest Operations, and as part of his duties supervises research and management activities on the UIEF, under the direction of the Dean. In FY2013, an existing UIEF outlying building in Princeton, ID was repurposed to create a new laboratory for the study of Forest Operations systems and equipment, focused specifically on forest utilization, harvesting productivity, efficiency, and cost analysis. Two new research projects were undertaken with partners. First, in collaboration with Potlatch Corp., a long-term thinning and overstory removal study evaluating biomass utilization impacts on productivity was established. Second, a statewide study to develop new methods for scaling logs by truck weight was established with the Idaho Dept. of Lands Forest Management Bureau.

Education involving hands-on experience to supplement classroom and laboratory exercises is a significant and valuable supplement to a college education in forest utilization. In FY2013 nine faculty members – College of Natural Resources (7), College of Agriculture and Life Sciences (1), and Washington State University (1) – used the UIEF for at least one field trip session during twelve different courses, ranging from an introductory freshman orientation to senior and graduate level courses demonstrating current research knowledge, land management practices, and using forest operations equipment. In total more than 300 university students visited the UIEF on 24 field trips, with an additional 20 follow-up laboratory sessions in which data collected during field trips were analyzed.

Internship opportunities for students have been offered by the UIEF since 1972. In FY2013 the UIEF employed 13 students and successfully completed the 40th consecutive year of the Student Logging Crew Program without a single injury to report. Staff provide hands-on education as the students help accomplish the management objectives in the UIEF Forest Management Plan, helping the College fulfill the duties of the Experiment Station as described in Idaho Code § 38-703 et seq. Student employee interns are required to think critically and solve problems on a daily basis, thus are acquiring job skills beyond just accomplishing the work-at-hand. These work assignments include technology transfer as students learn to employ state-of-the-art equipment and techniques, as well as incorporating their interdisciplinary academic learning in an operational and research forest setting. Upon graduation these student employee interns generally have little trouble finding employment.

The outreach and engagement highlight for FY2013 was the Washington Idaho Forest Owner’s Field Day, hosted by the Experimental Forest. This event involved collaboration with WSU Extension, UI Extension, Idaho Dept. of Lands, the Idaho Forest Owners Association, had over 24 forestry and timber harvesting workshops, a Research Tour of current projects on the UIEF, and 150 participants from throughout Idaho. In addition to the Field Day, the UIEF hosted stops and lunch as part of the Idaho Dept. of Lands Stewardship Field Tour, a tour for visiting scientists from the U.S. Dept. of Energy’s Idaho National Laboratory, and hosted multiple UI Extension Forestry workshops (Thinning and Pruning, Insects and Disease, and others), as well as one Inland Empire Tree Improvement Cooperative (IETIC) field tour.

Policy Analysis Group:

Highlights: 

Economic Contributions – 4 publications featured the role of the forest products manufacturing industry in the Idaho economy, including a fact sheet with replies to questions from the Idaho Legislature’s Economic Outlook and Revenue Assessment Committee. The waning economic contribution of federal lands in the State of Idaho and throughout the West was a topic of considerable interest to national policymakers during the year, and based on our previous work posted on the Internet we were invited to testify in March before a U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources oversight hearing on “Keeping the Commitment to Rural Communities.”


**Director Involvement** – 8 invited presentations, including oral and written testimony at a U.S. Senate oversight hearing, as described in the previous paragraph. Other presentations at national meetings during the year included the Society of American Foresters convention and the International Biomass Conference and Exposition. Continued to represent Idaho on the Western Governors’ Forest Health Advisory Committee. Continued as chair of the Idaho Strategic Energy Alliance’s Forestry/Biomass Task Force and served on its Carbon Issues Task Force. Was appointed to the Society of American Foresters’ Biogenic Carbon Response Team. Presented results of analysis at two continuing education events conducted by the Idaho Forest Products Commission, and in February served as master of ceremonies for the luncheon information session during Forestry Day at the Legislature.

**Publications** – 16 publications, including four mentioned above with estimates of the economic contribution of the state’s natural resource-based industries. Other publications during FY 2013 focused on a variety of natural resource policy issues, including wildland fire management, sage-grouse conservation, wood bioenergy economics and policy, regulation of greenhouse gas emissions from wood bioenergy, oil and gas exploration and development policy in Idaho, and regulation of forest roads under the federal Clean Water Act.

The Policy Analysis Group continues to meet its legislative mandate to provide objective data and analysis on natural resource and land-use issues of concern to Idaho Citizens. These issues are suggested and prioritized by an Advisory Committee comprised of natural resource leaders in the state, as per our enabling legislation. As analyses of current issues are completed they are replaced by others suggested by the Advisory Committee. Our website was redesigned this year to improve access to publications and to provide easy access to presentation materials (www.uidaho.edu/cnr/pag). In addition to research and outreach duties described in our enabling legislation, the director advised eight Master of Natural Resources students (four completed during the year and were replaced by four others), served on three graduate student committees, and chaired the search committee for the Head of the Forest, Rangeland and Fire Sciences Department.

**Pitkin Forest Nursery:**

**Highlights:**

**Research** – Improve the quality of plant material available for reforestation and restoration throughout Idaho. Working with forest industry and private landowners, studies are designed and maintained with the objectives of improving tree seedling cost effectiveness throughout the establishment period. Developing and refining plant propagation protocols for use in Idaho’s nursery industry, including difficult-to-grow species such as whitebark pine and big leaf maple.

**Education** – Supported 6 graduate and undergraduate students through research at the Pitkin Forest Nursery on a variety of issues including stocktype selection problems to help balance forest productivity with reforestation costs, broadening our understanding of sagebrush establishment in a restoration context, and the effects of animal browse on regenerating forests. These projects build on Idaho’s reputation as a leader in reforestation practices and help improve our restoration of degraded forests and rangelands.

**Outreach** – Conducted several workshops and training sessions aimed at improving forest management practices in Idaho, including the Inland Empire Reforestation Council and the Intermountain Container Seedling Growers Association. Activities for children, land management professionals and laypersons provide further instruction and education opportunities.

**Teaching** – Provided research and teaching facility for several UI courses which require hands-on nursery experience. This provides experience which is sought by forest tree seedling nurseries throughout the United States.
Programmatic Growth – In FY 2013, we received a $3.3 million dollar gift to support activities in teaching, research, and outreach relevant to nursery production. In addition this will include infrastructure upgrades at the Pitkin Forest Nursery.

The Pitkin Forest Nursery continues to actively engage with Idaho landowners, natural resource industries, and citizens. An ever-popular seedling growing program in partnership with the Idaho Forest Products Commission was documented in a web-clip for promoting the University of Idaho and Idaho’s Forest Industry. Ongoing research into improved forest management practices included studying the effects of stocktype (the method of production of nursery stock for reforestation and restoration) selection on seedling development. This research topic will provide information and decision support across the state that is anticipated to streamline nursery production practices with the site-specific reforestation needs; a second layer of complexity (managing competing vegetation in the field) will further develop the utility of this information for Idaho. Similar research with rangeland species is also underway. An additional study on seed germination will allow for field foresters to better understand the opportunities for natural regeneration of stands following timber harvesting. In FY2013, six graduate and undergraduate students were working towards degrees through research conducted at the nursery, and many other students are using the facilities at the Pitkin Forest Nursery as a component of their graduate research on forest nutrition and soil management, fire modeling, and post-fire regeneration. Private donors, working with the University of Idaho and Idaho’s forest industry, have partnered to construct a new, state of the art classroom featuring Idaho forest products. This will serve as the epicenter for teaching students and community members about reforestation, nurseries, and natural resources in general.

Through actively seeking to be a recognized leader in seedling research and technology transfer, we partnered extensively to have our facility serve as the base of training for American and International Students. Activities for children, land management professionals, and laypersons have helped increase understanding of the importance of forestry and natural resource management in Idaho. For example, in March our organization again planned the Inland Empire Reforestation Council (~200 attendees, Coeur d’Alene). In February, we co-organized an international workshop on managing the genetic base of future forests (Portland, OR). On the teaching side, several University of Idaho courses used the nursery facilities for hands-on education, where students are exposed to the intricacies associated with seed germination, fertilizing, and irrigation. Forest tree seedling nurseries throughout the United States are seeking graduates with experience such as that gained at the Pitkin Forest Nursery, with a high demand expected to continue as we are best suited to replace a retiring workforce.

Rangeland Center:
Highlights:

Research – 10 research projects can be specifically tied to the collaborative efforts of the Rangeland Center. Researchers in the Rangeland Center were also involved in about 75 related research projects that contribute to our understanding of rangelands and the communities that rely on them.

Teaching – 9 university courses taught by 7 faculty members are directly related to rangeland ecology and management research projects of the Rangeland Center.

Service – 11 service and outreach projects were conducted by the Rangeland Center in FY2013. Two projects provided service to conduct rangeland monitoring by student teams for ranchers and land management agencies. In addition, 9 workshops, symposia, or field tours were conducted by Rangeland Center members to provide educational opportunities for teachers, ranchers, and rangeland professionals.

Rangelands are vast natural landscapes that cover nearly half of Idaho. Rangelands account for over 26 million acres in Idaho (48%). Our ability to serve current and future generations of Idaho citizens will be influenced by our understanding of rangelands because these lands are vital to the ecological and economic health of Idaho. The innovative design of the Rangeland Center promotes active partnerships.
with individuals, organizations and communities who work and live on the vast landscapes known as rangelands. The Rangeland Center is a group of 24 researchers and outreach specialists in the College of Natural Resources and the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences. Our expertise covers several disciplines that affect rangeland management and conservation including grazing, rangeland ecology, entomology, soil science, economics, rural sociology, fish and wildlife resources, invasive plants, forage production, animal science, wildland fire, restoration, and the use of spatial technologies to understand rangelands. Our research and outreach efforts are aimed at creating science and improving rangeland problems.

During FY 2013, the Rangeland Center initiated a long-term research project in collaboration with the Idaho Dept. of Fish and Game, the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), and others to examine the effects of spring grazing on sage-grouse habitat and nesting success. Several research and outreach projects focused on the effects of grazing on wildland fuels and sagebrush community characteristics. We continue collaborative efforts to assess the effects of livestock impacts on slickspot peppergrass (an endangered plant) and the relationship between livestock grazing and the abundance and diversity of insects that provide food for sage-grouse chicks. Four field teams of students worked on a monitoring project for ranchers on BLM allotments and a state-wide project to assess rangelands as part of the National Resource Inventory program directed by the U.S. Dept. of Agriculture’s Natural Resources Conservation Service. The Rangeland Center also worked collaboratively with the Owyhee Initiative Science Center and the University of Idaho Library to create a new on-line open-access journal (The Journal of Rangeland Applications) that will provide scientific synthesis articles aimed at supporting well-informed land management decisions.

Several members of the Rangeland Center are involved in teaching university courses that focus on rangeland ecology and management. Five of 9 rangeland courses include extensive field trips where students engage in rangeland examinations and interact with land managers. Four rangeland courses are offered in an on-line format and are accessible to students and professionals who are unable to attend courses delivered only on campus. The Rangeland Principles course (REM 151) was also offered in cooperation with 6 Idaho high school teachers as a dual credit course in which high school student simultaneously gain high school and college credit. Rangeland Center members also created and participated in continuing education venues including the Intermountain Range Livestock Symposium and local workshops and field tours.

Service and outreach projects in the Rangeland Center this year include development of the Range Science Information System (www.rangescience.info) which provides ready access to scientific research papers for ranchers and land managers. We also worked with high school Future Farmers of America (FFA) programs to conduct the Idaho FFA Rangeland Assessment Career Development Event for high school students in Idaho and the Western National Rangeland Assessment event for high school students in Idaho, Nevada, and Utah. A summer workshop was also conducted for land owners and managers focused on plant identification and monitoring.
Part II – Performance Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>FY 2010</th>
<th>FY 2011</th>
<th>FY2012</th>
<th>FY2013</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of New Research Projects Per Year:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Forest</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Analysis Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitkin Forest Nursery</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangeland Center</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 2, Objective A, Strategy 1, 2, 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 3, Objective A, Strategy 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Research Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed/Published Per Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Forest</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Analysis Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitkin Forest Nursery</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangeland Center</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 3, Objective A, Strategy 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Publications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Forest</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Analysis Group</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitkin Forest Nursery</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangeland Center</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 1, Objective B, Strategy 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Workshops Conducted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Forest</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10(\dagger)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 3, Objective A, Strategy 1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Analysis Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 1, Objective B, Strategy 2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitkin Forest Nursery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 1, Objective A, Strategy 2</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 3, Objective A, Strategy 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangeland Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The Rangeland Center was initiated in FY2011; its benchmarks were established during FY2012.

\(\dagger\) Includes Forest Owner’s Field Day, counted as a single workshop, with 23 presenters doing independent, hands-on workshops on horse logging, portable sawmilling, log scaling, and many others.
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STRATEGIC PLAN

FY 2015 - FY 2019
IDAHO GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

VISION

The Idaho Geological Survey’s vision is to provide the state with the best geologic information possible through strong and competitive applied research, effective program accomplishments, and transparent access. We are committed to the advancement of the science and emphasize the practical application of geology to benefit society. We seek to accomplish our responsibilities through service and outreach, research, and education activities.

MISSION

The Idaho Geological Survey is designated the lead state agency for the collection, interpretation, and dissemination of geologic and mineral data for Idaho. The agency has served the state since 1919 and prior to 1984 was named the Idaho Bureau of Mines and Geology.

Idaho Geological Survey staff acquires geologic information through field and laboratory investigations and through grants and cooperative programs with other governmental and private agencies. The Idaho Geological Survey’s geologic mapping program is the primary applied research function of the agency. The Survey’s Digital Mapping Laboratory is central to compiling, producing, and delivering new digital geologic maps. These products constitute the current knowledge of Idaho geology and are critical to all geoscience applications and related issues. Other main Idaho Geological Survey programs include geologic hazards, hydrology, energy resources, mining, mine safety training, abandoned and inactive mines inventory, and earth science education outreach. As Idaho grows and new technology develops, demand is increasing for new geologic knowledge information related to resource management, energy- mineral- and water-resource development, landslides and earthquake hazards.

AUTHORITY AND SCOPE

Idaho Code provides for the creation, purpose, duties, reporting, offices, and advisory board of the Idaho Geological Survey. The Code specifies the authority to conduct investigations and establish cooperative projects and seek research funding. The Idaho Geological Survey publishes an Annual Report as required by its enabling act.

GOAL 1: OUTREACH AND ENGAGEMENT (SERVICE)

Context: Achieve excellence in collecting and disseminating geologic information and mineral data to the mining, energy, agriculture, utility, construction, insurance, and financial sectors, educational institutions, civic and professional organizations, elected officials, governmental agencies, and the public. Continue to strive for increased efficiency and access to Survey information primarily through publications, Web site products, in-house collections and customer inquiries. Emphasize Web site delivery of digital products and compliance with state documents requirements (Idaho Code 33-
Maintain concentrated effort to collect and preserve Idaho’s valuable geologic data at risk.

Objective A: Produce and effectively deliver relevant geologic information to meet societal priorities and requirements

Performance Measure:
- Number of published reports on geology/hydrology/geologic hazards/mineral and energy resources.
  Benchmark: The number of IGS published reports TBD based on preceding years and staffing.

Objective B: Build and deliver Web site products and develop user apps and search engines

Performance Measure:
- Number of IGS web site viewers and products used/downloads.
  Benchmark: The number of website products TBD based on preceding years and staffing.

Objective C: Maintain compliance of Idaho State Library Documents Depository Program and Georef Catalog (International)

Performance Measure:
- Percentage of total survey documents available
  Benchmark: 100%

GOAL 2: SCHOLARLY AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY (RESEARCH)

Context: Advance the knowledge and practical application of geology and earth science in Idaho. Promote, foster, and sustain a climate for research excellence. Develop existing competitive strengths in geological expertise. Maintain national level recognition and research competitiveness in digital geological mapping techniques in compliance with required state and federal GIS standards. Sustain and build a strong research program through interdisciplinary collaboration with academic institutions, regional coalitions, and state and federal resource management agencies. Pursue opportunities for public and private research partnerships.

Objective A: Sustain and enhance geological mapping and related studies

Performance Measure:
- Increase the area of modern digital geologic map coverage for Idaho by mapping in priority areas designated by the Idaho Geological Mapping Advisory Committee (IGMAC).
  Benchmark: A sustained increase in cumulative percent of Idaho's area covered by modern geologic mapping.
Objective B: Sustain and build research funding

Performance Measure:
- Externally funded grant and contract dollars

Benchmark: The number of externally funded grants and amount of contract dollars compared to a five year average.

GOAL 3: TEACHING AND LEARNING (EDUCATION)

Context: Educate clients and stakeholders in the use of earth science information for society benefit. Support knowledge and understanding of Idaho’s geologic setting and resources through earth science education. Achieve excellence in scholarly and creative activities through collaboration and building partnerships that enhance teaching, discovery, and lifelong learning.

Objective A: Develop and deliver earth science education programs and public presentations

Performance Measure:
- Educational programs for public audiences

Benchmark: The number of educational reports and presentations TBD based on previous years and staffing.

GOAL 4: COMMUNITY AND CULTURE (SERVICE)

Context: We are committed to a culture of service to Idaho. We value the diversity of Idaho’s geologic resources and diversity of community uses. We strive to partner with communities and stakeholders to increase the intellectual capacity to resolve resource challenges facing Idaho and consumers of our state resources.

Objective A: Develop and deliver products serving all sectors of users.

Performance Measure and Benchmark: (included in deliverables listed in Goal 1)

KEY EXTERNAL FACTORS:

Funding:

Achievement of strategic goals and objectives is dependent on appropriate state funding and staffing levels. External research support is largely subject to federal program funding and increasing state competition for federal programs. Partnerships
with state agencies and private sector sponsors are expanding. Many external programs require a state match and are dependent on state funding level.

Demand for services and products:

Changes in demand for geologic information due to energy and minerals economics play an important role in achievement of strategic goals and objectives. State population growth and requirements for geologic information by public decision makers and land managers are also key external factors.
Part 1 – Agency Profile

Agency Overview
The Idaho Geological Survey is the lead state agency for the collection, interpretation, and dissemination of geologic and mineral data for Idaho. The agency has served the state since 1919 and prior to 1984 was named the Idaho Bureau of Mines and Geology. The agency is staffed by about nine state-funded FTEs and 20-25 externally funded temporary and part-time employees.

Members of the Idaho Geological Survey staff acquire geologic information through field and laboratory investigations and through cooperative programs with other governmental and private agencies. The Idaho Geological Survey’s geologic mapping program is the primary applied research function of the agency. The Survey’s Digital Mapping Laboratory is central to compiling, producing, and delivering new digital geologic maps. Other main Idaho Geological Survey programs include geologic hazards, hydrology, mining, mine safety training, abandoned and inactive mines inventory, and earth science education outreach. As Idaho grows, demand is increasing for geologic information related to population growth, mineral-, energy-, and water-resources, landslides and earthquakes.

Core Functions/Idaho Code
Idaho Code Title 47, Chapter 2, defines the authority, administration, advisory board members, functions and duty of the Idaho Geological Survey. The section contents:

- **Section 47-201**: Creates the Idaho Geological Survey to be administered as a special program at the University of Idaho. Specifies the purpose as the lead state agency for the collection, interpretation and dissemination of geologic and mineral information. Establishes a survey advisory board and designates advisory board members and terms.

- **Section 47-202**: Provides for an annual meeting of the advisory board, and location of the chief office at the University of Idaho. Specifies the director of the Idaho Geological Survey report to the President of the University through the Vice President for Research. Specifies for the appointment of a state geologist.

- **Section 47-203**: Defines the duty of the Idaho Geological Survey to conduct statewide studies in the field and in the laboratory, and to prepare and publish reports on the geology, hydrology, geologic hazards and mineral resources of Idaho. Provides for establishment of a publication fund. Allows the Survey to seek and accept funded projects from, and to cooperate with, other agencies. Allows satellite offices at Boise State University and Idaho State University.

- **Section 47-204**: Specifies the preparation, contents, and delivery of a Survey Annual Report.
University of Idaho
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STRATEGIC PLAN 2015-2019

VISION STATEMENT:
Improved health and productivity of Idaho’s food-producing livestock

MISSION STATEMENT:
Transfer science-based medical information and technology concerning animal well-being, zoonotic diseases, food safety, and related environmental issues – through education, research, public service, and outreach – to veterinary students, veterinarians, animal owners, and the public, thereby effecting positive change in the livelihood of the people of Idaho and the region.

Authority and Scope:
The original Tri-State Veterinary Education Program (WOI Regional Program – Washington State University, Oregon State University, and University of Idaho) was authorized in 1973 by the Idaho Legislature (SJM 127). The Program in Idaho is administered by the State Board of Education and The Board of Regents of the University of Idaho. The first Idaho-resident students were enrolled in the program in 1974. In September 1977, the Caine Veterinary Teaching Center (CVTC) at Caldwell, an off-campus unit of the University of Idaho’s then Veterinary Science Department, was opened as a part of Idaho’s contribution to the WOI Regional Program in Veterinary Medicine. Oregon withdrew from the cooperative program in 2005. In 2012, Washington State University and Utah State University (USU) announced a new educational partnership (W-I-U). In 2013, Montana State University (MSU) became a fourth partner in what is now known as the Washington-Idaho-Montana-Utah (WIMU) Regional Program in Veterinary Medicine. The first DVM class to include MSU students will be admitted in Fall 2014.

The CVTC serves as a food animal referral hospital/teaching center located in Caldwell where senior veterinary students from Washington State University/College of Veterinary Medicine (WSU/CVM) participate in elective rotations that focus on food animal production medicine. The CVTC program is administered through the Department of Animal and Veterinary Science (AVS), in UI’s College of Agricultural and Life Sciences (CALS).
The Program allows Idaho resident students access to a veterinary medical education through a cooperative agreement with WSU, whereby students are excused from paying out-of-state tuition. The program currently provides access for 11 Idaho-resident students per year (funding for 44 students annually).

The American Veterinary Medical Association (AVMA) accredits the WIMU Program. Faculty members are specialized in virology, bacteriology, pharmacology, epidemiology, medicine, and surgery, and hold joint appointments between the UI College of Agricultural and Life Sciences in the AVS Department (scholarly activities/research/service) and the WIMU Regional Program in Veterinary Medicine (education/service/outreach/engagement).

The service and diagnostic components of the CVTC are integral to the food animal production medicine teaching program, offering clinical and laboratory diagnostic assistance for individual animal care or disease outbreak investigation for veterinarians and livestock producers in Idaho and surrounding states. Live animals referred by practicing veterinarians are utilized as hospital teaching cases for students when on rotation at that time. Students have access to select, in-house laboratories to process samples they collect and analyze the results. Practicing veterinarians throughout the state who need diagnostic help with disease problems also send samples directly to the laboratories at the CVTC for analyses. Diagnostic services and assistance are also provided to Idaho State Department of Agriculture and to the Idaho Department of Fish and Game. When additional services are required or requested by practitioners, personnel at CVTC receive, process, and ship samples to other diagnostic laboratories.

The establishment of the original “WOI Program” motivated the development of a cooperative graduate program with WSU, allowing cross-listing of the WSU Veterinary Science graduate courses. Thus, UI students are able to enroll for graduate coursework, through the University of Idaho, leading to the Master’s degree from the UI and/or to the PhD degree from WSU. The cooperative graduate program has enhanced research cooperation between WSU and UI faculty members.

Supervision and leadership for programs, operations, the faculty and staff at the CVTC are the responsibility the Director, Dr. Gordon W. Brumbaugh; and, administrative responsibility is with the Head of the AVS Department, Dr. Mark McGuire, and Dean of CALS, Dr. John Foltz.

Education:

Faculty members who are teaching-oriented and have clinical problem-solving skills provide 1- to 4-week blocks of time designed to prepare veterinary students for entry-level positions when they graduate. Opportunities target general food animal medicine, dairy production medicine, cow/calf management, feedlot medicine, sheep/lambing management, and small ruminant clinical medicine.
Activities are selected that allow the student to develop and gain confidence in technical skills as well as professional critical thinking and management of information. Disease agents, fluid therapy, appropriate drug use, nutrition, diagnostic sampling, and necropsy are examples of skills emphasized during individual animal medicine instruction at the CVTC. Production animal medicine stresses development of confidence with professional/technical skills, disease prevention strategies, investigational skills, animal well-being, recordkeeping and interpretation, and reduction of stress for beef or dairy cattle, and for small ruminants (primarily sheep and goats).

Five faculty positions are budgeted in the Idaho Program. In 2013, one faculty member that was stationed at the Moscow campus resigned and has not yet been replaced. Three faculty members are stationed at the CVTC, Caldwell, ID, and one vacancy exists. Also in 2013, the Dawn and Wes Downs Pre-Veterinary Intern Endowed Scholarship was initiated and provides experiential opportunities at the CVTC specifically for a student in the AVS Department undergraduate pre-veterinary program. The Northwest-Bovine Veterinary Experience Program (NW-BVEP) –started in 2007 for a limited number of first- and second-year WSU/CVM veterinary students– is a 6-week summer dairy/beef veterinary experiential learning program funded primarily by grants and gifts. Broadening recognition of the program, successful career development provided, and the growing support (tangible and intangible) are all indicators that the NW-BVEP should be continued.

The CVTC and AVS faculty are involved in state-wide producer educational programs using the CVTC facilities, when appropriate, to offer continuing education programs for veterinarians and livestock producers.

**Scholarly Activities/Research/Service:**

Nationally- and internationally- acclaimed research has been conducted at the CVTC and includes subjects of cryptosporidiosis, anaplasmosis, neonatal calf diseases, fluid therapy, reproductive diseases of cattle and sheep, genetic control of ovine foot rot, EID (electronic identification) of beef cattle, Johne’s disease in cattle, sheep, and goats, and scrapie in sheep. Collaboration with the Idaho Department of Fish & Game regarding wildlife/domestic livestock disease interaction has resulted in elucidation of respiratory organisms causing death in bighorn sheep. Research in many of those areas developed out of past experiences involving teaching/clinical or diagnostic services/outreach. Those activities serve as a source for continuing investigational activities. Funding to conduct research is derived from a variety of sources and results have been published in numerous scientific papers. The research is dedicated primarily to that relevant to regional disease problems.

**Service/Outreach/Engagement/Extension:**

Faculty members of the CVTC have responsibility for outreach activities, although none of them have official Extension appointments. Their routine activities such as daily/regular interaction and consultation with livestock producers, commodity groups,
veterinarians, UI Extension specialists, and others regarding a variety of topics including: production medicine; disease diagnostics, control, or prevention; and, reproductive problems are all service-oriented. Those activities are major contributors to “hours of operation” of the CVTC and can include receiving, processing, and/or shipping of samples for diagnostic services requested by practicing veterinarians. Several faculty members contribute material on a regular basis to lay publications and industry newsletters, and many are active in state and national professional associations. Faculty and staff members organize on-site tours for individual students, groups, or organizations as well as area residents who are interested in our activities, give presentations at county and state fairs, and participate in “Career Day” or “Job Fair” events at area high schools.

Selective diagnostic services, disease investigations, and clinical studies have significantly benefited many producers through the control of a number of economically devastating diseases. That form of assistance is provided on a fee-for-service basis and in conjunction with the veterinary teaching program. The veterinary pathology discipline was significantly diminished in 2005 when the second of two board-certified veterinary pathologists at the CVTC retired and was not replaced.

Goal 1. Education

Objective A: Continue to provide and improve the highly-rated and effective experiential veterinary clinical teaching program.

Action Items:

- Ensure offerings of elective rotations for experiential learning opportunities that meet contractual requirements (65 rotations offered)

Performance Measures:

- Percentage of elective offerings (blocks) filled

Benchmark:

- Student participation in at least 90% of elective rotations offered

Objective B: Pre-clinical veterinary educational opportunities

Action items:

- Administer experiential summer learning opportunities for first- and second-year students in veterinary education program (Northwest Bovine Veterinary Experience Program – NW-BVEP)
• Administer experiential learning opportunities for endowed pre-veterinary summer internship and scholarship

Performance Measures:
• Annual recurring placement of students

Benchmark:
• Total of 12 first- and second-year veterinary students in the NW-BVEP annually
• One student annually selected to receive the internship/scholarship

Goal 2. Scholarly and Creative Activity

Objective: To provide the atmosphere, environment, encouragement, and time for faculty members to cultivate and nurture their scholarly and creative abilities.

Action Items:
• Encourage faculty to remain influential in their professional/educational disciplines appropriate to the educational mission of the CVTC
• Contribute to the AVS Department area of excellence and the CALS Livestock Program of Distinction by the Idaho Veterinary Medical Education Program

Performance Measures:
• Number of fellows in disciplinary associations
• Personnel elected to leadership role in professional organizations
• Personnel invited to participate as presenters/speakers/advisors for professional organizations, private businesses, or public agencies/institutions

Benchmark:
• Participation in at least one departmental area of excellence and in the CALS Livestock POD
• At least one invited presentation by each faculty member to local, state, regional, national, or international meeting.
Goal 3. Outreach and Engagement

Objective A: Provide diagnostic laboratory, referral professional services, consultation, and field services for the veterinarians and livestock producers in Idaho and the region.

Action Items:

- Update clinical and laboratory instrumentation as budgets allow; thereby, maintaining or enhancing diagnostic laboratory testing procedures and services for veterinarians and livestock producers in the region.

- Encourage continuing education (personal and professional development) by laboratory or clinical support personnel in their given specialty.

Performance Measures:

- Number of field investigations; number of animals/herds served

- Number of laboratory diagnostic and live animal case accessions

Benchmarks:

- At least 250 live-animal clinical accessions per year

- At least 10,000 laboratory accessions per year

- At least 150 field investigations per year

- At least 75 necropsies per year

Objective B: Endeavor to recruit potential students in Idaho and the region who are interested in careers in agriculture and/or veterinary medicine.

Action Items:

- Encourage the participation of faculty and staff in Extension activities, community activities such as "job fairs", 4-H/FFA activities, and county fairs, etc., in order to elevate the visibility of the CVTC, AVS, CALS, and UI; and, to discuss future needs and careers in agriculture or veterinary medicine.

Performance Measures:

- Number of job fairs, career day or fair activities, or Extension-sponsored meetings in which faculty and staff participated
Benchmarks:

- Participation in at least 10 community activities as described above

External Factors:

1) **Caseload.** Numbers vary for live animal and diagnostic accessions subject to need and economic demand. Ideally, those should be sufficient for instructional goals and objectives as well as to support in-house laboratories. Employment of two faculty members to fill the current vacancies would allow growth in this area to meet requests from practitioners and promote capabilities/technologies currently being developed.

2) **Loss of essential personnel.** Many factors have contributed to suboptimal numbers of personnel currently at the CVTC. In 2013 the number of faculty was decreased to 3 due to resignations and positions left unfilled. It is difficult to hire and retain sufficient numbers of qualified individuals to meet current demands of the program. Positions have been restructured and funding sources modified to the extent possible. There is also very limited means to recognize, reward, and retain individuals with outstanding performance. Growth can only occur after a stable base of resources is in place.

3) **Diagnostic Veterinary Pathology.** This position has been vacant since the retirement of the second of our two veterinary pathologists in 2005. The Pathology specialty is in high demand in veterinary medicine and by clientele of the CVTC. We are outsourcing some diagnostic services, but are unable to incorporate this extremely important specialty in the veterinary teaching program at this time. Diagnostic Veterinary Pathology has been a core service for the producers and veterinarians of Idaho and the surrounding region. The study of disease (pathology) will always be an indispensable discipline for livestock production, veterinary medicine, homeland biosecurity, international marketing, and regulatory activities. The importance was reinforced by wording in the 2014 Farm Bill (ex. National Animal Health Laboratory Network (NAHLN), Animal Health and Disease Research/1433 Formula Funds, and Agriculture and Food Research Initiative (AFRI). The pathology discipline must be re-established at the CVTC.

4) **Agriculture beyond animal health.** Agriculture is the most important contributor to the economy of Idaho. Dairy Production and Beef Production are the two major (respectively) commodities. Other agricultural products and by-products (ex. alfalfa, cereal grains, beet pulp, and potato by-products) serve as cash crops for some producers; or, are utilized in Dairy and/or Beef Production. Idaho is strategically positioned for considerable influence on human and animal food production. That influence is local, regional, national, and international. Respective influences in those markets require that the CALS, AVS, and the CVTC become and remain astute to changes in those markets; and, to strategically prepare to help producers and veterinarians of the future. That requires trained personnel, foresight, resources, and opportunities.
Performance measures and notes listed below have been extracted from the FY13 WI Veterinary Medicine Performance Measurement Report. Refer to the Report in its entirety for more detail.

Performance Measures and Benchmarks:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>FY 2010</th>
<th>FY 2011</th>
<th>FY 2012</th>
<th>FY 2013</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Senior Veterinary Students Selecting Elective Rotations at the Caine Center.</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Number/Percentage of Idaho Resident New Graduates Licensed to Practice Veterinary Medicine in Idaho.</td>
<td>7 Students (64%)</td>
<td>7 Students (64%)</td>
<td>6 Students (56%)</td>
<td>9 Students (82%)</td>
<td>7 students (65%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Number of Disease Investigations Conducted by WI Faculty Members.</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Number/Dollar Amount of Grants/Contracts by WI Faculty Members.</td>
<td>10 / $303,350</td>
<td>9 / $358,651</td>
<td>8 / $242,476</td>
<td>8 / $326,332</td>
<td>7 / $300,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Performance Measure Notes:

Rotations offered as electives at the Caine Veterinary Teaching Center continue to be very popular with senior veterinary students and receive consistently high student evaluations. Diagnostic services and field service activities also remain strong.

Of the five faculty positions assigned to the W-I Program, four positions have been vacated during the period since July 2010 – one due to retirement (July 2010) and three due to resignation (September 2011, December 2012, and July 2013). The remaining faculty and one temporary hire have been handling a much heavier teaching and service/outreach load to try and maintain our teaching resources during that time. One position was filled (January 2013); Program Director and Veterinary Scientist, Dr. Gordon Brumbaugh, was hired and now provides leadership for the Caine Center and administrative structure for the W-I Veterinary Medicine Program. A Clinical Assistant Professor position has just been approved and a search will be conducted this fall. The two remaining vacancies each carry a portion of funding from Agricultural Research and Extension, and are under consideration by department and college administration.

Washington State University College of Veterinary Medicine (WSU CVM) has long been partners with the state of Idaho and the Western Interstate Commission of Higher Education (WICHE) program. WSU has announced a new educational partnership program with Utah State University (USU) at Logan. With this new partnership, the W-I Program is now known as the Washington-Idaho-Utah (WIU) Regional Program in Veterinary Medicine.

Designed as a “2+2 program”, the Utah students will spend their first two years in Logan, and the final two years at WSU in Pullman where, as seniors, they will have the opportunity to elect to participate in rotations at the Caine Center. Students accepted to this program earn a DVM degree from WSU College of Veterinary Medicine conferred by the Regents of Washington State University, with joint recognition of Utah State University. The first class of 20 Utah students entered the program at Logan in fall of 2012.
Part I – Agency Profile

Agency Overview
The W-I (Washington-Idaho) Veterinary Medicine Program is administered in Idaho by the Head of the Department of Animal and Veterinary Science, College of Agricultural and Life Sciences, University of Idaho. Originally established in 1974, the W-I Program annually provides 44 Idaho residents with access to a veterinary medical education through a cooperative agreement between the University of Idaho and Washington State University. The Doctor of Veterinary Medicine (DVM) degree is awarded to Idaho students by Washington State University College of Veterinary Medicine. Idaho provides the cooperative program with the majority of veterinary students who have an expressed interest in production agriculture animals.

Core Functions/Idaho Code
The University of Idaho provides educational opportunities for any senior student in the Washington State University College of Veterinary Medicine by providing the equivalent of 65, one-month teaching rotations in food animal production and clinical medicine at the Caine Veterinary Teaching Center (CVTC) in Caldwell. Faculty members at the Caine Center interact with Idaho veterinarians and livestock producers providing education and recommendations concerning animal production, diagnosis and clinical evaluation of disease situations.

1. Provide access to veterinary medical education at WSU for Idaho residents – the current W-I contract reserves 11 seats per year for Idaho veterinary medicine students. A total of 44 Idaho students are enrolled in this program each year.

2. Assist Idaho in meeting its needs for veterinarians – provide Idaho-trained, Idaho-resident graduate veterinarians to meet annual employment demands for the State. On average, 65-75% of new Idaho resident graduates of the W-I Program are licensed to practice veterinary medicine in Idaho annually.

3. Provide hands-on instruction opportunities for senior veterinary students – teaching rotations in food animal production medicine and clinical experience are offered year-round at the Caine Center in Caldwell.

4. Provide access to referrals from Idaho veterinarians in the areas of food animal production, diagnosis, and clinical evaluation of diseases – a) accept 400 to 500 hospital clinical referrals annually as student teaching cases; b) provide disease diagnostic testing on approximately 15,000 assays annually, and; c) conduct on-farm disease investigations for herd problems as requested by Idaho veterinarians and livestock producers.

Washington-Idaho Veterinary Medicine Program
Revenue and Expenditures:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>FY 2010</th>
<th>FY 2011</th>
<th>FY 2012</th>
<th>FY 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>$1,828,900</td>
<td>$1,822,500</td>
<td>$1,811,300</td>
<td>$1,882,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$1,828,900</td>
<td>$1,822,500</td>
<td>$1,811,300</td>
<td>$1,882,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>FY 2010</th>
<th>FY 2011</th>
<th>FY 2012</th>
<th>FY 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Costs</td>
<td>$528,000</td>
<td>$519,100</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$517,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenditures</td>
<td>1,200,900</td>
<td>1,203,400</td>
<td>1,211,300</td>
<td>1,244,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustee/Benefit Payments</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$1,828,900</td>
<td>$1,822,500</td>
<td>$1,811,300</td>
<td>$1,882,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Profile of Cases Managed and/or Key Services Provided:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases Managed and/or Key Services Provided</th>
<th>FY 2010</th>
<th>FY 2011</th>
<th>FY 2012</th>
<th>FY 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Idaho Resident Students Enrolled Each Year</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of One-Month Student Rotations (or equivalent) offered at the Caine Center Per Year</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Accepted Clinical Hospital Referral Cases</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Accepted Veterinary Diagnostic Samples</td>
<td>22,093</td>
<td>18,341</td>
<td>15,245</td>
<td>9,842</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Performance Highlights:

1) Teaching and learning at the Caine Center includes a variety of clinical experiences.
   A. Professional Students. Faculty instructs 4th-year veterinary students in hands-on production medicine and individual food animal medicine and surgery. Learning occurs in a variety of settings including hospital in/out-patient clinical care, field call services, disease investigations as well as formal presentations by faculty and guest lecturers. Several general and specialty blocks are offered, including:
   - **General Food Animal Production Medicine and Surgery** – Twelve 2-week rotations in which students participate in hands-on clinical food animal medicine and surgery from the in-house referral clinic, farm visits including dairy, beef, and small ruminant, live animal surgery labs, and small group lectures.
   - **Small Ruminant Production Medicine** – Two 2-week rotation in which students participate in all aspects of sheep, goat, and now including camelid production medicine. This block includes in-house referrals, breeding soundness exams, ultrasound pregnancy exams, treatment of urolithiasis, foot trimming, vaccination and parasite programs, and dystocia management.
   - **Cow/Calf Production Medicine** – Two 2-week rotations in which students participate in all aspects of cow/calf production medicine. Students participate in cattle processing activities at the Nancy M. Cummings Research, Extension and Education Center (NMCREEC) near Salmon, ID as well as field beef work in the Treasure Valley and on the Palouse.
   - **Reproductive Biotechnology** – Two 2-week rotations in which students are provided the opportunity to learn and practice techniques such as artificial insemination, ultrasonography of the reproductive tract of females, early pregnancy diagnosis, fetal sexing, and embryo transfer.
   - **Feedlot Production Medicine** – Two 2-week rotation in which students learn about feedlot layout(s) and management, feeding operation(s), hospital and processing, and bio-security programs. Students conduct a nutritional evaluation of the feedlot with a local feedlot nutritionist and prepare a comprehensive report and critique to be presented both in written and verbal format at the conclusion of the rotation.
   - **Lambing Management** – Two 2-week rotation in which students work alongside the crew of a large range-flock producer during the lambing period. Students participate in management of normal and abnormal pre-parturient, peri-parturient, and post-parturient ewes, neonatal diseases, and other routine veterinary procedures that arise during the lambing season.
   - **Beef Calving** – One 2-week rotation which gives students on-ranch experience in beef calving. Students are assigned to selected cow-calf operations. At their assigned location, students will be involved in intensive heifer calving, mature cow calving, and calving calls with local veterinarians. The students evaluate their assigned operation and prepare a written report at the conclusion of the rotation.
• **Dairy Production Medicine** – Three 2-week rotations in which students are exposed to all aspects of dairy production medicine. Students spend time with local dairy practitioners, U of I Extension dairy specialists, and a dairy nutritionist. They also are exposed to the products side of the dairy industry with tours of processing plants.

B. **Pre-veterinary Students.** A gift of $5,000 was given by the J.A. Wedum Foundation to support a pre-veterinary summer intern. The applicants for this internship are U of I pre-vet students who excel in academics and are interested in gaining some experience with production animal medicine before applying to veterinary school.

C. **Veterinary Technician Students.** We now offer a veterinary technician internship for College of Southern Idaho (CSI) students, in which the student works directly with our certified veterinary technician for a defined period of time to gain experience with production animals. We also provide cattle handling laboratories for veterinary technician students at two private institutions in the area.

2) Outreach is a major component of the CVTC program and the faculty and staff of the Caine Center. Activities consist of providing veterinary medical information and consultation to local and regional veterinarians, producers, small-herd or individual-animal owners; and, CVTC faculty regularly present continuing education programs for veterinarians at local, state, regional and national meetings. Faculty and staff present veterinary medical information to producers and animal owners both through oral presentations and in written format through Cooperative Extension Service publications and in lay magazines and journals. During the reporting period, CVTC faculty presented at the American Dairy Goat Association, Payette River Cattlemen’s Association annual meetings, at The Jackson Hole Veterinary Rendezvous and the American Association of Small Ruminant Practitioners annual conference. The CVTC faculty contributed to The Cattle Producers Library produced by the Western Beef Resource Committee. Presentations were made to local Extension Service programs across the state. The CVTC faculty contributed to the Owyhee County Cattleman’s Corner and to Idaho Cattle Association’s Line Rider. Tours of the CVTC and presentations at “career day” activities of local schools are also an outreach to the Idaho community. Members of the Caine Center faculty assist local and regional fairs with animal health and bio-security by performing health check of exhibited animals. Services were provided to the Payette, Owyhee, Twin Falls, Ada and Gem/Boise County Fairs.

3) FY2013 Grants and Contracts include $73,300 in funding for the Northwest Bovine Veterinary Experience Program (NW-BVEP). Now in its sixth year, the primary objective of this program is to use an aggressive mentoring program to increase the number of food animal veterinarians graduating from veterinary school and practicing in Idaho. Grant funding for this activity increased over $15,000 from FY2012, and supported stipends for 21 students participating in the 2013 summer program.

4) FY2013 Grants and Contracts also include $100,000 for a cooperative project with the Idaho Department of Fish and Game in the area of wildlife/domestic disease interaction, now in its 20th year. Topics of investigation under this project umbrella include Pasteurella, Mannheimia, Bibersteinia and Mycoplasma species (P: GC Weiser et al). Summary of recent research:

A. Developed analyses of shedding of microbial pathogens by domestic sheep. This is a continuation of the cooperative UI/Caine Center and Idaho Fish & Game-USDA/ARS project to ascertain the flora and shedding patterns of domestic sheep, which could affect bighorn sheep health and management.

B. Defined mycoplasma from domestic and bighorn sheep, and identified virulence factors for further analysis.

C. Characterized a portion of the Pasteurellaceae collection and domestic sheep isolates by gcp PCR and 16S rRNA sequencing. This has been a major thrust and will be finished soon. These data will help elucidate the identities of pathogens carried by bighorn and domestic sheep and their relationships.

D. Publications: Three refereed publications came into print during the last year. Another has been accepted and one more is in review.
5) A project initiated four years ago utilizing UI and USDA-ARS funding, followed the bacterial shedding characteristics of 125 sheep at the U. S. Sheep Experiment Station (USSES) at Dubois, ID over a two-year period. Analysis indicated that individual sheep do indeed shed Pasteurellaceae potential pathogens at different rates. The results of that project stimulated research collaboration between USDA-ARS and the University of Idaho for a five-year, $150,000 project to study the genetics of the sheep with regard to shedding of pathogens which cause respiratory disease (PI: GC Weiser, D Knowles et al).

6) Teaching and learning have also been an integral part of the wildlife/domestic disease research conducted at the Caine Center. This year we mentored a local student (Wilder High School) in a dual-enrollment honors program.

7) During FY 2013, the Faculty at the Caine Center continued efforts in applied research, often in conjunction with veterinary teaching and outreach activities:
   - A vaccine project is being conducted at the Nancy M. Cummings REEC (NMCREEC) near Salmon, ID to evaluate the potential of a vaccine for control of scours. This is a 3- to 5-year study funded by Zoetis (formerly Pfizer) Animal Health (PI: J England).
   - A flock of scrapie-positive sheep is still being maintained at the Caine Center. Tissues from these animals are utilized in ongoing research. We have on average 50 sheep available to TSE researchers, plus a very large bank of frozen tissues with known disease history and genotype. We also have a collection of scrapie brain homogenates, one of which has been described in the literature. One research paper is in the review process in collaboration with researchers in New Zealand, and a research abstract was presented at the International Sheep Conference in Rotorura, NZ, Feb. 2013 (PI: R. Kittelberger, SJ Sorensen et al).
   - Research continued this past year in the management of Johne’s disease in sheep and goats, also allowing for student interaction with several cooperative flocks and herds. Activities included: ultrasound pregnancy examination of yearling goats, collection of samples, and on-farm assistance with goat kidding (PI: N Dalton, MW Ayers, B Mamer).
   - The laboratory services program at the Caine Center includes a new contract with a private cancer research company which produces Immunohistochemistry (IHC) Assay Kits to identify prions in animal tissue. The Caine Center’s experience and volume of scrapie tissue are utilized in quality assurance testing.

Part II – Performance Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>FY 2010</th>
<th>FY 2011</th>
<th>FY 2012</th>
<th>FY 2013</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Senior Veterinary Students Selecting Elective Rotations at the Caine Center.</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Number/Percentage of Idaho Resident New Graduates Licensed to Practice Veterinary Medicine in Idaho.</td>
<td>7 Students (64%)</td>
<td>7 Students (64%)</td>
<td>6 Students (56%)</td>
<td>9 Students (82%)</td>
<td>7 students (65%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Number of Disease Investigations Conducted by WI Faculty Members.</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Number/Dollar Amount of Grants/Contracts by WI Faculty Members.</td>
<td>10 / $303,350</td>
<td>9 / $358,651</td>
<td>8 / $242,476</td>
<td>8 / $326,332</td>
<td>7 / $300,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Performance Measure Notes:

Rotations offered as electives at the Caine Veterinary Teaching Center continue to be very popular with senior veterinary students and receive consistently high student evaluations. Diagnostic services and field service activities also remain strong.

Of the five faculty positions assigned to the W-I Program, four positions have been vacated during the period since July 2010 – one due to retirement (July 2010) and three due to resignation (September 2011, December 2012, and July 2013). The remaining faculty and one temporary hire have been handling a much heavier teaching and service/outreach load to try and maintain our teaching resources during that time. One position was filled (January 2013); Program Director and Veterinary Scientist, Dr. Gordon Brumbaugh, was hired and now provides leadership for the Caine Center and administrative structure for the W-I Veterinary Medicine Program. A Clinical Assistant Professor position has just been approved and a search will be conducted this fall. The two remaining vacancies each carry a portion of funding from Agricultural Research and Extension, and are under consideration by department and college administration.

Washington State University College of Veterinary Medicine (WSU CVM) has long been partners with the state of Idaho and the Western Interstate Commission of Higher Education (WICHE) program. WSU has announced a new educational partnership program with Utah State University (USU) at Logan. With this new partnership, the W-I Program is now known as the Washington-Idaho-Utah (WIU) Regional Program in Veterinary Medicine.

Designed as a “2+2 program”, the Utah students will spend their first two years in Logan, and the final two years at WSU in Pullman where, as seniors, they will have the opportunity to elect to participate in rotations at the Caine Center. Students accepted to this program earn a DVM degree from WSU College of Veterinary Medicine conferred by the Regents of Washington State University, with joint recognition of Utah State University. The first class of 20 Utah students entered the program at Logan in fall of 2012.

For More Information Contact

Gordon W. Brumbaugh, DVM, PhD
Associate Professor and Director
Health Programs, W-I Veterinary Medicine
Caine Veterinary Teaching Center
1020 E. Homedale Road
Caldwell, ID 83607
Phone: (208) 454-8657
E-mail: gordonb@uidaho.edu
Web: www.cainecenter.uidaho.edu
WWAMI is Idaho’s regional medical education program, under the leadership and institutional mission of the University of Idaho, in partnership with the University of Washington School of Medicine (UWSOM). Idaho medical students spend the first year of their medical education on the campus of the University of Idaho in Moscow, study medicine on the campus of UWSOM in Seattle during their second year, and complete their third and fourth year clinical training at regional medical sites in Boise, across Idaho, or throughout the WWAMI (Washington, Wyoming, Alaska, Montana, Idaho) region.

As the medical education contract program for the State of Idaho with the University of Washington, the UI-WWAMI Medical Program supports the Strategic Action Plan of its host university, the University of Idaho, while recognizing its obligation
to the mission, goals, and objectives of its nationally accredited partner program, the UWSOM.

UWSOM and its partner WWAMI Medical Program in Idaho are dedicated to improving the general health and wellbeing of the public. In pursuit of our goals, we are committed to excellence in biomedical education, research, and health care. The UWSOM and WWAMI are also dedicated to ethical conduct in all of our activities. As the pre-eminent academic medical center in our region and as a national leader in biomedical research, UWSOM places special emphasis on educating and training physicians, scientists, and allied health professionals dedicated to two distinct missions:

- **Meeting the health care and workforce needs of our region**, especially by recognizing the importance of primary care and providing service to underserved populations;
- **Advancing knowledge** and assuming leadership in the biomedical sciences and in academic medicine.

We acknowledge a special responsibility to the people in the states of Washington, Wyoming, Alaska, Montana, and Idaho, who have joined in a unique regional partnership. UWSOM and WWAMI are committed to building and sustaining a diverse academic community of faculty, staff, fellows, residents, and students and to assuring that access to education and training is open to learners from all segments of society, acknowledging a particular responsibility to the diverse populations within our region.

**Vision for Medical Student Education**

Our students will be highly competent, knowledgeable, caring, culturally sensitive, ethical, dedicated to service, and engaged in lifelong learning.

**UWSOM – Idaho WWAMI Medical Student Education Mission Statement**
Our mission is to improve the health and wellbeing of people and communities throughout the WWAMI region, the nation, and the world through educating, training, and mentoring our students to be excellent physicians.

**Goals for Medical Student Education**

In support of our mission to educate physicians, our goals for medical student training are to:

1. Challenge students and faculty to achieve excellence;
2. Maintain a learner-centered curriculum that focuses on patient-centered care and that is innovative and responsive to changes in medical practice and healthcare needs;
3. Provide students with a strong foundation in science and medicine that prepares them for diverse roles and careers;
4. Advance patient care and improve health through discovery and application of new knowledge;
5. Teach, model, and promote:
   a. the highest standards of professionalism, honor, and integrity, treating others with empathy, compassion, and respect;
   b. a team approach to the practice of medicine, including individual responsibility and accountability, with respect for the contributions of all health professions and medical specialties;
   c. the skills necessary to provide quality care in a culturally sensitive and linguistically appropriate manner;
6. Encourage students to maintain and model a balanced and healthy lifestyle;
7. Foster dedication to service, including caring for the underserved;
8. Engage students in healthcare delivery, public health, and research to strengthen their understanding of healthcare disparities and regional and global health issues; and
9. Provide leadership in medical education, research, and health policy for the benefit of those we serve regionally, nationally, and globally.

**Alignment with the Idaho State Board of Education’s Strategic Plan**

**2015-2019**

**Goal I: A WELL EDUCATED CITIZENRY** — Continuously improve access to medical education for individuals of all backgrounds, ages, abilities, and economic means.
Objective A: Access - Provide outreach activities that help recruit a strong medical student applicant pool for Idaho WWAMI.

- **Performance measure**: the number of Idaho WWAMI medical school applicants per year and the ratio of Idaho applicants per funded medical student seat.
- **Benchmark**: National ratio of state applicants to medical school per state-supported seats.

Objective B: Transition to Workforce - Maintain a high rate of return for Idaho WWAMI graduate physicians who choose to practice medicine in Idaho, equal to or better than the national state return rate.

- **Performance measure**: Cumulative Idaho WWAMI return rate for graduates who practice medicine in Idaho.
- **Benchmark**: target rate – national average or better.

**GOAL 2: CRITICAL THINKING AND INNOVATION** - WWAMI will provide an environment for the development of new ideas, and practical and theoretical knowledge to foster the development of biomedical researchers, medical students, and future physicians who contribute to the health and wellbeing of Idaho’s people and communities.

Objective A: Critical Thinking, Innovation and Creativity – Generate research and development of new ideas into solutions that benefit health and society.

- **Performance Measure**: WWAMI faculty funding from competitive federally funded grants.
- **Benchmark**: $3M annually, through FY14.

Objective B: Innovation and Creativity – Educate medical students who will contribute creative and innovative ideas to enhance health and society.

- **Performance Measures**: Percentage of Idaho WWAMI medical students participating in medical research (laboratory and/or community health)
- **Benchmark**: 100%

Objective C: Quality Instruction – Provide excellent medical education in biomedical sciences and clinical skills.
• **Performance measure**: pass rate on the U.S. Medical Licensing Examination (USMLE), Steps 1 & 2, taken medical training.

• **Benchmark**: U.S. medical student pass rates, Steps 1 & 2.

GOAL 3: Effective and Efficient Delivery Systems – Deliver medical education, training, research, and service in a manner which makes efficient use of resources and contributes to the successful completion of our medical education program goals for Idaho.

**Objective A**: Increase medical student early interest in rural and primary care practice in Idaho.

• **Performance measure**: the number of WWAMI rural summer training placements in Idaho each year.

• **Benchmark**: 20 rural training placements following first year of medical education.

**Objective B**: Increase medical student participation in Idaho clinical rotations (clerkships) as a part of their medical education.

• **Performance measure**: the number of WWAMI medical students completing clerkships in Idaho each year.

• **Benchmark**: 20 clerkship students each year.

**Objective C**: Support and maintain interest in primary care and identified physician workforce specialty needs for medical career choices among Idaho WWAMI students.

• **Performance measure**: Percent of Idaho WWAMI graduates choosing primary care, psychiatry, general surgery, and OB/GYN specialties for residency training each year.

• **Benchmark**: 50% of Idaho WWAMI graduating class choosing needed workforce specialties for residency training each year.

**Objective D**: Maintain a high level Return on Investment (ROI) for all WWAMI graduates who return to practice medicine in Idaho.

• **Performance measure**: Ratio of all WWAMI graduates who return to practice medicine in Idaho, regardless of WWAMI origin, divided by the total number of Idaho medical student graduates funded by the State.

• **Benchmark**: target ratio – 60%

**Objective E**: Efficiently deliver medical education under the WWAMI contract, making use of Idaho academic and training resources.

• **Performance measure**: Percent of Idaho WWAMI medical education contract dollars spent in Idaho each year.

• **Benchmark**: 50%
Key External Factors (beyond the control of the Idaho WWAMI Medical Program):

**Funding:** the number of state-supported Idaho medical student seats each year is tied to State legislative appropriations. Availability of revenues and competing funding priorities may vary each year.

**Medical Education Partnerships:** as a distributed medical education model, the University of Idaho and the UWSOM WWAMI Medical Program rely on medical education partnership with local and regional physicians, clinics, hospitals, and other educational institutions in the delivery of medical training in Idaho. The availability of these groups to participate in a distributed model of medical education varies according to their own budget resources and competing demands on their time and staff each year.

**Population Changes in Idaho:** with a growing population and an aging physician workforce, the needs for doctors and medical education for Idaho’s students only increases. Changes in population statistics in Idaho may affect applicant numbers to medical school, clinical care demands in local communities and hospitals, and availability of training physicians from year to year.

**Planned Changes to Medical Curriculum in 2015:** the University of Washington School of Medicine is currently engaged in a major review and revision of the medical school curriculum which will impact delivery of education and training in the WWAMI programs in Idaho. It is not know, yet, what impact these proposed changes will have.
Supplement: Performance Measures

Goal 1 / Objective A. The benchmark is the national ratio of state applicants to medical school to the number of state supported seats. The ratio of applicants in Idaho to the number of available seats was 8.6:1; the national ratio of in-state applicants to available seats is 2.2:1.

Goal 1 / Objective B. The benchmark is 41%, the national average of students that return to their native state to practice medicine. In Idaho, the return rate was 51% (271/533).

Goal 2 / Objective A. The benchmark for this objective is $3M annually, through 2014. In FY13, UI WWAMI faculty earned $4.4M in new funding from federal grants.

Goal 2 / Objective B. The benchmark is 100% of Idaho WWAMI students participating in medical research. All students at the UWSOM must participate in a research activity.

Goal 2 / Objective C. The benchmark for the U.S. Medical Licensing Examination (USMLE), Steps 1 & 2, is the U.S. medical student pass rates.

Goal 3 / Objective A. The benchmark is 20 rural training placements following the first year of medical education. During the past summer, twenty-one students completed a R/UOP experience in Idaho.

Goal 3 / Objective B. The benchmark is 20 clerkships per year in Idaho. The Idaho Track is a voluntary program of the University of Washington School of Medicine in which students complete the majority of required clinical clerkships within Idaho. Third-year Idaho Track medical students complete five of six required clerkships in Idaho, and fourth-year Idaho Track medical students complete three of four required clerkships in Idaho. Thirteen third-year students and fourteen fourth-year students participated in the Idaho Track during the 2012-2013 academic year. In addition to Idaho Track students, other UWSOM students rotated among the various clinical clerkships in Idaho.

Goal 3 / Objective C. The benchmark is 50% of the Idaho WWAMI graduating class choosing a specialty for residency training that is needed in the state (primary care, psychiatry, general surgery, and OB/GYN specialties). The specialties of the 2013 graduating class are as follows:

- Anesthesiology (1)
- Dermatology (1)
- Emergency medicine (1)
- Internal medicine (2)
Obstetrics – Gynecology (1)
Ophthalmology (3)
Orthopedic surgery (1)
Pediatrics (2)
Psychiatry (1)
Radiation – Diagnostic (4)
Radiation – Oncology (2)
Thoracic surgery (1)

Goal 3 / Objective D. The benchmark for the Return on Investment (ROI) for all WWAMI graduates who return to practice medicine in Idaho is 60%. The current ROI is 73%.

Goal 3 / Objective E. The benchmark for this objective is 50%, the percentage of Idaho WWAMI medical education dollars spent in Idaho each year. In FY13, 60% of the State appropriations were spent in Idaho.
Part 1 – Agency Profile

Agency Overview

The Idaho WWAMI Medical Education Program provides Idaho medical students with the opportunity to complete three of four years of medical school in Idaho, thereby developing their familiarity with the healthcare needs of the State and region, and increasing the likelihood that they will remain in Idaho communities to practice medicine. Twenty Idaho students complete their first year of medical school through the University of Washington School of Medicine’s (UWSOM) regional program at the University of Idaho’s (UI) Moscow campus, sharing resources and faculty with the joint program at Washington State University in Pullman, Washington. After completing their second year of training in Seattle, students have the opportunity to complete their 3rd and 4th year clinical training requirements in Idaho. These clinical rotations are coordinated through the Idaho WWAMI Medical Education Program office in Boise.

The first year WWAMI Program at UI is directed by Andrew Turner, PhD, who reports to the Provost at UI, and also functions as an Assistant Dean of the UWSOM. The WWAMI Medical Education Program office in Boise is directed by Mary Barinaga, MD, who reports to the Vice Dean for Regional Affairs at UWSOM, and also serves as an Assistant Dean in Idaho. The WWAMI Program at UI employs twelve part-time faculty (shared with other academic programs) and three administrative staff. Idaho students admitted to the WWAMI Medical Program are interviewed and selected by the Idaho Admissions Committee, a group of four Idaho physicians appointed by the Idaho State Board of Education, who work in cooperation with the University of Washington School of Medicine Admissions Committee.

The Idaho WWAMI Medical Education Program is committed to helping prepare physicians for medical practice in Idaho, regardless of eventual specialty selection, as well as increasing the number of physicians who choose to practice in rural or underserved areas. There is also a strong commitment to the partnership between excellence in research and teaching in medical education. On average, WWAMI faculty in Idaho brings in $5 Million each year in biomedical research awards. Cutting-edge research prepares the next generation of doctors to be well-informed and at the forefront of clinical medical practice. The WWAMI faculty at the University of Idaho and our clinical/research faculty in Boise, Pocatello, Caldwell, Coeur d’Alene, Idaho Falls, McCall, Sandpoint, Hailey, and other rural training communities are committed to being dynamic teachers and informed biomedical scholars.

In addition, WWAMI program goals include the continued development of humanitarian and service interests of our medical students, and recruitment from groups within Idaho that are traditionally underrepresented in medical school populations. WWAMI has established outreach programs to high schools and community colleges to encourage and prepare talented Idaho students from rural, underprivileged, or minority backgrounds who have an interest in medicine and health careers.

Core Functions/Idaho Code

The core function of the Idaho WWAMI Medical Education Program at the University of Idaho is to provide qualified Idaho residents with access to and education in medical training as part of the Idaho State Board of Education’s contract with the University of Washington School of Medicine. Idaho Code §33-3720 authorizes the State Board of Education to enter into contractual agreements to provide access for Idaho residents to qualified professional studies programs, and specifically, the WWAMI Medical Education Program (33-3717B(7)).
### WWAMI Revenue and Expenditures:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2010</th>
<th>FY 2011</th>
<th>FY 2012</th>
<th>FY 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Fund Balance</td>
<td>$305,684</td>
<td>$344,314</td>
<td>$230,973</td>
<td>$425,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>$3,395,500</td>
<td>$3,402,400</td>
<td>$3,451,600</td>
<td>$3,465,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted Current</td>
<td>388,874</td>
<td>418,449</td>
<td>463,763</td>
<td>518,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$3,784,374</td>
<td>$3,820,849</td>
<td>$3,915,363</td>
<td>$3,983,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Costs</td>
<td>$711,639</td>
<td>$706,452</td>
<td>$667,856</td>
<td>$752,266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenditures</td>
<td>157,319</td>
<td>287,996</td>
<td>168,612</td>
<td>149,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td>12,626</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>18,150</td>
<td>8,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustee/Benefit Payments</td>
<td>2,864,160</td>
<td>2,939,741</td>
<td>2,866,599</td>
<td>2,845,515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$3,745,744</td>
<td>$3,934,190</td>
<td>$3,721,218</td>
<td>$3,755,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending Fund Balance</td>
<td>$344,314</td>
<td>$230,973</td>
<td>$425,119</td>
<td>$652,626</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Revenue

- **General Fund**
- **Unrestricted Current**
- **Total**

#### Expenditure

- **Personnel Costs**
- **Operating Expenditures**
- **Capital Outlay**
- **Trustee/Benefit Payments**
- **Total**

### Cases Managed and/or Key Services Provided

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2010</th>
<th>FY 2011</th>
<th>FY 2012</th>
<th>FY 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Idaho Students Applying to UW Medical School (WWAMI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Average GPA ID WWAMI</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Average MCAT Score ID WWAMI</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Idaho Students Admitted to UW Medical School</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number/Percentage of Graduates Practicing in Idaho (cumulative)</td>
<td>242/49%</td>
<td>248/50%</td>
<td>254/49%</td>
<td>263/50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Performance Highlights:

1. In 2012-2013, 20 UWSOM students from Idaho completed their first year of medical school in Idaho. In addition, thirteen third-year and fourteen fourth-year UWSOM students (from Idaho and other WWAMI states) completed the majority of their third and fourth year clinical rotations within Idaho on the “Idaho Track”. Overall, a total of 110 different UWSOM third and fourth year medical students completed one or more clinical rotations in Idaho during this academic year. Those 110 medical students took a total of 241 individual clinical rotations in Idaho (176 required courses and 65 elective courses).

2. In February of 2013, the Idaho State Legislature appropriated funding to support five new first-year medical seats in the Idaho WWAMI Targeted Rural and Underserved Track program (TRUST). This expands Idaho class size to 25 medical students starting in fall 2013. The mission of TRUST is to provide a continuous connection between underserved communities, medical education, and health professionals in our region. This creates a full-circle pipeline that guides qualified students through a special curriculum connecting them with underserved communities in Idaho. In addition, this creates linkages to the UWSOM’s network of affiliated residency programs. The goal of this effort is to increase the medical workforce in underserved regions.

3. Idaho WWAMI continues to nurture student interest in rural and underserved medicine through offering rural training experiences like the “Rural Underserved Opportunities Program” (R/UOP) during the summer between their first and second years of medical school. During summer 2013, we placed 21 first-year medical students in this one-month rural primary care training experience throughout Idaho. In addition, the Idaho WWAMI R/UOP program received the 2012 Outstanding Program Award from the American Academy of Family Physicians, and was honored at their AAFP Foundation awards banquet in Philadelphia, PA.

4. This year, five Idaho medical students were elected as members of the UWSOM chapter of Alpha Omega Alpha, the national honor society for medicine. By national guidelines, these students must be in the top twenty-five percent of the class to be eligible for election, and must show evidence of personal and professional development as a physician-in-training, integrity, compassion, fairness in dealing with one's colleagues, and capacity for leadership. Our Idaho honorees were Camille Asher (Boise), Hillary Chisholm-Stiefel (Coeur d’Alene), Derek Hill (Idaho Falls), Brooke Jardine (Twin Falls), and Lucas Marchand (Pocatello).

5. Admission interviews for Idaho applicants took place in Boise January 7-11, 2013 and in Seattle March 4-8, 2013. Applicants choose their interview site; all interviews were done by Idaho physicians who make up the Idaho Admissions Committee during both weeks. For the entering class of 2013, Idaho received 158 total applications. Of these applicants, a total of 72 were interviewed, 44 in Boise and 32 in Seattle. Idaho WWAMI admission interviews in Boise are a permanent part of the WWAMI admission process for Idaho students.

6. WWAMI-affiliated faculty at the UI continues to be highly successful in bringing National Institute of Health biomedical research funding into Idaho. The Idaho INBRE Program, now in its fifth year of a five year, $16.6 Million NIH award to build Idaho’s biomedical research infrastructure, continues to expand research capacity at all nine of Idaho’s universities and colleges and the Boise VA, through shared faculty funding and student research training support. In addition, WWAMI faculty earned $4 million in new funding from NIH, to advance biomedical research in infectious and genetic diseases.
### Part II – Performance Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>FY 2010</th>
<th>FY 2011</th>
<th>FY 2012</th>
<th>FY 2013</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Idaho Applicants Per Year; Ratio of State Applicants Per Seat</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>2.2 : 1¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho WWAMI Pass Rate on the U.S. Medical Licensing Examination</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>91% ²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Idaho Rural Summer Medical Student Placements Per Year</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10 ³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Idaho WWAMI return rate for graduates who practice medicine in Idaho</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>39% ⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Idaho return on investment (ROI) for WWAMI graduates (five states) who practice medicine in Idaho</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>&gt;60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Idaho WWAMI graduates choosing primary care specialties for residency training</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>50% ⁵</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. This is the national ratio of in-state applicants per admitted students (2010)
2. U.S. Pass Rate
3. The target is 50% interest in rural training experiences
4. This is the national return rate for all medical schools in the U.S.
5. This target rate is per WWAMI mission

---

For More Information Contact

Joe Cloud, Ph.D.
WWAMI Medical Education Program
University of Idaho
875 Perimeter Drive, MS 4207
Moscow, ID 83844-4207
Phone: 208-885-6696
E-mail: jcloud@uidaho.edu

Mary Barinaga, M.D.
WWAMI Medical Education Program
University of Idaho - Boise
332 E. Front Street
Boise, ID 83702
Phone: 208-364-4544
E-mail: barinm@uw.edu
ISU Department of Family Medicine
Strategic Plan
2015-2019

Vision:
The Idaho State University Family Medicine Residency (ISU FMR) envisions a clinically rich residency program; graduating courteous, competent, rural physicians.

Mission:
ISU FMR is committed to interdisciplinary, evidence-based care and service to our patients and community; university-based education of residents and students; and recruitment of physicians for the State of Idaho.

Values:

PROFESSIONALISM – We adhere to the highest level of professionalism in our relationships with our patients, staff and colleagues

COMMUNICATION – We aspire to clear, open communications with each other and our patients; and to precise, well-formatted presentation of medical information to other physicians

QUALITY – We continually seek ways to analyze and improve the quality of care provided to our patients, and to fulfill the published criteria of excellence in residency education.

COLLEGIALITY – As medical educators and learners we coordinate education and care with colleagues from a wide range specialties and health professions.

INNOVATION – We espouse current innovations in primary health care including electronic record keeping and communication, and the Patient Centered Medical Home Model.

ACCOUNTABILITY – We are accountable to ourselves and to our sponsors for the financial viability of the residency and the efficiency of the department.

RESPONSIBILITY – We take responsibility for our actions and work to improve patient care through excellence in medical education.

RESPECT – We demonstrate respect for each other and those with whom we interact. We remain courteous in our interactions and in respecting diversity. Even if we disagree, we do so with both civility and a desire to reach mutually beneficial solutions.
JUSTICE – We believe all patients have a fundamental right of access to appropriate health care. We advocate for our patients and assist them in navigating through the health care system.

BENEFICENCE – Primum non nocere. Patients will not be harmed by our care. Resident education will not be abusive or excessive in work hours or disrespectful of personal needs.

AUTONOMY – We respect a patient’s right to decide their health care, and to information to assist in the decision making process.

GOAL 1: Access – Recruitment of physicians for Idaho
Objectives for access:

a. Work with Portneuf Medical Center to establish collaborative hospitalist program
   • Performance measure:
     ▪ Integration of hospitalist and residency services
   • Benchmark:
     ▪ Complete shared attending supervision: 24 weeks / 28 weeks.

b. Start the new rural training track (RTT) in Rexburg
   • Performance measure:
     ▪ Interview and enter match for the RTT
   • Benchmark:
     ▪ Match RTT residents

c. Expand first-year class to 7 residents and total residency size to 21 to fill Rural Training Track
   • Performance measure:
     ▪ Number of residents
   • Benchmark:
     ▪ Overall number of residents will increase

d. Structure the program so that 50% of graduates open their practices in Idaho
   • Performance Measure
     ▪ Number of graduates practicing in Idaho
   • Benchmark:
     ▪ 50% of graduates practicing in Idaho

GOAL 2: Quality – Sustain and continuously improve medical care for Idaho citizens through education, quality improvement, and clinical research
Objectives for quality:

a. Develop additional pediatric training opportunities with FMRI in Boise at St. Lukes.
   • Performance measure:
     ▪ Number of pediatric rotations
b. Improve Quality of Care criteria of a Patient Centered Medical Home
   - **Performance measure:**
     - Meet the national criteria of PCMH
   - **Benchmark:**
     - 2013: 75% of criteria met. 2014: 90% of criteria met.

c. Maintain and expand clinical research program by identifying new project opportunities
   - **Performance measure:**
     - Number of new clinical research projects
   - **Benchmark:**
     - Number of new research projects will increase

**GOAL 3: Efficiency – improve long-term financial viability of the department/residency program**

Objectives for efficiency:

a. Identify the best operational and financial structure to maximize funding streams and clinical revenues
   - **Performance measure:**
     - Identify residency structural change for the clinic to become a New Access Point for Health West.
   - **Benchmark:**
     - Integration of Health West and Pocatello Family Medicine

b. Transition residency program through change in ownership and administration of Portneuf Medical Center (PMC)
   - **Performance measure:**
     - Level of support from PMC for ISU Family Medicine
   - **Benchmark:**
     - No reduction in financial and programmatic support

c. Increase GME reimbursement
   - **Performance measure:**
     - GME dollars reimbursed through cost report
   - **Benchmark:**
     - Number of resident FTEs reimbursed

**External Factors (beyond control of the ISU Department of Family Medicine)**

a. Hospitalist program is dependent on financial support from PMC. The integration of the hospitalists and residency services is dependent on PMC/ISU affiliation.

b. For the rural training track RTT to move forward, Madison Memorial Hospital must have adequate financial resources. As of January 2010, Madison has postponed its financial commitment to the RTT. As of March 2013, Madison Memorial has a new CEO and is able to contemplate the local financial support. A new site director is being appointed and maintenance of accreditation being pursued to allow late implementation.

c. Applicant interest in the ISU FMR Rural Training Track.

2. Quality – Sustain and continuously improve medical care for Idaho citizens through education, quality improvement, and clinical research.
   a. Availability of pediatric training in Boise
   b. National criteria of a Patient Centered Medical Home.
   c. External research funding opportunities.

3. Efficiency- Improve the Long-term financial viability of the department/residency program.
   a. New Access Point funding
   b. Medicaid interim rate
   c. The policies of Legacy are critical to the long term viability of the residency programs that are housed in PMC.

Strategic Planning – Mid-term (3-5 years)
The ISU Department of Family Medicine has defined mid-term (3-5 years) and long-term (6-10 years) strategic planning components some of which are outlined below.

GOAL 1: Access – Recruitment of physicians for Idaho
Objectives for access
   1. Expand core residency program to 8-7-7 with two residents in RTT
      o Performance measure:
         ▪ Number of residents
      o Benchmark:
         ▪ Increased number of residents
   2. Start a rural & international academic fellowship program
      o Performance measure:
         ▪ Number of fellows
      o Benchmark:
         ▪ Increased fellows

GOAL 2: Efficiency – Improve long-term financial viability of the department/residency program
Objectives for access
1. Develop collaborative and supportive affiliation with Health West.
   - **Performance measure:**
     - Completion of joint budgeting process
   - **Benchmark:**
     - Meeting joint budgetary goal

2. Develop collaborative and supportive affiliation with PMC.
   - **Performance measure:**
     - Completion of affiliation agreement with agreed ongoing support.
   - **Benchmark:**
     - Dollar amount of financial support
Strategic Plan
2014-2018

Background:
The Idaho Small Business Development Center (Idaho SBDC) was established in 1986 as part of a nationwide network created to improve the success of small businesses. The U. S. Small Business Administration, the State of Idaho, the hosting institutes of higher education, and private donations fund the organization.

The Idaho SBDC network includes business consultants, trainers, support staff and volunteers that operate from the state’s colleges and universities. Boise State University’s College of Business and Economics serves as the host with administrative responsibility for directing the type and quality of services across the state. Six Regional offices are funded under sub-contracts with their host institutions. The locations result in 90% of Idaho’s businesses being within a 1 hour drive:

1. North Idaho College - Coeur d’Alene
2. Lewis-Clark State College - Lewiston
3. Boise State University – Boise and Nampa
4. College of Southern Idaho - Twin Falls
5. Idaho State University - Pocatello
6. Idaho State University - Idaho Falls

Services include confidential one-on-one consulting and focused training. Staff members are very involved in the business and economic development efforts in their areas and; therefore, are positioned to respond rapidly to the changing business environment.

Mission:
To enhance the success of small businesses in Idaho by providing high-quality consulting and training.

Vision:
Idaho SBDC clients are recognized as consistently outperforming their peers.

Tag Line:
Directions, Solutions, Impact

Operating Principles:
Service is the primary product of the Idaho SBDC. Creating and maintaining a high standard of service requires a commitment to four principles:

1. Focus on the Client: The very future of the Idaho SBDC program depends on creating satisfied clients. To this end, each client contact must be considered an opportunity to focus on client needs and desires. Responding quickly with individual attention to specific and carefully identified client needs, then seeking critical evaluation of performance are standard processes followed with each client and training attendee.

2. Devotion to Quality: Providing consulting and training through a quality process and constantly seeking ways to improve that process are necessary to providing exceptional service. Fostering teamwork, eliminating physical and organizational barriers that separate
people, establishing long-term relationships with partners and encouraging all to participate in
good improvement are some of the actions that demonstrate devotion to quality.

3. Concentration on Innovation: To innovate is to improve through change. Staff members
constantly seek ways to improve methods and processes and assume a leadership role in
trying new approaches to serve clients. Regular performance reviews, participation in related
organizations, and attending professional development workshops are some of the ways that
innovation is supported.

4. Commitment to Integrity: The Center values integrity and will conduct all of our services in an
ethical and consistent manner. We will do our best to provide honest advice to our clients
with our primary motivation to be the success of the business. In return, we also expect our
clients to be straightforward and share all information necessary to assist them in their
business.

Priorities:
The Idaho SBDC will focus on the following priorities:

1. Maximum client impact – While the SBDC provides services to all for-profit small businesses,
it is clear that a small percentage of businesses will contribute the majority of the impact.
Improving the ability to identify impact clients, develop services to assist them, and create
long-term connections will increase the effectiveness of the Idaho SBDC.

2. Strong brand recognition – The Idaho SBDC remains unknown to a large number of
businesses and entrepreneurs, as well as stakeholders. A consistent message and image to
convey the SBDC value in conjunction with systematic marketing are necessary to raise the
awareness of the SBDC value to both potential clients and stakeholders.

3. Increased resources – Federal funding remained level from 1998 until 2007 resulting in a
very lean operating budget and loss of several positions. A slight increase was received for
2008 however; additional resources – both cash and in-kind – are necessary to have an
impact on a greater portion of small businesses and entrepreneurs.

4. Organizational excellence – The Idaho SBDC is in the top 10% of SBDCs on all impact
measures, is consistently one of the top 5 states on the Chrisman impact survey, and
received accreditation in 2009 with no conditions. The organization must continually improve
to maintain this excellence.

Market Segments:
The small business market served by the Idaho SBDC can be divided into three segments. With
limited resources and the knowledge that in-depth, on-going consulting gives greater returns, the
focus is on Segment 3 – high impact clients. The Idaho SBDC Marketing Plan contains additional
information on state demographics and how these segments fit into the overall plan.

Segment 1:
Pre-venture – These potential clients are not yet in business. They will be assessed for the level
of effort already put into the venture. Entrepreneurs who have not moved beyond the idea stage
will be directed to a variety of resources to help them evaluate the feasibility of their idea. They
will need to take further steps before scheduling an appointment with a consultant. These pre-
venture clients will be less than 40% of the total clients and will receive 25% or less of consulting
services. A small segment of these clients will be designated as high impact potential clients
(Segment 3).

Segment 2:
Established businesses – This segment has already established a business. A consultant will
meet with them to evaluate their needs and formulate a plan to work together. The majority of
businesses in this category will have 20 employees or less. Over 60% of Idaho SBDC clients and
over 75% of consulting time will be spend on clients in this category. This segment will also
contain some businesses that will be designated as high impact potential (segment 3).
Segment 3:
Impact clients – This segment is composed of businesses with the potential to grow sales and jobs. It is further divided into those with expected short-term impact and those that are considered long-term growth clients. These businesses will receive focused long-term services and coaching and be tracked separately in the MIS system with a goal of spending at least 40% of time on these clients.

Segment 4:
Export and Technology clients – Focus is on these segments because exporting brings wealth into the state and technology companies tend to create higher paying jobs. Cross network teams have been created to assist these clients. Export companies are typically existing businesses while tech companies can occur in either pre-venture or existing business segments.

Success:
Success is defined as a client achieving the best possible outcome given their abilities and resources. Success does not necessarily mean that the business will start or that there will be increases in capital, sales, and jobs. For some clients, the best possible outcome is to decide not to open a business which has a high likelihood of failure. Preserving capital can be success in some situations. There may also be circumstances that cause a client to choose to limit the growth of their business. It is important to recognize the clients’ goals, help them understand their potential, and then jointly identify success.

Allocation of Resources:
The Idaho SBDC shifts resources as appropriate to achieve the goals of the Strategic Plan. Lean budgets have prompted shifting financial resources from operating to personnel to assure that Idaho small businesses receive the same level of service. Currently, the operating budget for the Idaho SBDC is at what is considered a floor for supporting existing personnel and offices. The annual budget for the Idaho SBDC is distributed as follows:
- Personnel = 71% of total budget, 90% excluding indirect costs
- Operating (travel, consultants, supplies, etc.) = 8% of total budget and 10% excluding indirect costs
- Indirect costs = 21%

Increases in funding will be directed toward client assistance. Reduction in funding will favor minor reductions in employee hours versus eliminating positions.

In addition to financial constraints, the Operations Manual sets a policy for allocation of time as 60% consulting, 20% training, and 20% administrative. Milestones for each center and minimum hours for consultants and regional directors are based on the time allocation. To maintain service at the existing level, operate within the financial constraints, and meet the time allocation policy, the Idaho SBDC focuses on shifting personnel resources to achieve strategic plan goals. For example, to shift the focus to high impact clients, requests for assistance from pre-venture businesses are shifted to training and web resources to free up consulting time. The SBDC will continue to use this model for distribution of resources to achieve the strategic plan goals as long as a constraint remains on operating resources.

Needs:
In the statewide survey – three areas were identified as top client needs Idaho SBDC:
- Access to capital
- Marketing
- Health care insurance
- Business model
- Mobile apps and tools

These topics will be the incorporated into training courses and professional development for consultants.
SWOT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERNAL</th>
<th>EXTERNAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strengths</strong></td>
<td><strong>Opportunities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No-cost</td>
<td>• Changes in the economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• People – expertise, passion, and professional development system</td>
<td>• Strategic partners – leveraging resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Public and private partnerships and networks</td>
<td>• Entrepreneurial culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Systems for high performance</td>
<td>• Increase in angel investors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Leadership at all levels</td>
<td>• New business trends – green, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weaknesses</strong></td>
<td><strong>Threats</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Market position – penetration of established small business market, brand, awareness beyond startup assistance (attraction of high growth companies)</td>
<td>• Economy – especially in rural areas, hard for businesses to succeed and hard for businesses in all area to find funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sharing tools and resources at state and national levels</td>
<td>• Past funding reductions at state and federal level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Large geographical area to cover</td>
<td>• Competitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Implementation – disciplined follow-up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Goals and Objectives:

**Maximum Client Impact**

**Goal 1:** Maintain Idaho SBDC client sales and employment growth at 8 times the growth of the average Idaho small business.

**Objective 1.1:** Proactively manage impact clients.

*Performance Measure:* Hours devoted to impact clients
*Benchmark:* 40% by December 2014.

**Objective 1.2:** Create and implement a systematic process for collecting and verifying impact.

*Performance Measure:* Percent of impact verified
*Benchmark:* 100% of impact verified by 2014.

**Objective 1.3:** Expand and integrate export assistance into the network.

*Performance Measure:* Collaborate with the International Business program to develop student projects for clients.
*Benchmark:* 5 student projects per year.

**Objective 1.4:** Create a systematic process for assisting technology-based clients.

*Performance Measure:* Obtain technology accreditation by July 2015.
*Benchmark:* Decision

*Performance Measure:* Use statewide Tech Team to assist technology companies.
*Benchmark:* 100 companies
Strong Brand Recognition

Goal 2: Increase brand awareness with stakeholders and the target market.

Objective 2.1: Develop and implement a process for systematically communicating our impact and our success with stakeholders.
   Performance Measure: Distribute success stories
   Benchmark: Quarterly

Performance Measure: Develop and send an electronic newsletter to stakeholders.
   Benchmark: Quarterly

Objective 2.2: Increase articles, posts, etc. in the media
   Performance Measure: Increase media impressions
   Benchmark: 20% increase in media impressions for 3 years

Objective 2.3: Increase website usage by 20% by 2014.
   Performance Measure: Update website
   Benchmark: Increase website usage by 20% by December 2014.

Increase Resources

Goal 3: Increase funding to the Idaho SBDC by $300,000 and student/volunteer resources to 6,000 hours.

Objective 3.1: Seek additional state funding increase for FY16.
   Performance Measure: Line item request
   Benchmark: $300,000 funding for 100 jobs, $2,000,000 in client capital

Objective 3.2: Use students, faculty, volunteers and other experts to supplement SBDC consulting and provide additional resources for clients.
   Performance Measure: # students projects, # volunteer hours
   Benchmark: Minimum of 10 student projects or 500 volunteer hours per year per office.

Organizational Excellence

Goal 4: The percentage of Idaho SBDC clients’ impact to the total national impact is greater than Idaho’s percentage of SBA funding.

Objective 4.1: Integrate the highest standards and systems into day-to-day operating practices to achieve excellence on all reviews and meet goals.
   Performance Measure: Achieve highest rating and/or meet goals for SBA exam, program reviews, Accreditation, SBA goals, etc.
   Benchmark: Highest rating

Objective 4.3: Achieve 90% participation of the Advisory Board members in scheduled meetings.
   Performance Measure: Communicate regularly with Advisory Board by sending monthly critical measures, success stories and updates on significant events.
   Benchmark: 90% participation

External Factors

The items below are external factors that significantly impact the Idaho SBDCs ability to provide our services and are outside of our control.
1. **Economy.** The general state of the economy in Idaho and across the nation has a huge impact on the Idaho SBDC’s ability to create impact through our assistance to entrepreneurs. The Idaho SBDC has observed that businesses that use our services do much better in poor economic times than does the average business in Idaho. The recent economic downturn has highlighted how challenging it is to grow sales, increase jobs, raise capital, and start a new business.

2. **Funding.** Funding for Federal, University and State sources directly impact the resources available to the Idaho SBDC. Without the financial resources available to hire and retain the right people and provide them with resources (phone, computers, etc), it will be challenging to serve Idaho’s entrepreneurs effectively.
Idaho Small Business Development Center  
Program Performance Measures/Benchmarks  

Supplemental to Strategic Plan 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>Description/Benchmark*</th>
<th>CY2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consulting Hours</td>
<td>The total number of hours of consulting and preparation time; Goal is 16,000</td>
<td>16,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Hours Per Client</td>
<td>Goal is 8.5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% hours for Impact Clients</td>
<td>Goal is 40%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of tech companies</td>
<td>Goal is 100</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student/volunteer hours</td>
<td>Goal is 6,000</td>
<td>5,121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Client with 5 hours or more of contact and preparation time</td>
<td>Goal is 550</td>
<td>520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Starts</td>
<td>Goal is 72</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs Created</td>
<td>Goal is 500</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Growth</td>
<td>Growth in sales year to year. Goal is $25,000,000</td>
<td>$33,744,289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Raised</td>
<td>Capital raised in the current year. Goal is $25,000,000</td>
<td>$24,404,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROI (Return on Investment)</td>
<td>The cost of the Idaho SBDC versus the increase in taxes collected due to business growth by SBDC clients. Goal is 3.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Satisfaction</td>
<td>Percentage of above average and excellent rating. Goal is 90%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The benchmarks (goals) are developed with data from other SBDCs, the SBA, and from our accrediting organization.
Idaho Dental Education Program

STRATEGIC PLAN

2015-2019
MISSION STATEMENT

The Mission of the Idaho Dental Education Program is to provide Idaho residents with access to quality educational opportunities in the field of dentistry.

The Idaho Dental Education Program is designed to provide Idaho with outstanding dental professionals through a combination of adequate access for residents and the high quality of education provided. The graduates of the Idaho Dental Education Program will possess the ability to practice today’s dentistry. Furthermore, they will have the background to evaluate changes in future treatment methods as they relate to providing outstanding patient care.

The Idaho Dental Education Program is managed so that it fulfills its mission and vision in the most effective and efficient manner possible. This management style compliments the design of the program and provides the best value for the citizens of Idaho who fund the program.

GOALS OF THE IDAHO DENTAL EDUCATION PROGRAM

The Idaho Dental Education Program (IDEP) serves as the sole route of state supported dental education for residents of Idaho. The IDEP program has been consistent in adhering to the mission statement by fulfilling the following goals:

Goal 1: Provide access to a quality dental education for qualified Idaho residents.

Objective:
Provide dental education opportunities for Idaho residents comparable to residents of other states.

- Performance Measure:
  - Contract for 4-year dental education for at least 8 Idaho residents.
- Benchmark:
  - Current contract in place with Creighton University School of Dentistry or another accredited dental school.

- Performance Measure:
  - Board examination scores on both Parts I and II of the Dental National Boards.
- Benchmark:
  - Pass rate will meet or exceed 90%.

- Performance Measure:
  - Percentage of first time pass rate on the Western Regional Board Examination or Central Regional Dental Testing Service.
- Benchmark:
  - Pass rate will meet or exceed 90%.
Provide additional opportunities for Idaho residents to obtain a quality dental education.

- **Performance Measure:**
  - Number of students in the program.

- **Benchmark:**
  - Increase the number of students in the program from 8 to 10.

**Goal 2: Maintain some control over the rising costs of dental education.**

**Objective:**
Provide the State of Idaho with a competitive value in educating Idaho dentists.

- **Performance Measure:**
  - State cost per student.

- **Benchmark:**
  - Cost per student will be less than 50% of the national average state cost per DDSE (DDS Equivalent). The cost per DDSE is a commonly utilized measure to evaluate the relative cost of a dental education program.

**Goal 3: Serve as a mechanism for responding to the present and/or the anticipated distribution of dental personnel in Idaho.**

**Objective:**
Help meet the needs for dentists in all geographic regions of the state.

- **Performance Measure:**
  - Geographical acceptance of students into the IDEP program.

- **Benchmark:**
  - Students from each of the 4 regions of Idaho (North, Central, Southwest, and Southeast) granted acceptance each year.

- **Performance Measure:**
  - Return rates.

- **Benchmark:**
  - Maintain return rates of program graduates in private practice which average greater than 50%.

**Goal 4: Provide access for dental professionals to facilities, equipment, and resources to update and maintain professional skills.**

**Objective:**
Provide current resources to aid the residents of Idaho by maintaining/increasing the professional skills of Idaho Dentists.

- **Performance Measure:**
Continuing Dental Education (CDE).

Benchmark:
- Provide continuing dental education opportunities for regional dental professionals when the need arises.

Performance Measure:
- Remediation of Idaho dentists (if/when necessary).

Benchmark:
- Successfully aid in the remediation of any Idaho dentist, in cooperation with the State Board of Dentistry and the Idaho Advanced General Dentistry Program, such that the individual dentist may successfully return to practice.

KEY EXTERNAL FACTORS:

Funding:
Most Idaho Dental Education Program goals and objectives assume ongoing, and in some cases additional, levels of State legislative appropriations. Availability of these funds can be uncertain. Currently with State budget reductions that specifically impact our program, the goal to increase the number of available positions within the program from 8 to 10 is not feasible, but this will remain a long-term goal for the program.

Program Participant Choice:
Some IDEP goals are dependent upon choices made by individual students, such as choosing where to practice. Even though this is beyond our control, we have had an excellent track record of program graduates returning to Idaho to practice.

Idaho Dentist to Population Ratio
The more populated areas of Idaho are more saturated with dentists, making it difficult for new graduates to enter the workforce in these areas. With this in mind, we have still seen a good percentage of program graduates return to Idaho to practice.

Educational Debt of Graduates
The average educational debt of IDEP graduates continues to increase each year (for 2012 it was $186,385). This amount of debt may limit graduates to more urban areas of practice initially.

Student Performance
Some of the goals of the program are dependent upon pre-program students to excel in their preparation for the program. However, we have not encountered difficulty in finding highly qualified applicants from all areas of the State.
Idaho Museum of Natural History
Strategic Plan Revision
2014-2019

Herbert Maschner, Director
Idaho Museum of Natural History
Stop 8096
Idaho State University
Pocatello, ID 83209
Phone: 208-282-5417
E-mail: maschner@isu.edu
Dear Fellow Idahoan:

I present to you a five-year vision — a strategic plan — for the Idaho Museum of Natural History (IMNH). The plan outlines how we will build on the museum’s accomplishments in researching, preserving and sharing the story of Idaho’s natural and cultural history. It also takes us toward a new frontier: development of a “virtual” museum that uses the Internet to mitigate the challenges of Idaho’s geography and extend the benefits of the museum to all.

The plan puts substantial focus on important issues that impede our ability to fulfill the museum’s legislated mandate. Among those issues are funding, and the inadequacy of our current building. The overriding goal for the next five years, however, is increasing access to the research and educational benefits we offer not only to the people of Idaho, but to people around the world.

Various Internet-driven technologies make it possible now to deliver IMNH research and educational programs to students, educators, families, scientists and others wherever they live, learn and work. A “virtual visit” is no substitute for a personal visit to our exhibitions and collections. Yet we are acutely aware that personal visits to our facilities in Pocatello aren’t possible for many of the people we are obligated to serve. The Internet empowers us to bring the museum to them.

This is an ambitious plan, and the challenges we face in achieving its goals are formidable. Yet we are inspired by the determination of a few professors and community leaders to establish this museum during the depths of the Great Depression. They looked beyond the difficulties of their time, and saw what a museum could do for the generations to come. They saw opportunities when it was reasonable to see only obstacles. We are committed to doing no less.

The Idaho Museum of Natural History has been at the forefront of science education in Idaho for more than 75 years. This strategic plan reflects opportunities to build on that legacy. It is a pathway with obstacles to overcome, but the destination is worthy. Please join me on the journey ahead.

Sincerely,

Herbert Maschner, Ph.D.
Director, Idaho Museum of Natural History
Idaho Museum of Natural History
Draft Strategic Plan Revision
2014-2019
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Moving forward
Idaho Museum of Natural History

Introduction

The Idaho Museum of Natural History (IMNH) is the state’s premier institution of its kind for discovering, interpreting, preserving and disseminating knowledge is the core disciplines of Natural History. These include:

Earth Sciences and Ancient Environments
- paleontology
- rocks and minerals
- earth history

Life Sciences and Ecosystems
- botany
- mammals, birds, fish and reptiles
- ecosystems and adaptations

Peoples, Cultures, and Ancient Lifeways
- anthropology
- archaeology
- human ecology

Accredited by the American Association of Museums, IMNH operates under the auspices of the State Board of Education from the campus of Idaho State University, a doctoral-level and Carnegie-designated “research high” university in Pocatello. The university provides substantial support, advocacy and supervision. This is a mutually beneficial and supportive relationship that facilitates museum engagement with students, faculty, K-12 educators and other important constituents locally, statewide and around the world.

Our four divisions -- anthropology, earth sciences, life sciences and education -- operate in facilities that include classrooms, research laboratories, artifact and fossil preparation laboratories, storage for permanent collections, and an exhibition fabrication shop. The museum houses an exhibition gallery, the Idaho Virtualization Laboratory, curator offices, and research areas for students and visiting scientists. There also are administrative offices, the Education Resource Center, Children’s Discovery Room and the Museum Store.

Through a range of opportunities for learning and enrichment, we reach out continually to diverse constituencies, from K-12 and graduate students to higher-education faculties and field researchers.
Our roots
The museum is rooted in Idaho’s higher-education system. A group of forward-looking professors and community leaders founded it in 1934 as the Historical Museum at the Southern Branch of the University of Idaho — today’s Idaho State University. In 1977, Gov. John Evans signed a proclamation designating IMNH as Idaho’s museum of natural history; in 1986 the Legislature made the proclamation law.

Our mission
We are caretakers of Idaho’s natural and cultural history. Our legislative mandate is the collection, interpretation and exhibition of artifacts, fossils, plants and animals in educational ways. Our goal each day is to enrich the lives of the people of Idaho through understanding of our natural heritage.

We use science to tell the story of Idaho. Through scholarship, stewardship and outreach, we add new knowledge to past discoveries and make what we learn accessible to all for benefits we may not foresee. We answer questions about our world and raise new ones, always nurturing humankind’s yearning to know more.

Our vision
The Idaho Museum of Natural History strives to make science and cultural history accessible, relevant and meaningful. We aspire to democratize science, that is, to make our research and knowledge portfolios more broadly accessible through measures that will mitigate the limitations of brick-and-mortar facilities.

We see existing and emerging information technologies as tools that will enable us to overcome logistical, geographic and financial barriers to learning. There is no substitute for a leisurely afternoon spent among our exhibits, which the public can visit free of charge. Yet there is a new frontier: bringing Idaho’s museum to the people wherever they live, work and learn.

In this spirit, our staff is eager to augment our physical facilities in Pocatello with Internet-driven tools that will help us deliver the scientific, educational, cultural and economic benefits of this institution to its stakeholders wherever they are.

We work each day at IMNH to expand our contribution to Idaho as a productive research and education resource for the State and region. We are committed to being efficient and innovative in work that fulfills our mandate. So over the next five years IMNH will focus on making the benefits of our work known and available to all.

We will accomplish this through the following means:
IMNH today
The Idaho Museum of Natural History has never been just a storehouse of artifacts and exhibits. While it is indeed a steward of important artifact collections, it also is a research and education institution.

IMNH Director Herbert Maschner, Ph.D., successfully negotiated an affiliation with the Smithsonian. He negotiated MOUs with the National Park Service and the Smithsonian. He received over $2.1 million in grants and donations. He was inducted as a Fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science in 2013.

Curator Rick Williams, Ph.D., is one of the leaders in the development of The Consortium of Intermountain Region Herbaria (CIRH), which is seeking to “virtualize” herbaria of the Intermountain West by putting 3 million plant specimens online. That will provide access to researchers globally.

Curator Leif Tapanila, Ph.D., recently received more than $200,000 from the National Science Foundation for the Alamo Impact Project, a study of a Devonian Period meteor impact event in southern Nevada. This project will study the effects of that event on geology and on invertebrate life. The IMNH will work on developing and designing the website for the project, and will do public outreach through teacher workshops and other activities.

The following are further examples of research projects in which IMNH is involved:

- New discoveries of ice-age fossil tracks and trackways at American Falls Reservoir will provide critical details about life on the Snake River Plain more than 35,000 years ago.

- A study of stable isotopes of small mammals as indicators of climate change on the Snake River Plain is using new technologies to analyze bones from archaeological sites as a measure of environmental changes so that we might better understand the global changes occurring today.

- Ecological and genetic studies of Rocky Mountain plant reproduction and ongoing additions of plant specimens from throughout the Rocky Mountain West to track plant biodiversity in the region.

- We are using archaeometric techniques to identify the sources of obsidian artifacts from southeastern Idaho’s Wasden Site, and other sites across the region. Elemental
composition of obsidian artifacts and the source flows from where the raw obsidian was collected, are helping us learn about Native American trade, migration and land use.

- Further investigation of Helicoprion sharks, found in the fossil beds of the modern mines in southern Idaho, is transforming understanding of the evolution of sharks. This rare species of shark is completely unknown in the modern oceans and is critical to our understanding of life in the Permian Period.

- Digitization of the Life Sciences Project, which is creating a new database structure; development of a digital-image library; and development of online visual keys to plants of the region. This will include online specimen records and images with capabilities to map distributions, produce dynamic species lists, and multi-entry keys to plants of the Intermountain West -- critical to all studies of landscape change and the effects of both people and climate on ecosystems.

- Equine Navicular Syndrome, an incurable lameness in modern horses traditionally thought to be caused by humans, has now been found ago in the fossil horses of Idaho dating to over 3.5 million years ago. This discovery is changing our views of this pathology in modern horses.

- Studies of the ancient invertebrates of Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument are leading to new interpretations of environmental changes through comparisons between ancient ecosystems and the modern world.

IMNH-related research and education projects are being conducted by educators and scientists from around the world. These projects range from the Idaho Master Naturalist Program and studies of ice-age mammals of North America, to research on the global extinction of dinosaurs.

This caliber of scientific work by IMNH scientists, and the professional credentials of IMNH staff, attract and nurture professional networks and knowledge. This helps open doors, raise funding and enhance the stature of Idaho State University and the museum. We are currently enhancing the museum’s professional and scientific stature by expanding the museum’s collections and research activity in three key areas:

The John A. White Paleontological Repository houses the largest paleontological collections in Idaho. We are expanding these collections through extensive field research, and using these collections to assist the State of Idaho in meeting new US Government regulations concerning the discovery of paleontological resources on State and Federal lands.
The **Swanson Archaeological Repository** at the IMNH currently houses and preserves archaeological collections from southern and eastern Idaho that belong to state and federal agencies. This includes hundreds of boxes containing over 300,000 archaeological specimens. These collections are growing through active field research and contractual arrangement with a number of agencies. We are further expanding the existing Swanson Archaeological Repository to store collections for federal and state agencies outside of Idaho as well.

The **Ray J. Davis Herbarium**, with a collection of nearly 80,000 plants, is expanding through a consortium of regional herbaria through grants and cooperative agreements. Students and staff are actively collecting and processing plant specimens expanding our holdings, and making possible new studies of biodiversity and range management.

Collection efforts are substantial in all other areas of the museum as well. Active expansion in ethnography, mammalogy, herpetology, and geology are making the museum a stronger research and education institution, and enhancing our National and International reputation.

**Guiding IMNH’s future**

Stakeholder groups will be central to our success over the next five years. The new **Executive Committee**, comprised of IMNH curators, is tasked with long-range planning, seeking consensus in key areas of management, and building a team approach to solving important management priorities, including budgets. **Friends of the Museum** is a community auxiliary to the museum with broad subscription membership from southern Idaho. The Friends will provide an organizing network, sponsor lectures, field trips and community events. The 16-member **Museum Advisory Committee** includes state legislators, bankers, philanthropists, mayors, and business and community leaders; it is our organizational and advisory leadership unit, providing opportunities to reach out across Idaho and the Nation.

**Goals and objectives**

**FY 2014 -- 2019**

**Goal 1**

**A “virtual” museum**

In this era of “virtual” participation in so many aspects of life, visiting a museum to benefit from its collections, exhibits and research no longer has to mean traveling to a brick-and-
mortar facility many miles away. Today’s Web-based multi-media communication channels — interactive websites, Web cams, blogs, HD video, YouTube, Facebook and such — make it possible to take classes or view exhibitions, collections and artifacts “virtually” from any Internet-connected device in the world. We intend to be part of this revolution by developing a “virtual museum.”

Over the years, an amalgam of circumstances — museum closures due to renovations and remodeling, the challenge of preparing exhibitions that are relevant to K-12 curricula, strained school budgets, security concerns, testing mandated by federal “No Child Left Behind” legislation, the economy, rising fuel prices — has been chipping away at school districts’ ability to accommodate student visits to the museum. In addition, high gasoline prices and Idaho’s far-flung geography have impacted other IMNH constituents as well as students.

The virtual museum concept will help us mitigate these challenges. This strategy promises to make the benefits we offer more accessible than ever before.

A milestone in achieving this goal came in September 2010. The Idaho Museum of Natural History, Idaho State University Informatics Institute and the Canadian Museum of Civilization jointly received a $1 million grant from the National Science Foundation. This grant will bolster efforts to further develop an online, interactive “virtual museum” of northern animal bones. The title of the grant is “Virtual Zooarchaeology of the Arctic Project (VZAP): Phase II.” Combined with an additional Technology Incentive Grant from the State Board of Education for $135,000, the NSF award enabled us to develop a virtual Idaho natural-history program — the foundation in developing a plan to provide online access to all of our collections for all of our audiences.

In 2012-2013, a $600,000 gift (5 year award) from the Hitz Foundation, followed by a $300,000 award from the National Science Foundation, continued this effort to create a virtual museum. In 2013, a $266,000 award from the Murdock Trust was awarded to improve the informatics reach of the museum and continue the virtual museum project.

**Objective: Design, deploy and manage a “Virtual Museum”**

We will accelerate development of a virtual museum that will use digital technology to make our collections, exhibitions and other resources available to learners, educators and researchers online and on demand.

Our virtual museum will be a key tool for overcoming the growing challenges involved in making physical visits to our gallery and activities. It will help spread awareness of and access to the benefits of our work, including research and educational programs.
We will strive to have the entire museum collection online and accessible from anywhere in the world, in the next five years. This will require considerable funding from outside resources. We will immediately begin writing grant proposals to U.S. government agencies and philanthropic foundations in order to begin implementation of the Virtual Museum.

**Goal 2**

**Adequate staffing**

The museum currently serves the entire State of Idaho — and to a degree the Intermountain West — with fewer than eight (8) full-time-equivalent (FTE) positions. We rely as well on five (5) part-time employees. In academic year 2013-2014, we had 26 student employees.

Until academic year 2008-2009, IMNH’s functions and outreach were limited by inadequate staffing across divisions and in central administration. Efficient reorganization has provided positions necessary for expanded research and collections oversight.

Additional staff is required, however, because the needs and expectations of our expanding constituent base are evolving and expanding just as state funding is declining.

**Objective: Additional museum professionals**

To perform our expanding professional functions effectively, we will seek funding for additional staff according to the following priorities: Position Number 2 below was funded by the ISU administration on a short-term basis. We have made no progress in the other critical positions.

1. **Development officer** to help secure major financial gifts. This is the key missing link in the advancement of the IMNH.

2. An **information-technology specialist** to manage and maintain a database for the virtual museum; and to establish and maintain an interactive, multimedia IMNH Web presence. Currently funded by Idaho State University

3. An **exhibit design technician and gallery manager** to support our public-outreach mission and assist in delivering high-quality educational programs and exhibitions that reflect current best practices.

4. A **professional conservator** to ensure adequate care of collections.

5. **Professors** to work as curators and division leaders in each of the four IMNH divisions. Especially a Curator of Anthropology.
To achieve our immediate goals, we will propose to the State of Idaho an IMNH funding increase to hire a development officer. But we also fully recognize that we cannot “hire” our way to fulfillment of the museum’s complete mission. So we will rely to a significant degree on an energized museum membership drive to gain access to essential human and financial resources. We also recognize that managing volunteer staff will require time and energy from full-time staff.

Goal 3
Upgrade collections functions

IMNH houses more than 500,000 natural and cultural objects. These irreplaceable items are central to our research, exhibitions and educational work. They must be properly prepared, inventoried, preserved and stored following current best practices. As we become increasingly active in research, educational programs and exhibitions at locations beyond the museum building, we must deploy a secure internal system to track and manage our collections.

Objectives:

- We will purchase and deploy new storage systems that will help us make more efficient use of collections storage space. We will seek capital improvement funds to meet our storage and curation needs by implementing a $500,000 campaign for storage systems. We have applied for grants in 2013 to meet this need.

- The museum will update collection-management policies and procedure manuals. To do so, we have begun the process of hiring a new museum Registrar, who will be an experienced leader in museum regulations and best practices.

- We will complete development of a digital collections database for each division. To accomplish this, collections managers have begun training initiatives, and have been creating new database systems to enhance management of their collections. Implementation is in collaboration with the Informatics Research Institute at Idaho State University.

- We shall begin writing proposals to complete a conservation assessment of the museum, which will be done by a team of experts from other institutions. This will specifically define the conservation needs of our collections and make it possible to secure further grants to match those needs. Based on this assessment, we will create a conservation plan for each division.
Goal 4
Increase funding

Working through our regional Museum Advisory Committee, Friends of the Museum and other partners, we will be even more proactive in developing research grants, philanthropic and membership-based funding streams independent of State appropriations.

Objective: An endowment
Key to fulfilling and sustaining the museum’s mission for the long term will be establishment of an endowment founded on one or more major philanthropic gifts. To accomplish this goal in an era of declining public funding for higher education will require the continuing services of a professional development officer.

We will employ a number of tactics: events, outreach, marketing and communication initiatives, and opportunities to name facilities after philanthropists who support our mission with major gifts.

Objective: Research and stewardship grants
Competitive research grants from entities such as the National Science Foundation are a major source of funding for every higher-education institution. Such funding helps fund not only scholarship, research and stewardship of collections, but it also helps fund staff positions, faculty, even equipment and operating costs. The Idaho Museum of Natural History must be competitive, energetic and entrepreneurial in identifying and pursuing appropriate opportunities. And we shall be.

In 2012-2014, the IMNH secured nearly $300,000 in donations for remodeling and for exhibits.

Objective: A gift-funded travel and research fund
We will seek philanthropic support to establish and sustain a fund to support approved research projects that advance the museum’s core functions.

In 2014, the IMNH received some funds for travel from the Hitz Foundation.
Goal 5
Develop and support programs for K-12, higher-education and the general public

IMNH collections have been used for paleontological research leading to master’s and doctoral degrees, and in scholarly research related to Doctor of Arts degrees.

Much of what we do, however, is for the benefit of K-12 education. Since 1990, more than 36,150 K-12 students have come through our doors. We also have long provided a number of popular, informal science-education programs that enrich learners of all ages and backgrounds — school and community groups, individuals and families alike — through direct experience with science.

Among these programs are:

- **Pint-Sized Science Academy**, an early childhood science-learning opportunity
- **Science Trek**, an overnight adventure at the museum for children in the third through fifth grades
- **Forays into the Field**, a unique week-long science experience for young women in junior and senior high school; and
- **Science Saturdays**, a special series of hands-on classes for elementary-age students.

We offer tools to educators through the Education Resources Center. We’ve also received significant extramural funding for innovative projects designed to get science resources to K-12 and university educators. Among these are online educational resources such as: “Digital Atlas,” “Idaho Virtualization Lab,” “Fossil Plot” and “Bridging the Natural Gap.” The museum’s local partnerships, as well as its associations with Idaho State University faculty and students, enable each group to be mutually supportive.

To sustain and build on these successes in a cost-effective manner, the museum must build infrastructure that enables planning for efficient and effective expansion of educational programs.

We hope that by more effectively aligning our exhibits and educational programs with Idaho’s K-12 curriculum, we will improve the relevance of our work to the K-12 system. We see our “virtual museum” initiative doing a great deal to mitigate the access issues schools face today as well.
Personal visits will remain a cornerstone of the IMNH experience, so we are developing a long-term exhibit plan to ensure thematic continuity and regular rotations. An exhibition gallery that emphasizes research and education is a critical museum centerpiece.

Efforts are underway to bring parents and other adults back to the museum experience. An important obstacle to filling classes for adults is communicating the availability of adult classes for the public. Overcoming this will require a strong communications person and communications plan, based on efficient contemporary tactics and tools, to “get the word out.” Through granting and fund-raising we will work towards the following objectives.

Objectives:

- Maintain on-site visitation by students at an average of 8,000 per year by including exhibits that are relevant to K-12 curricula; providing appropriate outdoor accommodations for classes and families; making classrooms more accessible to adult learners; equipping classrooms with computers, Smartboards, digital projectors, DVD players, conferencing capabilities and other learning tools.

- Establish a Career Path Internship Program for 10 students each summer

- Create graduate-student assistantships to aid in program development and delivery.

- Build an interactive, multimedia website to connect self-learners with a rich array of science-education resources and experiences.

- Develop a Museum Store business plan to ensure success of store activities, including coordination of educational programming, a successful museum E-Store, and effective sales of IMNH and other relevant publications.

Goal 6

Improve communications and marketing

The Idaho Museum of Natural History is mandated to serve all of Idaho, yet for a variety of reasons it can seem most closely associated with only one of Idaho’s four-year higher education institutions — Idaho State University — and only one geographic region, southeastern Idaho. Geography explains much of that. Employing contemporary marketing and communications tools and tactics will help us strengthen our image and role as a statewide resource.

To raise the stature of our staff, our work and Idaho’s museum — which will strengthen our case for research funding and philanthropic support — we will tell our story more
effectively. That will require staff skilled in crafting and projecting communications that alert, inform and persuade targeted audiences. Key to meeting these objectives is the hiring of a development specialist; but in the meantime, we will begin many of these activities using a dedicated part-time staff of student employees.

**Objectives:**

- We will develop a media-relations strategy to generate positive publicity.
- The museum will improve two-way communications with K-12 educators to increase their awareness of the opportunities we offer, and our awareness of ways to make exhibitions and programs relevant to their needs.
- Implementation of a communications plan will be undertaken to raise general-public awareness of museum educational programs, leading to increased enrollment.
- We will offer online virtual tours of the museum and its exhibitions. Digital video technologies will be use to deliver lectures and workshops online.
- Partnerships will help us develop an interactive site where students can ask questions and receive authoritative answers.
- We will place IMNH news and feature stories on the IMNH website, in *ISU Magazine* and other channels, and we will publish a “viewbook” (print and digital) illustrating IMNH’s work.
- A redesign of the IMNH website will include interactive and multimedia communication tools.
- An active social-media presence will be established to engage targeted audiences. Included will be YouTube videos featuring IMNH subject-matter experts and exhibits.
- IMNH staff will place exhibits at University Place in Idaho Falls, the Capitol building in Boise and other high-profile venues to raise awareness of and interest in the museum.
- We will evaluate resuming the IMNH publication series (Tebiwa, Miscellaneous and Occasional Papers) in peer-reviewed online formats.
• Our outreach will spotlight IMNH research news using internal and external multimedia channels.

• We will strive to raise the public profile of our staff by encouraging them to serve as conference presenters, guest speakers and lecturers, editors of publications, and officers of relevant associations.

Goal 7
A new museum building

In December 2010, we proudly reopened our renovated and revitalized exhibit area. It features a more welcoming and comfortable foyer, new and familiar displays, easier-to-read interpretive panels, improved lighting and a more open look and feel. We debuted many exhibits, including ice-age animal mounts and an exhibit on how climate change on the Snake River Plain has affected its plant and animal life. The event attracted 500 visitors; since then the museum has received thousands of visits from K-12 students and the public.

We have maximized what can be done with the former library building we occupy on the Idaho State University campus. We cannot grow and expand our services to Idaho for the long term and remain in our current building.

Our operations are confined to 35,786 square feet as follows:

- **Basement:** 15,337 sq. ft.
- **Main floor:** 15,693 sq. ft.
- **Warehouse:** 3,606 sq. ft.
- **Garden:** 1,150 sq. ft.

Participation in one of our most popular and effective programs for children, the Science Trek sleepover program, provides an example of the impact our building is having on service to our constituents. Necessary remodeling has imposed space limitations that, in turn, hold participation to 120 children. Science Trek previously accommodated up to 150 children.

Meeting spaces also have been reduced so that classroom and auditorium capacity no longer permits comfortable seating for lectures and programs with more than approximately 25 people.

We have been resourceful and adaptable in making the best of our building, yet it has never been adequate for the work of a research- and exhibit-oriented public museum that must meet the expectations of constituents and stakeholders in the 21st century.
Obstacles the current building presents include the following:

- little or no room for expansion
- overcrowded collections areas
- security, environmental, pest-management and parking issues posed by sharing facilities with other campus operations
- lack of adequate storage for exhibits and educational materials

If the museum is to maximize its benefits to Idaho and focus increasingly on well-funded research, education and public engagement, a new building — constructed specifically for museum uses — is a necessary investment.

**Objective: Plan a capital campaign for a new building**

In partnership with our advisory and stakeholder groups, we will plan the launch of a multi-year capital campaign. The campaign would raise major financial gifts for construction, maintenance and operation of a museum-centered U.S. Green Building Council LEED-certified building to be located on the ISU campus.

**Benchmarks and Performance Measures**

In the following areas of museum operations, we shall target 10 percent increases per year in each year of this plan:

- philanthropic financial gifts
- research grants and other grants
- scientific publication
- public visitation
- enrollment in public programs
Performance Measures and Benchmarks FY 2011-2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of People Served by the General Public Museum Programs</td>
<td>13,543</td>
<td>12,252</td>
<td>12,980</td>
<td>Increase 5%</td>
<td>8750 so far</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant/Contract Revenue Received</td>
<td>$505,000</td>
<td>$650,000</td>
<td>$1,600,000</td>
<td>Increase 5%</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Exhibitions Developed</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Completed 2 large exhibits</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>2 large exhibits</td>
<td>Completed largest exhibits in IMNH history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Educational Programs</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Maintain programs</td>
<td>Unknown. Education officer was on medical leave for 9 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Performance Measures FY 2014-2019 Based on New Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal 1</td>
<td>Active Solicitation of grants, foundation awards, and donations to create the Virtual Museum – approximately $250,000 per year.</td>
<td>Success in the active solicitation of the funds and the implementation of the Virtual Museum concept. 2012: write proposals 2013: database construction 2014: beta implementation</td>
<td>$600,000 donation continuing $266,000 awarded from Murdock Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 2</td>
<td>Propose to State of Idaho the funding and creation of an Information Technology Specialist</td>
<td>Active discussion towards the resolution of all staffing needs in Goal 2.</td>
<td>Not Met: Continuing discussion with ISU and the Idaho Legislature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 4</td>
<td>Increasing Development activities in grants and donations.</td>
<td>At 10% per year.</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 5</td>
<td>Increase outreach and increase educational opportunities through new and exciting programs</td>
<td>At 10% per year.</td>
<td>Not Met: Education coordinator was on medical leave for 9 months.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 6</td>
<td>Create new exhibits in other areas of the State. Create newsletters and other public information.</td>
<td>Create exhibits in Idaho Falls and Boise. Increase public participation and visitation by 10% per year.</td>
<td>Met: working on traveling exhibits. Billboards, radio, and print advertising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 7</td>
<td>Form Capital committee for fund raising.</td>
<td>Create Capital Committee</td>
<td>Not Met. Planned for 2014.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
External Factors

All external factors are based in the success or failure of finding initiatives.

Moving forward

New leadership. New tools. A new vision of how we can give the people of Idaho an even greater return on their investment in science (STEM) education. These are stepping stones in our pathway through the final quarter of the museum’s first century. The professors and community leaders who joined together during the Great Depression to establish this museum looked beyond the challenges of their day to the promise of tomorrow. Today, we commit to doing the same.
CONSENT AGENDA
APRIL 17, 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TAB</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>IRSA – Quarterly Report: Programs and changes Approved by Executive Director</td>
<td>Information Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>IRSA – Idaho EPSCoR Committee Appointment</td>
<td>Motion to Approve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>PPGA - Boise State University – Facility Naming</td>
<td>Motion to Approve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>PPGA – Alcohol Permits – Issued by University Presidents</td>
<td>Information Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>SDE – Professional Standards Commission Appointment</td>
<td>Motion to Approve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>SDE – Curricular Materials Selection Committee Appointment</td>
<td>Motion to Approve</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BOARD ACTION

I move to approve the Consent Agenda as presented.

Moved by _________ Seconded by ___________ Carried Yes ______ No ______
CONSENT
APRIL 17, 2014

SUBJECT
Quarterly Report: Programs and Changes Approved by Executive Director

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY
Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies and Procedures, Section III.G.8.a., Postsecondary Program Approval and Discontinuance

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION
In accordance with Board Policy III.G.3.b.i.(2) and 4.b, prior to implementation the Executive Director shall approve any new, modification, and/or discontinuation of academic or professional-technical programs, with a financial impact of less than $250,000 per fiscal year prior to implementation.

Consistent with Board Policy III.G.8.a., “The Office of the State Board of Education shall report quarterly to the State Board of Education all program approvals and discontinuations approved by the Executive Director.” The Board office is providing a report of program changes, additions, and discontinuations from Idaho’s public colleges and universities that were approved between December 2013 and March 2014 by the Executive Director.

ATTACHMENTS
Attachment 1 – List of Programs and Changes Approved by the Executive Director

BOARD ACTION
This item is for informational purposes only. Any action will be at the Board’s discretion.
### Boise State University
- Discontinue BA in History, Social Studies, Secondary Education and Create BA in History, Social Sciences, Secondary Education
- Discontinue Bachelor of Business Administration in Accountancy/Finance
- Discontinue BS in Geophysics and replace with a BS in Geosciences with an emphasis in Geophysics
- New Graduate Certificate in College Teaching
- New Minor in Industrial Engineering

### Other Non-substantive Changes (does not require approval but is required to notify OSBE per policy III.G.)
- Change the name of existing Professional emphasis under Chemistry program to Professional emphasis – ACS Certified. The change would inform students that the emphasis is certified by the American Chemical Society.
- Change name of existing Media Studies emphasis to Journalism and Media Studies emphasis

### College of Southern Idaho
- New Associate of Science, STEM

### Idaho State University
- New Minor in Emergency Management
- New Interprofessional Geriatric Certificate

### Lewis-Clark State College
- Change name of existing Division of Natural Sciences to the Division of Natural Sciences and Mathematics
- Change name of existing Division of Education to the Division of Education and Kinesiology

### University of Idaho
- Other Non-substantive Changes (does not require approval but is required to notify OSBE per policy III.G.)
  - Change the name of degree from Foreign Language Business to Modern Language Business
  - Change the name of the minor from Women’s Studies to Women’s and Gender Studies
  - Change the name of Bi-State Department of Statistical Science to Department of Statistical Science
  - Discontinue a seamless enrollment option under the MMBB program where students were able to enroll in the MMBB M.S. program while they are completing the B.S.
Professional - Technical Education Programs
Approved by Executive Director

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Activity</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discontinue Human Services program and convert Addiction Studies option to a stand-alone program to offer a Technical Certificate and an AAS degree.</td>
<td>CSI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convert Web Developer program to an option under the Computer Information Systems program. New title for the option will be IT Development and Security.</td>
<td>CSI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addition of Medical Assistant, AAS</td>
<td>CWI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addition of new Advanced Manufacturing Technology program - Technical Certificate option and an AAS degree with areas of specialized training options.</td>
<td>ISU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addition of Mechanical Drafting, Technical Certificate under the existing Computer Aided Design Drafting Technology</td>
<td>ISU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUBJECT
Appointment of Idaho Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (EPSCoR) Committee Members

REFERENCE
April 2012  Board appointed Gynii Gilliam’s to the Idaho EPSCoR Committee
August 2012  Board appointed Dave Tuthill to the Idaho EPSCoR Committee
February 2013  Board reappointed Doug Chadderdon and Jean’ne Shreeve to the Idaho EPSCoR Committee
August 2013  Board appointed Dr. Hill to the Idaho EPSCoR Committee
December 2013  Board re-appointed Mr. Barneby to the Idaho EPSCoR Committee

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY
Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies & Procedures, Section III.W.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION
The Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (EPSCoR) represents a federal-state partnership to enhance the science and engineering research, education, and technology capabilities of states that traditionally have received smaller amounts of federal research and development funds. As a participating state, Idaho EPSCoR is subject to federal program requirements and policy established by the Idaho State Board of Education (Board). The purpose of EPSCoR is to build a high-quality, academic research base to advance science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) to stimulate sustainable improvements in research and development capacity and competitiveness.

Idaho EPSCoR is guided by a committee of sixteen (16) members appointed by the Board. The membership of this committee is constituted to provide for geographic, academic, business and state governmental representation as specified in Board policy III.W.

ATTACHMENTS
Attachment 2 – Matt Borud Letter of Interest  Page 3
Attachment 2 – Matt Borud Bio  Page 4

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
In April 2012 the Board appointed Gynii Gilliam to the Idaho EPSCoR Committee as the representative for the Idaho Department of Commerce. Since that appointment Ms. Gilliam has left the employment of the Department of Commerce. The Department has forwarded Matt Borud name for consideration as the Department of Commerce representative to the Idaho EPSCoR Committee.
BOARD ACTION

I move to re-appoint Matthew Borud 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.

Moved by___________ Seconded by_____________ Carried Yes_____ No_____
March 12, 2014

Dr. Laird Noh
Chair, Idaho EPSCoR Committee
MS 3029
875 Perimeter Drive
Moscow, ID 83844-3029

Dear Dr. Noh,

I am writing to express my interest in serving on the Idaho EPSCoR committee. I currently serve at the Idaho Department of Commerce in the business development administrator position.

One of my primary responsibilities is to oversee the department's role in the IGEM program where we are working to strengthen Idaho's economy by transitioning our state's university research to commercialized, private sector products or services. Together, EPSCoR and IGEM serve vital roles in investing in Idaho's technology future.

My bio, which is enclosed, contains additional information on my background.

I would appreciate the opportunity to join the committee and am happy to provide further information regarding my candidacy. I can be reached via phone at 208-287-0772 or by email at matt.borud@commerce.idaho.gov.

Thank you for your time and consideration. I look forward to speaking with you about this exciting opportunity.

Sincerely,

Matthew J. Borud

Matt Borud
March 12, 2014

Matt Borud is the Chief Business Development Officer for the Idaho Department of Commerce. His current position focuses on unifying the department’s new business development initiatives including overseeing the Idaho Global Entrepreneurial Mission (IGEM) program, state tourism marketing programs, the Commerce Department’s marketing program, and the national sales program.

Before joining the Department of Commerce, Matt was Program Manager for Balihoo in Boise where he was focused on business development and client services for strategic accounts. Prior to Balihoo, Matt was Director of Recruiting Services of Payette Group, an executive technical recruiting firm with offices in Boise and Menlo Park, CA and in Sales Operations at MPC Computers in Nampa.

Matt has B.A. in Political Science, Business, and German from the University of Oregon.
BOISE STATE UNIVERSITY

SUBJECT
Facility Naming - Dona Larsen Park

REFERENCE
June 2007  Board approved East Junior High land swap and joint use agreement including master plan illustration
August 2009  Board approved demolition of various structures on East Junior High site
February 2011  Board approved the naming of the former East Junior High site the Dona Larsen Park

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY
Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies and Procedures, Section I.K

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION
In 2011 the Board approved naming the former East Junior High site Dona Larsen Park to honor Dona Larsen, the mother of Debra Larsen Huber. The David and Debra Larsen Huber Family Foundation donated $2.5 million to Boise State University, which allowed for the construction of Dona Larsen Park.

This request concerns two of the facilities inside Dona Larsen Park: (1) the football stadium, and (2) the softball field. By altering the football stadium name to “Dona Larsen Stadium” and adding the name “Huber Field” to the currently unnamed softball field, the University will be able to further honor David and Debra Larsen Huber.

The proposed names have been reviewed and approved by the University’s Naming Committee.

IMPACT
Naming the football stadium the “Dona Larsen Stadium” and the softball field “Huber Field” will honor Dona Larsen and the David and Debra Larsen Huber Family Foundation while demonstrating appreciation for their community involvement.

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
Board Policy I.K.1.b(ii) outlines the requirements by which a building, facility, or administrative unit may be named for other than a former employee of the system of higher education. These include consideration of the nature of the gift and its significance to the institution; the eminence of the individual whose name is proposed; and the individual’s relationship to the institution.
Boise State University’s request is in alignment with Board policy. Staff recommends approval.

BOARD ACTION
I move to approve Boise State University’s request to name the facilities inside Dona Larsen Park the “Dona Larsen Stadium” and “Huber Field.”

Moved by __________ Seconded by __________ Carried Yes _____ No _____
SUBJECT
Alcohol Permits - Issued by University Presidents

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION
The chief executive officer of each institution may waive the prohibition against possession or consumption of alcoholic beverages only as permitted by, and in compliance with, Board policy. Immediately upon issuance of an Alcohol Beverage Permit, a complete copy of the application and the permit shall be delivered to the Office of the State Board of Education, and Board staff shall disclose the issuance of the permit to the Board no later than the next Board meeting.

The last update presented to the Board was at the February 2014 Board meeting. Since that meeting, Board staff has received thirty-two (32) permits from Boise State University, nine (9) permits from Idaho State University, and eighteen (18) permits from the University of Idaho.

Board staff has prepared a brief listing of the permits issued for use. The list is attached for the Board’s review.

ATTACHMENTS
Attachment 1 - List of Approved Permits by Institution

BOARD ACTION
This item is for informational purposes only. Any action will be at the Board’s discretion.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVENT</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>Institution Sponsor</th>
<th>Outside Sponsor</th>
<th>DATE (S)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gene Bleymaier Building Naming Reception</td>
<td>Gene Bleymaier Football Complex</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>01/24/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Idea of Nature Reception</td>
<td>Student Union Building</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>02/12/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Alumni Director Reception</td>
<td>Stueckle Sky Center</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>02/13/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy Center American College Theatre Festival</td>
<td>Stueckle Sky Center</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>02/20/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Now Read This Receptions</td>
<td>Yanke, Arts and Humanities Gallery</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>02/20/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Board of Education Meeting Reception</td>
<td>Stueckle Sky Center</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>02/26/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun Valley Film Festival</td>
<td>Stueckle Sky Center</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>02/27/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inaugural freedom of the Press with Charlie Savage</td>
<td>Student Union Building</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>03/18/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf Speaking Guest Graham Delaet</td>
<td>Stueckle Sky Center</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>03/28/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Diamonds and the Jimmy Dorsey Orchestra/Concert</td>
<td>Morrison Center</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>01/04/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho GOP</td>
<td>Student Union Building</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>01/04/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho Dance Theatre/Performance</td>
<td>Student Union Building</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>01/24/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hewlett Packard Reception</td>
<td>COBE Imagination Lab</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>02/21/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dvorak, Cello Concerto/Boise Philharmonic Concert</td>
<td>Morrison Center</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>02/22/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An Evening with Kenny Rogers</td>
<td>Morrison Center</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>02/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmen Opera</td>
<td>Morrison Center</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>02/26/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hello Dolly!/Broadway Musical</td>
<td>Morrison Center</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>03/04/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boise Young Professionals Reception</td>
<td>BODO/Colliers Building</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>03/06/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howell &amp; Werner Wedding Reception</td>
<td>Stueckle Sky Center</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>03/08/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVENT</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>Institution Sponsor</td>
<td>Outside Sponsor</td>
<td>DATE (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth Annual Idaho Energy Symposium</td>
<td>Stueckle Sky Center</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>03/10/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lady Antebellum Concert</td>
<td>Taco Bell Arena</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>03/12/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trey McIntyre Project Spring Show/Dance, Ballet</td>
<td>Morrison Center</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>03/15/14 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schwinn &amp; Drisan Wedding</td>
<td>Stueckle Sky Center</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>03/20/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rimsky-Korsakov's Scheherazade/Boise Philharmonic</td>
<td>Morrison Center</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>03/22/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Bonamassa/Concert</td>
<td>Morrison Center</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>03/28/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Survivor Remembers/Lecture</td>
<td>Morrison Center</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>04/03/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Cosby/Comedy</td>
<td>Morrison Center</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>04/04/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Forks Foundation Annual Fundraiser</td>
<td>Stueckle Sky Center</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>04/11/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volbeat</td>
<td>Taco Bell Arena</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>04/13/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWI – Culinary Showcase Course Dinner/Event</td>
<td>Culinary Arts Building and Tented Lawn</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>04/22/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAHU Symposium</td>
<td>Student Union Building</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>04/22/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verdi Wealth Planning – Spring Fever</td>
<td>Stueckle Sky Center’</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>04/30/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVENT</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>Institution Sponsor</td>
<td>Outside Sponsor</td>
<td>DATE (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho Nurse Educator Social</td>
<td>School of Nursing</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>03/05/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho Business Leader of the Year</td>
<td>Stephens Performing Arts Center, Marshall Rotunda</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>03/20/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gem Legacy Donor Recognition Dinner</td>
<td>Stephens Performing Arts Center, Marshall Rotunda</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>04/03/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU distinguished faculty Awards Reception</td>
<td>Stephens Performing Arts Center, Marshall Rotunda</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>04/09/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding Student Awards</td>
<td>Stephens Performing Arts Center, Marshall Rotunda</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>04/18/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 DHS Awards</td>
<td>Stephens Performing Arts Center, Marshall Rotunda</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>05/09/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snake River Symposium</td>
<td>Idaho Museum of Natural History</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>03/24/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schickedanz &amp; Grace Wedding Reception</td>
<td>Woodriver Room</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>04/05/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEI Winetasking</td>
<td>Bennion Student Union Building Multi-Purpose Room</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>01/01/15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPROVED ALCOHOL SERVICE AT UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO
**December 2013 – February 2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVENT</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>Institution Sponsor</th>
<th>Outside Sponsor</th>
<th>DATE (S)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jazz Festival Community Kick-Off</td>
<td>Prichard Art Gallery</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>02/19/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation Annual Banquet</td>
<td>SUB – Ballroom</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>03/29/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemingway Festival VIP Reception</td>
<td>President’s House</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>02/12/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Plan Competition Winner’s Dinner</td>
<td>Kibbie Dome/Litehouse Centre</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>04/26/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation Annual Banquet</td>
<td>SUB – Ballroom</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>03/29/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevator Pitch Competition</td>
<td>ALB Gallery</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>04/25/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty club Interdisciplinary Research Reception</td>
<td>Brink Hall Faculty Lounge</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>04/25/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBE Advisory board/Graue Reception</td>
<td>JA Albertson Building</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>04/24/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academy of Engineers &amp; College Awards Dinner</td>
<td>SUB – Ballroom</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>04/11/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UI BMBA Reception and Information Session</td>
<td>UI Boise – Legacy Point Room</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>04/09/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love Letters-Benefit Performance for Idaho Repertory Theatre</td>
<td>Hartung Theatre Lobby</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>04/05/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 Idaho Law Review Symposium Reception</td>
<td>UI Boise – Legacy Point Room</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>04/14/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Alumni</td>
<td>UI Boise Legacy Point Room</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>03/11/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMBA Advisory Committee Meeting/Dinner</td>
<td>CDA Resort, Board Room 7</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>03/06/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican GOP Convention VIP Event and Reception</td>
<td>Kibbie Dome/Litehouse Centre</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/13/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Petrino Vandal Scholarship Fund</td>
<td>UI Golf Course</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>04/26/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACADA Advisor Appreciation</td>
<td>SUB – Ballroom</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>02/27/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UI Faculty Club/Interdisciplinary Research Reception</td>
<td>Brink Hall Faculty Lounge</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>02/21/14 02/25/14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
APRIL 17, 2014

SUBJECT
Appointments to the Professional Standards Commission

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY
Section 33-1252, Idaho Code

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION
Section 33-1252, Idaho Code sets forth criteria for membership on the Professional Standards Commission (PSC) as follows:

The Commission consists of eighteen (18) members, one (1) from the State Department of Education and one (1) from the Division of Professional Technical Education. The remaining members shall be representative of the teaching profession of the state of Idaho, and not less than seven (7) members shall be certificated classroom teachers in the public school system and shall include at least one (1) teacher of exceptional children and at least one (1) teacher in pupil personnel services. The Idaho Association of School Superintendents, the Idaho Association of Secondary School Principals, the Idaho Association of Elementary School Principals, the Idaho School Boards Association, the Idaho Association of Special Education Administrators, the education departments of private colleges, and the colleges of letters and sciences of the institutions of higher education may submit nominees for one (1) position each. The community colleges and the education departments of the public institutions of higher education may submit nominees for two (2) positions.

Nominations were sought for the positions from the Idaho Department of Education, the Idaho Education Association, Northwest Professional Educators, the Idaho School Superintendents Association, the Idaho Association of Elementary School Principals, the Idaho School Boards Association, the Idaho Association of Special Education Administrators, and the Idaho Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. Resumes for interested individuals are attached.

State Department of Education:
Jason Hancock, Idaho Department of Education

Secondary Classroom Teacher:
Dawn Anderson, Madison School District
Mari Harris, Vallivue District
Sarah Holloway, Idaho State Correctional Institute
Charlotte McKinney, Mountain View School District
Bill Proser, Coeur d’Alene School District
Lynn Swanson-Puckett, Nampa School District
Aliene (Ali) Shearer, Meridian Joint School District

School Superintendent:
Laural Nelson, Idaho Digital Learning Academy (reappointment)

Elementary School Principal:
Gary Comstock, Jefferson County Joint School District
Monica English, Coeur d’Alene School District
Dave Kerns, Snake River School District
Elisa Saffle, Bonneville Joint School District

School Board Member:
Margaret Chipman, Weiser School District
Barbara Dixon, Meadows Valley School District
Juan Vuittonet, Meridian Joint School District

Special Education Administrator:
Clara Allred, Twin Falls School District (reappointment)

Public Higher Education:
Deborah Hedeen, Idaho State University
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BOARD ACTION
I move to appoint Jason Hancock as a member of the Professional Standards Commission for the remainder of a three-year term effective immediately, and ending June 30, 2015, representing the Department of Education.
Moved by __________ Seconded by __________   Carried: Yes ____   No ____

I move to appoint Charlotte McKinney as a member of the Professional Standards Commission for a three-year term effective July 1, 2014, and ending June 30, 2017, representing Secondary Classroom Teachers.

Moved by __________ Seconded by __________   Carried: Yes ____   No ____


Moved by __________ Seconded by __________   Carried: Yes ____   No ____

I move to appoint Elisa Saffle as a member of the Professional Standards Commission for the remainder of a three-year term effective immediately, and ending June 30, 2015, representing Elementary School Principals.

Moved by __________ Seconded by __________   Carried: Yes ____   No ____

I move to appoint Margaret Chipman as a member of the Professional Standards Commission for the remainder of a three-year term effective immediately, and ending June 30, 2015, representing School Board Members.

Moved by __________ Seconded by __________   Carried: Yes ____   No ____

I move to reappoint Clara Allred as a member of the Professional Standards Commission for a three-year term effective July 1, 2014, and ending June 30, 2017, representing Special Education Administrators.

Moved by __________ Seconded by __________   Carried: Yes ____   No ____

I move to appoint Deborah Hedeen as a member of the Professional Standards Commission for a three-year term effective July 1, 2014, and ending June 30, 2017, representing Public Higher Education.
### Professional Standards Commission Members – 2013-2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clara Allred</td>
<td>Special Education Administrator</td>
<td>Twin Falls SD #411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathy Bierne</td>
<td>Elementary Classroom Teacher</td>
<td>Coeur d’Alene SD #271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane Boothe</td>
<td>Public Higher Education</td>
<td>Boise State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristi Enger</td>
<td>Profession-Technical Education</td>
<td>Division of Professional-Technical Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esther Henry</td>
<td>Secondary Classroom Teacher</td>
<td>Jefferson County Joint SD #251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paula Kellerer</td>
<td>Private Higher Education</td>
<td>Northwest Nazarene University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angie Lakey-Campbell</td>
<td>Secondary Classroom Teacher</td>
<td>Cambridge Joint SD #432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becky Meyer</td>
<td>Secondary School Principal</td>
<td>Lake Pend Oreille SD #84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim Mikolajczyk</td>
<td>School Counselor</td>
<td>Moscow SD #281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laural Nelson</td>
<td>School Superintendent</td>
<td>Idaho Digital Learning Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mikki Nuckols</td>
<td>Secondary Classroom Teacher</td>
<td>Bonneville Joint SD #93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Ritter</td>
<td>School Board Member</td>
<td>Meridian Joint SD #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Roark</td>
<td>Public Higher Education – Letters and Sciences</td>
<td>Boise State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Sakota</td>
<td>Secondary Classroom Teacher</td>
<td>Madison SD #321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather Van Mullem</td>
<td>Public Higher Education</td>
<td>Lewis-Clark State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ginny Welton</td>
<td>Exceptional Child Education</td>
<td>Coeur d’Alene SD #271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Roark</td>
<td>Public Higher Education</td>
<td>Boise State University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Experience
7/07-present  Idaho Department of Education
Deputy Chief of Staff. Provide general supervision and management of the Idaho Department of Education (142 FTPs) in the absence of the Superintendent and Chief of Staff. Integral member of the Department’s senior management team. Responsible for development of the Superintendent’s policy and budgetary agendas, data analysis, communications with legislative and other groups, legislative strategy, bill drafting and successful passage of legislation.

8/96-7/07  Idaho State Legislature, Legislative Services Office
Budget & Policy Analyst. Provided research and analytical staff support to the Idaho Legislature and Joint Finance-Appropriations Committee (JFAC). Played a key role in working with legislators, executive branch personnel, and others to develop and execute state fiscal policies that have saved Idaho taxpayers tens of millions of dollars, and resolved complicated policy challenges.

Education
Boise State University – Boise, Idaho
Master of Public Administration, May 1996
- Chapter Founder and Charter Member, Pi Alpha Alpha
- President, MPA Student Association, 1995-1996

University of the Pacific – Stockton, California
Bachelor of Arts in History, May 1992
- President, Eiselen House, 1989-1990

Other
President, Depot Bench Neighborhood Association, 2002-2003
References

Tom Luna
Superintendent of Public Instruction
Idaho Department of Education
(208) 284-0953
Tom Luna is my ultimate supervisor at the Idaho Department of Education.

Luci Willits
Chief of Staff
Idaho Department of Education
(208) 830-7322
Luci Willits is my direct, day-to-day supervisor at the Idaho Department of Education.

Cliff Green
Fmr. Executive Director
Idaho School Boards Association & Idaho Education Network
(208) 866-4152
Cliff Green is included because I have worked closely with him for a number of years, both in his capacity as Director of the Idaho School Boards Association and the Idaho Education Network, as well as during his service on the public schools 2011 Technology Task Force.

Jeff Youtz
Director
Legislative Services Office
(208) 334-4825
Jeff Youtz is included because he hired me in my position with Legislative Services, and was my direct supervisor for nearly 10 years.

Ray Stark
Senior Vice President
Boise Area Chamber of Commerce
(208) 472-5200
Ray Stark is included because he was my direct supervisor during my time as a legislative intern with the Chamber.
The following is a list of legislators who can speak to the quality of my work. I have also included a reference to the policy areas involved:

U.S. Sen. Jim Risch – Property tax relief (2006 special session HB 1) – Crafted the one bill proposed and signed into law by Gov. Risch

Sen. John Goedde – Students Come First and other education issues

Sen. Bob Nonini – Students Come First and other education issues

Sen. Cliff Bayer – Public Schools budget, grocery tax credit increase (HB 588), Early Retirement Incentive Program (ERIP) repeal

Sen. Russ Fulcher – Grocery tax credit increase (HB 588)

Sen. Steve Thayn – Advanced K-12 educational opportunities

Fmr. Sen. Robert Geddes – School district consolidation issues

Rep. Scott Bedke – Charter schools, school facilities issues (HB 743), budget issues, Students Come First

Rep. Reed DeMordaunt – Charter schools

Rep. Maxine Bell – JFAC budget issues

Rep. Mike Moyle – Property tax relief (2006 special session HB 1)

Rep. Lance Clow – Teacher leadership awards

Rep. Grant Burgoyne – Teacher leadership awards
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Professional Profile
- Current Idaho Teacher Certification in Secondary Education (English emphasis)
- Master of Education Degree with major emphasis in Reading
- Twenty-five years experience teaching writing, literature, and reading education classes

Education, Honors, and Certifications

M Ed
Idaho State University, Pocatello, ID. 1995

Bachelor of Arts in Secondary Education (Honors)
Idaho State University, Pocatello, ID. 1987

Reading Endorsement K-12

Phi Kappa Phi Honor Society

Honorary Adjunct Teacher of the Year Award 2000-2001

Qualifications & Experience
- Taught 8th graders state standards content, including language use, literature analysis, vocabulary, and writing
- Taught freshman composition and advanced writing classes for many years, instructing students how to develop ideas, clarify concepts, defend arguments and master coherent writing skills.
- Taught children’s literature and young adult literature to elementary and secondary education majors
- Developed a wide variety of curricula for use in the classroom, employing peer-editing, small group writing assignments, brainstorming activities, dynamic class discussions, and research instruction.
- Helped develop a clinical program where education majors visited local Madison schools and worked with remedial reading students.

Computer Skills
- Microsoft Windows® Office software, including Word, Power Point, and Publisher
- Internet research
- Adept in grading programs Blackboard and PowerTeacher

Employment
Brigham Young University-Idaho Adjunct Faculty English Dept. Fall 1987 -2008
Madison Junior High School - 8th Grade English 2008 - present

Professional Development
Conference workshop presenter
Attended various conferences and workshops related to writing and teaching
Served on several scholarship and academic committees
CAT team member for Madison Junior High

Related Experience
Edited and published English Department newsletter for seven years
Regularly publish education editorials in the Post Register and Standard Journal newspapers
Worked as advocate for educators and education, serving as currently as president of the Rexburg Education Association

References available upon request
EDUCATION:

June 2012-August 2013  University of Idaho  Moscow, ID
Degree Awarded August 2013: Master of Education- Curriculum and Instruction

- Named a 2012-2013 Wright Fellow with full scholarship for Masters Degree

Professional Education Courses: May 2006-Present

- Fall 2013-Present  Northwest Nazarene University  Nampa, ID
  * AVID (Advancement Via Individual Determination) Site Team Member and Program Development
  * Mentoring High School Students
- Spring 2013  Northwest Nazarene University  Nampa, ID
  * AVID (Advancement Via Individual Determination) Site Team Member and Program Development
- Spring 2012  Northwest Nazarene University  Nampa, ID
  * Unit Study Course to implement the Common Core Standards within the Social Studies Curriculum at Vallivue High School using Critical Thinking and Document Based Questions.
- Summer 2011  Augustana College  Siox Falls, SD
  * Course looking at how to become a Master Teacher, pinpointing key characteristics of mastery teaching by looking at personal strengths and weaknesses.
  * Course looking at Assessment for Learning- changing the way teachers write assessments and engage students in preparation for those assessments.
- Fall 2010  Boise State University  Boise, ID
  * Course look at teaching the History of the United States and world through wars
- Summer 2009-Summer 2010  Augustana College  Sioux Falls, SD
  * Course regarding teaching through “Performance Based Learning”
  * Course in using “Instruction Strategies that work” by Marzano to reach all ability levels
  * Course in working with Gifted and Talented students “Tapping Talent Working with Gifted Students”
- Fall 2008-Spring 2009  Northwest Nazarene University  Nampa, ID
  * Professional Development Course regarding the teaching of students through Inquiry
  * Course regarding “Our Sense of Place” in history through the Idaho Council for History Educators Conference
- Fall 2008  Boise State University  Boise, ID
  * Course looking at Contemporary uses of Social Studies through the investigation of “Our Sense of Place” in history through the Idaho Council for History Educators Conference
- July 2008  University of San Diego  San Diego, CA
  * Advance Placement US History Summer Institute
- Summer 2006-April 2008  Boise State University  Boise, ID
  * Courses with the Teaching American History Grant: Progressive Era, New Deal, Judicial Review, Jacksonian America, Settlement of the West, Great Texts in American History.
  * Course introducing the International Economic Summit.
- Fall 2006-Spring 2008  Northwest Nazarene University  Nampa, ID
  * Professional Development classes in changing methodologies of teaching (SIOP, Culture of Poverty, Harry Wong and Marzano) as well as implementation and alignment of courses in Social Studies Dept.
- Summer 2007  University of Idaho  Moscow, ID
  * Course in Teaching Ethical Studies in Economics

August 2001-May 2006  University of Idaho  Moscow, ID
Degrees Awarded May 2006:  BSED Secondary Education (Social Studies and History Certifications)
BS History with Classical Studies Minor

- Inducted into Honor Societies: Phi Alpha Theta National History Honor Society and National Residence Hall Honorary
- Campus Leadership Opportunities: Residence Hall Association, Vandal Ambassadors, WINGS Instructor for incoming freshmen, and New Student Orientation Leader

EDUCATION CONTINUED…

August 1997-May 2001          Vallivue High School          Caldwell, ID
- National Honor Society, S.A.D.D., UI Top Scholar, Elks Legacy Scholar, and a People to People Student Ambassador

TEACHING EXPERIENCE:

September 2009- Present          College of Western Idaho          Nampa, ID
Dual Credit Adjunct
*Teaching US History 111 and US History 112 by Applying the CWI outcomes and objectives in my classroom teaching.

September 2008-May 2009          College of Southern Idaho          Twin Falls, ID
Dual Credit Adjunct
*Taught US History 111 and US History 112 by Applying the CSI outcomes and objectives to my classroom teaching

August 2006-Present          Vallivue High School          Caldwell, ID
Social Studies Teacher
Social Studies Department Chair (2012-Present)
*Assisting in the implementation, training, and teaching of the AVID program in Social Studies and across other curriculums
*Assisting in the implementation of the Common Core Standards through the creation of Critical Thinking Questions on all History unit exams as well as End of Course Exams.
*Teaching concurrent credit History 111 and History 112 through the College of Western Idaho
*Teaching and Developed a new AP US History and Honors US History program in the Social Studies Dept at VHS. Responsible for writing curriculum, adopting textbooks, designing assessments and other tools necessary for new courses.
*Wrote curriculum map, calendar and End of Course Assessments for US History 1. Teach and Develop lesson plans for US History for all student levels that adhere to district and state standards.
*Pilot program participant for Sheltered Instruction Observational Protocol (SIOP) US History Class. Developed and Taught lesson plans to English Language learners. (2007-2008)
*Wrote curriculum maps for Economics. Developed and Taught lesson plans for Senior Economics course. (2006-2008)

January 2006-May 2006          Vallivue High School          Caldwell, ID
Student Teacher
Developed Lesson Plans relating to current State Standards using a variety of methods to assess student learning and achievement.

PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND ACTIVITIES:

- VHS, Social Studies Department Chair
  Fall 2012-Present
- VHS, AVID Site Team Member
  Fall 2011-Present
- Marble Valley Subdivision, HOA Board Member
  Dec 2011-Dec 2012, Dec 2013-Present
- State of Idaho Curriculum Review Committee- Social Studies
  Summer 2010 and 2011
- Valley Community Credit Union, Board of Directors
  September 2010- Dec 2011
- Vallivue School District, GT Steering Committee
  Fall 2009-Present
- VHS, Academic Excellence Committee
  Spring 2008-Present
- Northwest Professional Educators and American Association of Educators
  Fall 2007-Present
- National Council for History Education
  Fall 2007-Present
- VHS, National Honor Society Advisor
  Fall 2007-Present
- VHS, SIOP Implementation Team
  Spring 2007-Spring 2008
- VHS, School Improvement Committee
  Fall 2006-Spring 2008
- VHS, Freshmen Leadership Advisor
  Fall 2006-Spring 2007
NON-TEACHING WORK EXPERIENCE:

C & K Farms (May 1997-Present) Caldwell, ID
Farm Employee
Work in all aspects of a specialty produce farm (tomatoes, peppers, etc) from pre-planting through harvest. Duties include weeding, watering, crop care, sales and post harvest cleanup, ground preparation and end of year inventory.

University of Idaho, University Residences (August 2005-December 2005) Moscow, ID
Resident Assistant
Responsible for mentoring, programming and enforcing policies within the Residence Halls.

University of Idaho, Dean of Students (May 2005-December 2005) Moscow, ID
Dean of Students WINGS to the Future Mentor
Mentored new freshman at UI through the WINGS transition class, responsible for developing lessons to assist new freshman in transitioning from high school to college through team building, study skills and personal development.

University of Idaho, University Residences (May 2005-December 2005) Moscow, ID
Information Desk Attendant/Mail Room Attendant
A customer service position in which residents and visitors to UI could ask for assistance 24 hours per day; responsible for distributing mail to the 1800 residents in the residence halls.

University of Idaho, University Residences (August 2003-May 2005) Moscow, ID
Special Events Coordinator
Worked with University Residences staff and the staff of other UI departments to create, plan and execute events for students living within the Residence Halls. Coordinated activities and events for incoming and prospective students.

Shopko (June 2002-May 2005) Pullman, WA
Customer Service Desk Specialist
Sales floor and Customer Service Desk ensuring that customers were receiving the best service, stocked shelves, processed returns and exchanges.

PLACEMENT FILE AVAILABLE AT THE UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO
REFERENCES AVAILABLE UPON REQUEST
Sarah K. Holloway

3724 E. Park Ridge Drive * Nampa, ID  83687 * sarahbecca28@gmail.com * Cell: (208)697-1175

Seeking Professional Standards Committee Position

Seeking a position that will enable me to use my current leadership and management skills while obtaining new skills and techniques which will allow me to stimulate professional development and enhance teacher and student learning. I am able to quickly problem solve and build positive relationships. My main objective is to present and communicate the importance of relationships, outside perspectives, and global effects of education to staff and students.

Education and Certifications

Master of Educational Leadership – University of Idaho, January 2010-December 2012
Master of Administration & Leadership / K-12 Administrator Certification

Bachelor of Arts: History, Social Studies – Boise State University, Boise, ID
Secondary Education Certification (May 2008)

US Navy – July 1993 through February 1997 – Honorable Discharge as PN3/E4
Health & Safety Coordinator, Auxiliary Security Force and Personnelman

County Sheriff Reserve – Perry County, Perryville, Arkansas (2003)


Technology Skills – Microsoft Office, Power School/Teacher, Peachtree Accounting Certified

Teaching Experience

Idaho State Correctional Institute
February 2013-Present

Idaho Department of Corrections

Special Education Instructor (for ISCI, SICI, IMSI, NICI & ICI-O)
Identify offenders for special education classes who are managed, taught, evaluated, counseled and assessed to meet their academic needs including creating and incorporating state and federal mandated Eligibility and Individual Education Plans (IEP) within the regular classroom setting for offenders 21 years of age and under. Develop, teach, determine, create, differentiate and review GED Reading/Writing/Math curriculum which includes professional development, assessment of students, tracking attendance, attending regular staff meetings and tutoring within a classroom setting are additional requirements of this position.

Ridgeline Alternative High School, Nampa, Idaho
Sept 2008-Feb 2013

Social Studies Teacher
Social Studies Department Head
Manage, teach, and prepare all 9- and 10- grade US History classes, Economics, and Government which includes all responsibilities of regular classroom teacher including professional development, assessment of students, and regular staff meetings. Collaborate with department and staff design curriculum, lesson plans beneficial to students; perform basic duties such as recording attendance and grading student’s individual work. Student Council Advisor (2009-2011) and Yearbook Advisor (2009-2011).

Educational Training

Frameworks for Teachers
Nampa, ID Sept 08-May 09
Instructional uses and application of the Charlotte Danielson’s: A Framework for Teaching model of evaluation.

Bell to Bell Instruction
Nampa, ID Jan 09-Jun 09
Incorporates training and activities designated to integrate all levels of student involvement in the classroom from the beginning to the end of the class period.
Framework for Understanding Poverty
Nampa, ID Apr 09-Jun 09
The importance of understanding the mindset of students and adults who are raised or live in poverty.

Framework for Understanding Poverty
Charlotte, NC Nov 09
Instructed by Dr. Ruby Payne, incorporation of personal experiences and classroom techniques.

Pyramid Response to Intervention
Nampa, ID Aug 2009
Instructional training on intervention in the classroom and as teams within the school.

Designing Effective Classroom Instruction
Nampa, ID Jun 2010
Ideas to incorporate and build effective classroom lessons.

Professional Learning Communities at Work
Jacksonville, FL June 2010
Working within groups and within the school as a cohesive unit and creating a positive working environment with the school.

Using Advanced Differentiation Strategies for Your Gifted Students
Boise, ID Dec 2010
Tips for the classroom to help advance those students who learn at a quicker pace than the rest of the students while still maintaining a positive learning environment.

Congress in the Classroom
Peoria, IL Aug 2011
Training for government teachers on new strategies and ideas to incorporate into the classroom.

Mentor Training Program
Nampa, ID Oct 2011
Training for mentor teachers to assist new teachers in designing and creating balanced and successful lessons and classroom environment.

Classroom Management & Differentiation in the Classroom
Boise, ID Dec 2011
Teaching positive behaviors in the classroom and differentiation techniques to actively involve student in learning.

Instructional Coaching
Nampa, ID Jan 2012
Teaches the process of working with other teachers that need curriculum and classroom management assistance. Helping the teacher to be more aware of how their actions and the content taught affects all aspects of the classroom.

Council for Exceptional Children Summit
San Antonio, TX April 2013
Summit of information and training applied to new Common Core State Standards and within all realms of education and the classrooms.

Educational Teaching

Teacher Summer Workshop
Nampa, ID July 2011
I co-created and co-taught a two day summer workshop. The workshop was created for high school and middle school teachers. The workshop included Whole Brain Teaching in the Classroom, Classroom Management Skills, Ruby Payne and Poverty, Planning for Block Scheduling, Differentiated Techniques, Brain Research and Relationship Building.
Charlotte McKinney
644 Wall Creek Road. Clearwater, ID 83552
208-926-4676 mckinneyc@sd244.org

Position Sought:
A position on the Professional Standards Commission

Professional Qualifications:
Experienced working with students in classroom and non classroom situations
- Managed a staff up to 100 people
- Actively involved with local community and students
- Proven organizational skills
- Elected and appointed various positions for several community and professional organizations

Education:
Lewis-Clark State College Lewiston, ID
PACE secondary teaching endorsements 2009
Passing Praxis scores-Social Studies, History, English, Completed the required courses for secondary certification

The Ohio State University Columbus, OH
B.A. Communications 1995
President Griffin Honor Society, Dean’s List, Emerge Program for returning adult students, Cultural Optimist Club, Mentoring program for ‘at-risk’ elementary/middle school students

Experience:
Clearwater Valley High School Kooskia, ID
Teacher Aug 2010 to present
Classroom English teacher. As the one of the Title I teachers I work closely with other teachers and parents to help with struggling students be successful. Various school activities including Health Council, Anti-Bulling, Fundraising and after school tutoring

Clearwater Valley High School Kooskia, ID
Plato Aide August 2004 to August 2010
Credit recovery and online courses not offered at the school. Program administrator for PLATO

Lifework Prospect, OH
Vocational Rehabilitation Counselor November 1999 to February 2002
Assisted injured workers on re-entering the workforce; Assessed each client needs and matched skills and abilities with jobs; Dealt with employers on hiring and job applications in addition to tax credits;

References: Available upon request
SUMMARY OF QUALIFICATIONS

Highly skilled teacher
Excellent communicator
A developed work ethic
A sense of humor

EDUCATION

Ph.D. Educational Leadership, Gonzaga University 1993
Dissertation: "Existential Implications of the Nazi Death Camps Based on Selected Readings of Four Jewish Thinkers"

The reaction of Jewish thinkers to the Holocaust can be ranged along a continuum extending from the conservative orthodox position of Eliezer Berkovits to the radical position of Richard L. Rubenstein. Rubenstein suggests that the events of World War II completely destroy the orthodox position of Berkovits and that a new revelation has come to the world. That new revelation must start with, "In the beginning was the Holocaust." The implications of these divergent views remain largely unexplored and conflict dramatically with a worldview that is currently dominated by existentialism and post-modern thought.

M.Ed. Education, University of Idaho, 1981 (Principal certification)
M.A. English, Arizona State University, 1975
B.A. English, Pacific University, 1973

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

1999-present Founder, former principal, teacher: Coeur d' Alene Charter Academy
(First college prep charter high school in the Pacific Northwest) (99-00)
Founder, academic dean, teacher (00-02) Founder, English department chair, Teacher (02-05)
Advanced Placement American Literature, English Literature, World Literature, World Religions, Economics


1977-1997 Teacher-Honors English, American and World Literature, Research Writing, Coach Baseball and Basketball: Coeur d' Alene School District, Idaho

1996-1998 Adjunct Professor-Literature of the Holocaust, Historical and Philosophical Foundations of Education: University of Idaho

1983-1984 Adjunct Professor-World Religions: North Idaho College

1975-1977 Teacher-Australian Literature, American Literature: Queensland Dept. of Education, Australia

1974-1975 Graduate Teaching Assistant-Freshman Composition: Arizona State University

Community Involvement

2002-2004  Committee member to take Neo-Nazi Aryan Nation compound and develop it into a Human Rights Study Center
2004-present  Northwest Professional Educators Board of Directors
2002-2005  Advanced Placement Reader (Grade Eng. Literature essays) Florida
2004-2005  American Board for Certification of Teacher Excellence (ABCTE) (completed teacher certification test for grades 1-6, (St. Louis) 2004 grades 6-12, (Washington DC) 2005 (St. Louis) 2006
1996-2002  Board Member: Idaho Humanities Council
1996-present  Small business owner: Retirement Investments
1992-present  Kidd Island Sewer District Board of Directors
1997-present  Coeur d' Alene Teachers Credit Union Board Member
1983-1997  Kidd Island Water Association Board of Directors
1998-1999  Idaho Board of Education Exiting Standards Committee
1992  Intern: Hecla Mining Company
1992  Head Coach: American Legion Baseball (W49 L14) 1992 League and District Champions
2004  Head Coach Boys Basketball

Honors

Teacher of the Year Nominee: Lake City High School  1997
Teacher of the Year National Honor Society (multiple years)
Teacher of the year Key Club (multiple years)
North Idaho Student/Teacher Recognition
Class Valedictorian: Most Influential Teacher Award 1993, 94, 95, 96, 2004

Grants

Local:  Excel Committee  "Great Ideas in the Humanities" 1985

State:  The Idaho Humanities Council  "Existential Implications of the Nazi Death Camps"

National:  Fellow: The National Endowment for the Humanities
         Herman Melville's  Moby Dick
         University of California at Santa Barbara  1986

         Fellow: The National Endowment for the Humanities
         Literature of the Holocaust
         Simmons College, Boston, MA  1991

         The Holocaust and Jewish Resistance
         Study Tour in Poland and Israel 1994

         American Gathering of Holocaust Survivors

         American Gathering of Holocaust Survivors

Professional References Available Upon Request
February 18, 2014

Lynn Swanson-Puckett
735 W. Arbor Pointe Way
Nampa, ID 83686

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to express my interest in being nominated as the secondary educator for the Idaho Professional Standards Commission. I hold current certification in administration and elementary education and I would appreciate the opportunity to serve in this position for the Idaho Professional Standards Commission.

I have 25 years experience as an educator working at the elementary school through high school levels, I have also taught various adult education classes. I am very dedicated to the profession of education and continually look for ways to hone the craft of better educating students. I have been a dean of students for the last 6 years at Lone Star Middle School, Response to Intervention (RTI) Coordinator for LSMS, team leader, Positive Behavior Interventions and Strategies (PBIS) team member, and on the Grading and Assessment Committee. I have training and experience as a mentor teacher and in the supervision of student teachers.

I have worked for the Nampa School District at Lone Star Middle School and West Middle School for the last 7 years, at the Meridian School District, Caldwell School District, Huntley Project School District in Montana, and for the Beach School District in North Dakota. I enjoy all aspects of education, and the opportunity to serve my profession in this capacity would be an honor. I know my years of experience will be invaluable to the committee.

I thank you in advance for any consideration you give to me for this position and I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely,

Lynn Swanson
LYNN SWANSON  
735 W Arbor Pointe Way, Nampa ID 83686  
T 208-695-8097  E lynn83686@gmail.com  W lynnswanson.weebly.com

VISION STATEMENT

Results oriented administrator that strives to improve the quality of education by providing instructional leadership that ensures educational strategies are in place that support effective learning for all students and fostering an environment that is safe and conducive to learning. To work in partnership with district, staff, and community to develop well-rounded students who are actively involved in a relevant curriculum and engaged in becoming life long problem solvers. As well as creating a learning environment that encourages teamwork, offers encouragement, and promote success for all.

ADMINISTRATIVE SKILLS & EXPERIENCE

DEAN, NAMPA SCHOOL DISTRICT (NSD), NAMPA, ID
- Enforced school expectations and attendance guidelines.
- Conferenced with parents and staff to discuss educational policies and student behavioral and/or learning issues.
- Counseled and provided guidance to students regarding personal, academic, vocational or behavioral issues.

RESPONSE TO INTERVENTION COORDINATOR (RTI), NSD, NAMPA, ID
- Collaborated with teachers about individual student’s performance goals and objectives.
- Evaluated intervention strategies to determine their effectiveness and efficiency.
- Collaborated with special education staff and teachers to create RTI documents.
- Presented our RTI process, paperwork, and intervention programs at the Middle Level Association Conference.
- Planned and conducted teacher training in RTI procedures and data collection.

POSITIVE BEHAVIOR INTERVENTIONS & SUPPORTS (PBIS) TEAM MEMBER, NSD, NAMPA, ID
- Collaborated with team to successfully implement a school wide behavior plan that focused on positive reinforcement.

GRADING & ASSESSMENT TEAM MEMBER, NSD, NAMPA, ID
- Collaborated with team to establish a school wide grading policy that provides congruency and consistency among departments and grade levels in the use of grading and assessment procedures.

ONWARD TO EXCELLENCE SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT TEAM LEADER, CALDWELL SCHOOL DISTRICT, CALDWELL, ID
- Extensive training and experience in developing study teams to improve instruction, curriculum and assessment through Northwest Regional Education Lab.
STRONG EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND WITH TRAINING IN:
AdvaneED External Review Team Member for School Accredidation, Curriculum writing and updating, Brain Compatible Teaching, Implementing Professional Learning Communities (PLCs), Teaching with Technology (Milken Foundation), Mathematical Thinking for Instruction (MTI), Comprehensive Reading Course, Peer Mentoring, Frameworks for Teachers, Open Court Reading, SIPPS, Read Naturally, 6+1 Writing Steps, Project WET, Project WILD, and Odyssey of the Mind Coach, Future Business Leaders of America Advisor.

PROFESSIONAL WORK EXPERIENCE
LONE STAR MIDDLE SCHOOL, NAMPA SCHOOL DISTRICT, NAMPA, ID
2008 - CURRENT
Dean of Students, 6th Grade Math Teacher and RTI Coordinator

WEST MIDDLE SCHOOL, NAMPA SCHOOL DISTRICT, NAMPA, ID
2007 - 2008
7th Grade Math Teacher

SAWTOOTH MIDDLE SCHOOL, MERIDIAN SCHOOL DISTRICT, MERIDIAN, ID
2006 - 2007
Math, Language Arts and Math Inclusion Instructor

SACAJAWEA ELEMENTARY, CALDWELL SCHOOL DISTRICT, CALDWELL, ID
2004 - 2006
4th Grade Teacher and Onward to Excellence Team Leader
Completed my Administrative Internship in 2005-2006

HUNTLEY ELEMENTARY, HUNTLEY SCHOOL DISTRICT, WORDEN, MT
2002 - 2004
6th Grade Teacher and 6th Grade Inclusion Teacher

LINCOLN ELEMENTARY, BEACH SCHOOL DISTRICT, BEACH, ND
1991 - 2002
5th/6th Grade Combination Teacher, 1992-1997
6th Grade Teacher, 1992-1997
3rd Grade Teacher, 1997-2002

BEACH HIGH SCHOOL, BEACH SCHOOL DISTRICT, BEACH, ND
1990 - 1991
Day Treatment Teacher

EDUCATION

GRAND CANYON UNIVERSITY, PHOENIX, AZ
MASTER IN EDUCATION ~ ADMINISTRATION 2006

DICKINSON STATE UNIVERSITY, DICKINSON, ND
BACHELOR OF SCIENCE ~ ELEMENTARY EDUCATION 1990

~Do all the good you can. By all the means you can. In all the ways you can. In all the places you can. At all the times you can. To all the people you can. As long as you ever can.
~John Wesley
THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK
PROFILE
Classroom teacher with 16 years of experience in the high school setting. Solid reputation as an effective instructor, devoted professional and supportive colleague. Demonstrates passion for learning, teaching, and the teaching profession. Excellent organizational and communication skills.

STRENGTHS
- Collaborative
- Professional
- Reflective
- Inquisitive
- Able to compromise
- Excellent written and oral communication skills

EXPERIENCE
Centennial High School, Boise, Idaho, Joint School District #02 1998-Present
Teacher of French, English, Language Arts Lab, and Student Council
- Managed student loads of approx. 180 students per school year
- Prepared and presented lessons to classes in French, levels 1-3
- Collaborated with colleagues to create common assessments, establish curricular goals, analyze student data, and improve instruction
- Mentored two student teachers
- Developed and implemented school-wide Response to Intervention plan as part of Faculty Advisory Council
- Formulated and implemented school-wide late work policy as part of Faculty Advisory Council
- Wrote portion of school accreditation report as World Language Department Chair
- Wrote district concept-based curriculum for Junior level Language Arts
- Wrote district End-of-Course exams for French, levels 1, 2, and 3

Teacher of English, Journalism, and Newspaper Advisor
- General Classroom Duties

EDUCATION
Master’s of Educational Leadership, Northwest Nazarene University, Nampa, Idaho 2006
Bachelor of Arts, Secondary English Education, Idaho State University, Pocatello, Idaho 1998
April 5, 2011

Dear Dr. Thomas and Board,

Upon receiving the communication asking for a volunteer to represent ISSA on the Professional Standards Commission, I decided to submit my letter of interest.

I believe that my 21 years of experience as a face to face principal, superintendent, online principal and Director of Supervision and Accountability for IDLA gives me a unique perspective and qualifications for this position. As Idaho moves to more online and blended instruction, it may be valuable to have someone with experience in both face 2 face and online administrative experience on the Professional Standards Commission.

I would be happy to serve in this position if selected by ISSA board.

Sincerely,

Laural Nelson

Dr. Laural Nelson
Director of Supervision and Accountability
Idaho Digital Learning
laural.nelson@idla.k12.id.us
208-316-0450
Dr. Laural Nelson

Objective
To Serve on the Professional Standards Commission

Experience
2005-current    IDLA    Idaho Digital Learning Academy
                  Director of District Services and Supervision
                  • Strategic planning.
                  • Developed policy and procedures.
                  • IDLA is ranked 3rd in the country for online learning policy
                    and practice.
                    “Survey conducted by the Center for Digital Education”
                  • Conducted professional development for online teachers.
                  • Spoke at conferences and webinars.
                  • Presented at the VSS Virtual School Symposium held in
                    Austin, Texas, November 2009.
                  • Conducted State Wide Best Practices Webinars on
                    Implementation Strategies for Student Success In Online
                    Programs.
                  • Supervised online teachers and helped implement a pay-
                    for-performance model of reimbursement.
                  • Evaluated and interviewed online teachers.
                  • Team Player.
                  • Public Relations Specialist/Liaison - Engage in promoting
                    IDLA to Region IV Schools and statewide.
                  • Marketing IDLA to Region IV and statewide.
                  • Implementation - Aiding Districts and Schools as they
                    design a plan for successful implementation of IDLA
                    classes.
                  Currently, supervising app. 300 teachers and 22 principals.

1990-2008 July 1,2008 Valley School District,Hazelton, Idaho
Superintendent of Schools
• Experience in budget, personnel, curriculum and
  instruction, facilities, law.
- Experienced leader with a vision for educational excellence.
- Skilled in leading-edge educational practices.
- Understands the dynamics of teaching and learning.
- Possesses integrity and values honesty.
- Effective human relations skills in person to person and in an on-line environment.
- Excels in financial management.
- Understands the use and value of technology and online education.
- Community member and leader.
- **Teacher 1990-1993.**
- **Principal 1993-1998.**
- **Superintendent 1998-2008.**

Summer 2007  Idaho State University  Pocatello, Idaho
**Adjunct Professor of Educational Law**
- Was asked to step in for the summer for a staff member that was ill to develop and teach a hybrid Doctorate Educational Law class as well as a Masters level hybrid law class (part online and part face to face).
- Students reported that it was the most practical and interesting class that they had taken.

Spring 2010  University of Phoenix  Phoenix, Arizona
**Faculty Member**
- Facilitate online Educational Law and Research classes.

**Education**
- Idaho State University  Pocatello, Idaho
  - **1998 Doctorate of Education - Educational Administration Honors**
  - 1996 Educational Specialist
  - 1995 Masters of Education
  - 1990 BA in Elementary Education

College of Southern Idaho  Twin Falls, Idaho
- **1982 Associate of Arts -**

**Interests**
- Spending time with my family, ranching, riding cutting horses, quilting, gardening, taking classes and reading.
Gary R. Comstock

1005 E. 21st Street Idaho Falls, Idaho 83404 (208) 542-0179 (208) 360-2671 (cell) gcomstock@sd251.org

Objective

To provide educational assistance to students in an ever-challenging world.

Education and Credentials

Ashland University, Ashland, Ohio
Superintendent's Certificate
2007

Miami University, Miami, Ohio
M.Ed., Educational Leadership
1998

The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio
M.A., German Literature
1992

Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah
B.A., German
1988

Experience

Jefferson County School District, #251, Rigby Idaho
Elementary School Principal, Midway Elementary
2013-present

- Supervise 18 elementary teachers, focusing on Individual Professional Development Plans, PLCs and the Common Core State Standards; Preparing students to take the new generation of SBAC tests
- ESL Director; Oversee all aspects of the ESL program in the district; supervise 7 separate employees; see that all State and Federal laws are observed, all IELA tests are administered, and that all ESL students are served
- Revitalize and re-start proper RTI and MDT meetings
- Enforced all district policies and rules in the parent/student planner
- Supervise all aspects of a K-5 school, including parent meetings, instruction, using data to assist in decision making

Jefferson County School District #251, Rigby, Idaho
High School Principal, Rigby High School
2007 to 2013

Implementation of School Board Policies

- Coordinate directly with Special Education and LEP teachers with the implementation of new laws and practices
- Work personally with Guidance Department with the registration of new students, including transients
- Monitor Foreign Exchange Students, making sure State and Federal laws are followed
- Provide alternatives for students having difficulty adhering to attendance and graduation requirements
- Enforce student dress code, student code of conduct, make up work, behavioral expectations
- Work directly with School Resource Officer daily to maintain a safe and secure educational environment

Leadership of Faculty

- Plan, share, implement and monitor Marzano teaching strategies to improve student performance
- Work collaboratively with staff and teacher leaders to solve school problems
- Created and lead Technology Committee to review, propose, and execute educational technology in the school
- Plan, implement, instruct Professional Development for teachers, including Reading and Writing in all subjects
- Together with teachers, created committees to address school issues

General Responsibilities

- Enforce safety procedures; encourage appropriate preparation for school
- Visible and approachable administrator; worked daily with teachers to build teacher morale, utilize data to move instruction forward, and investigate potential changes to improve student achievement
• Created time for teachers to collaborate together to address student need; visited their meetings
• Reworked the Parent/Student handbook for patron understanding
• Supervised six (6) secretarial workers; evaluated certificated and classified staff
• Efficiently scheduled building working in tandem with other schools and bussing routes
• Monitored substitutes teachers, creating a feedback system for both substitutes and teachers

East Knox Local School District, Howard, Ohio  
2004 to 2007

MS/HS Principal

Implementation of School Board Policies
• Applied policies regarding eligibility of resident/non-resident students.
• Enforced student attendance policies, student conduct polices, dress, grooming and electronic devices policies.
• Worked closely community agencies and guidance counselor to help with students who had difficulties in meeting graduation requirements.
• Reduced student gross misbehavior 70% by implementing a Positive Behavior Support initiative; Students were rewarded weekly for good behaviors
• Coordinated the collaboration of Special Education teachers with Regular Education teachers

Leadership of Faculty
• Led the implementation of Power Standards for 43 teachers and support personnel; encouraged Professional Development and the testing out of new ideas
• Together with teachers, created a working Departmental Meeting and Duty Roster schedule
• Created Homework Center
• Together with teachers, created a school-wide Writing Rubric
• Launched a Junior High and Senior High PTO
• Provided letters of encouragement and support; initiated Master Teacher and Grand Master incentives
• Encouraged and championed X period classes

General Responsibilities
• Enforced safety protocols; created committees to solve building problems, including Professional Learning Communities, and Technology Committees
• Visible and approachable administrator; worked daily with teachers to build teacher morale, utilize data to move instruction forward, and investigate potential changes to improve student achievement
• Created time for teachers to collaborate together; visited their meetings
• Developed a solid, easy to understand Parent/Student handbook
• Supervised six (6) custodial workers
• Efficiently scheduled staff and students despite facility constraints
• Monitored substitutes teachers, creating a feedback system for both substitutes and teachers

Hopewell-Loudon Local School District, Bascom, Ohio  
1998 to 2004

MS/HS Principal

Implementation of School Board Policies
• Reviewed teaching curricula, recommended improvements in educational programs, integrated the Ohio Academic Content Standards into all core teaching disciplines
• Directed, supervised, and evaluated student guidance programs.
• Developed and led school improvement initiatives, including programs for students with special needs (Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and Section 504)
• Monitored teacher's implementation of school board policies
• Enforced the Ohio Revised Code as to Residency and Immunization Requirements

Supervision of Faculty
• Supervised and motivated the professional growth and personal development of 29 teachers and the Dean
• Observed and evaluated teacher lessons and instructional delivery; prepared and reviewed performance
evaluations with individual teachers; fostered teacher creativity to raise student proficiency test scores

- Directed, supervised, and evaluated guidance programs
- Exposed Teachers to Curriculum Mapping
- Built Master Schedule of Classes
- Encouraged interaction between teachers and parents on all student-related issues.
- Hired substitutes and monitored their assignments
- Revised teacher, student, and parent handbooks.

General Responsibilities

- Developed policies/plans to safeguard District equipment, property and grounds
- Developed and enforced an emergency preparedness plan in event of tragedy or alarm.
- Administered the registration, assignment, promotion, and retention of all students.
- Championed high standards of student conduct and administered discipline according to school board policy.
- Maintained positive community/school relations through attendance at community, school, and extra-curricular functions.
- Supervised employee use of sick, personal, and professional leave; coordinated the scheduling of a K-12 building.
- Approved expenditures for all extra-curricular and student activities; supervised ordering of supplies; prepared yearly budgetary requests and monitored expenditures for texts, equipment, and teacher supplies.

North College Hill City Schools, Cincinnati, Ohio, Cincinnati, Ohio 1992 to 1998

German Teacher
Taught students in an inner-city school environment to speak, read, write, listen to and enjoy the learning of German, with additional emphasis on German culture. Used a combination of teaching methods to stimulate interest. Emphasized intelligent conversation within meaningful contexts. Encouraged students to use the language in numerous ways outside the classroom. Developed an innovative Middle School German Curriculum. Responsibilities expanded from four periods of German to six in an eight-period day. Skills included having lived in Germany for 2 years.

North College Hill City Schools, Cincinnati, Ohio 1997 to 1998

Administrative Assistant
Assisted two principals with student discipline matters. Made administrative detention assignments, including alternative classroom assignments and after-school programs. Duties included considerable parental contact and attendance at administrative meetings.

Grant Writing

- 2013 AASP Health Grant, designed to purchase equipment for PE classes
- 2009 Idaho Department of Juvenile Corrections “Drinking and Driving Grant;” Idaho National Laboratories STEM Grant to serve under privileged minority students
- 2006 SERRC Grant; North Central Coop Grant; Breakfast Start-Up Grant; Learn and Serve America Grant; Conflict Management Grant; Goals 2000 Grant
- 2011 Question of the Day Grant; Jefferson County Educational Foundation

Additional Training

- State of Idaho Principal Evaluation Pilot, 2014
- Project Leadership Graduate, 2010; SIOP (Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol) trained; Reasonable Suspicion Training; Value-Added Training; Crisis Planning Table Top Exercises; eSis Training; Data-Driving Decision Making 2008; Strategies and Tools Training to Meet AYP; OhioLit; Learn and Serve Ohio; Professional Conferences; Formula Writing; Standards Aligning; School Conflict Management Training; Institute for Leadership Development; Crime Prevention Training.

Activities, Honors, Certificates

- 2010 FFA Honorary Chapter Degree; AED trained; eTech Professional Development Grant; Continuous Improvement Leadership Award, Teacher Exchange Representative with Munich, Germany, 1996; German Language Certificates; Vice President, Ohio Association of Teachers of German.
Professional Memberships

- Idaho Association of Elementary School Principals

Volunteer Work

- Greater Menan City Council, Boy Scouts of America; Sunday School Teacher, East Knox Levy Committee; Labor for Field House Project, Professional Development Committee, Local Technology Committee, MBC President, 2006-07; Hopewell-Loudon Youth Committee, Ohio Association of Secondary School Administrators--Legislative Committee; IASSP Region VI Representative;
By Whom It May Concern,

It is with great enthusiasm that I am applying for the opening on the Professional Standards Commission for the IAESP board. I desire to continue to be an instructional leader who promotes the voice of Idaho educational leaders and develops leadership at the building, district and state level.

Serving as the IAESP-Region 1 President in 2011-2012, I had the opportunity to conduct monthly meetings that provided relevant information on current and anticipated issues, focused discussions regarding professional development, and developed capacity to maximize effectiveness with other Region 1 elementary principals. I believe that relationships, communication, and high expectations are key components in working together.

I am an administrator who leads with integrity, has an open door policy, is approachable, self motivated, and highly organized. I have the proven ability to create and monitor policies and practices that promote that ultimately lead to school improvement. Moreover, I have further developed interpersonal skills necessary to build and maintain open communication and relationships with not only students, but teachers, administrators, parents and community members within my district and state.

It is my hope that IAESP will take advantage of my experience and passion. It would be my commitment to continue to lead, advocate, and partner with fellow Idaho educators. I appreciate your time and consideration for this position.

Cordially,

Monique English
Monique Anne English
7743 N. Abercrombie Court, Coeur d'Alene, ID 83815
Home (208) 772-0790 Cell (208) 640-6915
moniqueenglish1@yahoo.com

EDUCATION:
Masters in Educational Leadership, University of Idaho, 05/07
Bachelor of Science Elementary Education, Linfield College, 06/03
Associate of Arts Oregon Transfer Degree, Columbia Gorge Community College, 06/01

CERTIFICATION:
Idaho Administration Credential K-12
Idaho Education Credential, Endorsements: Standard Elementary All Subjects, K/8
Washington Residency Teacher, Endorsements: Elementary and Early Childhood Education

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPERIENCE:
Assistant Principal-Skyway Elementary K/5--550 students, Coeur d'Alene, ID (10/13-Current)
Principal-Lakeside Elementary PreK/6--250 students, Plummer, ID (07/10-7/12)
IAESP-Idaho Association Of Elementary School Principals-Region 1 President (10/11-7/12)
Vice Principal-Skyway Elementary K/5--620 students, Coeur d'Alene, ID (08/07-8/09)
Principal Intern-Atlas Elementary K/5--535 students, Hayden, ID (08/06-06/07)
Assistant Site Coordinator/Principal Summer School- Atlas Elementary, Hayden ID (08/06)

Training/Background In:
• TIA-Total Instructional Alignment
• Language Arts Curriculum Adoption
• Character Education Development
• 1-2-3 Magic/Love & Logic
• Bullying/Harassment Prevention
• Emergency/Safe Schools Planning
• RTI-Response To Intervention
• Individual Education Plans/Writing Of 504’s
• PBIS-Positive Behavioral Intervention Supports
• SWIS-School Wide Information System/Discipline Tracking
• Writing & Implementation Of School Improvement Grant
• Shared Decision Making/Development Of Action Teams
• Designing, Planning & Opening Of Brand New Elementary Building
• WISE Tool-Ways To Improve School Effectiveness
• Staff Recruitment & Evaluation
• Charlotte Danielson Model
• Parental & Community Involvement
• Administrative Reporting
• Fiscal Management
• BlockFest-Certified Trainer
• Instructional Training For Teachers

INSTRUCTIONAL EXPERIENCE:
Kindergarten, First, and Second Grade Teacher- Coeur d'Alene, ID (08/05-08/10 8/12-Present)
First Grade Teacher-John Brown Elementary, Rathdrum, ID (08/04-08/05)
Seventh and First Grade Summer School Teacher- Lakeland District, Rathdrum, ID (06/04-08/04)
Long-Term Substitute Third Grade-Prairie View Elementary, Post Falls, ID (01/04-03/04)
Substitute Teacher K-12 Coeur d’Alene, Lakeland, and Post Falls School Districts, ID (09/03-6/04)
Background In:

- Curriculum Design & Development
- Early Literacy Skills
- Differentiated Instruction
- Intervention Reading-Switch
- Student Centered Learning
- Classroom Management
- Student Motivation Programs
- Student Assessment
- Classroom Website Design
- Parental & Community Involvement
- Mentoring of Student Teachers
- Development of Standards Based Report Card
Dear Colleagues,

My name is Dave Kerns and I would like to be considered for the position of Elementary Principal Representative on the Professional Standards Commission. I have been serving as an elementary principal in Snake River School District for the last two years with experience supervising 4th, 5th, and 6th grades. Previously, I was Superintendent of Clark County School District and the K-12 Principal for four years. Prior to that assignment, I served as Principal of Aberdeen High School for four years. I know I will be a strong instructional leader and can help all teachers to work together as we all strive to meet the rigors of federal and state mandates.

I thoroughly enjoyed teaching at the high school and middle school level for twenty-one years, and I also enjoyed my first four years of administrative experience at Aberdeen as the high school principal, my assignment as Superintendent of Clark County School District, and now as Principal of Snake River Middle School. My experience in teaching and enjoyment of young people will be a great asset to your district. The training I have received while teaching and serving as a high school principal, as a superintendent, and now as a Principal of 5th and 6th grades qualify me for the position, and I am ready to grow even further in this new responsibility.

I sincerely hope to contribute to the PSC and to help improve the classroom atmosphere in the State. I will provide good judgment tempered with strict confidentiality. I also firmly believe in following the leadership of the Association and working with the employees in the main office so we may all pull in the same direction and do what is best for all students.

Please consider me for an interview at your earliest convenience. I appreciate your time and effort in this matter. I look forward to meeting you and having an opportunity to discuss the position further.

Sincerely,

David L. Kerns
Principal, Snake River Middle School, School District #52
David L. Kerns  
610 Chesterfield Lane  
Idaho Falls, Idaho 83402  
208-522-6067  
kerndavi@isu.edu

OBJECTIVE:

Professional, experienced educator seeking a position as a Public School Administrator

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:

Snake River School District #52, Blackfoot, Idaho  
2012 – Present

Principal, Snake River Middle School  
Federal Programs Director

Clark County School District #161, Dubois, Idaho  
2008 – 2012

Superintendent

Aberdeen High School, Aberdeen, Idaho  
Fall 2004 – 2008

High School Principal

Idaho Association of Teachers of Language and Culture  
Fall 2004 – 2005

President

Idaho Falls Teachers’ Credit Union  
Spring 2004

Board Member

Sandcreek Middle School, Idaho Falls, Idaho  
Fall 2001

Administrative intern

Hillcrest High School, Idaho Falls, Idaho  
1992 – 2004

Foreign Language Department Chair  
Spanish Teacher

• Interpreted for Superintendent and School Board.
• Organized Hispanic students for purposes of service and attendance at the Hispanic Youth Symposium in Sun Valley.
• Led several highly successful student trips to Mexico and Spain.

Foreign Language Department Chair
Spanish Teacher and Spanish club advisor
Sophomore Football Coach
Girls Basketball Coach

Salmon High School, Salmon, Idaho 1985 – 1986

Spanish and English Teacher
JV Boys basketball coach


Spanish teacher
Girls basketball coach
Instructor of English as a second language
Yearbook advisor

EDUCATION:

- Education Specialist in Educational Administration, May 2010, Idaho State University, Pocatello, Idaho GPA: 3.86
- Masters of Education in Educational Administration, May 2002, Idaho State University, Pocatello, Idaho GPA: 3.92 (Summa Cum Laude)
- Bachelor of Science in Education, June 1983, Utah State University, Logan, Utah. Major – Spanish, Minors – English and P. E. GPA: 3.64 (Cum Laude, academic scholarship recipient)

REFERENCES:

Chad R. Struhs – Assistant Supt. Ron Perrenoud – Superintendent
Blackfoot School District Ririe School District
270 East Bridge Street P.O. Box 548
Blackfoot, Idaho 83221 Ririe, Idaho 83443
Work – (208) 785-8800 Work – (208) 538-7482
Cell – (208) 317-5500 Home – (208) 523-0271

Charles Shackett – Superintendent Geoffrey Thomas – Superintendent
Bonneville Joint School District Madison School District
3497 North Ammon Road 290 North 1st East
Idaho Falls, Idaho 83401 Rexburg, Idaho 83440
Work – (208) 525-4400 Work – (208) 359-3300
Home – (208) 535-1207 Cell – (208) 313-3210
March 5, 2014

Idaho Association of Elementary School Principals
777 S. Latah St.
Boise, ID 83705

RE: Professional Standards Commission Opening

Dear IAESP Board:

Please accept this as my letter of interest for the immediate opening on the Idaho Professional Standards Commission. Included with this letter is my résumé demonstrating the variety of educational positions and experiences I have held over the past nineteen years.

I am interested in engaging in the tasks assigned to the commission. If you need any additional information, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Elisa S. Saffle
Principal, Hillview Elementary School

safflee@d93.k12.id.us
Elisa S. Saffle  
5455 Denning Ave., Iona, Idaho 83427  
208-244-2757 elisasaffle@gmail.com

EDUCATION:

Educational Specialist Educational Administration: Idaho State University, Pocatello, Idaho  
May 2009

Master of Education Educational Administration: Idaho State University, Pocatello, Idaho  
December 2008

Master of Education Curriculum and Instruction – Mathematics Specialist: Kent State University, Kent, Ohio  
August 2000

Bachelor of Arts in Mathematics – Secondary Teaching Certification: Malone College, Canton, Ohio  
May 1995

CERTIFICATION:

Idaho: Superintendent Pre K – 12, School Principal Pre K – 12, Mathematics 6 – 12

EXPERIENCE:

Bonneville Joint School District #93, Idaho Falls, Idaho

Elementary School Principal: June 2013 to present – Hillview Elementary School
• Ensured implementation of professional learning communities focusing on student learning and growth.
• Responsible for making discipline decisions for prevention and consequences.
• Provided all certified and classified employee evaluations.
• Completed walk-throughs for snapshots of teacher effectiveness.
• Prepared professional development plans with teachers.
• Collaborated with parents for family activities, fundraisers, volunteers, and school needs.
• Responsible for school finances and budgeting.

High School Assistant Principal: July 2009 to June 2013 – Hillcrest High School
• Responsible for making discipline decisions for prevention and consequences.
• Provided teacher evaluations for the mathematics, physical education, and fine arts departments.
• Completed walk-throughs for snapshots of teacher effectiveness.
• Organized the school accreditation process and site visit with the Northwest Accreditation Commission.
• Scheduled teachers for extra supervision responsibilities.
• Supervised athletic, extra-curricular, and co-curricular events.
• Contributed to the planning and development of the master schedule.
• Helped organize the high school course description book.
• Served as member of the district calendar committee.
• Supervised school clubs.

Idaho Falls School District #91, Idaho Falls, Idaho

Coordinator of Staff Development: July 2008 to June 2009
• Managed part of the district Federal Title II funds to facilitate professional learning.
• Responsible for scheduling, designing, and teaching graduate level continuing education courses.
• Organized and executed the Whole Child, Whole Teacher conference for over 800 educators.
• Planned and carried out new teacher induction and monthly academies to train and retain new teachers.
• Led the mentoring and professional development committees.

Coordinator of Assessment and Program Evaluation: June 2007 to June 2008 (interim position)
• Responsible for implementing federal and state mandated K-12 assessments.
• Supervised the district ISAT (Idaho Standards Achievement Test) Coordinator.
• Collaborated with Directors of Elementary and Secondary and Coordinator of Curriculum and Professional Development on assessment, curriculum, and professional development projects.
• Communicated regularly with the State Department of Education and the Office of the State Board of Education for clarification and compliance issues.
• Trained and supervised the Idaho Reading Indicator (IRI) proctors.
• Analyzed national, state, and local data for instructional and curricular decision-making.
Math Curriculum Specialist: June 2004 to June 2007
- Responsible for the mathematics curriculum needs of the district including in-service opportunities, trainings, updating assessments, and alignment of mathematics curriculum.

Junior High School Math Teacher: August 2000 to August 2006 – Clair E. Gale Jr. High School
- Taught ninth grade Geometry and Algebra and seventh grade Pre-Algebra.

ACT Preparation Teacher: October 2003 to May 2004 – Community Education Program
- Prepared high school students for the English, Mathematics, Reading, and Science ACT Tests.

North Olmsted City Schools, North Olmsted, Ohio
High School Math Teacher: North Olmsted High School, North Olmsted, Ohio.
- August 1997 to August 1999.

Lakeland Community College, Kirtland, Ohio
Part-time Instructor: April 1996 to June 1996 – Math 094

Other Teaching Experience

Continuing Education Graduate Courses:
- The Core Six Essential Teaching Strategies – Teaching Strategies for Common Core Implementation
- Tools for Teaching – Discipline, Instruction, and Motivation
- Responsive Teaching – Instructional Strategies for the Differentiated Classroom
- Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) I – Introduction to the Eight Components
- Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) II
- New Teacher Induction
- New Teacher Academy
- Teacher Academy
- Mathematics Academy – Focus on Remediation
- Mathematics Academy – Focus on Differentiation

Workshops and Seminars:
- Questioning Strategies
- Writing Content and Language Objectives
- Closing the Achievement Gap
- 9 Strategies of Classroom Instruction that Works
- Understanding and Using Assessment Data
- Engaging Students
- Grouping and Interaction

Substitute Teacher: September 1995 to June 1996 – Fairport Harbor, Painesville City and Township, Ohio

ORGANIZATIONS AND ACTIVITIES:

Project Leadership
Idaho LEADS
Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD)
Delta Kappa Gamma – Honor Society of Women Educators
Idaho Association of School Administrators (IASA)
Idaho Association of Elementary School Principals (IAESP)
National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP)
Idaho Association of Secondary School Principals (IASSP)
National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP)
Coordinator of Idaho Association of Student Council (IASC) Region V/IV Conference 2010

References Available Upon Request
February 22, 2014

State Board of Education Members
State Board of Education
P.O. Box 83720
Boise, ID 83720-0037

State Board of Education Members:

Thank you for considering my application to fulfill the remainder of Anne Ritter’s term on the Professional Standards Commission.

After reviewing the responsibilities of the members of the PSC, I believe I am aptly qualified to fill the position and represent school board members around the state and the Idaho School Boards Association.

As you can see from my resume, I have several years of experience as a school board member and I am also very active in my local community. I understand the time commitment involved and am able to fulfill that requirement.

I feel I would be a valuable member of the Committee and look forward to serving.

Thank you for your time in considering my resume.

Respectfully,

Margaret Chipman
MARGARET GAIL Felton CHIPMAN

Position Applied For: Professional Standards Commission

School Board Work:

- Member and former chairman—Weiser School District #431 Board of Trustees
- Member and current Region 8 chairman—Idaho School Boards Association (ISBA) Executive Board
- Member of the ISBA Scholarship Trust Committee
- Member of the ISBA Governmental Affairs Committee
- Member of the ISBA Board Training and Leadership Development Committee
- Member of the ISBA Finance and Audit Committee

Community Activities:

- Vice-Chairman—Idaho Oil and Gas Conservation Commission
- Member Chapter T, PEO—promotes education for women
- Member Shamrock Club—raises funds to restore and maintain historic Jeffrey’s School in Weiser
- Former member—Weiser Memorial Hospital Foundation Board
- Former chairman and precinct committeeman—Washington County Republican Party Central Committee

Work Experience:

- Certified Pharmacy Technician at ParkVu Pharmacy and BiMart Pharmacy in Weiser, ID—8 years
- Licensed Practical Nurse for Weiser Memorial Hospital and Dr. Phillip Krueger—10 years
- Co-owner of family cattle feeding and ranching business—40 years

Education:

- Graduated Cum Laude with BS (Business) from U of I in 1967
- Received LPN Certificate from TVCC in 1992
Barbara A. Dixon
P.O. Box 759
New meadows, ID 83654
208 347 3143
bada2@cwomc.com

February 21, 2014

Taylor Raney
Professional Standards Administrator
Professional Standards Commission
Idaho Dept. of Education
P.O. Box 83728
Boise, ID 83720

Dear Mr. Raney,

Karen Echeverria has informed the Executive Board of the ISBA that Anne Ritter will not be completing her last year of service on your board due to other commitments. After speaking briefly with both Karen and Anne, I find that I am interested in applying to fill that vacancy.

I have done some research regarding the mission, philosophy and long term goals of the commission along with the responsibilities of the various committees. In addition, Anne has described the time commitment for serving. Based on that information, my years on national, state and local boards as well as varied teaching and mentoring experience, I feel that I can be a valuable, committed member and a good fit to serve on this commission.

Thank you for your time in considering my resume.

Regards,

Barbara A. Dixon
PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS COMMISSION MEMBER APPLICATION

APPLICATION

PERSONAL INFORMATION

APPLICANT NAME: Barbara A. Dixon

ADDRESS: P.O.Box 759
CITY & STATE: New Meadows, Idaho 83654
PHONE: (DAY) (208)347-31453 (EVENING) Same
E-MAIL: bada2@cwomc.com

EMPLOYMENT HISTORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Position/Title</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>From/To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td></td>
<td>2000-present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous #1</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Bend La Pine School Dist #1</td>
<td>1979-2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous #2</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Beaverton School Dist.</td>
<td>1973-1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous #3</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Seattle School Dist #1</td>
<td>1970-1973</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EMPLOYMENT EXPERIENCE

* Developed the curriculum & taught Industrial Ed. to multiply handicapped ages 12-21 (3 years)
* Core Mentor (master teacher) for student teachers from Portland State (6 years).
* Developed Marine Outdoor Ed. curriculum for 6th grade which included the curriculum and implementation of the program for counselors at Warner Pacific College.
* Member of state reading and math coalition/ Oregon
* Warner Pacific College visiting instructor.
* 10 years as 4,5,6 grade teacher
* 11 years Media Specialist/ head librarian responsible for:
  developing curriculum for all elementary and middle schools (9 at the time)
  budgeting and purchasing all hardware, software & media products
  plan for and purchase entire media collections for 5 new schools

BOARD SERVICE/EXPERIENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Committees Served On</th>
<th>Type of Organization</th>
<th>From/To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Idaho School Boards Assoc.</td>
<td>Scholarship</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>2008-present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training/Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Governance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region #8 Board ISBA</td>
<td>Vice Chair and Chair</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>2008-present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadows Valley School Board</td>
<td>Member/currently Chair</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>2006-present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Ski Patrol Board</td>
<td>Audit</td>
<td>Non-profit</td>
<td>2002-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Governance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Governance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Degree/ Field</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Washington</td>
<td>BA Industrial Ed.</td>
<td>1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State University</td>
<td>Environmental Ed. Courses</td>
<td>1973-1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland State University</td>
<td>Public Admin. Courses</td>
<td>1976-1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td>Supt. Credential Courses</td>
<td>1981-1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Oregon State College</td>
<td>Media Technology Certification</td>
<td>1984-1986</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### REFERENCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Phone/Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James Whittaker PHD</td>
<td>Vice Chair of Instruction</td>
<td>541 278 5811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blue Mt. Community College</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jwhittaker@bluecc.edu">jwhittaker@bluecc.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Howard</td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>208 315 2582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meadows Valley District #11</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mihoward@mvsd11.org">mihoward@mvsd11.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stacey Dreyer</td>
<td>County Assessor</td>
<td>208 347 2352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adams County</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bsdreyer@frontiernet.net">bsdreyer@frontiernet.net</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Resume of Juan Vuittonet

2235 S.E 5th Way

Meridian Idaho 83642

Phone 208-884-1149 (office)

Phone 208-870-9981 (Cell Phone)

Previous work History prior to appraisal career path

Del Ray Metal Polishing 1969 – 1975

Worked in family owned business on weekends and summertime. Duties included clean up and metal polishing.

Most significant accomplishment: Learned the value of hard work.

Anadite Metal Finishing (Southern California) 1975- 1979

Anadites a large metal finishing company. Specializing in military and government contracts within the aircraft industry. Duties hired to run the metal polishing shop. Moved to quality control trained in all facets of quality control for multiple types of metal finishing. Obtained license for Level Three Non Destructive testing and inspection. Passed top of my class. Oversaw this department as foreman.

Most significant accomplishment: Saved the company a multi-million dollar contract for the F-14 fighter jet wing span metal finishing process. I was placed in charge of finding the source of wing span corrosion found after our metal finishing process was completed. My investigation proved that the corrosion failure found on the F-14 wings was not a function of our process. It was a packing problem from the manufacture.

Procter and Gamble (Southern California) 1979- 1986

Procter and Gamble a major manufacture of household products, such as laundry soaps, cooking oils and food products. Entered in at soap packing department. Moved to mechanical division, started in janitorial position within the Boiler House. Successfully tested into the mechanical division applied for an assistant Stationery Engineer position and was accepted. Trained in this position as an assistant to the Shift Engineer. Duties responsible for safe operation of a wood fired 14.5 Mega Watt Co-Generation system, air, water and refrigerant systems supplying the whole plant.

Most significant accomplishment: Studied tested and obtained and Unlimited Stationary Engineer license within the state of California. Was the youngest recipient for this type of licensure within the state at that time. Rose to lead Engineer on shift.
Personal interest and community affiliations

I am a father of four children with seven grandchildren. I enjoy camping and sing in a gospel quartet. I work in my churches ministry and perform weddings and funerals. I have served on my local school board for thirteen years.

Proudest accomplishment: Raising my children. Having succeeded in my own business for the past twenty years and for serving on my local school board for more than a decade.

School Board and Education affiliation:

School Board:

Currently serving on the Joint School District #3 (Meridian) school board for thirteen years. Eleven of those years as the board chairman. During this time I have gained experience in all facets of education, from the running of Bond levies, employee negotiation team, curriculum adoptions, budget process, strategic planning, transportation, real estate and land purchase. I have spent significant time at the legislator concerning bills we have run for the furtherance and support of education.

Idaho School Boards Association

Elected as region 3 ISBA chairman (Idaho School Boards Association). Currently serving on the governmental affairs comity (GAC).

Have served on two state comities for teacher evaluation and administrator evaluations.

Meridian Education Foundation

I am currently serving as a member of the board of directors. MEA is a fundraising organization which provides funding for teachers with innovative educational grant requests.
QUALITY EVALUATIONS
JUAN VUITTONET
2235 S.E. 5th Way
Meridian, Idaho 83642
Phone: (208) 884-1149
Fax: (208) 884-1153

RESUME
STATEMENT OF COMPETENCY

EMPLOYMENT HISTORY

Quality Evaluations Present employer
Owner of appraisal firm, appraising all types of residential properties, vacant land, two to four units and specializing in upper end properties. Located in the state of Idaho

State Certified residential appraiser. Senior appraiser at firm. Job duties included review appraising, quality control, appraiser training and appraising all types of residential properties. Located in the state of Idaho

ELECT APPRAISALS December 1991 -December 1992
Joined in partnership with Julia Rias, providing fee appraisal services. Specializing in million dollar plus residential properties. Co-owner and manager with a staff of three appraisers and two clerical employees.

Employed as senior appraiser, appraised all types of residential properties.

FOSS AND ASSOCIATES February 1988- January 1990
Employed by this general practice real estate appraisal firm and provided most types of appraisals as well as review appraisals.

SECURITY PACIFIC BANK August 1987- February 1988
In house fee appraiser acquiring experiences in several types of residential appraisals, including mobile homes.

UNION BANK/AMERICAN LENDERS July 1986- August 1987
Trained through inter program at bank and performed fee work.
PRACTICAL APPRAISAL EXPERIENCE

-Single family residences  
-Condominiums/PUD's  
-Small residential units 2-4  
-Complex residential (multi million dollar properties)

-Relocation appraisals  
-Mobile homes  
-Review appraisal

EDUCATION:

Lambleau Real Estate School                       Passed - 96%
Fullerton College- real estate appraisal         Grade - A
SREA 101 course                                   Passed
Professional practice (Appraisal standards ethics) Passed
Have retaken and passed as of September 1995     Passed
Twenty one hours continued education credit

Idaho real estate law in Idaho                   No grade (three day course)
Idaho state tax commission as of July 30, 1995   Twenty one hours continued education

HUD appraiser seminar                             No grade (one day seminar)
Thirty specialized appraisal issues               Seven hours continuing education
Appraisal institute March 4, 1994                 Appraisal institute April 4, 1994
Appraising from blue prints                      Appraising from blue prints
Writing the narrative appraisal                  Writing the narrative appraisal
Lincoln Graduate School                           Lincoln Graduate School
USPAP required course 1995                       USPAP required course 1995
Intro to review appraising 1997                   Appraisal seminar HUD updates 1997
Appraisal seminar HUD updates 1997                Writing and appraisal report  1998
Writing and appraisal report  1998                Fannie Mae/HUD 1998

No grade (one day seminar)                        No grade (one day seminar)
No grade (one day seminar)                        No grade (one day seminar)
No grade (one day seminar)                        No grade (one day seminar)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Description</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HUD appraisal seminar</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>No grade (five hours)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHA appraising corresponds course</td>
<td></td>
<td>Passed (twenty five hours)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USPAP required course 2001</td>
<td></td>
<td>Passed (15 hours)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single family appraisal 2002 Poll &amp; Assoc.</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>15 hours (Two day seminar)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USPAP course Lincoln Graduate School</td>
<td></td>
<td>15 hours (passed test)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Construction 2003 McKissock</td>
<td></td>
<td>8 hours (one day seminar)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraising the oddball 2004 McKissock</td>
<td></td>
<td>8 hours (one day seminar)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 hour National USPAP update Appraisal Inst.</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>7 hours (one day seminar)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Appraisal writing Appraisal Inst.</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 hours (one day seminar)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraising Multi Family Dwellings</td>
<td></td>
<td>8 hours 7-08-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fannie Mae Revisions and the Appraiser</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 hours 8-24-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USPAP Update</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 hours 5-12-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope of Work</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 hours 8-18-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraising FHA today-Mckissock</td>
<td></td>
<td>8 hours 8-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Fannie Mae Form 1004MC-McKissock</td>
<td></td>
<td>8 hours 8-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National USPAP Update Equivalent (2010-2011)</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 hours 7-23-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HVCC and the Future of Appraising: Taking Our Profession</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 hours 7-25-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REO and Short Sale Appraisal Guidelines</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 hours 7/25/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Writing-the UAD, No. 120</td>
<td></td>
<td>8 hours 8-03-2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice of Appraisal Review-FHA Protocol, No. 145</td>
<td></td>
<td>8 hours 8-4-2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mold, Pollution and the Appraiser</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 hours 8-29-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REO and Foreclosures</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 hours 8-29-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National USPAP Update Course</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 hours 7-31-2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EDUCATION CONTINUED

Commercial Office Leasing 4 hours 8-20-2013
The Nuts and Bolts of Green Building 3 hours 8-19-2013
Even Odder-More Oddball Appraisals 7 hours 8-18-2013
Introduction to the Uniform Appraisal Dataset 2 hours 8-18-2013
Essential Elements of Disclosures and Disclaimers 5 hours 8-18-2013

MEMBERSHIPS LICENSES:

Idaho state certified residential appraiser #CRA-62 (in good standing)
FHA approved appraiser state of Idaho #2200 (in good standing)
California state certified appraiser #AR005102 (not current)
National association of Real Estate appraisers Member (in good standing)
Real estate licenses/ state of California #0101447 (not current)
Real state licenses in the state of Idaho Active in good standing

Personal and professional references available upon request.
Clara Ann Allred, Ed.S.
561 4th Avenue East
Twin Falls, ID 83301
208-308-2789 (home)
208-733-8456 (work)

Curriculum Vita

Academic Degrees
Ed.S.  Idaho State University, 2005 (Administrator)
Administration Certificate, 2004 (Special Education)
M.Ed.  Idaho State University, 1997 (Special Education)
B.S.  Idaho State University, 1995 (Psychology, Focus of study, brain and behavior)
A.A.  College of Southern Idaho, 1992 (Psychology)

Professional Education Experience
2007- Present  Director Support Services/ Gifted and Talented, Related Services, Supervisor of Graduation/Dropout Specialist, 504 Coordinator, Special Education Testing Coordinator, Twin Falls School District
2008-Present  Adjunct Teacher, Northwest Nazarene College
2005-Present  Idaho State Department of Education IEP Facilitator
2003- 2006  Director Special Programs/ Federal Funds/Safe and Drug Free schools/Title 1/Testing Coordinator, Gooding School District
2006 - 2008  Council for Exceptional, Idaho Representative
2001 - 2004  Instructor, Education Department, Idaho State University
2002 - 2003  Pocatello, Idaho
2002 - 2003  Idaho State University Instructor, Special Education
2002 - 2003  Twin Falls, Idaho
1999 - 2003  Special Education Teacher, High School, Twin Falls, Idaho
1997 - 1999  Special Education Teacher, Elementary, Twin Falls, Idaho
1996 - 1997  Special Education Practicum, O’Leary Junior High, Twin Falls, Idaho
1996 - 1999  Reading Teacher, Southern Idaho Learning Center, Twin Falls, Idaho
Summer 1995  American Psychological Association Careers Program, Idaho participant, Studied Psychology in France, Switzerland, and England

Professional Activities and Certificates
1999 - 2004  Committee Member, Idaho Alternate Assessment, Idaho State Special Education Department
Summer 2003  Direct Instruction Training, Eugene, Oregon
Clara Ann Allred
1999 - 2003  
RIAT Assistive Technology Certificate, University of Idaho
1999 – 2003  
Twin Falls School District Assistive Technology Team, Twin Falls, Idaho
Summer 2002  
TEACCH Training for Autism, University of North Carolina, Chappell Hill, NC.
2002 – 2003  
Twin Falls School District Autism Team, Twin Falls, Idaho
2002- Present  
Mandt System Training Certificate, Twin Falls, Idaho
2002 - 2003  
Professional Development Committee, Twin Falls High, Twin Falls, Idaho
2001 - 2002  
Teacher Evaluation Committee Member, Twin Falls School District, Twin Falls, Idaho
2001 - 2002  
Quality Schools Committee Member, Twin Falls School District, Twin Falls, Idaho
2000 - 2001  
Drug Testing Committee, Twin Falls School District, Twin Falls, Idaho
1987 – 1992  
Emergency Medical Technician (EMT) Certificate, Howe, Idaho
2006- 2007  
Nominated by staff for Special Education Director of the year

Teaching and Administrative Load, Idaho State University

Summer 2004  
Development and Individual Differences

Spring 2004  
Precision Teaching
Direct Instruction
Development and Individual Differences
Special Education Student Teacher Supervision
Advisor Student Council for Exceptional Children

Fall, 2003  
Direct Instruction
Professional Development
Special Education Student Teacher Supervision
Co-Teach Special Education Seminar
Teacher Education Program Review Committee

Spring, 2003  
Precision Teaching

Fall, 2002  
Policy and Procedures

Summer, 2002
Clara Ann Allred

Direct Instruction

Current Professional and Academic Association Memberships
President Idaho Association Special Education Administrators (IASEA)
Member Idaho Association School Administrators (IASA)
Member Idaho Association Special Education Administrators (IASEA)
Member Council of Administrators of Special Education (CASE)
Member, Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) Idaho Representative
Active-for-Life Member, Phi Kappa Phi
Member, Association for Direct Instruction (ADI)
Member Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD)
Member American Psychological Association (APA)
Idaho State Department of Education Mediator
Board Member Student Education Automated System Software (SEAS)

Presentations
ADHD Presentation Project Leadership (2009-2010)
High Schools That Work Data Presentation, Twin Falls, Idaho (February 2003)
TEACCH Presentation, Twin Falls School District (October 2002)
Picture Exchange Communication system, Twin Falls, Idaho (March 2000)

Publications
Abbreviated Curriculum Vitae

Deborah L. Hedeen
Dean, College of Education
Idaho State University
921 South 8th Ave, STOP 8059
Pocatello, ID 83209

Email: hededebo@isu.edu
Phone: work 208/282-4143

EDUCATION

Ph.D.  Syracuse University, 1994 (Special Education)
M.Ed.  Lesley College, 1985 (Special Education)
B.S.   St. Cloud State University, 1984 (Special Education and Spanish)

CURRENT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Dean, College of Education, Idaho State University, 2006—present
Associate Dean, College of Education, Idaho State University, 2005—2006
Assistant Dean of Teacher Education, Idaho State University, 2002—2005
Professor of Special Education, Idaho State University, 2004—present
Associate Professor of Special Education, Idaho State University, 1998—2004
Assistant Professor of Special Education, Idaho State University, 1993—1998

LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT


NWCCU Evaluation Committee – Montana State University, Bozeman, MT October 2009.


Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE), New Dean’s Institute - Academy for Leadership Development, Minneapolis, MN. June 2005.

HONORS AND AWARDS

2004 Outstanding Public Service Award, Idaho State University
2004 Most Influential Professor, College of Education
1999 Sabbatical Leave to Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand
1997 Outstanding Young Woman of America
1997 Master Teacher Award, Idaho State University
1996 Master Teacher Award, Idaho State University
1996 Most Influential Professor, College of Education

SCHOLARSHIP

Refereed Journal Articles


Solicited Book Chapters


State, National and International Featured Presentations


Hedeen, D.L., & Southern, T. (2004, March). *You think I have challenging behaviors, but let me teach you what I can do!* Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL) State Conference, Boise, ID.

Hedeen, D. L. (2001, June). *Lee’s determination to be included!* Keynote address at the Queensland Association of Special Education Conference, Brisbane, Australia.

International Refereed Conference Presentations


National Refereed Conference Presentations

AACTE—American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
CEC—Council for Exceptional Children
TASH—The Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps


direction of teacher preparation. AACTE National Conference, San Diego, CA.


**Idaho State Conference Presentations**


**PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

AACTE – American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
TECSCU – Teacher Education Council of State Colleges and Universities
Tokai University, College of Education visit – Tokyo, Japan. May 2007.
Renaissance Group Meeting – Kennesaw State University, GA. April 2007.
TECSCU Fall Conference, Charleston, SC. October 2006.
SUBJECT
Appointments to the Curricular Materials Selection Committee

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY
Section 33-118; 33-118a, Idaho Code

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION
Sections 33-118 and 33-118a, Idaho Code and IDAPA 08.02.03.128 - Rules Governing Thoroughness, sets forth criteria for membership on the Curricular Materials Selection Committee.

The State Board of Education will appoint a committee to select curriculum materials. Committee appointments will be for a period of five (5) years. Committee appointments shall consist of not less than ten (10) total members from the following stakeholder groups: certified Idaho classroom teachers, Idaho public school administrators, Idaho higher education officials, parents, trustees, local board of education members, members of the Division of Professional Technical Education, and State Department of Education personnel. The Executive Secretary will be an employee of the State Department of Education and will be a voting member of the committee. The State Department of Education shall charge publishers submission fees of sixty dollars ($60) or equal to the retail price of each, whichever is greater, to defray the costs incurred in the curricular material review and adoption process.

Nominations were sought for the positions from Idaho School Districts, the Idaho State Department of Education, and the Division of Professional Technical Education. All resumes received for interested individuals are attached.

Secondary Teacher:
  Chris Wadley, Whitepine Joint District
  Kristie Scott, Terreton
  Lisa Olsen, Idaho Falls
  Rebecca Parrill, Lewiston

Division of Professional-Technical Education:
  Kristi Enger

Elementary Teacher:
  Donna Wommack, Genesee School District
  Heide Fry, Meridian School District

ATTACHMENTS
Attachment 1 – Committee Membership Page 5
Attachment 2 – Resume for Chris Wadley Page 7
Attachment 3 – Resume for Kristie Scott Page 9
Attachment 4 – Resume for Lisa Olsen Page 11
Attachment 5 – Resume for Rebecca Parrill Page 13
BOARD ACTION

I move to appoint Chris Wadley to the Curricular Materials Selection Committee for a five-year term effective June 1, 2014, and ending May 31, 2019, representing Secondary Teachers.

Moved by __________ Seconded by __________ Carried: Yes ____ No ____

I move to appoint Kristie Scott to the Curricular Materials Selection Committee for a five-year term effective June 1, 2014, and ending May 31, 2019, representing Secondary Teachers.

Moved by __________ Seconded by __________ Carried: Yes ____ No ____

I move to appoint Lisa Olsen to the Curricular Materials Selection Committee for a five-year term effective June 1, 2014, and ending May 31, 2019, representing Secondary Teachers.

Moved by __________ Seconded by __________ Carried: Yes ____ No ____

I move to appoint Rebecca Parrill to the Curricular Materials Selection Committee for a five-year term effective June 1, 2014, and ending May 31, 2019, representing Secondary Teachers.

Moved by __________ Seconded by __________ Carried: Yes ____ No ____

I move to appoint Kristi Enger to the Curricular Materials Selection Committee for a five-year term effective June 1, 2014, and ending May 31, 2019, representing the Division of Professional Technical Education.

Moved by __________ Seconded by __________ Carried: Yes ____ No ____

I move to appoint Donna Wommack to the Curricular Materials Selection Committee for a five-year term effective June 1, 2014, and ending May 31, 2019, representing Elementary Teachers.

Moved by __________ Seconded by __________ Carried: Yes ____ No ____
I move to appoint Heide Fry to the Curricular Materials Selection Committee for a five-year term effective June 1, 2014, and ending May 31, 2019, representing Elementary Teachers.

Moved by __________ Seconded by __________  Carried: Yes ____  No ____
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMITTEE MEMBER</th>
<th>EIGHT (B) REGIONAL CENTERS</th>
<th>CONTACT INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - Curriculum Consultant from the Division of Professional Technical Education</td>
<td><strong>1. College of Idaho</strong>&lt;br&gt;Attn: Claudia Nelson&lt;br&gt;N. L. Tinteling Library&lt;br&gt;2112 Cleveland Blvd.&lt;br&gt;Caldwell ID 83605</td>
<td>Phone: 208-459-5521&lt;br&gt;Email: <a href="mailto:C.Nelson@collegeofidaho.edu">C.Nelson@collegeofidaho.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td><strong>2. Northwest Nazarene University</strong>&lt;br&gt;Attn: Carol Poe&lt;br&gt;John Riley Library&lt;br&gt;623 University Boulevard&lt;br&gt;Nampa ID 83686</td>
<td>Phone: 208-332-6800&lt;br&gt;Email: <a href="mailto:c.poe@nu.edu">c.poe@nu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Division Professional Technical Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO Box 83720</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boise ID 83720-0096</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Curriculum Consultant from the Division of Instruction of the State Department of Education</td>
<td><strong>3. Boise State University</strong>&lt;br&gt;Attn: Jerri Martin&lt;br&gt;Library Administration&lt;br&gt;1910 University Drive&lt;br&gt;Boise ID 83725</td>
<td>Phone: 208-423-5451&lt;br&gt;Email: <a href="mailto:ytap48@msn.com">ytap48@msn.com</a>&lt;br&gt;Email: <a href="mailto:Jmartin@boisestate.edu">Jmartin@boisestate.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Arts Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho State Department of Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO Box 83720</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boise ID 83720-0027</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Representative (parent, teacher, or administrator) Representing Idaho's Private/Parochial Schools</td>
<td><strong>4. Faith Academy</strong>&lt;br&gt;Attn: Chris Lyon&lt;br&gt;3005 W. Kathleen Ave.&lt;br&gt;Coeur d'Alene, ID 83815</td>
<td>Phone: 208-669-9140&lt;br&gt;Email: <a href="mailto:clyon@hfc.net">clyon@hfc.net</a>&lt;br&gt;Phone: 208-669-4050&lt;br&gt;Email: <a href="mailto:clyon@hfc.net">clyon@hfc.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Lyon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holy Family Catholic School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3005 W. Kathleen Ave.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeur d'Alene, ID 83815</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Public School Trustee</td>
<td><strong>5. Meridian Senior High School</strong>&lt;br&gt;Attn: Emily Perkes&lt;br&gt;109 South 900 West&lt;br&gt;Blackfoot, ID 83221</td>
<td>Phone: 208-604-1162&lt;br&gt;Email: <a href="mailto:emilyjjudge@yahoo.com">emilyjjudge@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patty Silvers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murtaugh Joint School District 418</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO Box 117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murtaugh, ID 83344</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - PTA Parent Representative Who is Not a Public School Educator Nor a Public School Trustee</td>
<td><strong>6. Meridian High School</strong>&lt;br&gt;Attn: Emily Perkes&lt;br&gt;109 South 900 West&lt;br&gt;Blackfoot, ID 83221</td>
<td>Phone: 208-604-1162&lt;br&gt;Email: <a href="mailto:emilyjjudge@yahoo.com">emilyjjudge@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Perkes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109 South 900 West</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackfoot, ID 83221</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 of 2 - Idaho Public School Administrators</td>
<td><strong>7. Idaho State University</strong>&lt;br&gt;Attn: Shu-Yuan Lin&lt;br&gt;Instructional Materials Center (IMC)&lt;br&gt;College of Education, B-61&lt;br&gt;1550 East Terry&lt;br&gt;Pocatello ID 83209</td>
<td>Phone: 208-282-2624&lt;br&gt;Email: <a href="mailto:ruchti@isu.edu">ruchti@isu.edu</a>&lt;br&gt;Phone: 208-282-2624&lt;br&gt;Email: <a href="mailto:nichwenda@isu.edu">nichwenda@isu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geri Gilliespy, Vice Principal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siena K-8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2870 East Rome Drive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meridian, ID 83333</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 of 4 - Parent Representatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larea Jansen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3669 North 3200 East</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly, ID 83341-5344</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 of 4 - Idaho Public School Elementary Classroom Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tara Drexler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Stuart Middle School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>644 Caswell Avenue West</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twin Falls, ID 83301-3798</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 of 4 - Representative from Each of the State's Institutions of Higher Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy Perry Ruchti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Foundations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pocatello ID 83209</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Idaho 2012 Curricular Materials Selection Committee

Appointed by the State Board of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMITTEE MEMBER</th>
<th>EIGHT (8) REGIONAL CENTERS</th>
<th>CONTACT INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 of 2 Idaho Public School Administrators Dana Bradley</td>
<td>4. Brigham Young University-Idaho Attn: Marcia Bair David O. McKay Library, MCK 312 Rexburg ID 83460-0405</td>
<td>Phone: (208) 876-6627 E-mail: <a href="mailto:bradana@sd151.k12.id.us">bradana@sd151.k12.id.us</a> 5-Year Term Expires: June 30, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stacey Jensen Edahow Elementary School 2020 Pocatello Creek Road Pocatello, ID 83201</td>
<td></td>
<td>Phone: 208-233-1844 E-mail: Jensen <a href="mailto:jensenst@d25.k12.id.us">jensenst@d25.k12.id.us</a> 5-Year Term Expires: June 30, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 of 2 – Idaho Public School Elementary Classroom Teachers Darlene Matson Dyer Wood River High School 950 Fox Acres Road Hailey, ID 83333.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Phone: 208-578-5020 E-mail: <a href="mailto:ddyer@blaineschools.org">ddyer@blaineschools.org</a> 5-Year Term Expires: June 30, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 of 4 – Parent Representatives Vacant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 of 4 – Parent Representatives Vacant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 of 4 – Representative from Each of the State’s Institutions of Higher Education Vacant</td>
<td>6. University of Idaho Attn: Ramirose Attebury Instructional Materials Tech Center Moscow ID 83844-3089</td>
<td>Phone: 208-895-7257 E-mail: <a href="mailto:rattebury@uidaho.edu">rattebury@uidaho.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 of 4 – Representative from Each of the State’s Institutions of Higher Education Vacant</td>
<td>3. Boise State University Attn: Margie Ruppel Curriculum Resource Center Albertson Library 1910 University Blvd Boise ID 83725-1430</td>
<td>Phone: 208-426-1323 E-mail: <a href="mailto:margieruppel@boisestate.edu">margieruppel@boisestate.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 of 4 – Representative from Each of the State’s Institutions of Higher Education Vacant</td>
<td>5. Lewis-Clark State College Attn: Shannon Casteel Curriculum Library 600 8th Avenue Lewiston ID 83501</td>
<td>Phone: 208-792-2229 E-mail: <a href="mailto:scasteel@lcsc.edu">scasteel@lcsc.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 of 2 Idaho Public School Secondary Classroom Teachers Vacant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Executive Secretary will be an Employee of the State Department of Education Vacant, Executive Secretary Idaho State Department of Education PO Box 83720 Boise ID 83720-0027</td>
<td>8. Idaho State Department of Education Curriculum &amp; Technology Center 650 West State Street, 2nd Floor Boise ID 83702</td>
<td>Phone: 208-334-2228 E-mail: No Term Limit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chris Wadley

Employment

2005 – present  Deary High School, Deary, ID
English teacher grades 7 – 12
Department Chair
Student Council Advisor
Senior Class Advisor

2011 – 2012  PEAK Learning Systems, Conifer, CO
English/Language Arts Summer Focus Session Presenter

2002 – 2005  Ferndale High School, Ferndale, WA
English teacher grades 9 – 12

2001 – 2002  Lynden High School, Lynden, WA
English teacher grades 9 – 12

1998 – 2001  Marcus High School, Flower Mound, TX
English teacher grades 9 – 12

Education

Grand Canyon University, Phoenix, AZ
Master of Arts in Teaching, 4.0 GPA

University of Texas, Arlington, TX
Bachelor of Arts in English, Cum Laude

References

Darrah Eggers, Principal, Deary High School, ID 208-877-1151
Tera Reeves, Superintendent, Whitepine School District 208-877-1408
Chane Beam, Director of Curriculum and Professional Development, Yukon Koyukuk School District, AK 907-374-9412

Trainings and Qualifications

Idaho Core Coaches Training, 2013-2014
Concurrent Enrollment Instructor with LCSC, 2013-2014
PEAK Summer Institute, Advanced Training, 2007-2012
Summer School Curriculum Development, 2002
WASL Writing Prompt Conference, 2002
District Reading Strategy Team, 2002
District Curriculum Advisory Committee, 2001 – 2002
Supervisory Mentor Teacher, 2000
Lewisville ISD District Textbook Adoption Committee, 2000
Campus TAAS Tutor, 1999 – 2001
Lewisville ISD TAAS Writing Grader, 1998 – 2001
Region XI TAAS Elaboration Strategy Conference, 1999
New Jersey Writing Project Training, 1999
Kristie N. Scott

Objective
To have the opportunity to work with the curriculum materials committee.

Experience
1997–
West Jefferson High School
Terreton, ID

High School English Teacher
• Teach a variety of classes including: Freshman-Senior English, honors Jr. English, speech, advanced speech, psychology, creative writing, sociology, novels, poetry, language and literature, and drama
• Been advisor for leadership, Honor Society, drama, class advisor, and journalism
• Have helped plan curriculum for our English classes, helped implement honors courses, participated in the F.L.A.D program, graduated from Methods of Teaching class offered through District #91 last summer, taught at our school in-services and also at Idaho Falls conference, on quality teacher committee and calendar committee
• Currently going through the Idaho Core Coach training.
• Coached basketball, volleyball, and softball

2011–
BYU-Idaho and BYU-Hawaii
Rexburg, ID

Online English Professor
• Have taught foundations 101 for BYU-Idaho alternately with English 106. The 101 course deals with composition and critical thinking. The English 106 class is part of their Pathways program and is a feeder program into 101. It deals with various elements of English from grammar instruction to essay writing to reading and critical thinking
• Teach English 101 for BYU-Hawaii. This course is more literary based and is their required beginning English course.

2000-2006
State of Idaho
Boise, ID

ICTE Board Member
• Attend all meetings and make decisions regarding issues related to English in the state of Idaho
• Helped co-chair for Idaho Falls conference in 2004 and was responsible for finding presenters, registration and booklet paperwork, set-up and clean-up, and scheduling
• Presented five times at various ICTE conferences including topics on global learning/differentiated instruction, book report helps, writing, poetry, and journaling

2000-2004, 2008–
Idaho Falls, Ririe, Rexburg, and Hamer, ID

Community Education Instructor and Volunteer Work
• Teach English classes to Hispanic adults every Wednesday using Daily Dose program through the church, however there is no church affiliation involved
• Worked in Jr. Miss program conducting mock interviews, judging scholastics, and also have judged various pageants in the area
• Taught a variety of adult education classes including: poetry, organization, crocheting, marriage ideas, and creative writing
• Taught at BYU-Idaho Education week program that they have in the summer

Education

2002–2008 Capella University (Online) Minneapolis, MN
• Master of Science, General Psychology.
• Maintained 3.9 GPA throughout program
• Some course work included: social psychology, inferential statistics, multi-cultural perspectives, cognitive psychology, psychology of learning, lifespan development

1994-1997 Brigham Young University Provo, UT
• Bachelor of Arts, English teaching-maintained 3.6 GPA throughout program
• Course work included: British and American literature, introduction to English language, literature for adolescents, perspectives of American literature, history of the English language, grammar and usage, microcomputers in school, multi-cultural and exceptional education, Shakespeare, intro to folklore, teaching reading, senior seminar: Thomas Hardy, Spanish, and student teaching.
• Course work taken after graduation from BYU through independent study includes: reading and writing poetry, abnormal psychology, speech, methods of speech and drama, and writing your life.

1992-1994 Ricks College Rexburg, ID
• Associates of Arts, English-maintained 3.6 GPA throughout program
• Course work included: Composition, creative writing, introduction to literature, analytical reading, literature interpretation, critical writing and research, perspectives of English literature, Spanish

Hobbies
• I enjoy doing a variety of things in my spare time including: reading, traveling, writing fiction and poetry, taking photos and then digital scrap-booking, working outside in my yard, spending time with family, walking, learning new things, organizing my house.
Professional Profile

I currently teach eighth-grade English language arts at Rocky Mountain Middle School.

- Highly-qualified secondary English language arts teacher
- Leads Making Middle Grades Work school focus team
- Presents at school and district in-service
- Mentors new teachers and student teachers
- Researching the effects of intrinsic motivation on reading comprehension
- Collaborates with fellow teachers
- Works with other curricula for interdisciplinary units
- Participated in district calendar committee
- Attends yearly district and school in-service
- Received Rookie Teacher of the Year Award 2006-2007

Professional Accomplishments

Core Instructional Coach Training

- Utilized the EQuiP rubric
- Created an instructional until
- Vetted other instructional units
- Provided professional development with inquiry based units

Total Instructional Alignment 2010-2012

- Collaborated with fellow eighth-grade English teachers to create TIA working document
- Attended training sessions preparatory for summer working conference
- Presented conference information to fellow teachers at in-service meetings
- Created pacing guide, assessment questions, and SIOP examples

Why Mark Twain Still Matters Conference Attendee 2010

- Selected by Idaho Humanities Council
- Read and studied Twain’s Mississippi writings
- Participated in various workshops, lectures, and discussions with Twain scholars and other attendees

High School Praxis Standard Setting Study 2010

- Worked with teachers from various states
- Reviewed and ranked Praxis test questions used in secondary English teacher examinations
- Attended conference in Princeton, NJ, at Educational Testing Services conference center

Middle School Praxis Standard Setting Study 2009

- Worked with various teachers from the state of Idaho
- Reviewed and ranked Praxis test questions used in middle school English teacher examinations
- Attended conference in Boise, ID
Direct Writing Assessment 2007-2010
- Acted as table leader for scoring sessions
- Participated in range finding sessions for creating scoring guides and establishing guidelines for scoring sessions
- Assisted in creating and selecting writing prompts for the ninth grade Direct Writing Assessment for the state of Idaho

Work History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eighth-grade English language arts teacher</td>
<td>Rocky Mountain Middle School, Idaho Falls, ID</td>
<td>2007 to current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy Aide</td>
<td>3-B Juvenile Detention Center, Idaho Falls, ID</td>
<td>2006-2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substitute Teacher</td>
<td>School Districts 91 and 93, Idaho Falls, ID</td>
<td>2005-2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio co-owner and teacher</td>
<td>Rocky Mountain Clogging Company, St. Anthony, ID</td>
<td>1996-2002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masters of Reading</td>
<td>Northwest Nazarene University, Nampa, ID</td>
<td>December 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science in English Education</td>
<td>Brigham Young University-Idaho, Rexburg, ID</td>
<td>December 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associates Degree in Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>Ricks College, Rexburg, ID</td>
<td>December 1991</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

References

Jason Lords
Principal at Rocky Mountain Middle School
3443 North Ammon Road
Idaho Falls, ID, 83401
208-525-4403; 208-313-6148
lordsj@d93.k12.id.us

Mikki Nuckols
Eighth-grade English language arts teacher
3443 North Ammon Road
Idaho Falls, ID 83401
208-525-4403; 208-680-6454
nuckolsm@d93.k12.id.us
Rebecca Marie Parrill  
Highly Qualified  
Secondary Education/Language Arts

Experience

Lewiston Independent School District #1, Idaho: Eighth grade Language Arts  
August 2011 – Present
- Teach four forty-seven minute class periods of Eighth grade Language Arts.  
- Teach one forty-seven minute class period of Research and Writing: an introductory course on research paper writing in the MLA format and argumentative writing.

Lewiston Independent School District #1, Idaho: Freshmen English  
August 2010 – June 2011  
- Taught five fifty-two minute class periods of Freshmen English.  
- Developed standard-based differentiated lessons to meet the diverse learning needs of my students.

Barberton City School District, Ohio: Seventh grade Language Arts  
November 2009 – June 2010  
- Taught three eighty minute blocks of Seventh grade Language Arts.  
- Developed standard-based lessons to meet the diverse learning needs of my students while implementing Balanced Literacy.

Barberton City School District, Ohio: Temporary Instructor  
April 2009 – September 2009  
- Taught three eighty minute blocks of Seventh grade Language Arts.  
- Taught three eighty minute blocks of Eighth grade Language Arts.  
- Developed standard-based lessons to meet the diverse learning needs of my students while implementing Balanced Literacy.

Santa Cruz Unified School District #35, Arizona: Freshmen English  
August 2008 – April 2009
- Taught two 100 minute blocks of Reading with Teens: a class designed for at-risk students.  
- Taught one Freshmen English class.  
- Developed standard-based SIOP (Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol) lessons to meet the diverse learning needs of my students.

Nogales Unified School District #1, Arizona: Eighth Grade Language Arts  
August 2007 – May 2008  
- Taught one Honors and three SEI (Structured English Immersion) Language Arts classes.  
- Developed standard-based SIOP lessons to meet the diverse learning needs of my students.  
- Began a school wide recycling program through a class project.
Barberton City and Coventry Local Schools, Ohio: Temporary Instructor
May 2005 – June 2007
- Tutored special education students.
- Administered the WIAT II, wrote IEPs and assisted in running IEP meetings.
- Developed standard-based lessons for an Inclusion and General Sophomore English class, a General and Honors Junior English class, and General Freshmen English class.

Education and Professional Development

The University of Akron, Ohio
September 2001 – May 2005
- B.A. Secondary Education, Integrated Language Arts

Walsh University, Ohio
Winter 2007
- Seminar on strategies from Jim Fay and David Funk's Teaching with Love and Logic.

AVID Workshop, Arizona
Winter 2008
- One day workshop focused on training teachers in The Write Path, a curriculum that enables ethnically and linguistically diverse, underachieving students to pass college entry and placement writing exams.

Cochise College, Arizona
Spring 2008
- Three credit-hour course on Structured English Immersion and SIOP Lesson plans.

Lewis-Clark State College, Idaho
Spring 2012, 2013
- One credit class on the Common Core State Standards and Unit Development (2012).
- One credit class on teaching the Holocaust (2013).
- One credit class on Motivating the Inner Writer (2013).

Idaho State Department of Education and University of Idaho
Fall 2013 – Summer 2014
- Core teacher for the Idaho Core Teacher Network: Professional development focused on building capacity through research based strategies for Idaho teachers, so they can not only implement Idaho's Core Standards in a successful way, but sustain that implementation. This training also focuses on building coaching skills that enable the core teachers to be Idaho Core coaches for their building and district through professional development sessions and mentoring whenever possible.

University of Idaho
Spring 2014-Undetermined
- Graduate work in Educational Leadership
Kristi A. Enger
2258 N Morello Avenue  •  Meridian, Idaho 83646  •  Phone: 208-794-0239  •  kenger@cableone.net

Objective: Combine my strengths as an educational leader, professional-technical program coordinator, counselor, and business educator in providing statewide leadership for professional-technical education as secondary coordinator.

Recent Professional Honors and Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership In Career Development Award</th>
<th>(Idaho Career Information System), 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Leadership Cadre</td>
<td>(OVAE School Counseling State Consortium, 1 of 8 states), 2006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Professional Experience

IDAHO DIVISION OF PROFESSIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION  –  Boise, Idaho
State of Idaho education agency responsible for programs leading to less than a Baccalaureate degree

Secondary Coordinator; Career Guidance Coordinator; IOT & Marketing Education Program Manager, 6/2005 to Present
Coordinate career guidance grades 7-16 statewide to support professional-technical programs and access for all students, including special populations. Manage individualized occupational training and marketing education programs toward the Division’s quality initiative. Coordinate programs associated with the High Schools That Work school reform model. Represent the Division as a superintendents’ liaison.

Selected Accomplishments:
- Provide technical assistance to the field at the secondary and postsecondary levels in the areas of career guidance, student learning plans, work-based learning, single parent/displaced homemaker and other special populations, and marketing education.
- Provide technical assistance to the field with regard to questions related to Perkins, and other state and federal legislation.
- Facilitate various groups of internal and external stakeholders in generating quality products and program direction such as:
  - Resource development for Idaho grades 7-12 based on direction provided by postsecondary technical college Curriculum development for the Idaho School Counseling Model and IOT
  - Curriculum development related to the American Careers Student Planner and Idaho Career Planning Guide
  - Career Pioneer Network implementation in response to Perkins IV and Idaho’s low nontraditional field measures of enrollment and completion at the secondary and postsecondary levels.
- Administer and provide technical assistance to the Centers for New Directions.
- Communicate regularly with the field through various means, including two e-Newsletters—Career Connection, and Diamond Points.
- Define professional development needs and develop learning opportunities for grades 7-20 counselors, work-based learning coordinators, marketing education instructors, and other educational personnel.
- Network with educational and industry professionals throughout Idaho in an effort to promote professional-technical education, access for all, and career pathway education and employment.

GLENNS FERRY SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 192  –  Glenns Ferry, Idaho
Local education agency
High School Principal, 6/1999 to 6/2005
Supervised instruction and provided educational leadership to a staff of 32 certificated and classified staff in academic, co-curricular, and extracurricular activities. Served as district professional-technical online administrator, district curriculum coordinator, and K-12 summer school administrator

Selected Accomplishments:
- Coordinated district curriculum writing in English and mathematics.
- Authored successful Title I CSR Grant to assist in implementing High Schools That Work systemic school reform and provided collaborative leadership to involve all staff in improving student achievement.
• Administered high school general budget and special project funds, and Associated Student Body funds as district’s assistant treasurer.

THREE FORKS SCHOOL DISTRICT – Three Forks, Montana
Local education agency
K-6 Counselor, Drug-Free Schools Coordinator, Technology Coordinator, 8/1995 to 5/1999
Secured resources and implemented K-6 guidance curriculum. Established and maintained collaborative relationships with instructional staff, students, and parents toward facilitating student success. Facilitated district-wide technology implementation, growth, and maintenance.

Selected Accomplishments:
• Provided individual, group and family counseling as requested/identified.
• Established Sidekick mentoring program (K-12) in collaboration with Big Brothers Big Sisters, and secured grant funding to establish Bridging the Gap after-school program.

WILLOW CREEK SCHOOL DISTRICT – Willow Creek, Montana
Local education agency
K-12 Counselor, Drug-Free Schools Coordinator, Title I Coordinator, 8/1995 to 5/1999

Selected Accomplishments:
• Administered Title I program in cooperation with Title I staff.
• Established electronic student database.

POPLAR PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICT – Poplar, Montana
Local education agency
High School Counselor, 6/1991 to 5/1995

Selected Accomplishments:
• Established crisis intervention management plan and trained staff in same.
• Developed and implemented counseling curriculum, K-12.

Business Education Instructor, 8/1987 to 5/1991

Selected Accomplishments:
• Designed, maintained, and upgraded PC-compatible lab.
• Implemented student store as authentic, project-based, learning laboratory.

Professional Memberships
American School Counseling Association, Idaho Counseling Association, Idaho School Counseling Association
Association for Career and Technical Education, Career and Technical Educators of Idaho
Idaho Career Guidance Association, Idaho Career Development Association

Education
MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY – Bozeman, Montana
Administrative Endorsement, Educational Leadership, 8/1998

MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY – Bozeman, Montana
Masters of Education, 8/1994
• Major: Guidance and Counseling | Graduated with highest honors

MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY – Bozeman, Montana
Bachelor of Science, 3/1986
• Major: Business Education/Office Systems | Minor: Business Management | Graduated with highest honors
Donna Wommack

Educator: Genesee Elementary School in the Genesee Joint School District for 18 years. She taught third grade for the past 8 years and has taught first through eighth grade during her time there. Donna will be teaching fourth grade next year.

Donna's focus is to engage students in enriching, meaningful learning experiences. Her students learn mathematics, science, and engineering skills through rocketry, forest research, and activities that involve the entire community.

Donna is a leader in grant writing for her school and has been awarded thousands of dollars for innovative technology and engineering projects that have made a significant impact on the school and community. Recent grants enabled students to work collaboratively to research, design, and build a rinsing/recycling station for the school.

Donna shares her love of learning by collaborating with staff and serving on leadership committees to develop programs and make decisions that benefit all students.

Donna has a B.S. Ed., cum laude, in education and an M.Ed. in special education from the University of Idaho. She is certified in elementary education. Donna is a National Board Certified Early Childhood Generalist.
Heide Fry
3126 S. Harbour Springs St.
Nampa, ID 83686
Phone: 208- 409-8396
heidefry@gmail.com or fry.heide@meridianschools.org

EDUCATION

1998

Boise State University Technology Outreach Program
Boise, ID
Certified Educational Technology Instructor

1996

Boise State University
Boise, ID
Bachelor of Arts Elementary Education
Cum Laude

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

August 1996 to Present

Meridian School District
Siena Elementary School, Fifth Grade Teacher, 2008-present
Cecil D. Andrus Elementary School, First/Fifth Grade Teacher, 1997-2008
Ustick Elementary School, First Grade Teacher, 1996-1997
Meridian, ID
Teacher of the Year, 2001 and 2009

June 1998 to Present

Boise State University Center for School Improvement
Camp Director / Lead Teacher
Five- week Science and Technology Summer Camp
Boise, ID

PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES

- Idaho Humanities Council Outstanding Teacher of the Humanities Award, May 2013
- Meridian School District Social Studies Digital Content Committee, 2013
- Meridian School District Continuing Education Instructor, We the People PACE 2004-Present
- Advisor, Siena Elementary Yearbook, 2008-Present
- Meridian School District Social Studies Curriculum and Standards Committee, 2007
- State Department of Education Social Studies Standards Committee, 2006
- Scorer, Direct Writing Assessment, 2004-2006
- Center for Civic Education We the People Advanced Institute, University of Virginia, 2005
- Meridian School District Language Arts Curriculum Committee, 2004
- Meridian School District Continuing Education Instructor, Various Technology Courses, 1998-2004
- Center for Civic Education We the People Elementary Institute, James Madison University, 2003
- Meridian School District Curriculum Committee, 2002
- Building Bridges with Technology, BSU/Meridian School District Trainer, 1999-2001

REFERENCES

Kacey Schneidt, Meridian School District Principal, schneidt.kacey@meridianschools.org 208-350-4370
Teri Powell, Meridian School District Testing Coordinator, powell.teri@meridianschools.org 208-855-4500
Lori Gash, Meridian School District SS Coordinator, gash.lori@meridianschools.org 208-350-5041
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SUBJECT
University of Idaho (UI) Annual Progress Report

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY
Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies & Procedures, Section I.M.3.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION
This agenda item fulfills the Board’s requirement for the University of Idaho to provide a progress report on the institution’s strategic plan, details of implementation, status of goals and objectives and information on other points of interest in accordance with a schedule and format established by the Board’s Executive Director.

President Chuck Staben will provide a 15-minute overview of UI's progress in carrying out the University's strategic plan.

IMPACT
The University of Idaho’s strategic plan drives the University’s integrated planning; programming, budgeting, and assessment cycle and is the basis for the institution’s annual budget requests and performance measure reports to the State Board of Education, the Division of Financial Management and the Legislative Services Office.

ATTACHMENT
Attachment 1 – Annual Report

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

April 2014

Strategic Plan Implementation

- Completing the current strategic plan and beginning the process of creating a new strategic plan, as "Leading Idaho: Strategic Plan 2011-2015" will sunset within the next year.
- University of Idaho has fully implemented a revised general education curriculum that includes assessment points across all four years of undergraduate education.
- University of Idaho has fully implemented program assessment with continuous improvement based on the University learning outcomes.
- University of Idaho has implemented its new clinical faculty ranks as a strategy to leverage the skills of non-tenure track faculty.
- President’s Diversity Council has made significant strides in terms of a coherent recruitment program for diverse students, faculty, and staff as well as a robust student retention program. Concurrently, there is increasing cultural competency through curricular changes and university-wide initiatives.

Personnel Budget

- 819 FTE faculty (35% of the population)
- 641 FTE managerial/professional (27% of the population)
- 885 FTE classified (38% of the population)

Enrollment

- Graduation Rate of 54%
- Retention Rate of 79%
- Total Enrollment 11,884 (headcount); 10,017 (FTE) – Fall, 2013
- Record number of national merit scholars (76), including 25 freshmen enrolled in Fall 2013
- Recognized by Forbes magazine as among the "Top 25 Value Colleges" in the nation
- Recognized in 2013 by US News and World Report as the 35th "Best College for Veterans" nationwide for initiatives that help veterans and active service members apply, pay for and complete their degrees

Research and Economic Development

- New NSF EPSCoR RII awards entitled *Managing Idaho’s Landscape for Ecological Services*— $20 million over 5 years
- Idaho Pathways: a project funded by the Economic Development Agency and the Idaho Department of Commerce to develop a comprehensive economic
development strategy for each of the six economic development districts and for the State.

- NSF Integrated Graduate Education and Research Traineeship award of $3.1 million over five years to develop its graduate interdisciplinary water resources degree program
- Research expenditures reported to NSF for 2013 were $95,891,000
- 2010 study done by Economic Model Specialists Inc. shows the existence of the University of Idaho has a $934 million impact on the economy of Idaho.
- Classified by the prestigious Carnegie Foundation distinction for “high research activity” among national Research Universities
- Celebrating 125 years as one of the nation’s top research institutions, which provides an engine for educational innovation and economic growth in Idaho
- Contributes nearly $1 billion to Idaho’s economy through the combined activities of the University and its alumni. That’s nearly 2 percent of the state’s economy

Special/Health Programs

- WWAMI added five seats (Washington, Wyoming, Alaska, Montana, Idaho)
- Idaho Veterinary Medical Education
- Forest Utilization Research and Outreach (FUR)
- Agricultural Research and Extension Service (ARES)

University Updates

- Named to the Presidential Honor Roll for Community Service again in 2013 and one of only five institutions in the Pacific Northwest awarded "with distinction" status
- College of Law ranked a top-25 "Most Innovative" program by PreLaw magazine, fall 2013
- Successful Program/Department Accreditation review and awards in the Colleges of Engineering, Education, Letters, Arts, & Social Sciences, and Natural Resources.

Collaborations

- Research: Center for Advanced Energy Systems
- Research: Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research
- Research: Idea Network of Biomedical Research Excellence (INBRE)
- Research: Regional Approaches to Climate Change for the Pacific Northwest
- Research/Economic Development: Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy for Idaho
- City/Chamber of Commerce/UI collaboration to promote and brand community events
- Collaboration with City and Gritman Medical Center to plan and develop Legacy Crossing
• Intermodal Transit Center with City of Moscow, houses UI Parking and Transportation

Capital Campaign

• The University is in the last year of its 7.5 year $225M Inspiring Futures capital campaign.
• The university has received 100,000 gifts from over 40,000 donors in support of our campaign.
• Through the generosity of individuals, corporations and foundations, we have achieved 95 percent of our campaign goal.
• In FY 2013 the university raised $27,626,903.

Outreach

• McCall Outdoor Science School program finalist for MaGraw Award
• 4-H Food Smart Families funded by National 4-H Council and ConAgra Foundation will provide in-depth nutrition, grocery shopping, etc. skills for 2500 underserved youth in Idaho
• Community Service Hours of 267,000; 162,000 through service learning courses, 105,000 through service projects sponsored by the ASUI volunteer Center and other student organizations.
• Digin’ It Science, Technology, Engineering & Math program for middle school aged girls in Coeur d’Alene

New Buildings

• Acquired MOSS Field Campus in McCall, Idaho
• Final Design for IRIC; Later in this meeting a request for approval to start construction $49 m project ($5M from the state/$44 M to be bonded)
• In Design for Education Building renovations done in collaboration with DPW; Details later in this meeting for approval to start construction $17.1M ($7M state,$7.5M bonded, $2.6M gifts)
• In various stages of design: University House
  o Aquaculture Research lab
  o Ada County Courthouse/ Law and Justice Learning Center
• Recently completed: CNR Parker Farm Classroom/Offices $650K
  o SUB 2nd Floor Renovation $1.5 M
  o Deceo Center Lab $495K
  o Niccolls Child and Food Labs Renovation $3 M ($830K State, $2.7M gifts)
PRESIDENTS’ COUNCIL

SUBJECT
Presidents’ Council Report

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION
President Joe Dunlap, North Idaho Community College President and current chair of the Presidents’ Council, will give a report on the recent activities of the Presidents’ Council and answer questions. The Presidents’ Council met on March 10th and April 1st.

At the March and April meetings they discussed the development of a Board policy regarding the recent passage of allowing certain individuals to carry concealed weapons on the universities and colleges campuses, the workforce gap analysis study, the Idaho Community College Consortium, budget guidelines, and Enrollment Workload Adjustment related topics.

ATTACHMENT
Attachment 1 – Community College Consortium Mission and Vision Page 3

BOARD ACTION
This item is intended for informational purposes only. Any action will be at the Board’s discretion.
Idaho Community College Consortium Mission Statement and Values

March 2014

Mission Statement for the Idaho Community College Consortium:
The Community College Trustees of Idaho will cooperate in promoting, representing, supporting, and serving the community colleges to ensure the highest quality of education and training to students and the communities they serve.

Values Statements for the Idaho Community College Consortium:
The Community College Trustees of Idaho will:
- Continually strive for a common community college voice while preserving local autonomy;
- Demonstrate cooperation;
- Promote student access;
- Promote and measure student success;
- Be fiscally responsible;
- Proactively and responsively provide high quality educational and training programs;
- Proactively and responsively develop economic and workforce opportunities;
- Promote the role and mission of community colleges; and
- Embrace diversity.
IDAHO EPSCOR

SUBJECT
Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (EPSCoR) Annual Summary Report

REFERENCE
- August 2012: EPSCoR provided their annual report to the Board
- August 2013: EPSCoR provided their annual report to the Board

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY
Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies & Procedures, Section III.W. Higher Education Research

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION
The Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (EPSCoR) is a federal-state partnership designed to enhance the science and engineering research, education, and technology capabilities of states that traditionally have received smaller amounts of federal research and development funds. Through EPSCoR, participating states are building a high-quality, academic research base that is serving as a backbone of a scientific and technological enterprise.

Idaho EPSCoR is currently led by a state committee composed of 16 members with diverse professional backgrounds from both the public and private sectors and from all regions in the state. The Idaho EPSCoR committee oversees the implementation of the EPSCoR program and ensures program goals and objectives are met. The Idaho EPSCoR office and the Idaho EPSCoR Project Director are located at the University of Idaho. Partner institutions are Boise State University and Idaho State University.

Consistent with Board Policy III.W.2. d., EPSCoR has prepared an annual report regarding current EPSCoR activities that details all projects by federal agency source, including reports of project progress from associated external Project Advisory Board (PAB).

ATTACHMENTS
- Attachment 1 – Annual Report Presentation
- Attachment 2 – EPSCoR Overview
- Attachment 3 – Idaho Outcomes

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
The current Idaho NSF-EPSCoR award is a five (5) year, $15M award focusing on water resources in a changing climate. The past NSF-EPSCoR award was a five
(5) year, $15M award that expired August 31, 2013. Idaho EPSCoR applied for, and has recently been awarded a new NSF-EPSCoR award for $20M over five (5) years. NSF-EPSCoR grants require a state matching component, the past award match requirement was $600,000, these funds have been paid out of the funds allocated for use by the Board’s Higher Education Research Council (HERC). The new award has a higher match requirement. This past year (HERC) recommend the Board request an additional $200,000 to cover the higher matching requirement for the new award. The legislature this last session appropriated an additional $200,000 for use toward this end. In FY15 the total match paid out of the funds allocated to HERC will be $600,000.

BOARD ACTION
This item is for informational purposes only. Any action will be at the Board’s discretion.
Idaho NSF EPSCoR Research Infrastructure Improvement (RII): Annual Report - 2014

Peter Goodwin, Project Director
Rick Schumaker, Assistant Project Director

Idaho State Board of Education
Moscow, Idaho
April 17, 2014

Idaho EPSCoR Overview
Accomplishments
New EPSCoR RII Awards
Concluding Remarks

www.uidaho.edu/epscor
“ONEIdaho” Philosophy

ONE Idaho
Innovation * Integration * Inspiration

Idaho EPSCoR Committee
Google has associated "Idaho" and "EPSCOR" with the data set (named "IDAHO_EPSCOR/GRIDMET")

"...Google is announcing today new partnerships with the Desert Research Institute, the University of Idaho, and the University of Nebraska to (1) provide drought mapping and monitoring for the entire continental United States in near real-time and (2) model water consumption from vegetation across the entire planet.

— The White House, Office of the Press Secretary, March 19, 2014
Active NSF EPSCoR RII Projects

✓ Track 1: Academic Research Capacity
  • Managing Idaho’s Landscapes for Ecosystem Services (MILES); June 2013 – 2018) $20 M plus required 20% match.

✓ Track 2: Cyberinfrastructure
  • Western Consortium for Watershed Analysis, Visualization, and Exploration (WC-WAVE) (2013-2016) $2M to Idaho

NSF EPSCoR RII - MILES

✓ 11 New Faculty Positions
✓ MURI – Undergraduate Research
✓ Cyberinfrastructure
✓ Integrated Statewide Social-Ecological Research
✓ Modeling and Visualization
✓ Diversity contributions to State STEM Roadmap
✓ Stakeholder Engagement
Collaboration

EPSCoR Track 2 RII

✓ Watershed Science
✓ Visualization and Data
✓ Workforce Development and Education

Western Consortium for Watershed Analysis, Visualization, and Exploration

WC-WAVE
Evidence of Idaho’s Success

An increase in the number of proposals is an indication that a state is trying to raise its research profile by hiring additional researchers or giving current faculty more time to devote to proposal writing. The challenge is to maintain quality, which is reflected in the success rate, while increasing quantity. This is particularly difficult during periods when overall success rates are falling.

All states have increased their number of submissions during the past two decades, and many have managed to do so without an excessive drop in success rate (see Figure 3-4). Idaho, for example, has doubled its number of proposals with no decline in success rate. Conversely, other EPSCoR states have failed to keep pace and have actually experienced a decline in their rankings for R&D expenditures.

Committee to Evaluate the Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (EPSCoR) and Similar Federal Agency Programs (2013). The Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research; Committee on Science, Engineering, and Public Policy; Policy and Global Affairs; National Academy of Sciences; National Academy of Engineering, and Institute of Medicine of the National Academies. The National Academies Press. Washington, D.C. 142 p.
Idaho EPSCoR Meetings

- Tri-State Consortium Meeting
  - March 19-21, 2014
  - Boise, Idaho

- Idaho Annual Meeting
  - April 22-24, 2014
  - Coeur d’Alene, Idaho

- Reverse Site Visit (RSV)
  - September 15, 2014
  - Arlington, VA

MILES
Idaho NSF EPSCoR Program
Director: Dr. Peter Goodwin

The Idaho Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (EPSCoR) represents a federal-state partnership to provide lasting improvements to academic research infrastructure and increase Idaho’s research competitiveness. Idaho’s EPSCoR partners are the University of Idaho, Boise State University, Idaho State University, and Idaho’s 2-year and 4-year colleges.

An EPSCoR Committee of 16 members leads Idaho EPSCoR, with representatives from the public and private sectors, the legislature, and all regions of Idaho. The Director reports to the Idaho EPSCoR Committee and is supported by a professional staff in the Idaho EPSCoR Office, located on the Moscow campus. It leads the planning, administration, and implementation of EPSCoR Research Infrastructure Improvement (RII) programs and supports the state “Science and Technology Plan for Higher Education” in areas that contribute to the National Research Agenda through the philosophy of ONEIdaho - an integrated, productive, and creative research culture and community of Idaho researchers and educators.

RECENT ACCOMPLISHMENTS

- Catalyzed Cyberinfrastructure (CI) and data management, data sharing, research, and sharing of data products through the Northwest Knowledge Network (NKN), the Idaho LiDAR Consortium, and national systems.

- Engaged more than 400 university faculty, staff, undergraduates, graduate students and technicians and nearly 14,000 K-12 students, teachers, and other stakeholders in STEM programs throughout the state to prepare Idaho’s workforce to prosper in a science-based, high technology world.

- Contributed to development of the Idaho STEM Roadmap by leading the State’s strategy for increasing diversity in STEM.

- Improved internet connectivity to the Hagerman Fish Culture Experiment Station and the UI Kimberly Research and Extension Center, and created a new Data Manager position at UI.

- Improved cyber-connectivity and broadband access (up to 100 x more) at three rural 2-year and 4-year colleges and two universities via the Idaho Regional Optical Network (IRON), providing increased video collaboration and distance learning capabilities via the Idaho Education Network (IEN).
ACTIVE NSF EPSCoR RII PROJECTS

RII Track 1 - Managing Idaho’s Landscapes for Ecosystem Services (MILES) (2013-2018) was funded at $20.0M in June 2013. It will advance Idaho’s capacity to create new knowledge about relationships between the benefits humans get from the natural world (ecosystem services), landscape change, and associated social and economic systems, and establish the infrastructure to provide science-based decision support for sustainably managing Idaho’s resources.

The project will facilitate integrated, collaborative research and education on characterization, vulnerability, integrative modeling, and visualization and virtualization, with study sites in the Coeur d’Alene, Treasure Valley, and Pocatello/Idaho Falls areas. The grant will help Idaho’s universities add 11 new faculty positions in related disciplines statewide. It will involve extensive stakeholder engagement, and Cyberinfrastructure, Diversity, and Workforce Development improvements and programs.

RII Track 2 - Western Consortium for Watershed Analysis and Visualization (WC-WAVE) (2013-2016) is the second $6.0M collaborative project involving Idaho, Nevada, and New Mexico EPSCoR. It will advance watershed science, workforce development, and education with Visualization and Data Cyberinfrastructure (CI)-enabled discovery and innovation.

RECENTLY COMPLETED THREE CONCURRENT NSF EPSCoR RII PROJECTS IN LATE 2013

- Track 1 - Water Resources in a Changing Climate ($15.0M) for research and education capacity related to the effects of climate change on water resources and the impact of these effects on ecological, human, and economic systems.
- Track 2 - Western Consortium of Idaho, Nevada, and New Mexico ($2.0M) for cyberinfrastructure and data management capacity to support collaborative regional science; and
- C2 - Intra- and Inter-Campus Connectivity ($1.2M) for improved internet connectivity and collaboration at five of Idaho’s higher education institutions.

For more information, please contact:
Idaho EPSCoR Office, MS 3029, 875 Perimeter Drive, Moscow, ID 83844-3029
pgoodwin@uidaho.edu  208.885.5742  www.idahoepscor.org
Idaho NSF EPSCoR: RII C2 Outcomes Report (EPS-1006968)

Idaho’s Research Infrastructure Improvement (RII) Inter- and Intra-Campus Connectivity (C2) project has developed significant statewide capacity for research and research-based education by providing improved cyber-connectivity and broadband access at 2-year, 4-year and rural institutions in Idaho. Through partnerships with the Idaho Regional Optical Network (IRON), more institutions now have high-speed bandwidth connectivity to the Internet. In addition, increased institutional participation in IRON within Idaho now provides more high-speed connections between education and research facilities within the State.

Strategic investments have improved Internet connectivity across Idaho:

- **North Idaho College (NIC) / University of Idaho (UI) Harbor Center** – Access to high speed Internet and enhanced videoconferencing capabilities were implemented (e.g., the UI facility has 100 times more Internet capacity). The project provided many mutual benefits to the higher-education institutions in northern Idaho, including increased collaboration and joint use of facilities.

- **Lewis Clark State College (LCSC)** – Access to high-speed Internet and state-of-the-art video capabilities resulted in improved distance education delivery. This enabled video conferencing network traffic for multiple simultaneous video classrooms in high definition.

- **College of Southern Idaho (CSI)** – Significant improvements have been made to desktop and wireless Internet speeds. The network responsiveness and availability to faculty, instructional computing labs, and wireless networks at the main CSI campus and their branch campuses has been greatly improved. Network upgrades greatly enhanced CSI’s ability to support math and science learning and research and have improved services to rural Idaho students.

- **Idaho State University (ISU)** – Network improvements access to IRON improved collaboration between ISU and affiliate research centers including the University of Idaho, Boise State University, Idaho Education Network, Idaho National Laboratory, and the Center for Advanced Energy Studies with significantly improved bandwidth and redundant links to the Internet. This has expanded ISU’s effectiveness in creating educational opportunities for students, faculty, administrators, and research staff.

Idaho also now has a well-organized structure for sharing of data because of a strategic planning effort that resulted in a State Cyberinfrastructure Strategic Plan for Idaho universities. In partnership with the Idaho National Laboratory, a new tenure-track faculty member at the University of Idaho, specializing in data architecture, was hired and is providing expertise for Idaho’s growing data management initiatives, including the Northwest Knowledge Network (NKN). This project also contributed to creation of a data portal (housed at the NKN) to increase access and improve management of data.

Improved connectivity is helping Idaho institutions reach a broader audience. With better Internet connections, distance learning is better meeting the needs of underrepresented and rural students. The increased bandwidth and video conferencing now enables improved delivery of video courses for distance education, participation and delivery of dual credit courses through the State’s Idaho Education Network (IEN), improved access to college resources for current and prospective students, improved access for employees and students to materials for work and research, and increased ability for faculty to participate in research. For example, many Biology classes at College of Southern Idaho have frequent in-class tasks that require Internet access; those classes serve over 1,160 students each year.

This award leveraged partnerships with the USDA Regional Approaches to Climate Change (REACCH) and NASA Intermountain Climate Education Network (ICE Net) projects to provide professional development and learning opportunities for college instructors and K-12 teachers. Online educational materials on climate change were created and then disseminated to K-12 and community colleges in a variety of ways, including distance learning via live interactive and/or computer-based classes. This has allowed university faculty to communicate relevant research, provide access to new data, and train teachers who are preparing the next generation workforce. Events promoting the use of cyberinfrastructure at ISU and UI improved awareness of these capabilities among faculty, staff, students, and community members. As a result of this work, more of Idaho’s residents have better access to STEM research and research based-educational opportunities.
SUBJECT
Idaho Division of Vocation Rehabilitation Interim Administrator Appointment

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY
Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies and Procedures IV.E.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION
Don Alveshere the current Administrator for the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation (IDVR) has resigned his position, following a recent leave of absence, for personal reasons. Jane Donnellan, the Division’s Planning and Evaluation Manager has served as the Acting Administrator during the current Administrators leave of absence.

The Executive Director is recommending the appointment of Ms. Donnellan as the Interim Administrator until such time as a permanent administrator may be appointed.

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
Ms. Donnellan is a long time employee of the Division well versed in the services and clients that rely on the IDVR.

Staff recommends approval.

BOARD ACTION
I move to appoint Jane Donnellan as the Interim Administrator for the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation and to set her salary at $42.56/hr ($88,524.80 annually), effective April 17, 2014.
SUBJECT
Amendment to Board Policy V.L. (I.R) Campus Security

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY
Governing Policies and Procedures Section V.R. Campus Security
Section 18-3309(2), Idaho Code

REFERENCE

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION
During the 2014 legislative session Senate Bill 1254 passed allowing for the concealed carry of firearms on public college and university grounds for certain licensed persons. The institutions under the direct governance of the Board have asked that the Board look at implementing a Board policy that would provide additional guidance on the implementation of changes in response to the Bill.

Current Board Policy Section V.R. outlines the requirements for each institution to develop a campus security plan. The legal counsel from each of the four (4) year institutions have worked closely with the Board’s legal counsel over the past several weeks and are proposing the language outlined in Attachment 1 prohibiting the carrying of firearms, including open carry, on campus, except under specific circumstances and as allowed in Section 18-3309(2), Idaho Code. Additionally after review of the existing policy staff has determined the policy would be better placed if it were to be moved from Board Policy Section V. Financial Affairs to Board Policy Section I. General Governing Policies and Procedures. While there is a financial impact to the implementation of campus security plans, Section I, contains the other provisions in Board policy relevant to facilities, planning, and reporting.

IMPACT
Proposed changes would make it clear to the institutions that firearms are only allowed on campus as described in section 18-3309(2), Idaho Code or allowed by the institution as part of a campus security plan, or as part of an event or program approved by the chief executive officer of the institution.

ATTACHMENTS
Attachment 1 – Board Policy I.R. Campus Security – First Reading
STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff shared the proposed amendments with the Institution Presidents during the April Presidents’ Council meeting. The Presidents asked questions regarding the inclusion of language that would specify how to treat facilities that were shared with K-12 programs. This specific question was discussed with institution legal counsel and it was determined that specific language regarding that issue should not be included in the policy. The Board and institution legal counsels will be available to answer questions.

BOARD ACTION

I move to approve the first reading of Board Policy I.R. as submitted in Attachment 1.

Moved by __________ Seconded by __________ Carried Yes _____ No _____
1. An environment of safety and security is critical for institutions to cultivate a climate conducive to knowledge and learning. The Board recognizes a need for consistency among the institutions in regard to firearms. All institutions shall allow concealed carry of firearms and ammunition by holders of licenses described in section 18-3309(2), Idaho Code under the conditions and limitations set out in that section. Any other possession of firearms, including open carry, on institution property is prohibited, unless allowed by the institution as part of a campus security plan, or as part of event or program which has been approved by the chief executive office for the institution.

22. Each institution must develop a campus security plan to maintain the physical security of persons and property on the campus and in full cooperation with state and local law enforcement agencies.

23. Overall responsibility for campus security rests with the chief executive officer of the institution. Each chief executive officer must designate a senior administrative officer and an alternate to serve as liaison between the institution and state and local law enforcement agencies.
SUBJECT
2014 Legislative Update – Board Action

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION
Several pieces of legislation were passed this year that require Board action.

**House Bill 521** – directing school districts to develop a strategic plan and providing funding for training of administrators and school boards. The legislation granted the Board rulemaking authority to establish appropriate procedures, qualifications and guidelines for training providers and to prepare a list of qualified training providers within the state of Idaho. Board staff will work with the State Department of Education, the Idaho Association of School Administrators and the Idaho School Boards Association to develop guidelines and create a list of providers.

**Senate Bill 1233** – clarifies which students may be eligible for the Mastery Advancement Scholarship, that professional certificates are eligible for advanced opportunity programs and to provide $200 for high school juniors and $400 for high school seniors for dual credit and professional technical certificates. The board will work with the Department of Education to develop necessary procedures and to promulgate rules if necessary to carry out the provisions of the new law.

**Senate Bill 1275** – enhances the secondary Agriculture and Natural Resource programs currently offered in Idaho schools and provides start up grants for new programs as well as grants for high quality existing programs. The legislation requires the Board to do the following:

- Request funding for the grant programs in its annual budget request;
- Adopt and implement Idaho quality program standards for agricultural and natural resource education programs offered in any grade 9 through 12 in the areas of instruction, curriculum development, advisory committees, student development and community development;
- Adopt rules to implement the grant programs;
- Establish and administer both grant programs for school districts and public charter schools to begin or to re-establish an agricultural and natural resource education program;
- Develop an application form and criteria to judge each application for both grants.

Board staff will work with the Division of Professional-Technical Education to carry out the provisions of the new law. Division staff will take the lead on establishing the grant program requirements.

**Senate Bill 1372** – establishes procedures for sharing student information, procedures collecting new data elements, and requires reporting to the legislature pertaining to the statewide K-12 and postsecondary longitudinal data systems.
The law stipulates that all decisions relating to the collection and safeguarding of student data are the responsibility of the executive office of the state board of education. The law requires the Board to do the following:

- Create, publish and make publicly available a data inventory and dictionary or index of data elements with definitions of individual student data fields currently in the student data system;
- Update annually the data inventory and index of data elements;
- Develop, publish and make publicly available policies and procedures to comply with the federal Family Educational Rights And Privacy Act (FERPA) and other relevant privacy laws and policies;
- Restrict access to student data to authorized staff of the Board and the Department and their vendors who require access to perform their duties; the district and the district's vendors who require access; and public postsecondary staff who require access; students and their parents or legal guardians; and authorized staff of other state agencies as required by law and/or defined by interagency data-sharing agreements. All data-sharing agreements must be summarized in a report and submitted by January 15 each year to the Senate Education Committee and the House of Representatives Education Committee;
- Ensure that any contracts that govern databases, online services, assessments or instructional supports that include student data and are outsourced to private vendors, include express provisions that safeguard privacy and security, contain restrictions on secondary uses of student data; and provide for data destruction, including a time frame for data destruction, and penalties for noncompliance;
- Notify the Governor and the Legislature annually of any new student data proposed for inclusion in the state student data system and submit any new “provisional” student data collection to the Governor and the Legislature for their approval within one year in order to make the new student data a permanent requirement through the administrative rules process;
- Develop model policy for districts and requires districts to develop their own data security policy.

The legislation provided funding for a half-time project coordinator. Board staff and the Data Management Council are working to develop a model policy for Board approval. While funding for the project coordinator will not be available until July 1, 2014, the bill contained an emergency clause and will require immediate implementation of the provisions of the law.

**Senate Bill 1396** – requires that the Board appoint a review committee consisting of parents, teachers, and administrators representing public and charter schools in all six regions of the state. The committee is to be comprised of 30 people serving staggered four year terms. They will be charged with reviewing and making recommendations to the State Board of Education and the Department of Education to revise or eliminate certain summative computer adaptive test questions. The Board is to determine when committee
recommendations are to be submitted provided that there is at least 30 days for the committee to review test questions before the test is administered to students. While the committee is appointed by the Board and the Board has the final decision on which recommendations to implement the legislation requires the Department of Education staff the committee. The Department is currently collecting names from various stakeholder groups to forward to the Board for consideration as Committee members.

IMPACT

Board staff will work with staff of the relevant education agencies to ensure that these new laws are implemented.

BOARD ACTION

This item is for informational purposes only. Any action will be at the Board's discretion.
SUBJECT
Superintendent of Public Instruction Update to the State Board of Education.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION
Superintendent of Public Instruction, Tom Luna, will provide an update on the State Department of Education.

BOARD ACTION
This item is for informational purposes only. Any action will be at the Board's discretion.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TAB</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>WWAMI PROGRAM REPORT</td>
<td>Information Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>BOARD POLICY III. V, STATEWIDE ARTICULATION-FIRST READING</td>
<td>Approval Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>BOARD POLICY III. G, PROGRAM APPROVAL AND DISCONTINUANCE-SECOND READING</td>
<td>Approval Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>BOARD POLICY III. N, GENERAL EDUCATION-SECOND READING</td>
<td>Approval Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>BOARD POLICY III. Y, ADVANCED OPPORTUNITIES-SECOND READING</td>
<td>Approval Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>BOISE STATE UNIVERSITY-GRADUATE CERTIFICATE IN VICTIM SERVICES, SELF-SUPPORT PROGRAM</td>
<td>Approval Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>BOISE STATE UNIVERSITY-MASTER OF ATHLETIC LEADERSHIP</td>
<td>Approval Item</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUBJECT
University of Washington School of Medicine Curriculum Renewal Report

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION
The University of Washington started the WWAMI program (Washington, Wyoming, Alaska, Montana, Idaho) as a regional medical education program in 1971. WWAMI was founded with five goals: 1) provide publically supported medical education; 2) increase the number of primary-care physicians and correct the maldistribution of physicians; 3) provide community-based medical education; 4) expand graduate medical education (residency training) and continuing medical education; and 5) provide all of these in a cost-effective manner.

Currently, twenty-five Idaho WWAMI students complete their first year of medical training at the University of Idaho’s Moscow campus, sharing resources and faculty at Washington State University in Pullman. WWAMI allows first-year medical students to train in their home state, increasing their familiarity with the health care needs of their region and state, and increasing the likelihood that students will select further training or practice opportunities in Idaho, once their training is complete.

Students take their second year of training at the University of Washington School of Medicine (UWSOM) in Seattle. During their third and fourth years WWAMI students have the opportunity to return and complete their clinical training requirements in Idaho. These clinical rotations are coordinated through the University of Washington School of Medicine WWAMI (Idaho) Office for Clinical Medical Education in Boise.

In 2010, the UWSOM initiated a Curriculum Renewal Process which currently is in the final stage of development. The new curriculum model will be composed of three phases:

- Scientific Foundations
- Clinical Foundations
- Career Exploration & Focus

The target start date is academic year 2015-16. This new curriculum will be instituted throughout the five state WWAMI region.

IMPACT
While these changes will have no fiscal impact to WWAMI states or students, the curriculum changes will constitute a foundational shift in the delivery of medical education to WWAMI students. The new model will also change the duration and geographic location of delivery.
ATTACHMENTS
Attachment 1 – UWSOM Curriculum: Current and Proposed  Page 3
Attachment 2 – Curriculum Renewal: Changes at the UI  Page 6

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
WWAMI briefed the Board’s now decommissioned Medical Education Study Committee several times on the Curriculum Renewal Process. Now that the new curriculum is nearing deployment, Board staff requested a presentation to the full Board. Representatives from UWSOM will present an update on the Curriculum Renewal. The referenced Attachments provide information on how the current and proposed curricula differ, and how the curriculum change will impact WWAMI at UI.

BOARD ACTION
This item is for informational purposes only. Any action will be at the Board’s discretion.
# Current UWSOM Curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st year</th>
<th>2nd year</th>
<th>3rd year</th>
<th>4th year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11 Basic Science Courses</td>
<td>17 Organ System Science Courses</td>
<td>Required Clerkships – 6 over 42 weeks</td>
<td>Required Clerkships – 4 over 16 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to Clinical Medicine (ICM I)</td>
<td>ICM II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preceptorships</td>
<td>Preceptorships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# New UWSOM Curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific Foundations Phase</th>
<th>Clinical Foundations Phase</th>
<th>Career Explore &amp; Focus Phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integrated blocks medical science in clinical context</td>
<td>Required clerkships Integrated basic science</td>
<td>Career exploration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Meaningful</em> clinical experience: longitudinal clerkship</td>
<td>Specific rotations in Seattle</td>
<td>Specialty- specific preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scholarship</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Curriculum Renewal: Changes at the UI

1. Increased instructional participation: 18 months of instruction on the Palouse
2. Systems-based instructional format
3. Integration of basic sciences and clinical medicine
SUBJECT
Board Policy III.V, Articulation and Transfer- First Reading

REFERENCE
February 2007  The Board approved the second reading of proposed amendments to Board Policy III.V.

June 2011  The Board approved the first reading of proposed amendments to Board Policy III.V, which reduced the number of general education credits from 16 to 15 credits and updated titles of AAS degree core areas.

August 2011  The Board approved the second reading proposed amendments to Board Policy III.V.

October 2012  The Board approved the first reading of proposed amendments to Board Policy III.V, which provided flexibility in the six credits required of the general education core that are not assigned to a specific discipline.

December 2012  The Board approved the second reading of proposed amendments to Board Policy III.V.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION
Board Policy III.V, Articulation and Transfer, provides Idaho’s public institutions with guidance for administering the articulation and transfer of courses between Idaho’s public postsecondary institutions.

The proposed changes in Board Policy III.V will transform articulation and transfer among Idaho’s public institutions by the establishment of a common general education framework. This new framework establishes statewide General Education Matriculation (GEM) competencies that will guide institutions' in identifying courses that will be designated as GEM courses. Students who take an approved GEM course at one Idaho public institution will be able to transfer to another Idaho public institution and fulfill their general education requirements. The framework includes 36 credits of which 27 to 30 credits are general education matriculation credits leaving six to nine credits, set aside for institutional design. The proposed new Policy III.N details each of the competency areas and how those credits are distributed.

Board Policy III.V was revised to bring it into alignment with new Board Policy III.N General Education for the facilitation of GEM course transfer. Other amendments include removal of language that has been incorporated into the new Board Policy III.N. From the student perspective, the changes make
statewide general education more comprehensive and transparent across institutions. This will promote transfer and transfer planning.

The proposed amendments were shared with the Registrar’s Council in January and also shared with the Council on Academic Affairs and Programs at their February meeting. Both groups endorsed the general education related changes. Additionally they recommended the removal of the maximum 70 lower division credit rule.

IMPACT
Approval of proposed amendments will bring Board Policy III.V into alignment with Board Policy III.N and will provide institutions and staff with the necessary guidance for articulation and transfer for general education and non-general education courses between postsecondary institutions.

ATTACHMENTS
Attachment 1 – Proposed Amendments to Board Policy III.V, Articulation and Transfer – First Reading

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
Proposed amendments to Board Policy III.V will bring policy into alignment with proposed new Board Policy III.N on statewide general education and provide a seamless transfer of courses between Idaho public postsecondary institutions for students.

It’s important to note that CAAP also forwarded a recommendation to remove language from Policy III. V – the final sentence - which deals with acceptance of credit between institutions. Staff determined this language properly ensures the facilitation of transfer between Idaho’s public institutions and concluded that it should remain in policy. Some academic institutions have expressed concern this language could be interpreted to require them to accept professional-technical credits.

Board staff recommends approval as presented.

BOARD ACTION
I move to approve the first reading of proposed amendments to Board Policy III.V, Articulation and Transfer as submitted in Attachment 1.

Moved by __________ Seconded by __________ Carried Yes _____ No _____
This subsection shall apply to the University of Idaho, Boise State University, Idaho State University, Lewis-Clark State College, Eastern Idaho Technical College, College of Southern Idaho, College of Western Idaho, and North Idaho College.

The Statewide General Education Policy outlines Idaho’s General Education Framework and establishes guidelines for General Education Matriculated (GEM) curricula across all public postsecondary institutions. Statewide recognition of common GEM competencies creates a transparent and seamless transfer experience for undergraduates as defined in Board Policy III.N.

The transfer of GEM courses is predicated on the acquisition of competencies in broad academic areas. Each institution recognizes the professional integrity of all other public institutions in the acceptance of their General Education courses and programs.

1. Statewide Articulation

   a. Associate of Arts, and Associate of Science, and Baccalaureate Degrees

      To facilitate the transfer of students, Boise State University, Idaho State University, Lewis-Clark State College, the University of Idaho, the College of Southern Idaho, North Idaho College, and the College of Western Idaho, shall individually and jointly honor the terms of this statewide articulation policy.

      i. Students who complete requirements for the Associate of Arts or Associate of Science degree at an accredited institution in Idaho will be considered as satisfying the lower-division General Education core requirement, as defined in Board Policy III.N., and shall be granted junior standing upon transfer to a four-year public institution in Idaho and will not be required to complete any additional lower-division General Education Requirementscore courses subject to the conditions listed below.

      ii. Students who have completed the 36-credit General Education Framework, as defined in Board Policy III.N., without an Associate of Arts or Associate of Science Degree and Transfer students from any in-state or out-of-state accredited institution who have completed the equivalent of the State Board of Education’s general education core for the Associate Degree will not be required to complete additional lower-division General Education core requirements at the receiving institution. However, these students must obtain certification of such completion. Certification of successful completion of the lower division general education core for students who have not completed the Associate of Science or Associate of Arts degree is the responsibility of the transferring institution.
iii. If a student has completed GEM courses/categories but has not completed the entire General Education Framework or an Associate of Arts or Associate of Science Degree those GEM courses will satisfy the associated GEM course requirement at the receiving institution.

This transfer policy will provide for the fulfillment of all general education, lower division core requirements only. It is not intended to meet specific course requirements of unique or professional programs (e.g., engineering, pharmacy, business, etc.). Students who plan to transfer to unique or professional programs should consult with their advisors and make early contact with a program representative from the institution to which they intend to transfer.

Transfer students who have not completed the Associate of Arts or Associate of Science or the general education core courses will not come under the provision of this articulation policy.

A maximum of seventy (70) lower division credit hours or one-half of the total credits required for a student’s intended baccalaureate degree, whichever is greater, will normally be accepted for transfer from accredited community or junior colleges.

b. Associate of Applied Science Degrees

i. A student who satisfactorily completes a GEM course as part of the Associate of Applied Science (AAS) degree and then subsequently transfers to another public Idaho postsecondary institution will have satisfied the associated GEM course of the receiving institution for an AAS.

ii. The Bachelor of Applied Science (BAS) and Bachelor of Applied Technology (BAT) are interdisciplinary degrees designed for students who have completed an AAS degree. The BAS and BAT provide AAS graduates the opportunity to pursue a baccalaureate degree focused on upper-level academic coursework.

Students who complete all or a portion of the State Board of Education’s general education coursework for the Associate of Applied Science degree at one of the public postsecondary institutions in Idaho may fully transfer those completed general education core courses into an academic program. However, professional-technical transfer students who have not completed any courses under the general education core will not be covered under the provisions of this articulation policy.

2. Transfer Associate Degree

The 100 and 200 level general education core requirement must fit within the following thirty (30) credit and course requirements and must have a minimum of
thirty-six (36) credit hours. The remaining six (6) credits may come from the disciplines listed below, interdisciplinary courses, or foundational program courses.

Interdisciplinary courses integrate coursework from different academic areas and provide students an opportunity to engage in learning through inquiry while drawing on knowledge from multiple fields.

Foundational program courses integrate a disciplinary lens approach to the curriculum, serve as an academic introduction to the kinds of inquiry that are required for college learning, build problem solving skills, and identify student learning outcomes.

State Board of Education General Education Core:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Area</th>
<th>Required Courses</th>
<th>Minimum Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communications</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coursework in this area enhances students’ ability to communicate clearly, correctly, logically, and persuasively in spoken English. Disciplines: Speech, Rhetoric, and Debate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>English Composition</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3 to 6*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In meeting this goal, students must be able to express themselves in clear, logical, and grammatically correct written English. Up to six (6) credits may be exempt by ACT, SAT, CLEP or other institution accepted testing procedure. *3 or 6 credit hours depending upon initial placement results.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Behavioral and Social Science</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coursework in this area provides instruction in: (1) the history and culture of civilization; (2) the ways political and/or economic organizations, structures and institutions function and influence thought and behavior; and (3) the scientific method as it applies to social science research. Disciplines: Anthropology, Economics, Geography, History, Political Science, Psychology and Sociology. Note: Courses must be distributed over two (2) different disciplines.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Humanities, Fine Arts, and Foreign Language</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coursework in this area provides instruction in: (1) the creative process; (2) history and aesthetic principles of the fine arts; (3) philosophy and the arts as media for exploring the human condition and examining values; and (4) communication skills in a foreign language. Disciplines: Art, Philosophy, Literature, Music, Drama/Theater, and Foreign Languages.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural Science</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coursework in this area: (1) provides an understanding of how the biological and physical sciences explain the natural world and (2) introduces the basic concepts and terminology of the natural sciences. Disciplines: Biology, Chemistry, Physical Geography, Geology, and Physics. Note: Courses may be distributed over two (2) different disciplines and must have at least one (1) accompanying laboratory experience.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mathematics</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coursework in this area is intended to develop logical reasoning processes; skills in the use of space, numbers, symbols, and formulas; and the ability to apply mathematical skills to solve problems. Disciplines: College Algebra, Calculus, Finite Mathematics, and Statistics.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Associate of Applied Science Degree.

This professional-technical degree requires a minimum of 15 credit hours of general education coursework selected from each institution’s general education core and is comparable to the general education core of the Associate of Arts (A.A.) and Associate of Science (A.S.) degrees. The courses completed from the general education core of the A.A.S. will be fully transferable to the A.A., A.S., and baccalaureate degrees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required Courses</th>
<th>Minimum Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. English/Communication</td>
<td>2 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In meeting this goal, students must be able to express themselves in clear, logical, and grammatically correct written English. Disciplines: English 101 required, English 102 or Communication 101; An Applied English or Technical Writing course may be used if found to be comparable to ENGL 102.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics/Computation</td>
<td>1 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coursework in this area is intended to develop logical reasoning processes; skills in the use of space, numbers, symbols, and formulas; and the ability to apply mathematical skills to solve problems. Disciplines: College Algebra, Calculus, Finite Mathematics and Mathematical Statistics. An Applied Mathematics course may be used if found to be comparable to a traditional mathematics course.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Social Science/Human Relations</td>
<td>1 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coursework in this area provides the student with the skills needed for understanding individuals in the workplace and the functioning of thought and behavior. Disciplines: Human Relations, Psychology, and Sociology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Elective</td>
<td>1 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coursework in this area may come from any general education core requirement as listed in III.V.2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Each institution is responsible for publishing the current curriculum equivalencies of GEM courses on the state transfer web portal.

43. Authority is delegated to the postsecondary institutions under the Board’s governance to evaluate and accept equivalent or elective credits on behalf of transferring students who have earned those credits from any out-of-state accredited institution or from any non-accredited institution or other educational source. However, if the Board has previously approved credits for courses and programs, those credits are transferable among all Idaho public institutions. Notwithstanding the foregoing, an institution may deny credit transfer to comply with specialized accreditation requirements, or in unique degree requirements.

Credits accepted by one institution under the Board’s governance are transferable by the student to any other postsecondary institution under the Board’s governance.
**SUBJECT**

Board Policy III.G. Program Approval and Discontinuance- Second Reading

**REFERENCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 2005</td>
<td>The Board approved the first reading of proposed amendments to Board Policy III.G that would simplify language, clarify roles for approval, and clearly define requirements for routine changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2005</td>
<td>The Board approved the second reading of proposed amendments to Board Policy III.G that would simplify language, clarify roles for approval, and clearly define requirements for routine changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2007</td>
<td>The Board approved the first reading of proposed amendments to Board Policy III.G.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2007</td>
<td>The Board approved the second reading of proposed amendments to Board Policy III.G that would clearly define PTE’s program approval procedures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 19, 2013</td>
<td>The Board supported moving forward with policy amendments to III.G that would streamline and simplify procedures for program review and approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2013</td>
<td>The Board approved the second reading of Board Policy III.G.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2014</td>
<td>The Board approved the first reading of proposed amendments to Board Policy III.G that would clarify the proposal submission and modification of PTE programs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION**

Board Policy III.G, Postsecondary Program Approval and Discontinuance provides Idaho’s public institutions with procedures for the development, approval, and discontinuation of academic and professional-technical programs.

During the implementation of policy changes approved by the Board in December 2013, the State Division of Professional-Technical Education (PTE) identified areas of policy that may not be as clear regarding proposal submission and modification of PTE programs. This was not realized until after the second reading was approved. While clarifying language would be minor, required
language changes were substantial enough to warrant additional changes to Board Policy, requiring two readings.

IMPACT
Approval of proposed amendments will provide institutions and staff the necessary guidance for processing PTE programs.

ATTACHMENTS
Attachment 1 – Proposed Amendments to Board Policy III.G, Page 3
Postsecondary Program Approval and Discontinuance

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
Proposed amendments to Board Policy III.G will clarify requirements for new PTE programs and modifications to existing programs. Amendments also include striking out redundant language for name or title changes to programs and instructional units. Structural changes were also made so that provisions in policy for PTE programs flow and align with the requirements for academic programs.

Additional changes were made between the first and second reading to clarify that programs may not be implemented without prior Board approval where applicable. Board staff and the Council on Academic Affairs and Programs recommend approval as presented.

BOARD ACTION
I move to approve the second reading of proposed amendments to Board Policy III.G, Postsecondary Program Approval and Discontinuance as submitted in Attachment 1.

Moved by __________ Seconded by __________ Carried Yes _____ No _____
The Board is responsible for the establishment, maintenance, and general supervision of policies and procedures governing the academic and program affairs of the institutions. This subsection shall apply to the University of Idaho, Idaho State University, Boise State University, Lewis-Clark State College, Eastern Idaho Technical College, North Idaho College, the College of Southern Idaho, and the College of Western Idaho.

The Board affirms that a major percentage of instructional and professional-technical program planning, assessment, and review rests with the institutions, both in theory and in practice. In addition, program planning shall be a collaborative process which includes the Board, Board staff, the institutions, faculty, external advisory groups, regional and specialized accreditation bodies, and other stakeholders pursuant to Board Policy Section III.Z. However, the Board has final authority and responsibility for program approval and how a program and the curriculum relate to other institutions, the system as a whole, and the educational and workforce needs of the state. All postsecondary program approvals will include identifiable learning outcomes and competency measurements for graduates of their programs as defined in Board Policy Section III.X.

1. Classifications and Definitions

   a. Instructional Unit(s) shall mean departments, institutes, centers, divisions, schools, colleges, campuses, branch campuses, and research units (e.g. extension centers) that are responsible for academic programs.

   b. Administrative Unit(s) shall mean offices, centers, bureaus, or institutes that are responsible for carrying out administrative functions, research, or public service as their primary purpose, and are not responsible for programs.

   c. Academic Program(s) shall mean a systematic, usually sequential, grouping of courses forming a considerable part, or all, of the requirements (i.e., curricula) that provides the student with the knowledge and competencies required for an academic certificate, an associate, baccalaureate, master’s, specialist, or doctoral degree as defined in Board Policy Section III.E. A course or series of courses leading to an Academic Certificate of Completion is not considered an academic program for approval purposes.

   d. Major(s) shall mean a principal field of academic specialization that usually accounts for 25 to 50 percent of the total degree requirements. The concentration of coursework in a subject-matter major serves to distinguish one program from others leading to the same or a similar degree.
e. Academic Program Components shall include options, minors, emphases, tracks, concentrations, specializations, and cognates as defined by each institution.

f. Professional-Technical Program(s) shall mean a sequence or aggregation of competencies that are derived from industry-endorsed outcome standards and directly related to preparation for employment in occupations requiring professional-technical certificates or an associate of applied science degree as defined in Board Policy Section III.E. These programs must include competency-based applied learning that contributes to an individual’s technical skills, academic knowledge, higher-order reasoning, and problem-solving skills. A course or series of courses leading to a technical certificate of completion is not considered a program for approval purposes.

g. Professional-Technical Program Components shall include option(s); which shall mean alternative instructional paths to fields of specialized employment, consisting of more than one specialized course, and may have a separate advisory committee.

2. Roles and Responsibilities

a. Institutions shall establish internal program review processes and procedures. Institutions shall follow their internal review processes and procedures pursuant to Board Policy Section III.H. prior to forwarding proposals to the Board.

b. Program proposals shall be reviewed by the Council on Academic Affairs and Programs (CAAP). CAAP shall make recommendations to the Instruction, Research, and Student Affairs (IRSA) committee on instructional programmatic matters and related policy issues.

c. The Idaho Division of Professional-Technical Education and the Professional Standards Commission shall review and make recommendations as appropriate to IRSA and/or the Board on instructional programmatic matters and policy issues related to their roles and responsibilities.

3. Academic Program Proposal Submission and Approval Procedures

Subsequent to institutional review and consistent with institutional policies, all requests requiring Board or Executive Director approval will be submitted by the institution to Board staff as a proposal in accordance with a template developed by the Board’s Chief Academic Officer. Each proposal shall be reviewed by CAAP within 30 days from receipt of said proposal. For purposes of this Section, financial impact shall mean the total financial resources, regardless of funding source, needed to support personnel costs, operating expenditures, capital outlay, capital facilities construction or major renovation, and indirect costs that are generated as a direct result of the new instructional program or modification to an existing program.
Proposals that require new state appropriations shall also be included in the annual budget request of the institution for Board approval.

a. Branch Campuses

The establishment of a new branch campus or change in location geographically apart from the main campus where the institution offers at least 50% of an education program shall require Board approval regardless of fiscal impact. This subsection of policy excludes community colleges.

b. Academic Programs

i. All new, modification, and/or discontinuation of academic program majors certificates, associates, bachelors, masters, doctorates, instructional units, administrative units, expansions, consolidations, including the transition of existing programs to an on-line format requires completion of the program proposal prior to implementation.

1) Prior to implementation, an institution shall obtain The Board shall approval, prior to implementation, of any new, modification, and/or discontinuation of academic or professional-technical programs, with a financial impact of $250,000 or more per fiscal year.

2) Prior to implementation, an institution shall obtain The Executive Director shall approval, prior to implementation, of any new, modification, and/or discontinuation of academic or professional-technical programs, with a financial impact of less than $250,000 per fiscal year.

3) Prior to implementation, an institution shall obtain The Board shall approval, prior to implementation, of any new, modification, and/or discontinuation of all graduate academic programs leading to a master’s, specialist, or doctoral degree regardless of fiscal impact.

4) The Executive Director may refer any proposal to the Board or subcommittee of the Board for review and action.

ii. Modifications to existing programs shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

1) Converting one program option into a stand-alone program.
2) Consolidating an existing program to create one or more new programs.
3) Adding a degree program not already approved by the Board.
4) Adding courses that represent a significant departure from existing program offerings or method of delivery from those already evaluated and approved by the Board.
5) Transitioning of existing programs to an on-line format.
6) Changes from clock hours to credit hours or vice-versa, or substantial increase or decrease in the length of a program or number of clock or credit hours awarded for successful completion of program.

iii. All doctoral program proposals shall require an external peer review. The external peer-review panel shall consist of at least two (2) members and will be selected by the Board's Chief Academic Officer and the requesting institution's Provost. External reviewers shall not be affiliated with a public Idaho institution. The review shall consist of a paper and on-site peer review, followed by the issuance of a report and recommendations by the panel. Each institution shall provide the panel with a template developed by the Board's Chief Academic Officer. The peer reviewer's report and recommendations will be a significant factor of the Board's evaluation of the program.

iv. New educator preparation programs require concurrent submission of the program proposal to the Board office and the Professional Standards Commission (PSC) prior to implementation. The PSC ensures that programs meet the Idaho standards for certification. The Board office ensures that the program proposal meets the standards approved by the Board and established in rule.

c. Academic Program Components

Modification of existing academic program components may or may not require a proposal. For academic program components that require a proposal, subsection 4.b.i. of this policy applies.

New, modification, and/or discontinuation of academic program components; program name or title changes to degrees, departments, divisions, colleges, or centers; or changes to Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) codes require a formal letter notifying the Office of the State Board of Education prior to implementation of such changes. If the change is judged to be consistent with academic program components as provided in this section, Board staff will notify the institution in writing that they may proceed with said changes. If the change is determined to be inconsistent with academic program components or the CIP code change represents a significant departure from existing offerings, Board staff will notify the institution in writing and they will be required to complete a program proposal.

i. Changes to program names or degree titles related to Statewide Program Responsibilities as provided in Board Policy III.Z., require a proposal as specified in subsection 43.b.i of this policy, and shall be reviewed and approved by the Board.
ii. Non-substantive changes do not require notification or approval. These shall include minor curriculum changes; minor credit changes in a program; descriptions of individual courses; other routine catalog changes; and do not require additional funding to implement. Institutions must provide prior notification of a name or title change for programs, degrees, departments, divisions, colleges, or centers via a letter to the Office of the State Board of Education.

4. Professional-Technical Programs

New, modification, and/or discontinuation of professional-technical programs, instructional units, expansions, consolidations, and transition of existing programs to an online format require completion of the program proposal prior to implementation. Professional-technical program proposals shall be forwarded to the State Administrator of the Division of Professional-technical Education for review and recommendation. All professional-technical program requests requiring Board or Executive Director approval will be submitted by the institution to the Division of Professional-Technical Education as a proposal in accordance with a template developed by Board staff. Each proposal shall be reviewed within 30 days from receipt of said proposal. The State Administrator shall forward the request to CAAP for its review and recommendation. Once CAAP and/or State Administrator recommends approval, the proposal shall be forwarded, along with recommendations, to the Board for action. Requests that require new state appropriations shall be included in the annual budget request of the State Division of Professional-Technical Education for Board approval.

For purposes of this Section, financial impact shall mean the total financial resources, regardless of funding source, needed to support personnel costs, operating expenditures, capital outlay, capital facilities construction or major renovation, and indirect costs that are generated as a direct result of the new instructional program or modification to an existing program. Proposals that require new state appropriations shall also be included in the annual budget request of the institution for Board approval.

a. Professional-Technical Programs

i. All new, modification, and/or discontinuation of professional-technical degrees, instructional units, expansions, consolidations, including the transition of existing programs to an online format, require completion of the program proposal prior to implementation. Professional-Technical program proposals shall be forwarded to the State Administrator of the Division of Professional-Technical Education for review and recommendation. The State Administrator shall forward the request to CAAP for its review and recommendation. Once CAAP and/or State Administrator recommends approval, the proposal shall be forwarded, along with recommendations, to the Board for action.
1) Prior to implementation, an institution shall obtain the approval of The Board shall prior to implementation, of any new, modification, and/or discontinuation of professional-technical programs with a financial impact of $250,000 or more per fiscal year.

2) Prior to implementation, an institution shall obtain The Executive Director shall approval prior to implementation, of any new, modification, and/or discontinuation of professional-technical programs with a financial impact of less than $250,000 per fiscal year.

3) The Executive Director may refer any proposal to the Board or subcommittee of the Board for review and action.

ii. Modifications to existing programs shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

1) Converting one program option into a stand-alone program.
2) Consolidating an existing program to create one or more new programs.
3) Adding a certificate or degree program not already approved by the Board.
4) Adding courses that represent a significant departure from existing program offerings or method of delivery from those already evaluated and approved by the Board.
5) Transitioning of existing programs to an on-line format.
6) Changes from clock hours to credit hours or vice-versa, or substantial increase or decrease in the length of a program or number of clock or credit hours awarded for successful completion of program.

b. Professional-Technical Programs Components

Modification of existing professional-technical program components may or may not require a proposal. For professional-technical program components that require a proposal, subsection 4.a.i of this policy applies.

New, modification, and/or discontinuation of professional-technical options for existing programs; changes to a program’s status to inactive, changes to CIP codes, or name title changes (e.g., programs, degrees, certificates, departments, divisions, colleges, or centers) require a formal letter notifying the State Administrator prior to implementation of such changes. If the change is judged to be consistent with program components as provided in this section, the State Administrator will notify the institution in writing that they may proceed with said changes. If the change is determined to be inconsistent with definition of program components, the State Administrator will notify the institution in writing and they will be required to complete the program proposal.
i. Non-substantive changes to courses within a current program (e.g., course
number, title, description, addition, deletion, and/or credit hours) must be
submitted to the State Division of Professional-Technical Education.

ii. Changes to a program’s status to inactive, or name title changes (e.g.,
programs, degrees, certificates, departments, divisions, colleges, or
centers) require a formal letter notifying the State Administrator prior to
implementation of such changes. If the change is judged to be consistent
with program components as provided in this section, the State
Administrator will notify the institution in writing that they may proceed with
said changes. If the change is determined to be inconsistent with definition
of program components, the State Administrator will notify the institution in
writing and they will be required to complete the program proposal.

5. Sunset Clause for Program Approval

Board or Executive Director approval of academic and professional-technical
education programs shall include a three-year sunset clause. A program not
implemented within the three years from the date of its approval shall be
resubmitted by the institution to the Board or Executive Director for approval.
Institutions shall submit a new proposal to include a justification for the renewal.

6. Academic and Professional-Technical Program Proposal Denial Procedures
a. The Executive Director shall act on any request within thirty (30) days.

b. If the Executive Director denies the proposal he/she shall provide specific
reasons in writing. The institution shall have thirty (30) days in which to address
the issue(s) for denial of the proposal. The Executive Director has ten (10)
working days after the receipt of the institution’s response to re-consider the
denial. If the Executive Director denies the request after re-consideration, the
institution may send its request and the supporting documents related to the
denial to the Board for final reconsideration.

7. Program Discontinuance

The primary considerations for instructional program discontinuance will be whether
the instructional program is an effective use of the institution’s resources, no longer
serves student or industry needs, or when programs no longer have sufficient
students to warrant its allocation. This policy does not apply to instructional
programs that are discontinued as a result of financial exigency as defined and
discussed in Board Policy Section II.N. of these policies.

For professional-technical program discontinuance, institutions shall adhere to
criteria and procedures as provided in IDAPA 55.01.02.
a. Students

Institutions shall develop policies, in accordance with the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities Accreditation Handbook, which requires institutions to make appropriate arrangements for enrolled students to complete affected programs in a timely manner with minimum interruptions.

b. Employees

i. Any faculty or staff members whose employment the institution seeks to terminate due to the discontinuance of a program based upon Board Policy Section III.G. shall be entitled to the following procedures:

   1) Non-classified contract employees, including non-tenured faculty, may be dismissed or have their contracts terminated or non-renewed in accordance with Board and institutional policies.

   2) State of Idaho classified employees shall be subject to layoff as provided in the rules of the Division of Human Resources. Classified employees of the University of Idaho shall be subject to layoff as provided in the policies of the University of Idaho.

   3) Tenured faculty will be notified in writing that the institution intends to dismiss them as a result of program discontinuance. This notice shall be given at least twelve (12) months prior to the effective date of termination.

   4) An employee who receives a notice of termination as a result of program discontinuance is entitled to use the internal grievance procedures of the institution. The sole basis to contest a dismissal following a program closure is in compliance with these policies.

8. Reporting

a. The Office of the State Board of Education shall report quarterly to the State Board of Education all program approvals and discontinuations approved by the Executive Director.

b. All graduate level programs approved by the State Board of Education require a report on the program’s progress in accordance with a timeframe and template developed by the Board’s Chief Academic Officer.

c. Institutions shall notify the Board office in writing when an approved program has been officially implemented.
SUBJECT
Board Policy III.N., General Education – Second Reading

REFERENCE
The Board approved the first reading of proposed new Policy III.N, General Education.

BACKGROUND / DISCUSSION
A key initiative of the Board’s Complete College Idaho Plan includes reforming general education under the Structure for Success strategy. The goal of this initiative is to re-map the delivery of general education statewide by creating an outcomes-based core, rather than a discipline-based core. This new approach to program design and assessment addresses the needs of stakeholders and creates stronger general education alignment between postsecondary institutions.

The General Education Taskforce, consisting of key educational leaders from all eight public institutions, received draft rubrics and recommendations in early December from the various discipline groups, which resulted in a proposed new policy that would provide guidance and coverage for General Education statewide. The new policy provides a common general education framework; establishes statewide General Education Matriculation (GEM) competencies that will guide institutions’ determination of courses that will be designated as GEM courses; establishes shared rubrics that guide course/general education program assessment; and creates a transparent and seamless transfer experience for undergraduate students.

IMPACT
Approval of the proposed new policy will allow for restructuring the delivery of general education statewide and provide a common general education framework, which will facilitate seamless transfer between all of Idaho’s public institutions.

ATTACHMENTS
Attachment 1 – Board Policy III.N, General Education – 2nd Reading

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
The new policy will establish ongoing responsibilities for the faculty discipline groups, who will ensure consistency and relevance of General Education competencies related to their discipline. Additionally, policy will also formally establish the State General Education Committee, who will be responsible for reviewing competencies and rubrics for institutionally-designated General Education categories and ensure transferability.

In the development of this new policy, outdated language regarding general education was taken from Board Policy III.V (Articulation and Transfer) and updated and incorporated in Board Policy III. N. Specifically, subsections 2 and
3 were removed from III.V. This is reflected in the proposed amendment to Board Policy III.V presented earlier.

There were no changes between the first and second readings. Board staff and Council on Academic Affairs and Programs recommend approval as presented.

BOARD ACTION

I move to approve the second reading of the proposed new Board Policy III.N, General Education as presented and to be implemented by the Fall 2015 academic semester.

Moved by __________ Seconded by __________ Carried Yes _____ No _____
In our rapidly-changing world, students need to understand how knowledge is
generated and created. They need to adapt to new knowledge and opportunities as they
arise, as well as effectively communicate and collaborate with increasingly diverse
communities and ways of knowing. In combination with a student's major, General
Education competencies prepare students to use multiple strategies in an integrative
manner, to explore, critically analyze, and creatively address real-world issues and
challenges. Course work provides graduates with an understanding of self, the physical
world, the development and functioning of human society, and its cultural and artistic
endeavors, as well as an understanding of the methodologies, value systems, and
thought processes employed in human inquiries. General Education helps instill
students with the personal and civic responsibilities of good citizenship. General
Education prepares graduates as adaptive, life-long learners.

This section shall apply to the University of Idaho, Boise State University, Idaho State
University, Lewis-State Clark College, Eastern Idaho Technical College, College of
Southern Idaho, College of Western Idaho, and North Idaho College (hereinafter
“institutions”).

1. The state of Idaho’s General Education framework for Associate of Arts, Associate of
Science, and Baccalaureate degrees shall be:

a. The General Education curricula must be thirty-six (36) credits.
b. Twenty-seven (27) to thirty (30) credits of the General Education curricula
(dependent upon Written Communication placement) must fit within the General
Education Matriculation (GEM) competency areas defined in subsection 4.
c. Six (6) to nine (9) credits of the General Education curricula are reserved for
institutions to create competency areas that address the specific mission and
goals of the institution. Courses in these competency areas shall have learning
outcomes linked to Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U)
Essential Learning Outcomes.

2. The intent of the General Education framework is to:

a. Establish statewide competencies that guide institutions’ determination of
courses that will be designated as GEM courses;
b. Establish shared rubrics that guide course/general education program
assessment; and
c. Create a transparent and seamless transfer experience for undergraduate
students.
3. There are six (6) General Education Matriculation (GEM) competency areas. The first two emphasize integrative skills intended to inform the learning process throughout General Education and major. The final four represent ways of knowing and are intended to expose students to ideas and engage them in a broad range of active learning experiences. Those competencies are:

   a. Written Communication
   b. Oral Communication
   c. Mathematical Ways of Knowing
   d. Scientific Ways of Knowing
   e. Humanistic and Artistic Ways of Knowing
   f. Social and Behavioral Ways of Knowing

4. GEM courses in each area shall include the following competencies.

   a. Written Communication: Upon completion of a course in this category, students are able to demonstrate the following competencies.

      i. Use flexible writing process strategies to generate, develop, revise, edit, and proofread texts.
      ii. Adopt strategies and genre appropriate to the rhetorical situation.
      iii. Use inquiry-based strategies to conduct research that explores multiple and diverse ideas and perspectives, appropriate to the rhetorical context.
      iv. Use rhetorically appropriate strategies to evaluate, represent, and respond to the ideas and research of others.
      v. Address readers’ biases and assumptions with well-developed evidence-based reasoning.
      vi. Use appropriate conventions for integrating, citing, and documenting source material as well as for surface-level language and style.

   b. Oral Communication: Upon completion of a course in this category, students are able to demonstrate at least five (5) of the following competencies.

      i. Research, discover, and develop information resources and structure verbal messages to increase knowledge and understanding.
      ii. Research, discover, and develop evidence-based reasoning and persuasive appeals for influencing attitudes, values, beliefs, or behaviors.
      iii. Understand interpersonal rules, roles, and strategies in varied contexts.
      iv. Effectively listen and adapt verbal messages to the personal, ideological, and emotional perspectives of the audience.
      v. Employ effective verbal and nonverbal behaviors that support communication goals.
      vi. Effectively recognize and critically evaluate the reasoning, evidence, and communication strategies of self and others.
c. Mathematical Ways of Knowing: Upon completion of a course in this category, a student is able to demonstrate the following competencies.

i. Read, interpret, and communicate mathematical concepts.
ii. Represent and interpret information/data.
iii. Select, execute and explain appropriate strategies/procedures when solving mathematical problems.
iv. Apply quantitative reasoning to draw and support appropriate conclusions.

d. Scientific Ways of Knowing: Upon completion of a course in this category, a student is able to demonstrate at least four (4) of the following competencies.

i. Apply foundational knowledge and models of a natural or physical science to analyze and/or predict phenomena.
ii. Understand the scientific method and apply scientific reasoning to critically evaluate arguments.
iii. Interpret and communicate scientific information via written, spoken and/or visual representations.
iv. Describe the relevance of specific scientific principles to the human experience.
v. Form and test a hypothesis in the laboratory or field using discipline-specific tools and techniques for data collection and/or analysis.

e. Humanistic and Artistic Ways of Knowing: Upon completion of a course in this category, students are able to demonstrate at least five (5) of the following competencies.

i. Recognize and describe humanistic, historical, or artistic works within problems and patterns of the human experience.
ii. Distinguish and apply terminologies, methodologies, processes, epistemologies, and traditions specific to the discipline(s).
iii. Perceive and understand formal, conceptual, and technical elements specific to the discipline.
iv. Analyze, evaluate, and interpret texts, objects, events, or ideas in their cultural, intellectual or historical contexts.
v. Interpret artistic and/or humanistic works through the creation of art or performance.
vi. Develop critical perspectives or arguments about the subject matter, grounded in evidence-based analysis.
vii. Demonstrate self-reflection, intellectual elasticity, widened perspective, and respect for diverse viewpoints.

f. Social and Behavioral Ways of Knowing: Upon completion of a course in this category, students are able to demonstrate at least four (4) of the following competencies.
i. Demonstrate knowledge of the theoretical and conceptual frameworks of a particular Social Science discipline.

ii. Develop an understanding of self and the world by examining the dynamic interaction of individuals, groups, and societies as they shape and are shaped by history, culture, institutions, and ideas.

iii. Utilize Social Science approaches, such as research methods, inquiry, or problem-solving, to examine the variety of perspectives about human experiences.

iv. Evaluate how reasoning, history, or culture informs and guides individual, civic, or global decisions.

v. Understand and appreciate similarities and differences among and between individuals, cultures, or societies across space and time.

5. General Education Requirement

a. This subsection applies to Associate of Arts, Associate of Science, and Baccalaureate degrees.

General Education curricula must reflect the following credit distribution:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency Area</th>
<th>Minimum Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Written Communication</td>
<td>3 to 6 (depending on placement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Communication</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematical Ways of Knowing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific Ways of Knowing</td>
<td>7 (from two different disciplines with at least one laboratory or field experience)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanistic and Artistic Ways of Knowing</td>
<td>6 (from two different disciplines)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Behavioral Ways of Knowing</td>
<td>6 (from two different disciplines)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutionally-Designated Competency Areas</td>
<td>6 to 9 (depending on Written Communication placement)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

i. GEM courses are designed to be broadly accessible to students regardless of major, thus college-level and non-GEM pre-requisites to GEM courses should be avoided unless deemed necessary by the institution.

ii. Additional GEM courses, beyond the General Education curricula, may be required within the major for degree completion.

b. This subsection pertains to Associate of Applied Science degrees.

i. The General Education curricula for the AAS degree must contain a minimum of fifteen (15) credits, so distributed in the following areas:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency Area</th>
<th>Minimum Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Written Communication</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Communication</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematical Ways of Knowing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Behavioral Ways of Knowing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutionally-Designated</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Governance of the General Education Program and Review of Courses

   a. GEM courses are developed by faculty and approved via the curriculum approval process of the institution delivering the courses. Those courses are transferable as meeting the GEM requirements at any Idaho public institution. Faculty discipline groups representing all public postsecondary institutions shall ensure consistency and relevance of General Education competencies related to their discipline.

   b. The State General Education Committee (The Committee): The Committee, established by the Board, shall consist of a representative from each of the eight public postsecondary institutions. To ensure transferability, the Committee reviews competencies and rubrics for institutionally-designated General Education categories; final approval resides with the Board. Committee membership and duties are prescribed by the Board.

   c. The eight (8) public postsecondary institutions shall identify all GEM courses in their curricula and identify them on the state transfer web portal.
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February 2014 Board approved the first reading of amendments to Board Policy III.Y which would allow secondary students two options for earning postsecondary credits through the technical college system.

APPLICABLE STATUTES, RULE OR POLICY
Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies & Procedures, Section III.E.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION
Over the last year, the Division of Professional-Technical Education (PTE), in conjunction with a stakeholder group made up of representatives from the technical colleges and industry evaluated Idaho’s TechPrep Program and has proposing amendments to the program. The “traditional” TechPrep Program contained in Board policy allowed secondary professional-technical students the opportunity to participate in a TechPrep Program that allowed them to transcribe postsecondary credits within a defined period of time at the conclusion of the program. The TechPrep Programs must have an approved articulation agreement between the high school and the postsecondary institution. This agreement outlines how the credits will transfer at the conclusion of the program. The proposed amendments would allow for two pathways of earning technical credits. The first, Technical Competency Credit would be similar to the current process for TechPrep. The second, Technical Dual Credit would mirror the current dual credit options.

Technical Competency Credit students would not be considered postsecondary students and do not earn credits until they matriculate to a postsecondary institution. The credits earned would be based on successfully mastering the program competencies. Technical Dual Credit students, similar to Academic Dual Credits students, would be awarded at the successful completion of each course, students would be dually enrolled as secondary students and postsecondary students.

The Council on Academic Affairs and Programs (CAAP) expressed some concerns regarding proposed amendments to Board Policy III.Y. following the approval of the first reading. Board staff met with the Provost and VP’s of Academic Affairs to discuss their concerns, the most significant concerns expressed were regarding the language specify the qualifications for instructors and the fee for the technical dual credit courses, the bulk of the changes made
were wording changes for additional clarity and the moving of language approved during the first reading to different sections of the policy. The group came to consensus on the following changes:

- the language regarding faculty qualifications was amended to mirror the language in the academic dual credit section. The intent of the original language was that the college approve the faculty, and that the faculty or instructor have the same credentials required by the institution for their professional-technical courses.
- the language regarding the fee for the technical dual credit courses was changed to mirror the original dual credit fee language. This language specifies that the Board will set the fee at their Fee Setting meeting. The fee is currently $65 per credit.
- the reference to "technical college" was changed to "postsecondary institution" throughout the policy.
- additional specificity was added to the advising language in the technical dual credit standards and the technical competency credit standards specifying that advising must include information regarding the difference between professional-technical credit and academic credit and how these credits would apply toward a degree.
- language was removed from both the academic dual credit standards section and technical dual credits standards section that was not clear regarding requirement that students successfully complete all of the course requirements. Language in other sections of the standards already specified that the students are assessed based on the same standards as traditional postsecondary students and that course content meets the same standards as the on-campus courses. To add additional clarity to the student assessment section the language "and awarded credit" was added.
- the introduction to the term Professional-Technical Advanced Learning (PTAL) was removed, the two pathways that fell under PTAL were split out, the standards for the two programs introduced in the first reading stayed the same, except as noted herein.
- the definition of dual credit was amended to clarify that dual credit encompassed both academic dual credit and technical dual credit.
- the technical dual credit standards were moved so that they followed the academic dual credit standards.
- the definition of technical competency credit was moved to its own definition section rather than following under the PTAL designation.
- the reference to statutory requirements in the standards section for dual credit courses taken on campus was amended to bring it into alignment with changes made to the that referenced section of code. The statutory requirement was removed from code making the reference no longer accurate.
- redundant language in the dual credit on campus standards was cleaned up, since the standard only applies to high school students taking classes.

The fee for technical competency credit did not change and remains the same Workforce Training Fee as specified in the first reading.
IMPACT
Approving the amendments now would allow the institutions time to evaluate changes they would like to make in the advanced opportunities they offer secondary students and notify the school districts they work with prior to the start of the secondary schools summer break. This will allow the secondary schools to make any necessary changes to their fall course offerings.

ATTACHMENTS
Attachment 1 – Board Policy III.Y. Certificates and Degrees – Second Reading

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
The Council on Academic Affairs and Programs (CAAP) was notified that PTE was proposing changes to III.Y Advanced Opportunities at their December meeting and was provided a draft of the proposed policy amendments at their February meeting. CAAP did not have any additional changes or recommendations to bring forward at that time. Subsequent conversations following the approval of the first reading brought to light some additional concerns and lack of understanding regarding some of the proposed policy amendments. The additional amendments requested by the institutions provide for added clarity to the policy without changing the overall intent of the consistent application of advanced opportunities for secondary students across the state.

The original fee proposed for the technical dual credit courses was based on the current funding structure for professional-technical courses provided by the technical colleges, further discussions made it evident that additional oversight would be needed to assure the standards for the technical dual credit courses were met, thereby making it appropriate for the institutions to charge the same fee as the academic dual credit courses.

Lewis-Clark State College (LCSC) expressed concerns regarding the policy itself. The language in the technical competency credit standards specifying that these students are not postsecondary students and do not receive the postsecondary credits until they matriculate will impact LCSC’s current TechPrep practices. LCSC concurrently enrolls these students as postsecondary students. The Technical Dual Credit model would allow LCSC to concurrently enroll secondary students, however, these courses would now be subject to the dual credit fee set by the Board. LCSC does not currently charge for TechPrep courses.

The Board policy outlines the process and minimum standards for the various Advanced Opportunity options available to secondary students. It does not dictate how the secondary schools or postsecondary institutions internally manage the processes.

Due to timing related to secondary school schedules, if the Board were to approve the second reading of the amendments to Board Policy III.Y. at this meeting, it is anticipated that the changes would not impact the students until the Fall of 2014. Institutions would be expected to implement any necessary changes no later than Fall of 2014.
BOARD ACTION

I move to approve the second reading of proposed amendments to Board policy III.Y. Advanced Opportunities as submitted in Attachment 1.

Moved by __________ Seconded by __________ Carried Yes _____ No _____
Idaho State Board of Education
GOVERNING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES
SECION: III. POSTSECONDARY AFFAIRS
SUBSECTION: Y. Advanced Opportunities

1. Coverage

Boise State University, Idaho State University, the University of Idaho, Lewis-Clark State College, Eastern Idaho Technical College, North Idaho College, the College of Southern Idaho, and the College of Western Idaho are covered by these policies. Post-secondary programs intended for transfer come under the purview of the Board.

2. Purpose

The State Board of Education has made a commitment to improve the educational opportunities to Idaho citizens by creating a seamless system. To this end, the Board has instructed its postsecondary institutions to provide educational programs and training to their respective service regions, to support and enhance regional and statewide economic development, and to collaborate with the public elementary and secondary schools. In addition to the Board's desire to prepare secondary graduates for postsecondary programs, the Board is also addressing advanced opportunities programs for qualified secondary students. These programs have the potential for reducing the overall costs of secondary and postsecondary programs to the students and institutions.

The primary intent of the Board is to develop a purpose of this policy is to provide program standards for advanced opportunities programs for secondary students which would:

- Enhance their postsecondary goals;
- Reduce duplication and provide for an easy transition between secondary and postsecondary education; and
- Reduce the overall cost of educational services and training to the student.

3. Definitions

There are various advanced opportunities programs students may access to receive post-secondary credit for education completed while enrolled in the secondary system. Examples include Advanced Placement® (AP), dual credit courses that are taken either in the high school or on the college campus, Tech Prep Professional-Technical Advance learning (PTAL) technical competency credit, and International Baccalaureate programs. For the purpose of this policy the State Board of Education recognizes four different types of advanced opportunities programs depending upon the delivery site and faculty. They are: Advanced Placement®, dual credit, Tech Prep PTAL technical competency credit, and the International Baccalaureate program.
a. Advanced Placement® (AP)

The Advanced Placement® Program is administered by the College Board. AP students may take one or more college level courses in a variety of subjects. AP courses are not tied to a specific college curriculum, but rather follow national College Board curricula. While taking the AP exam is optional, students may earn college credit by scoring well on the national AP exams. It is up to the discretion of the individual colleges to accept the scores from the AP exams to award college credit or advanced standing.

b. Academic Dual Credit

Dual credit allows high school students to simultaneously earn credit toward a high school diploma and a postsecondary degree or certificate. Postsecondary institutions work closely with high schools to deliver college courses that are identical to those offered on the college campus. Credits earned in a dual credit class become part of the student’s permanent college record. Students may enroll in dual credit programs taught at the high school or on the college campus. Dual credit may be earned for both academic courses and professional-technical courses. Academic dual credit refers to credits earned on a student’s secondary transcript and postsecondary transcript for a single academic dual credit course. Technical dual credit refers to credits earned on a student’s high school transcript and postsecondary transcript for the same professional-technical course.

c. International Baccalaureate (IB)

Administered by the International Baccalaureate Organization, the IB program provides a comprehensive liberal arts course of study for students in their junior and senior years of high school. IB students take end-of-course exams that may qualify for college-credit. Successful completion of the full course of study leads to an IB diploma.

d. Tech Prep Professional-Technical Advance Learning (PTAL) Technical Competency Credit

Professional-technical education programs are delivered through comprehensive high schools, professional-technical schools, and technical colleges. Tech Prep allows secondary professional-technical students the opportunity to simultaneously earn secondary and postsecondary technical credits. A Tech Prep course must have an approved articulation agreement between the high school and a technical college. Tech Prep is an advanced learning opportunity that provides a head start on a technical certificate or an associate of applied science degree. PTAL is an advanced opportunity that provides a head start on a technical certificate or an associate of applied science degree. PTAL allows secondary professional-technical students the opportunity to simultaneously earn secondary and postsecondary technical credits for programs delivered through the Idaho Technical College System. Credits earned in a PTAL course may become part of a student’s permanent college record or be escrowed for future use. Technical Competency Credit provides an avenue for secondary students to document proficiency in the skills and abilities they develop in high school professional-technical programs to be evaluated for postsecondary transcription for future transcription as appropriate when they matriculate to a
postsecondary institution. Technical Competency Credits are awarded for courses and competencies identified as eligible Technical Competency Credit through a Technical Competency Credit Agreement with at least one Idaho technical college postsecondary institution. Eligible courses are professional-technical courses provided at the high school and approved by the postsecondary institution in advance. Students participating in a technical competency credit program are not considered postsecondary students until they matriculate to a technical college postsecondary institution.

4. Idaho Programs Standards for Advanced Opportunities Programs

All advanced opportunities programs in the state of Idaho shall be developed and managed in accordance with these standards which were designed to help school districts, colleges and universities plan, implement, and evaluate high quality advanced opportunities programs offered to high school students before they graduate.

a. Academic Dual Credit Standards for Students Enrolled in Courses Taught at the High School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curriculum</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum 1 (C1)</td>
<td>Courses administered through a dual credit program are catalogued courses and approved through the regular course approval process of the postsecondary institution. These courses have the same departmental designation, number, title, and credits; additionally these courses adhere to the same course description and course content as the postsecondary course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum 2 (C2)</td>
<td>Postsecondary courses administered through a dual credit program are recorded on students’ official academic record of the postsecondary institution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum 3 (C3)</td>
<td>Postsecondary courses administered through a dual credit program reflect the pedagogical, theoretical and philosophical orientation of the sponsoring faculty and/or academic department at the postsecondary institution.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty 1 (F1)</td>
<td>Instructors teaching college or university courses through dual credit meet the academic requirements for faculty and instructors teaching in a postsecondary institution or provisions are made to ensure instructors are capable of providing quality college-level instruction through ongoing support and professional development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty 2 (F2)</td>
<td>The postsecondary institution provides high school instructors with training and orientation in course curriculum, student assessment criteria, course philosophy, and dual credit administrative requirements before certifying the instructors to teach the college/university’s courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty 3 (F3)</td>
<td>Instructors teaching dual credit courses are part of a continuing collegial interaction through professional development, such as seminars, site visits, and ongoing communication with the postsecondary institutions’ faculty and dual credit administration. This interaction addresses issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty 4 (F4)</td>
<td>High school faculty is evaluated by using the same classroom performance standards and processes used to evaluate college faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students 1 (S1)</th>
<th>High school students enrolled in courses administered through dual credit are officially registered or admitted as degree-seeking, non-degree or non-matriculated students of the sponsoring post-secondary institution.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students 2 (S2)</td>
<td>High school students are provided with a student guide that outlines their responsibilities as well as guidelines for the transfer of credit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students 3 (S3)</td>
<td>Students and their parents receive information about dual credit programs. Information is posted on the high school’s website regarding enrollment, costs, contact information at the high school and the postsecondary institution, grading, expectations of student conduct, and other pertinent information to help the parents and students understand the nature of a dual credit course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students 4 (S4)</td>
<td>Admission requirements have been established for dual credit courses and criteria have been established to define “student ability to benefit” from a dual credit program such as having junior standing or other criteria that are established by the school district, the institution, and State Board Policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students 5 (S5)</td>
<td>Prior to enrolling in a dual credit course, provisions are set up for awarding high school credit, college credit or dual credit. During enrollment, the student declares what type of credit they are seeking (high school only, college only or both high school and college credit). Students are awarded academic credit if they successfully complete all of the course requirements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment 1 (A1)</th>
<th>Dual credit students are held to the same course content standards and standards of achievement as those expected of students in postsecondary courses.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment 2 (A2)</td>
<td>Every course offered through a dual credit program is annually reviewed by postsecondary faculty from that discipline and dual credit teachers/staff to assure that grading standards meet those in on-campus sections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment 3 (A3)</td>
<td>Dual credit students are assessed and awarded credit using the same methods (e.g. papers, portfolios, quizzes, labs, etc.) as their on-campus counterparts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Program Administration and Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Admin &amp; Evaluation 1 (AE1)</th>
<th>The dual credit program practices are assessed and evaluated based on criteria established by the school, institution and State Board to include at least the following: course evaluations by dual credit students, follow-up of the dual credit graduates who are college or university freshmen, and a review of instructional practices at the high school to ensure program quality.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admin &amp; Evaluation 2</td>
<td>Every course offered through a dual credit program is annually reviewed by faculty from that discipline and dual credit staff to assure that grading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(AE2 )</td>
<td>standards meet those in postsecondary sections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin &amp; Evaluation 3 (AE3 )</td>
<td>Dual credit students are assessed using the same methods (e.g. papers, portfolios, quizzes, labs, etc.) as their on-campus counterparts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin &amp; Evaluation 4 (AE4 )</td>
<td>A data collection system has been established based on criteria established by the high school, institution and State Board to track dual credit students to provide data regarding the impact of dual credit programs in relation to college entrance, retention, matriculation from high school and college, impact on college entrance tests, etc. A study is conducted every 5 years on dual credit graduates who are freshmen and sophomores in a college or university.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin &amp; Evaluation 5 (AE 5)</td>
<td>Costs for high school students have been established and this information is provided to students before they enroll in a dual credit course. Students pay a reduced cost per credit that is approved annually at the Board’s fee setting meeting. The approval process will consider comparable rates among institutions within the state and the cost to deliver instruction for dual credit courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin &amp; Evaluation 6 (AE 6)</td>
<td>Agreements have been established between the high school and the postsecondary institution to ensure instructional quality. Teacher qualifications are reviewed, professional development is provided as needed, course content and assessment expectations are reviewed, faculty assessment is discussed, student’s costs are established, compensation for the teacher is identified, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin &amp; Evaluation 7 (AE 7)</td>
<td>Postsecondary institutions have carefully evaluated how to provide services to all students regardless of where a student is located.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Technical Dual Credit provides the opportunity for high school students to simultaneously earn high school and technical college credit. Credits earned will become a part of a student’s permanent college record; and Technical Dual Credit Standards for Students Enrolled in Courses Taught at the High School

**Curriculum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curriculum 1 (C1)</th>
<th>Courses are catalogued postsecondary technical courses approved through the regular course approval process of the technical college-postsecondary institution. These courses have the same departmental designation, number, title, and credits as traditional technical college postsecondary institution courses. These courses adhere to the same course description and course content as the technical college postsecondary institution course.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum 2 (C2)</td>
<td>Courses are recorded on a student’s official academic record of the technical college-postsecondary institution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum 3 (C3)</td>
<td>Courses reflect the pedagogical, theoretical and philosophical orientation of the sponsoring department at the technical college postsecondary institution.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Faculty**

| Faculty 1 (F1) | Instructors teaching courses must meet the professional-technical certification requirements for postsecondary faculty and instructors of the postsecondary institution awarding credits or provisions are made to ensure instructors are capable of providing quality college-level |
### Faculty 2 (F2)

The technical college postsecondary institution provides high school instructors with training and orientation in course curriculum, student assessment criteria, course philosophy, and Technical College postsecondary institution administrative requirements before approving instructors to teach the technical college’s postsecondary institution’s courses.

### Faculty 3 (F3)

Instructors are part of continuing professional development, such as seminars, site visits, and ongoing communication with the college faculty, and Division of Professional-Technical Education Program Manager, and regional Transition Coordinator. This interaction addresses issues, including but not limited to: course content, course delivery, assessment, evaluation, and professional development in the field of study.

### Faculty 4 (F4)

Instructors teaching Technical Dual Credit courses are evaluated according to processes agreed upon by the technical college postsecondary institution and school district.

### Students

| Students 1 (S1) | High school students enrolled in Technical Dual Credit courses are considered both high school and technical college postsecondary institution students. |
| Students 2 (S2) | High school students are provided with a student guide that outlines their responsibilities, as well as guidelines for the credit transfer and the value over time of transcripted technical credit information regarding how the credit will apply to postsecondary certificate and degree requirements. The student guide will include an explanation of the difference between technical and academic credit, how a professional-technical course is a part of a professional technical program sequence, and how the courses may impact their academic standing when they fully matriculate after high school. |
| Students 3 (S3) | Technical Dual Credit student admission requirements are outlined in Board Policy Section III.Q.11 Professional-Technical Early Admission. |
| Students 4 (S4) | To enroll the student must enroll as a technical college postsecondary institution student to receive the post-secondary credit. Enrolled students are only awarded credit if they successfully completes all of the course requirements. |

### Assessment

| Assessment 1 (A1) | Technical Dual Credit students are held to the same course content standards and standards of achievement as those expected of students in technical college postsecondary institution courses. |
| Assessment 2 (A2) | Every Technical Dual Credit course offered is annually reviewed by technical college postsecondary institution faculty and high school program instructors to assure that technical college postsecondary institution standards are being met. |
| Assessment 3 (A3) | Students enrolled for Technical Dual Credit are assessed and awarded credit at the same level of proficiency using the same methods as technical college postsecondary institution students and by a process approved by the technical college postsecondary institution. |

### Program Administration and Evaluation
The technical college in each region will provide a Transition Coordinator to facilitate the PTAL program and provide transition services to high school professional technical students.

Agreements are established between the high school and the technical college postsecondary institution to ensure instructional quality. Teacher qualifications, course content, student assessment, and faculty assessment are reviewed and agreed upon by the technical college postsecondary institution.

Costs information is provided to students prior to enrollment in a course. Students pay a transcription fee consistent with the current Workforce Training Fee (SBOE Policy IV.R.3.a.ix.). Costs for high school students have been established and this information is provided to students before they enroll in a dual credit course. Students pay a reduced cost per credit that is approved annually at the Board’s fee setting meeting. The approval process will consider comparable rates among institutions within the state and the cost to deliver instruction for dual credit courses.

c. Dual Credit Standards for Students Enrolled in Courses at the College/University Campus (Academic and Technical Dual Credit)

A. The student is admitted by the postsecondary institution as a non-matriculating degree seeking student.

B. The student is charged the part-time credit hour fee or tuition and additional fees as established by the institution.

C. Instructional costs are borne by the postsecondary institution.

D. Four (4) semester college credits are typically equivalent to at least one (1) full year of high school credit in that subject.

E. In compliance with Idaho Code 33-5104, an institution may require prior to enrolling, the student and the student's parent/guardian must sign and submit a counseling form provided by the school district or the institution that outlines the provisions of the section of this Code. The counseling form includes written permission from the student's parent/guardian, and principal or counselor, the risks and possible consequences of enrolling in postsecondary courses, including but not limited to the impacts on future financial aid, and the consequences of failing or not completing a course in which the student enrolls. It is the responsibility of the postsecondary institution to provide advising for all students taking courses on the postsecondary campus.

F. Any high school student may make application to one of the public postsecondary institutions provided all of the following requirements are met:

   The student has reached the minimum age of 16 years or has successfully completed at least one half of the high school graduation requirements as certified by the high school.

   Submission of the appropriate institutional application material for admission. Written notification of acceptance to the institution will be provided to the student after he or she submits the appropriate
If required by institutional policy, a student must obtain approval of the college or university instructor to enroll in a course.

Those high school students meeting the above requirements will be permitted to enroll on a part-time basis or full-time basis as defined in Board policy.

G. Students seeking admission who do not meet the above requirements may petition the institution's admission committee for consideration. Students under the age of 16 enrolled in a public secondary school may seek admission to enroll in courses provided on the postsecondary campus by submitting a petition to the high school principal's office and to the admissions office of the postsecondary institution.

c. Advanced Placement Standards

Advanced Placement (AP) courses are taught by high school teachers following the curricular goals administered by The College Board. These college level courses are academically rigorous and conclude with the optional comprehensive AP exam in May. Students taking AP courses accept the challenge of a rigorous academic curriculum, with the expectation of completing the complex assignments associated with the course and challenging the comprehensive AP exam. The AP Examination is a national assessment based on the AP curriculum, given in each subject area on a specified day at a specified time, as outlined by the College Board. Students and parents are responsible for researching the AP policy of the postsecondary institution the student may wish to attend. College/university credit is based on the successful completion of the AP exam, and dependent upon institutional AP credit acceptance policy.

**Curriculum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curriculum 1 (C1)</th>
<th>Postsecondary institutions evaluate AP scores and award credit reflecting the pedagogical, theoretical, and philosophical orientation of the sponsoring faculty and/or academic department at the institution.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum 2 (C2)</td>
<td>High school credit is given for enrollment and successful completion of an AP class.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Faculty**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty 1 (F1)</th>
<th>AP teachers shall follow the curricular materials and goals outlined by The College Board.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty 2 (F2)</td>
<td>The AP teacher may attend an AP Institute before teaching the course.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Students/Parents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students 1 (S1)</th>
<th>A fee schedule has been established for the AP exam. Students and their parents pay the fee unless other arrangements have been made by the high school.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students 2</td>
<td>Information must be available from the high school counselor, AP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
coordinator or other faculty members regarding admission, course content, costs, high school credit offered and student responsibility.

Assessment

| Assessment 1 (A1) | Students are assessed for high school credit according to the requirements determined by the high school. |

Program Administration and Evaluation

| Admin & Evaluation 1 (AE1) | To evaluate the success of the programs and to improve services, the school district must annually review the data provided by The College Board. |
| Admin & Evaluation 2 (AE2) | The school district must carefully evaluate how to provide services to all students, regardless of family income, ethnicity, disability, or location of educational setting. |

**d. Tech Prep Professional-Technical Advanced Learning (PTAL) Technical Competency Credit Standards**

Professional-Technical Education programs in Idaho are delivered through comprehensive high schools, professional-technical schools, and the technical college system. Tech allows secondary professional-technical students the opportunity to simultaneously earn secondary and postsecondary technical credits. A Tech Prep course must have an approved articulation agreement between the high school and a postsecondary institution. Tech Prep is an advanced learning opportunity that provides a head start on a technical certificate, an associate of applied science degree, or towards a baccalaureate degree. There are two pathways for the awarding of PTAL credits, Technical Dual Credit and Technical competency Credit. The technical college in each region provides a Transition Coordinator to facilitate the PTAL program and provide transition services to high school professional-technical students.

**Curriculum**

| Curriculum 1 (C1) | A Tech Prep course must have an approved articulation agreement with a postsecondary institution. High school professional-technical courses and course content must have competencies comparable with technical college postsecondary institution courses and be identified as eligible for Technical Competency Credit consideration through a Technical Competency Credit Agreement (e.g. articulation agreement) with at least one Idaho technical college postsecondary institution. |
| Curriculum 2 (C2) | Secondary and postsecondary educators must agree on the technical competencies, and agree to the student learning outcomes, and level of proficiency to be demonstrated by the student. |

**Faculty**

| Faculty 1 (F1) | Secondary and postsecondary educators must hold appropriate professional-technical certification in the program area for which articulated credit is to be awarded. |
Students/Parents

| Students 1 (S1) | Tech Prep Technical Competency Credit students participating in this advanced opportunity are high school students, and are not enrolled in the technical-college postsecondary institution. These students are not counted as dual credit students. Postsecondary credits are not awarded until the student matriculates to the postsecondary institution. |

| Students 2 (S2) | High school students are provided with a student guide that outlines their responsibilities, guidelines for the process of transcripting and the value over time of the transcripted technical-college postsecondary credit and information regarding how the technical credit will apply to postsecondary certificates and degree requirements. |

| Students 3 (S3) | At the completion of the TechPrep course Technical Competency Credit program, the instructor will recommend identify students eligible for college credit based on their performance. To be eligible for college credit students must receive a grade of B or complete a minimum of 80% of the competencies in the course, who have met program competencies. |

Assessment

| Assessment 1 (A1) | The students are assessed for high-school and postsecondary technical credit according to the requirements of the articulation Technical Competency Credit agreement. |

Program Administration and Evaluation

| Admin & Evaluation 1 (AE1) | The technical college in each region administers the Advanced Learning Partnership (ALP). The school districts in each region are members of the ALP. The Tech Prep program is administered through the six Advanced Learning Partnerships and each of the technical colleges serves as the fiscal agent. The ALP Advisory Committee meets at least twice per school year. |

| Admin & Evaluation 21 (AE21) | Each articulation Any Technical Competency Credit agreement between a secondary professional-technical program and a technical-college postsecondary institution must be reviewed annually. |

| Admin & Evaluation 2 (AE 2) | At the time of regular admission to the technical-college postsecondary institution program, the student will be assessed a transcription fee consistent with the current Workforce Training Fee (Board Policy Section IV.R.3.a.ix.) for qualifying Technical Competency credits earned in high school. |
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SUBJECT
Approval of Graduate Certificate in Victim Services

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY
Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies & Procedures, Section III.G.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION
Boise State University (BSU) proposes to create a new self-support program that will award a Graduate Certificate in Victim Services. This proposed program is a one year curriculum designed to provide a theoretical and applied foundation in victimization and victim services. The program will be offered fully online, and will therefore be accessible both to working professionals and to individuals interested in becoming professionals in this discipline. For students interested in victim services, there is no specialized degree program (undergraduate or graduate) in Idaho and only five exist nationally of which two are offered via distance education or a hybrid program of study.

There is a growing demand for victim service providers (especially those working within the criminal justice and social services systems) to have academic degrees. Typically, however, the most relevant degrees are general degrees in criminal justice, social work, or psychology/counseling and do not offer a specialization in working with crime victims who are often experiencing physical, emotional, financial, and safety consequences of their victimization while attempting to navigate the system of services.

By creating academic credentialing of victim service providers, BSU will create more skilled criminal justice and social service professionals. In turn, those professionals will provide enhanced services to crime victims in Idaho and across the nation. Enhanced services to crime victims will reduce the likelihood of secondary victimization and increase the likelihood of cooperation with criminal justice processing of offenders.

BSU commissioned a study by the Education Advisory Board entitled “Employer Demand for Graduate Certificates in Victim Services” (Appendix B in the full proposal). That study found:

- From 2010-2012, there was a 69% increase in jobs requiring victim services skills.
- From 2010-2012, there were 79,912 job postings nationwide requiring victim services and case management skills and a bachelor’s degree.
- The jobs with the highest need for victim services education, included positions spanning in areas of health sciences, social work, human services, social services, law, and criminal justice, and included:
Registered Nurses
Medical and Health Services Managers
Social Workers
Social and Human Service Assistants
Paralegals and Legal Assistants
Mental Health Counselors
Physical Therapists
Probation Officers and Correctional Treatment Specialists
Criminal Justice and Law Enforcement Teachers
Substance Abuse Specialists

IMPACT
BSU plans to charge $340 per credit hour. Students enrolled in the program are expected to generate 260 graduate credit hours per year. The expected annual gross revenue will therefore be approximately $88,400.

ATTACHMENTS
Attachment 1 – Graduate Certificate in Victim Services Proposal

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
Boise State University (BSU) proposes to create a new program granting a Graduate Certificate in Victim Services. The proposed program will require 16 credits of graduate coursework. BSU projects that 18 students will enter the program each year and anticipates they will complete in one year, resulting in approximately 18 students enrolled at any time. BSU estimates that since there will be attrition from the program, 14 students will graduate per year.

BSU’s request to create a new self-support Graduate Certificate in Victim Services is aligned with their Service Region Program Responsibilities and their Five-year Plan for Delivery of Academic Programs in the Southwest Region. Pursuant to III.Z, no institution has the Statewide Program Responsibility in this discipline.

The proposal went through the program review process and was presented to the Council on Academic Affairs and Programs (CAAP) on March 20, 2014.

BSU also requests approval to assess a self-support fee consistent with Board Policy V.R.3.b. (v). Based on the information for self-support fees provided in the proposal, staff finds that the criteria have been met for this program. CAAP and Board staff recommends approval of the proposed self-support Graduate Certificate in Victim Services as presented.
BOARD ACTION

I move to approve the request by Boise State University to create a new self-support program granting a graduate certificate in Victim Services.

Moved by __________ Seconded by __________ Carried Yes _____ No _____

I move to approve the request by Boise State University to designate a self-support fee for the Graduate Certificate in Victim Services program in conformance with the program budget submitted to the Board in Attachment 1.

Moved by __________ Seconded by __________ Carried Yes _____ No _____
**Idaho State Board of Education**

Proposal for Other Academic Program Activity and Professional-Technical Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Proposal Submission:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institution Submitting Proposal: Boise State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of College, School, or Division: College of Social Sciences &amp; Public Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Department(s) or Area(s): Criminal Justice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Program Identification for Proposed New, Modified, or Discontinued Program:**

| Title: Graduate Certificate in Victim Services |
| Degree: Graduate Certificate in Victim Services |
| Method of Delivery: Online, Self Support |
| CIP code (consult IR/Registrar): 43.0199 Corrections and Criminal Justice, Other |
| Proposed Starting Date: Fall 2014 |

Indicate if the program is:

| Regional Responsibility | Statewide Responsibility |

Indicate whether this request is either of the following:

- [X] New Program (minor/option/emphasis or certificate)
- [ ] Discontinuance of an Existing Program/Option
- [ ] New Off-Campus Instructional Program
- [ ] Consolidation of an Existing Program
- [ ] New Instructional/Research Unit
- [ ] Expansion of an Existing Program
- [ ] Contract Program/Collaborative

Date: 10-30-13

College Dean (Institution)

Date: 10-30-13

Graduate Dean (For Grad Progs) / ExtStudies Dean / Self-spprt &/or online

Date: 11-1-13

Chief Fiscal Officer (Institution)

Date: 11-8-13

Chief Academic Officer (Institution)

Date: 11-8-13

President

Date: 11-8-13

Vice President for Research (as applicable)

Date:

State Administrator, SDPTE (as applicable)

Date: 2/4/14

Academic Affairs Program Manager

Date:

Chief Academic Officer, OSBE

Date:

SBOE/OSBE Approval

Date:
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Before completing this form, refer to Board Policy Section III.G., Program Approval and Discontinuance. This proposal form must be completed for the creation of each new program and each program discontinuation. All questions must be answered.

1. **Describe the nature of the request.** Will this program/option be related or tied to other programs on campus? Please identify any existing program, option that this program will replace. *If this is request to discontinue an existing program, provide the rationale for the discontinuance. Indicate the year and semester in which the last cohort of students was admitted and the final term the college will offer the program. Describe the teach-out plans for continuing students.*

Boise State University's Department of Criminal Justice proposes to create a self-support, fully online graduate certificate program in Victim Services. This graduate certificate is a one year curriculum designed to provide a theoretical and applied foundation in victimization and victim services. The online aspect of the program was created to be accessible to both working professionals and traditional students.

The discipline of victim services is in the midst of a movement towards professionalism. Nationwide, victim services professionals are seeing more requests for credentials specific to crime victims. Professional organizations, such as the National Organization for Victim Assistance (NOVA), offer certifications, but these are professional, not academic, in nature. There is a growing demand for victim service providers (especially those working within the criminal justice and social services systems) to have academic degrees and currently these degrees are generally criminal justice, social work, or psychology/counseling degrees. However, these courses of studies do not offer a specialization in working with crime victims who are often experiencing physical, emotional, financial, and safety consequences of their victimization while attempting to navigate the system of services. For students interested in victim services, there is no specialized degree program (undergraduate or graduate) in the entire state of Idaho and only five (5) exist nationally of which two (2) are offered via distance education or a hybrid program of study.

2. **List the objectives of the program.** The objectives should address specific needs (industry) the program will meet. They should also identify the expected student learning outcomes and achievements. *This question is not applicable to requests for discontinuance.*

Objectives of creating the program are the following:

1. Create a program to meet the growing need for education and credentialing specific to crime victimization and its effects.
2. Create a curriculum to develop victim service professionals who are more effective at serving crime victims because of increased knowledge about the physical, psychological, financial, and societal effects of crime on its victims.
3. Support a standard level of knowledge and professionalism for the discipline of victim services.
4. Recruit and retain professionals who are knowledgeable and committed to improving the quality of service provided to crime victims through medical, social, human, and criminal justice services.

Expected Student Learning Outcomes are the following:

1. Synthesize theory and research to inform policy and practice affecting crime and its victims.
2. Create attitudinal and behavioral change in communities and their systems that supports
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victims of crime.
3. Develop skills to provide evidence-based services to reduce the effects of crime on its victims.

3. **Briefly describe how the institution will ensure the quality of the program** (i.e., program review). Will the program require specialized accreditation (it is not necessary to address regional accreditation)? If so, please identify the agency and explain why you do or do not plan to seek accreditation. *This question is not applicable to requests for discontinuance.*

The following measures will ensure the high quality of the proposed program:

Regional Institutional Accreditation: Boise State University is regionally accredited by the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU). Regional accreditation of the university has been continuous since initial accreditation was conferred in 1941. Boise State University is currently accredited at all degree levels (A, B, M, D).

Program Review: Internal program evaluations will take place every five years as part of the normal departmental review process conducted by the Office of the Provost. This process requires a detailed self-study (including outcome assessments) and a comprehensive review and site visit by external evaluators.

Graduate Policy and Procedure: The proposed program will adhere to all applicable policies and procedures of the Graduate College as developed and approved by the graduate faculty of the university through its representatives on the Graduate Council.

Financial Review: Current federal regulations require online certificate programs (both undergraduate and graduate) to undergo annual financial audits and long term reporting on loan repayment and graduates' success in obtaining relevant employment. State board policy requires that all self-support programs undergo audits on a 3-year cycle.

Online Programs: Quality assurance measures for online programs and faculty: A) The program faculty participate in a 10-week online program curriculum, outcome, and course mapping process. B) The faculty members developing courses go through the 12-week eCampus Course Design and Development seminar, working with an Instructional Design Consultant, receiving 20 hours of hand-on development support, and building the courses in a Boise State online course template that has been developed using the Quality Matters rubric. Each course will undergo a peer review using the Quality Matters course design rubric. C) All faculty teaching in the program will also participate in a 6-week seminar, eCampus Teaching Online Seminar.

There is no applicable specialized accreditation in victim services.

4. **List new courses that will be added to curriculum specific for this program.** Indicate number, title, and credit hour value for each course. Please include course descriptions for new and/or changes to courses. *Attach a Scope and Sequence, SDPTE Form Attachment B, for professional-technical education requests.* *This question is not applicable to requests for discontinuance.*

**Victim Services (VS) Courses:**
VS 531 Research Methods and Data Analysis – (3 credits) Covers the basic methods of quantitative and qualitative research and their application to the field. Discusses the relationship among theory, research, and social policy. Instructs on the use of computerized
statistical packages in the social and behavioral sciences and statistical problem-solving using various data-sources. PREREQ: Victim services admission required.

VS 532 Administration of Justice – (3 credits) Locates the profession of criminal justice within historical, theoretical, and political perspectives. Focuses on contemporary theoretical perspectives. Defines the nature and scope of the discipline through the relationships among theory, policy, and practice. PREREQ: VS 531 and victim services admission required.

VS 533 Victimology and Victim Services – (3 credits) Explores theoretical perspectives on the role of victims in crime. Discusses the prevalence of various forms of victimization, the effects of crime on its victims, and the nature and scope of victim services as a discipline. Locates the evolution of victims’ rights within the context of other societal movements. PREREQ: VS 532 and victim services admission required.

VS 534 Crisis Intervention and Ethics in Victim Services – (3 credits) Instructs students in the foundational tools to intervene in crisis situations with victims of crime. Discusses the various existing programmatic frameworks for intervention and evidence-based research supporting their use. Provides overview of ethical considerations and professional requirements in victim services, including confidentiality, mandatory reporting, boundaries, and case management. PREREQ: VS 533 and victim services admission required.

VS 535 Survey of Types of Victimization – (1 credit) Focuses on current issues in victimology and victim services. PREREQ: VS 534 and victim services admission required.

VS 536 Intimate Partner Violence and Rape – (3 credits) Explores the theoretical perspectives of violence occurring within intimate relationships and across all forms of rape. Discusses topics in terms of offending, victimization, and criminal justice/social services response. PREREQ: VS 535 and victim services admission required.

5. **Please provide the program completion requirements and attach to this proposal as Appendix A. This question is not applicable to requests for discontinuance.**

| Credit hours required in certificate: | 16 |
| Credit hours required in minor: | N/A |
| Credit hours in institutional general education or core curriculum: | N/A |
| Credit hours in required electives: | N/A |
| **Total credit hours required for completion:** | 16 |

6. **Identify similar programs offered within Idaho or in the region by other colleges/universities.** If the proposed request is similar to another state program, provide a rationale for the duplication. Institutions do not need to complete this section for PTE programs. This question is not applicable to requests for discontinuance.

No other university or college within Idaho or the region offers a similar program.
### BSU Graduate Certificate in Victim Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BSU Graduate Certificate in Victim Services</th>
<th>Graduate Certificate</th>
<th>Broadly covers victim services.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSI</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWI</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EITC</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCSC</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIC</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UI</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7. Describe the methodology for determining enrollment projections.

If a survey of student interest was conducted, attach a copy of the survey instrument with a summary of results as Appendix B. *This question is not applicable to requests for discontinuance.*

The Department used two primary factors in determining enrollment projections: current staffing levels in the department and contacts within the community.

First, staffing levels place limits on the size of cohorts to be enrolled in the proposed program: a new cohort of 18 will begin every August, and each cohort will be expected to complete in one year.

Second, a number of lines of evidence indicate that there will be well more than 18 students who will want to pursue the program.

- The primary audience for this degree program is working professionals who are often on shifts or on-call statuses. In order to best serve this audience, we believe the program must be offered solely in an online environment to meet those limitations. In addition, the lack of degree offerings for this discipline across the country allows us to market beyond the Treasure Valley and the State of Idaho, thus necessitating an online format.

- The Department has a solid working relationship with the two primary professional organizations for victim services in the state of Idaho: the Idaho Coalition Against Domestic & Sexual Violence (ICDSV) and the Idaho Victim-Witness Association (IVWA). In addition, the Department also has contact with the primary federal funding agency in the state for victim services, the Idaho Council on Domestic Violence & Victim Assistance (ICDVVA). The Department has been in ongoing discussion with our community partners over the past four years regarding the development, potential, and marketing of this proposed graduate certificate.

- We have examined interest here on campus. Interest in victim services is growing here at BSU as evidenced by the increasing enrollment in our Crime Victims’ Rights Week workshop, internships at victim service agencies, external and internal funding into the department, and research interest among graduate students. This growing interest has led to an increased number of students requesting internships in victim services, registering for the one week Crime Victims’ Rights Week workshop (which has seen a 100% growth in the past 5 years to a current cap of 75-100 students across multiple disciplines), and requesting information on additional educational opportunities for this area. The Department of Criminal Justice has a healthy M.A. program where, in the past...
two years, at least half of the students undertook culminating events involving victimization topics. Thus, we believe a number of our M.A. students would be interested in the graduate certificate as well as evidenced by the number of graduate students who are currently enrolled in the graduate certificate in Addiction Studies.

We project that 18 students will enter the program each year and will complete in one year, resulting in approximately 18 students enrolled at any time. Given that there will be attrition from the program, we estimate that 14 students will graduate per year.

8. Enrollment and Graduates. Provide a realistic estimate of enrollment at the time of program implementation and over three year period based on availability of students meeting the criteria referenced above. Include part-time and full-time (i.e., number of majors or other relevant data) by institution for the proposed program, last three years beginning with the current year and the previous two years. Also, indicate the number of graduates and graduation rates.

Discontinuations. Using the chart below include part-time and full-time (i.e., number of majors or other relevant data) by institution for the proposed discontinuation, last three years beginning with the current year and previous two years. Indicate how many students are currently enrolled in the program for the previous two years to include number of graduates and graduation rates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Relevant Enrollment Data</th>
<th>Number of Graduates</th>
<th>Graduate Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate certificate in victim services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EITC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCSC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Will this program reduce enrollments in other programs at your institution? If so, please explain.

We do not foresee any negative impact in enrollments for our Masters of Arts program in Criminal Justice or any other graduate level programs. In fact, we see this as an attractive ancillary to a number of those current graduate programs.
10. Provide verification of state workforce needs such as job titles requiring this degree. Include State and National Department of Labor research on employment potential. This question is not applicable to requests for discontinuance.

We commissioned a study by the Education Advisory Board’s COE Forum entitled “Employer Demand for Graduate Certificates in Victim Services” (Appendix B). That study found:

- From 2010-2012, there was a 69% increase in jobs requiring victim services skills.
- From 2010-2012, there were 79,912 job postings requiring victim services and case management skills and a bachelor’s degree.
- The jobs with the highest need for victim services education; those positions spanned health sciences, social work, human services, social services, law, and criminal justice, and included:
  - Registered Nurses
  - Medical and Health Services Managers
  - Social Workers
  - Social and Human Service Assistants
  - Paralegals and Legal Assistants
  - Mental Health Counselors
  - Physical Therapists
  - Probation Officers and Correctional Treatment Specialists
  - Criminal Justice and Law Enforcement Teachers
  - Substance Abuse Specialists

Using the chart below, indicate the total projected job openings (including growth and replacement demands in your regional area, the state, and nation. Job openings should represent positions which require graduation from a program such as the one proposed. Data should be derived from a source that can be validated and must be no more than two years old. This question is not applicable to requests for discontinuance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>1,995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>1,332</td>
<td>1,332</td>
<td>1,332</td>
<td>3,996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nation</td>
<td>26,637</td>
<td>25,411</td>
<td>25,411</td>
<td>79,912</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Describe the methodology used to determine the projected job openings. If a survey of employment needs was used, please attach a copy of the survey instrument with a summary of results as Appendix C.

Nation: Calculated as one-third of the total job listings nationwide for 2010-2012. State: Calculated as 5% of the nation-wide openings, which is the percent of the nation’s population that resides in Idaho.
Region: Calculated as ½ of the state-wide openings, corresponding to the approximate proportion of the state’s population residing in this region of the state.

b. Describe how the proposed change will act to stimulate the state economy by advancing the field, providing research results, etc.
N/A

c. Is the program primarily intended to meet needs other than employment needs, if so, please provide a brief rationale.
Enhancing the knowledge and skills of criminal justice and social service professionals who have contact with crime victims will assist in reducing secondary victimization and increase crime victims’ willingness to seek services and cooperate with criminal justice processing of offenders.

11. **Will any type of distance education technology be utilized in the delivery of the program on your main campus or to remote sites? Please describe.** *This question is not applicable to requests for discontinuance.*

One of the primary audiences for this degree program is working professionals who are often on shifts or on-call statuses. In order to best serve this audience, we believe the program must be offered solely in an online environment to meet those limitations. In addition, the lack of degree offerings for this discipline across the country allows us to market beyond the Treasure Valley and the State of Idaho, thus necessitating an online format.

This certificate program will be delivered online using a design created specifically with the working professional/working student in mind, using shorter, intensive courses to be taken one at a time (8 week courses), year round, with all course work completed online. This design allows for student completion within a timely manner (1 year).

The Graduate Certificate in Victim Services follows the Boise State University mission of expanding graduate programs and is in line with the University’s plan for flexibility of delivery method and meeting a community need. The Boise State program will be the only online program in the Western U.S., and will serve the of current students and current professionals who are searching for formal education in the area of victimization and victim services.

12. **Describe how this request is consistent with the State Board of Education’s strategic plan and institution’s role and mission.** *This question is not applicable to requests for discontinuance.*

By creating academic credentialing for victim service providers, we will create more skilled criminal justice and social service professionals. And more skilled criminal justice and social service professionals will provide enhanced services to crime victims in Idaho and across the nation. Enhanced services to crime victims reduce the likelihood of secondary victimization and increase the likelihood of cooperation with criminal justice processing of offenders.

Those outcomes will serve the following aspects of the SBOE strategic plan:

**GOAL 1: A WELL EDUCATED CITIZENRY**

*The educational system will provide opportunities for individual advancement.*

- **Objective A: Access** [The proposed program will provide online access to a valuable program relevant to a wide range of professionals]
- **Objective C: Adult Learner Re-Integration** – [The proposed program will meet the needs of professionals seeking credentialing in victim services]
13. Describe how this request fits with the institution's vision and/or strategic plan. This question is not applicable to requests for discontinuance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals of Institution Strategic Mission Plan</th>
<th>Proposed Program Plans to Achieve the Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal 1: Create a signature, high-quality educational experience for all students. Strategies: Invest in faculty development, innovative pedagogies, and an engaging environment for learning.</td>
<td>Offering an innovative program in a discipline with unmet educational needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 2: Facilitate the timely attainment of educational goals of our diverse student population. Strategy: Bring classes to students using advanced technologies and multiple delivery formats.</td>
<td>Offering an online certificate program with a one year start-to-completion time to meet the educational needs of both traditional students and working professionals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 4: Align university programs and activities with community needs. Strategy: Include community impact in the creation and assessment of university programs and activities.</td>
<td>The Department has been in ongoing discussion with our community partners over the past four years regarding the need, development, potential, and marketing of this proposed graduate certificate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 4: Align university programs and activities with community needs. Strategy: Leverage knowledge and expertise within the community to develop mutually beneficial partnerships.</td>
<td>Enhancing the knowledge and skills of criminal justice and social service professionals who have contact with crime victims will assist in reducing secondary victimization and increase crime victims' willingness to seek services and cooperate with criminal justice processing of offenders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 5: Transform our operations to serve the contemporary mission of the university. Strategy: Reinvent our academic and business practices to improve service and efficiency.</td>
<td>The program makes use of a self-support model</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Is the proposed program in your institution's Five-Year plan? Indicate below. This question is not applicable to requests for discontinuance.

Yes  x  No ______

If not on your institution's Five-Year plan, provide a justification for adding the program.

15. Explain how students are going to learn about this program and where students are going to be recruited from (i.e., within institution, out-of-state, internationally). For request to discontinue program, how will continuing students be advised of impending changes and consulted about options or alternatives for attaining their educational goals?

There are numerous ways that potential students will become aware of the Graduate Certificate in Victim Services.

- The Department of Criminal Justice at BSU has over 850 students in both the undergraduate and graduate degree programs. Those students will be made aware of the existence of the program.

- An increasing number of students, not all of them Criminal Justice majors (i) request internships in victim services and (ii) have registered for the one week Crime Victims' Rights Week workshop, both of which will make students aware of the program.

- The Department has a solid working relationship with the primary professional organization for victim services in the state of Idaho: the Idaho Coalition Against Domestic & Sexual Violence (ICDSV). The ICDSV hosts an annual summit on victimization issues in
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October of each fall. These summits regularly bring in 350-700 people working directly with crime victims or in allied professions. We will provide hard copy information on the proposed program and links to the online Department website in registration packets and offer an educational presentation during the summit on the program itself.

- The Department also has contact with the primary federal funding agency in the state for victim services, the Idaho Council on Domestic Violence & Victim Assistance (ICDVVA). The ICDVVA also hosts an annual conference in June which is required attendance for all grantee programs and is routinely attended by representatives from most victim services programs in the state and a growing number of allied professionals as well. We will provide hard copy information on the proposed program at the conference.

- In addition, the Department is the academic partner to the Idaho Victim Assistance Academy (IVAA), an organization offering one week of college level, theoretical education on victimization issues to victim services and allied professionals here at BSU each June. Acceptance into the IVAA is interdisciplinary and competitive in nature and the program is viewed as one of the best state level victim assistance academies in the country. Again, the opportunity for recruitment is ripe in this arena, especially since the IVAA is already offered for academic credit to interested students who are selected to attend and would be offered as one on-site, possible elective for the certificate program.

- The Department would have the opportunity to recruit potential students through the National Organization for Victim Assistance (NOVA) website by purchasing advertising space. NOVA currently offers voluntary, professional certification and the IVAA’s basic and advanced curricula have been accepted as meeting the baseline requirements for NOVA certification.

- There is a professional organization in Idaho specifically for victim service professionals, the Idaho Victim Witness Association (IVWA). The Department has regular contact through community committee work with officers/members of this organization and would find opportunities for student recruitment during their bi-annual meetings to publicize the program.

16. Program Resource Requirements. Using the Excel spreadsheet provided by the Office of the State Board of Education, provide a realistic estimate of costs needed for the overall program. This should only include the additional costs that will be incurred and not current costs. Include both the reallocation of existing resources and anticipated or requested new resources. Second and third year estimates should be in constant dollars. If the program is contract related, explain the fiscal sources and the year-to-year commitment from the contracting agency(ies) or party(ies). Provide an explanation of the fiscal impact of the proposed discontinuance to include impacts to faculty (i.e., salary savings, re-assignments).

The program will use a self-support model.

Cost per credit for the graduate certificate will be $340. We anticipate an annual cohort of 18 students will begin the year-long program, with attrition to 14 students by the end of the year. The expected graduation rate is 14 students per year. The expected average annual revenue is approximately $88,400. Expenditures include faculty costs, administrative salary replacement and stipend, travel costs for faculty professional development, program marketing/advertising, and course related costs.
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Annual Faculty FTE = (Credit hour load)/30
Annual Student FTE = (Student Credit Hrs)/24 for Grad programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 15</th>
<th>FY 16</th>
<th>FY 17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Summ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total enrollment</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student FTE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of courses running</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of credits running</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit Hours Produced</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Income</td>
<td>$36,720</td>
<td>$32,640</td>
<td>$19,040</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. Planned Student Enrollment
(FTE calculated as 1 FTE = 24 credit hours per year for grad programs; Headcount calculated as 1/3 of total registrations for year; assumes each student takes 3 courses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 15</th>
<th>FY 16</th>
<th>FY 17</th>
<th>Cumulative Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>Headcount</td>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>Headcount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. New Enrollments</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Shifting Enrollments</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 15</th>
<th>FY 16</th>
<th>FY 17</th>
<th>Cumulative Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>One-time</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>One-time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Appropriated-Reallocation</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Appropriated new</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Federal</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Tuition</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Student Fees</td>
<td>$88,400</td>
<td>$88,400</td>
<td>$88,400</td>
<td>$88,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Other (Local Account)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenue</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$88,400</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$88,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## III. Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 15</th>
<th>FY 16</th>
<th>FY 17</th>
<th>Cumulative Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>One-time</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>One-time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Personnel Costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. FTE</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Faculty</td>
<td>$21,510</td>
<td>$21,180</td>
<td>$22,170</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Administrators</td>
<td>$7,813</td>
<td>$7,813</td>
<td>$7,813</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Adjunct Faculty</td>
<td>$2,850</td>
<td>$2,850</td>
<td>$2,850</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Instructional Assts</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Research Personnel</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Support personnel</td>
<td>$6,500</td>
<td>$6,631</td>
<td>$6,764</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Fringe benefits</td>
<td>$12,530</td>
<td>$12,463</td>
<td>$12,846</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total FTE personnel and costs</strong></td>
<td><strong>$51,202</strong></td>
<td><strong>$50,937</strong></td>
<td><strong>$52,442</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## B. Operating Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 15</th>
<th>FY 16</th>
<th>FY 17</th>
<th>Cumulative Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Travel</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Professional Services</td>
<td>$800</td>
<td>$800</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$3,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Communications</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Materials and Supplies</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Rentals</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Miscellaneous</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL OPERATING EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td><strong>$12,600</strong></td>
<td><strong>$12,600</strong></td>
<td><strong>$13,800</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## C. Capital Outlay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 15</th>
<th>FY 16</th>
<th>FY 17</th>
<th>Cumulative Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Library resources</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Equipment</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td><strong>$71,066</strong></td>
<td><strong>$70,775</strong></td>
<td><strong>$79,055</strong></td>
<td><strong>$220,896</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 15</th>
<th>FY 16</th>
<th>FY 17</th>
<th>Cumulative Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Income (Deficit) per year</td>
<td>$17,334</td>
<td>$17,625</td>
<td>$9,345</td>
<td>$44,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Income (Deficit) cumulative</td>
<td>$17,334</td>
<td>$34,959</td>
<td>$44,304</td>
<td>$44,304</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

Budget Notes

III.A.2: Faculty FTE: 0.533 per year total

III.A.3: Administrator FTE: 0.13 per year

III.A.4: A practitioner from the community will teach the “crisis intervention & ethics in victim services” course

III.A.6: Support personnel: 0.25 FTE per year

III.A.7: Benefits calculated as 34% for faculty and administrators; 35% for support personnel.

III.B.1: Travel to professional conferences

III.B.2: Video services

III.B.4: Advertising

III.B.6: Office supplies and materials

III.E: Indirect costs consist of: University administrative fee: 10% of expenditures; Online support fee: 1% of revenue; Extended Studies administrative fee: 6% of revenues beginning third year.
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Attachment A: Curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Number and Title</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foundational Courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The following core courses are required of all students. They are to be taken in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chronological order.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CJ 531 Research Methods and Data Analysis</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CJ 532 Administration of Justice</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CJ 533 Victimology and Victim Services</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CJ 534 Crisis Intervention and Ethics</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CJ 535 Survey of Types of Victimization</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CJ 536 Intimate Partner Violence and Rape</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Employer Demand for Graduate Certificates in Victim Services

Data Request – January 2013

Burning Glass – The Education Advisory Board’s Partner for Real-Time Labor Market Data

The data included in this report is made possible through our partnership with Burning Glass, a Boston-based firm specializing in use of web spidering technology and Artificial Intelligence engines to mine more than 80 million online job postings for real-time employer demand data. Under the partnership, the Education Advisory Board may use certain features of Burning Glass’s proprietary tool called Labor/Insight™ to answer common member questions about employer demand for specific educational requirements, job titles, and competencies over time and by geography. A fuller description of the tool is available at http://www.burning-glass.com/products/labor.html.

Learn about Burning Glass and Labor/Insight™

Many Education Advisory Board member institutions subscribe to the Labor/Insight™ tool, to provide program directors and marketers desktop access to the tool’s full suite of features. Burning Glass is pleased to provide Labor/Insight™ to our members at a substantial discount. For more information about the service, please contact Kelly Bailey, Business Development Manager, kbailey@burning-glass.com or 732-800-2484.
This report includes data from online job postings that require victim services and case management skills and a bachelor's degree in the United States in 2010, 2011, and 2012.

**Demand Over Time:** The number of job postings requiring victim services and case management skills in the United States increased by almost 54 percent in the second half of 2010 and a little over 15 percent between the end of 2011 and the first half of 2012. From the end of 2010 until 2012, the number of job postings remained relatively stable. Additionally, in the second half of 2012, job postings decreased by approximately nine percent.

**Number of Job Postings Requiring Victim Services and Case Management Skills**

*January 2010-December 2012*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Job Postings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 2010-June 2010</td>
<td>22,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2010-December 2010</td>
<td>34,463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2011-June 2011</td>
<td>36,179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2011-December 2011</td>
<td>36,294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2012-June 2012</td>
<td>41,858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2012-December 2012</td>
<td>38,054</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Education Levels Required: The majority of the 219,600 job postings require applicants with a bachelor's degree. Fourteen percent require candidates with a graduate or professional degree. However, this does not include information on employer’s preferred education qualifications and 33 percent of the job postings do not specify education requirements.

Levels of Education Required for Victim Services Job Postings in the United States
Between January 1st, 2012 and December 31st, 2012

- 54% of Job Postings Requiring a High School Diploma
- 23% of Job Postings Requiring a Post-secondary or Associate's Degree
- 14% of Job Postings Requiring a Bachelor's degree
- 9% of Job Postings Requiring a Graduate or Professional Degree

n=219,600 job postings with 71,954 unspecified
Demand by Location: 79,912 job postings require victim services and case management skills and a bachelor’s degree. Almost 10 percent of these postings are located either in the New York or Washington D.C Metropolitan areas. Victim services and case management skills are in high demand in all regions.

**Top Metropolitan Statistical Areas for Job Postings Requiring Victim Services and Case Management and Bachelor’s Degrees**

*Between January 1st, 2012 and December 31st, 2012*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New York-Northern New Jersey-Long Island, NY-NJ-PA</td>
<td>4,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV</td>
<td>2,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles-Long Beach-Santa Ana, CA</td>
<td>2,771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago-Joliet-Naperville, IL-IN-WI</td>
<td>2,436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston-Cambridge-Quincy, MA-NH</td>
<td>2,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix-Mesa-Glendale, AZ</td>
<td>2,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco-Oakland-Fremont, CA</td>
<td>1,891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia-Camden-Wilmington, PA-NJ-DE-MD</td>
<td>1,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta-Sandy Springs-Marietta, GA</td>
<td>1,722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle-Tacoma-Bellevue, WA</td>
<td>1,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington, TX</td>
<td>1,506</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=79,912 job postings with 0 unspecified
Demand by Occupation: Registered nurses represent 30 percent of all job postings and are the most common occupations for job postings that require victim services and case management skills and a bachelor’s degree in the United States between January 1st, 2012 and December 31st, 2012. Almost one-half of all 79,912 job postings fall under the top four occupations, which include registered nurses, medical and health services managers, social workers, and social and human service assistants.

**Top Occupations for Job Postings Requiring Victim Services and Case Management**

*Between January 1st, 2012 and December 31st, 2012*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Registered Nurses</td>
<td>24,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical And Health Services Managers</td>
<td>4,073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Workers, All Other</td>
<td>3,768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social And Human Service Assistants</td>
<td>3,478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paralegals And Legal Assistants</td>
<td>1,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, Family, And School Social Workers</td>
<td>1,768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health Counselors</td>
<td>1,565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General And Operations Managers</td>
<td>1,402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-Line Supervisors Of Production And Operating Workers</td>
<td>969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Therapists</td>
<td>877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Systems Analysts</td>
<td>838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation Officers And Correctional Treatment Specialists</td>
<td>778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice And Law Enforcement Teachers, Postsecondary</td>
<td>738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health And Substance Abuse Social Workers</td>
<td>634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers, All Other</td>
<td>624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselors, All Other</td>
<td>596</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=79,912 job postings with 2,948 unspecified
Demand by Job Titles: The top job title, registered nurse, represents less than twenty percent of all job postings, and the top four job titles represent almost 30 percent of total job postings. The fifth most common title, physical therapist, represents only one percent of the total job postings, which indicates that the remaining 70 percent of postings are spread among a variety of job titles and positions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Registered Nurse</td>
<td>12,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Worker</td>
<td>3,326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Manager</td>
<td>3,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurse Case Manager</td>
<td>2,858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Therapist</td>
<td>823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litigation Paralegal</td>
<td>774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paralegal</td>
<td>621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Manager</td>
<td>473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Case Manager</td>
<td>407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurse Practitioner</td>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Account Manager</td>
<td>356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialysis Registered Nurse</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss Prevention Manager</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurse Manager</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensed Practical Nurse (lpn)</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctional Officer</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director Of Case Management</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Therapist</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice Instructor - Adjunct</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Analyst</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=79,912 job postings with 195 unspecified
**Employer Demand:** The top employer, the Department of Veterans' Affairs, posts only two percent of the 79,912 total job postings that require victim assistance and case management skills and a bachelor's degree, which suggests a wide variety of employers seek similarly qualified candidates. Many health insurance companies such as United Health Group and Kaiser Permanente hire applicants with victim services and case management skills, which suggests demand for victim services skills by health care providers.

**Top 13 Employers with Job Postings Requiring Victim Services and Case Management Skills**

*Between January 1st, 2012 and December 31st, 2012*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employer</th>
<th>Number of Postings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department of Veterans' Affairs</td>
<td>1,777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odessy Healthcare, Inc.</td>
<td>1,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital Corporation of America</td>
<td>1,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gentiva Health</td>
<td>1,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Health Group</td>
<td>1,236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humana</td>
<td>809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universal Health Services, Inc.</td>
<td>737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coventry Health Care</td>
<td>679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiser Permanente</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Health Systems</td>
<td>501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brightstar Care</td>
<td>439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allied Barton Security Services</td>
<td>431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty Mutual</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=79,912 job postings with 18,282 unspecified
Industry Demand: Forty-eight percent of job postings that require victim services and case management skills and a bachelor's degree are in healthcare-related industries, including hospitals, ambulatory health care services, insurance carriers and related services, and nursing and residential care facilities. Professional, scientific, and technical services comprise under six percent of job postings, suggesting the remaining 52 percent of job postings are distributed in small amounts among many other industries service-oriented industries, such as educational services, social assistance, and civic organizations.

Top 10 Industries for Job Postings Requiring Victim Services and Case Management Skills
Between January 1st, 2012 and December 31st, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals</td>
<td>18,662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambulatory Health Care Services</td>
<td>11,235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance Carriers And Related Activities</td>
<td>7,353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, Scientific, And Technical Services</td>
<td>4,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive, Legislative, And Other General Government Support</td>
<td>3,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Services</td>
<td>3,547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Assistance</td>
<td>3,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration Of Human Resource Programs</td>
<td>1,917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing And Residential Care Facilities</td>
<td>1,397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious, Grantmaking, Civic, Professional, And Similar Organizations</td>
<td>1,394</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=79,912 job postings with 12,452 unspecified
**Job Titles:** In addition to victim services and case management skills, employers require familiarity with patient care and discharge and treatment planning. Almost 13 percent of job postings require criminal justice skills and ten percent require clinical experience skills. A small number of job postings require a specialized focus, such as mental health or pediatrics and childcare, which indicates a demand for specializations within jobs that require victim services and case management skills.

**Top Specialized Skills for Job Postings Requiring Victim Services and Case Management Skills**
*Between January 1st, 2011 to December 31st, 2012*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patient Care</td>
<td>13,639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discharge Planning</td>
<td>11,324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment Planning</td>
<td>10,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>10,247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Experience</td>
<td>8,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health</td>
<td>7,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acute Care</td>
<td>7,432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
<td>6,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managed Care</td>
<td>6,504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment Plans</td>
<td>6,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>5,829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Health</td>
<td>4,809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Services</td>
<td>4,592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Care</td>
<td>4,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis Intervention</td>
<td>3,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>3,718</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=79,912 job postings with 0 unspecified
BOISE STATE UNIVERSITY

SUBJECT
Approval of New Master of Athletic Leadership Program

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY
Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies & Procedures, Section III.G.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION
Boise State University (BSU) proposes to create a new self-support program that will award a Master of Athletic Leadership degree. The proposed program will be offered face-to-face in BSU’s regional service area, and will differ from programs currently offered in Idaho because of its focus on leadership training from both coaching and athletic administration perspectives, and the inclusion of substantial practical experience and mentoring, as opposed to being based only on traditional coursework.

The program will emphasize the development of essential leadership competencies necessary to create and maintain athlete-centered athletic programs. The hallmark of athlete-centered athletic programs is that they provide clearly delineated infrastructure and overall support for student-athletes to seek and achieve excellence in academic and athletic pursuits.

The proposed program will prepare future leaders of athletic programs for service in youth sport, interscholastic, and intercollegiate settings, and has been designed to meet the educational goals and professional aspirations of professionals who are currently employed as (a) K-12 public school teachers, coaches, and/or athletic directors, (b) current coaches and administrators of club and/or youth sport organizations, and (c) graduate assistants employed by BSU Athletics.

Chris Peterson, former Head Football Coach at BSU, said of the proposed program in his letter of support:

“This type of training and the ability to be mentored would have saved me years of frustration as a young coach. I ultimately learned by trial and error over the years, but as I work with young coaches today, I realize they would be more effective if they had an educational foundation and an opportunity to participate in a mentorship like the Master of Athletic Leadership program.”

Franklin Dea, Athletic Director of Rolling Hills Charter School, said of the proposed program in his letter of support:
“Current and future coaches would benefit from the various leadership competencies and skills that will be provided by the proposed program. This program will help K-12 schools by increasing leadership skills of teachers and coaches at all levels of the game…”

Idaho State University’s (ISU) Department of Sport Science and Physical Education offers a Master of Physical Education/Athletic Administration that is broadly similar to the proposed program. It is offered at the ISU-Meridian Campus and at the ISU-Pocatello campus. The brochure for the program describes the program as follows: “The Athletic Administration degree is designed to prepare students for management positions within the sports industry. These can include positions such as a high school athletic director or coach; positions in a college athletic department such as a coach, athletic director, development officer, marketing coordinator, compliance officer, sports information, or event manager; positions in professional sports; or positions in fitness and recreation.”

BSU and ISU have developed a Memorandum of Agreement that describes the cooperative actions that will be taken by the two institutions, including (i) sharing of and access to coursework common to the two programs, (ii) advising of potential students to choose the most appropriate program, and (iii) agreement on administrative issues relating to student enrollments. Note that graduate assistant-coaches employed at BSU must be enrolled in a program wholly controlled by BSU and with a curriculum wholly offered by BSU so as to comply fully with NCAA rules and regulations that pertain to institutional control.

BSU’s proposed Master of Athletic Leadership program differs from ISU’s Master of Physical Education/Athletic Administration in the following ways.

- Although BSU’s proposed program necessarily includes some coursework pertaining to athletic administration, the focus is strongly on leadership training from the coaching perspective. In contrast, the program at ISU maintains a predominate focus on athletic administration, not on coaching. Programs with a focus on coaching education from a leadership perspective are few in number across the country. The BSU program is designed to provide the leadership training and support to help coaches become leaders, not just coaches who know their respective sports.

- The curriculum of BSU’s proposed program is focused on practical experience, requiring that students enroll in KIN-AL 508 & 509 ATHLETIC LEADERSHIP PRACTICUM I & II, which consist of 10 total credit hours (nearly one-third of the total credits required) of practical experience under the guidance of a qualified professional mentor. The qualified mentors used in BSU’s program will be leaders of athletic teams or programs (coaches or athletic administrators) who have demonstrated a consistent,
long-standing commitment to an athlete-centered philosophy of leadership and who have earned a level of respect and admiration from peers in the field. In contrast, ISU’s program requires practical experience consisting of (i) a minimum one-year of professional experience or an internship of 3 credits and (ii) the option for a student to take an additional 3 internship credits as elective.

• The curricula of the two programs differ substantially beyond the practical experience requirement listed above. Comparing ISU’s non-thesis option to BSU’s proposed program, (i) the ISU and BSU programs require 33 and 32 credits total, respectively, (ii) courses totaling 15 to 21 credits are required by ISU but have no equivalent in BSU’s curriculum, (iii) courses totaling 14 to 20 credits are required by BSU but have no equivalent in ISU’s curriculum.

The program adheres to Board Policy V.R.3.b.(v), as follows:

• “The Self-support program shall be distinct from the traditional offerings of the institution by serving a population that does not access the same activities, services and features as full-time, tuition paying students, such as programs designed specifically for working professionals, programs offered off-campus, or programs delivered completely online.”

This program will primarily serve two groups of working professionals: (i) those presently employed as coaches or teachers at K-12 or post-secondary institutions, or coaches or administrators with club sports, etc., and (ii) those employed as graduate assistants with BSU’s Athletic Department. Graduate Assistants employed by the Athletic Department work in a number of fully professional positions such as the following: (i) Graduate Assistant Athletic Trainer, often with full responsibility for a sport, (ii) Graduate Assistant Coaches, (iii) Graduate Assistants in Media Relations, and (iv) Graduate Assistants in Promotions. Note that because of strict demands on their time, Graduate Assistants employed by the Athletic Department are unable to participate in activities that would be regarded as part of the lifestyle of a traditional student.

• “No appropriated funds may be used in support of Self-support programs. Self-support program fee revenue shall cover all direct costs of the program. In addition, Self-support program fee revenue shall cover all indirect costs of the program within two years of program start-up.”

No appropriated funds will be used to support this program. Program revenue will cover all indirect costs of the program by the second year of the program.
• “Self-support program fees shall be segregated, tracked and accounted for separately from all other programs of the institution.”
BSU’s Division of Extended Studies serves as the entity that tracks and accounts for all self-support program fees. Program fees will be held in a separate local account.

• “If a Self-support program fee is requested for a new program, an institution may fund program start-up costs with appropriated or local funds, but all such funding shall be repaid to the institution from program revenue within a period not to exceed three years from program start-up.”

BSU’s budget model includes the repayment of $57,117 in local funds within three years of program startup.

IMPACT
BSU plans to charge $340 per credit hour taken. In the second year of the program (when the program is fully functional), BSU will teach a total of 6 courses of 5 to 6 credits each with an estimate of 18-20 students per class. BSU expects to produce 593 graduate student credit hours per year for a total gross income of $201,620. Local funds totaling $57,117 will be used to initiate the program; the local account will be repaid with program revenues by the end of the third year of the program consistent with Board Policy V.R.

ATTACHMENTS
Attachment 1 – Master of Athletic Leadership Proposal Page 5
Attachment 2 – MOU between BSU and ISU Page 47

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
Boise State University (BSU) proposes to create a new program granting a Master of Athletic Leadership degree. The proposed program will require 32 credits of graduate coursework. The program will enroll a cohort of 20 new students each year, and those students will be expected to complete in two years. BSU believes that there is sufficient market need to provide more than 20 new students per year, based on information from Department of Labor statistics and from a survey of potential students.

BSU’s request to create a new Master of Athletic Leadership is consistent with their Service Region Program Responsibilities and their Five-year Plan for Delivery of Academic Programs in the Southwest Region. Pursuant to III.Z., no institution has the Statewide Program Responsibility for Education.

Currently, ISU offers a similar program at its Meridian and Pocatello campuses leading to a Master of Physical Education, Athletic Administration. The offerings at the Meridian campus are primarily via distance delivery. Staff believes there
are sufficient differences in focus, curriculum, delivery method, and pedagogy to justify the simultaneous offering of the BSU program and the ISU program.

The proposal went through the program review process and was presented to the Council on Academic Affairs and Programs (CAAP) on January 23, 2014 and March 20, 2014. While ISU had initial concerns regarding potential duplication of their existing Athletic Administration program, both institutions agreed to a memorandum of understanding to facilitate cooperation between the institutions.

BSU also requests approval to assess a self-support fee consistent with Board Policy V.R.3.b.(v). Staff had initial concerns regarding the proposed program meeting self-support criteria, particularly, whether the program is distinct from traditional offerings of the institution. BSU indicates the proposed program would specifically serve a distinct group of working professionals, such as graduate assistant-coaches employed by BSU Athletics, K-12 public school teachers, coaches, and/or athletic directors. Based on this clarification and information for self-support fees provided in the proposal, staff finds the proposed program meets the criteria consistent with Board Policy V.R.

BOARD ACTION
I move to approve the request by Boise State University to create a new self-support program granting the degree of Master of Athletic Leadership.

Moved by __________ Seconded by __________ Carried Yes _____ No _____

I move to approve the request by Boise State University to designate a self-support fee for the Master of Athletic Leadership program in conformance with the program budget submitted to the Board in Attachment 1.

Moved by __________ Seconded by __________ Carried Yes _____ No _____
# Idaho State Board of Education
## Proposal for Graduate and Doctoral Degree Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Proposal Submission:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institution Submitting Proposal:</td>
<td>Boise State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of College, School, or Division:</td>
<td>College of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Department(s) or Area(s):</td>
<td>Department of Kinesiology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Program Identification for Proposed New, Modified, or Discontinued Program:

| Title: | Master of Athletic Leadership |
| Degree: | Master’s Degree |
| Method of Delivery: | Traditional; Self-Support Program |
| CIP code (consult IR/Registrar) | 31.0504 Sport and Fitness Administration/Management. |
| Proposed Starting Date: | Summer 2014 |
| Indicate if the program is: | [ ] Regional Responsibility [ ] Statewide Responsibility |

**Indicate whether this request is either of the following:**

- [x] New Graduate Program
- [ ] New Doctoral Program
- [ ] New Off-Campus Graduate Program
- [ ] New Off-Campus Doctoral Program
- [ ] Contract Program/Collaborative
- [ ] Expansion of an Existing Graduate/Doctoral Program
- [ ] Consolidation of an Existing Graduate/Doctoral Program
- [ ] Discontinuation of an existing Graduate/Doctoral Program

**Signatures:**
- College Dean (Institution): Ronald Wolf, 11/23/13
- Graduate Dean / ExtStudies Dean (For Grad Progs / Self-sprtt &/or online): John R. Pelton, 12/11/13
- Chief Fiscal Officer (Institution): Steve Newman, 12/3/13
- Chief Academic Officer (Institution): K. S. Neely, 12/3/13
- Vice President for Research (as applicable): Patty Leong, 3/12/14
- Academic Affairs Program Manager: [Signature], 3/12/14
- Chief Academic Officer, OSBE: [Signature], 3/12/14
- SBOE/OSBE Approval: [Signature], Date
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Before completing this form, refer to Board Policy Section III.G., Program Approval and Discontinuance. This proposal form must be completed for the creation of each new program and each program discontinuation. All questions must be answered.

1. **Describe the nature of the request.** Will this program be related or tied to other programs on campus? Please identify any existing program, option that this program will replace. If this is request to discontinue an existing program, provide the rationale for the discontinuance. Indicate the year and semester in which the last cohort of students was admitted and the final term the college will offer the program. Describe the teach-out plans for continuing students.

Boise State University proposes the creation of a new self support program leading to the degree of “Master of Athletic Leadership.”

The goal of the proposed program is to prepare future leaders of athletic programs for service in youth sport, interscholastic, and intercollegiate settings. The proposed program has been designed to meet the educational goals and professional aspirations of potential students who are currently employed as (a) K-12 public school teachers, coaches, and/or athletic directors (b) graduate assistants in Boise State University Athletics, and (c) administrators and current coaches of club and/or youth sport organizations.

The proposed program will meet the needs expressed by Kris Knowles, Assistant Principal at Sandpoint High School, in his letter of support:

“It has been my experience, through 15 years of athletic and educational service at the high school and collegiate level within the State of Idaho, that there is great need for a masters program to enhance professional development and prepare future leaders in the fields of coaching and athletics. I believe that currently, leadership training in athletics at the interscholastic and intercollegiate level is underdeveloped; very few opportunities to attain leadership competencies in these areas exist in the state. Athletics is a growing industry, and developing a masters program to foster leadership skills through research of current, historical, and legal issues in athletics, providing expert instruction by current professionals working in the industry, and developing mentor relationships with coaches and athletic personnel at Boise State, as well as throughout Idaho is greatly needed.”

2. **List the objectives of the program.** The objectives should address specific needs the program will meet. They should also identify and the expected student learning outcomes and achievements. **This question is not applicable to requests for discontinuance.**

The Master of Athletic Leadership program is designed to enhance the leadership competencies of current and future athletic leaders. The program is practitioner-oriented, with a strong emphasis on development of essential leadership competencies necessary to create and maintain athlete-centered athletic programs. The hallmark of athlete-centered athletic programs is that they provide clearly delineated infrastructure and overall support for student-athletes to seek and achieve excellence in academic and athletic pursuits.

The current program will address the following learning domains specified by the National Association for Sport and Physical Education (NASPE) and the North American Society for Sport Management (NASSM):

1. Philosophy and Ethics
2. Socio-Cultural
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3. Leadership and Management
4. Interpersonal and Organizational Communication
5. Athletic Program Administration
6. Program Evaluation

The expected learning outcomes each graduate will achieve are:

- Development an athlete-centered philosophy of athletic leadership
- Facilitate a positive learning environment in athletic leadership settings
- Enhance self-management and reflection skills in athletic leadership settings
- Demonstrate application of sound ethical decision-making in athletic leadership settings
- Model communication skills that support an athlete-centered philosophy of leadership
- Implement motivational strategies that relate to an athlete-centered philosophy of leadership
- Teach and reinforce the positive values of sport
- Model ethical behavior in athletic leadership settings
- Establish athletic program management skills pertaining to finance, human resources, public relations, legal liability, and program evaluation

3. Briefly describe how the institution will ensure the quality of the program (i.e., program review). Will the program require specialized accreditation (it is not necessary to address regional accreditation)? If so, please identify the agency and explain why you do or do not plan to seek accreditation. This question is not applicable to requests for discontinuance.

The following measures will ensure the high quality of the proposed program:

Regional Institutional Accreditation: Boise State University is regionally accredited by the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU). Regional accreditation of the university has been continuous since initial accreditation was conferred in 1941. Boise State University is currently accredited at all degree levels (A, B, M, D).

Program Review: Internal program evaluations will take place every five years as part of the normal departmental review process conducted by the Office of the Provost. This process requires a detailed self-study (including outcome assessments) and a comprehensive review and site visit by external evaluators.

Graduate Policy and Procedure: The proposed program will adhere to all applicable policies and procedures of the Graduate College as developed and approved by the graduate faculty of the university through its representatives on the Graduate Council.

Financial Review: Current federal regulations require online certificate programs (both undergraduate and graduate) to undergo annual financial audits and long term reporting on loan repayment and graduates' success in obtaining relevant employment. State board policy requires that all self-support programs undergo audits on a 3-year cycle.

As outlined above, the program will be organized following the learning domains specified by the NASPE and the NASSM. Aligning the program with the learning domains delineated by these two organizations will serve two primary purposes for the proposed program: (i) ensure the highest standards for program quality and (ii) provide a framework for periodic review and program evaluation opportunities. Although the Commission on Sport
Management Accreditation (COSMA) does offer an accreditation approval process, the proposed program will not seek accreditation from this agency: the focus of the proposed program relates to athletic leadership from both coaching and sport management perspectives; COSMA accreditation is specifically devoted to sport management programs, not to coaching education programs. By aligning the proposed program with the learning domains specified by the NASPE and the NASSM, stakeholders and program participants can be assured of appropriate education and training recommended by respected national organizations.

4. List new courses that will be added to your curriculum specific for this program. Indicate number, title, and credit hour value for each course. Please include course descriptions for new and/or changes to courses. This question is not applicable to requests for discontinuance.

**KIN-AL 501 FOUNDATIONS OF ATHLETIC LEADERSHIP (3 credits).** Emphasizes the knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed of leaders in athletic programs. Includes a study of advanced leadership theory and its application to athletic programs and a focus on personal leadership development.

**KIN-AL 502 ATHLETIC ORGANIZATIONAL COMMUNICATION (3 credits).** Analysis of organizational communication theory and research as related to athletic leadership. Examines communicative practices associated with relationship development, leadership, and collaboration.

**KIN-AL 503 ATHLETIC PROGRAM MANAGEMENT (3 credits).** Examines managerial responsibilities of athletic leaders including legal liability, sport law, finance and marketing, personnel management, and program evaluation.

**KIN-AL 504 PHILOSOPHY OF SPORT & ATHLETIC LEADERSHIP (3 credits).** Examines philosophical and ethical issues within sport and society and their corresponding relevancy to athletic leadership settings.

**KIN-AL 505 SOCIOLOGY OF SPORT & ATHLETIC LEADERSHIP (3 credits).** Examines sociological and cultural issues within sport and society and their corresponding relevancy to athletic leadership settings.

**KIN-AL 506 PSYCHOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF ATHLETIC LEADERSHIP (3 credits).** Examines individual differences and environmental factors relevant to athletic leadership as identified by sport and exercise psychology theory and research. Focuses on applying psychological skills training programs to athletes, coaches, and administrators.

**KIN-AL 507 ATHLETIC LEADERSHIP ACADEMY (2 credits).** Provides training and mentoring from current and former athletic leaders from Boise State University and other institutions regarding various facets of athletic leadership.

**KIN-AL 508 ATHLETIC LEADERSHIP PRACTICUM I (5 credits).** Provides students with a supervised practical experience in athletic leadership under the direct supervision of a qualified mentor.
KIN-AL 509 ATHLETIC LEADERSHIP PRACTICUM II (5 credits). Continuation of KIN-AL 508.

5. Please provide the program completion requirements to include the following and attach a typical curriculum to this proposal as Appendix A. For discontinuation requests, will courses continue to be taught?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Credit hours required:</th>
<th>32</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Credit hours required in support courses:</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit hours in required electives:</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit hours for thesis or dissertation:</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total credit hours required for completion:</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Describe additional requirements such as preliminary qualifying examination, comprehensive examination, thesis, dissertation, practicum or internship, some of which may carry credit hours included in the list above. This question is not applicable to requests for discontinuance.

Program participants will be expected to complete a comprehensive portfolio documenting their learning throughout the program. The portfolio will serve as a culminating activity that provides participants the opportunity to demonstrate how they will use their education and training in their future responsibilities as leaders of athletic programs.

7. Identify similar programs offered within Idaho or in the region by other colleges/universities. If the proposed request is similar to another state program, provide a rationale for the duplication.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution and Degree name</th>
<th>Specializations within the discipline (to reflect a national perspective)</th>
<th>Specializations offered within the degree at the institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BSU Master of Athletic Leadership</td>
<td>Coaching Education</td>
<td>Master of Athletic Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sport Management</td>
<td>A program designed to prepare future leaders of athletic programs for service as sport coaches and/or athletic administrators. Each course in the program offers educational training related to both coaching and athletic administration. The program specifically emphasizes the leadership competencies required of professionals in both coaching and athletic administration positions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Degree Level</td>
<td>Program Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EITC</td>
<td></td>
<td>promotion, scheduling and management; facilities management; public relations; legal aspects of sports; and applicable health and safety standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU</td>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>Master of Physical Education in Athletic Administration. A program designed to strengthen the student's understanding, knowledge, and skills in the areas of leadership and administration as they relate to the management of athletic programs at the interscholastic and intercollegiate levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCSC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The University of Idaho offers one master’s level program that concerns athletics but is only peripherally related to the proposed program: a Master of Science in Athletic Training.

Idaho State University’s Department of Sport Science and Physical Education offers two master’s-level programs that concern athletics. Their Master of Science in Athletic Training is only peripherally related to the proposed program, and will not be discussed further. The Master of Physical Education, Athletic Administration is broadly similar to the proposed program. It is offered at the ISU-Meridian Campus and at the ISU-Pocatello campus. The brochure for the program describes the program as follows: "The Athletic Administration degree is designed to prepare students for management positions within the sports industry. These can include positions such as a high school athletic director or coach, positions in a college athletic department such as a coach, athletic director, development officer, marketing coordinator, compliance officer, sports information, or event manager; positions in professional sports; or positions in fitness and recreation."

Boise State’s proposed Master of Athletic Leadership program differs from Idaho State’s Master of Physical, Athletic Administration in three ways.

First, although BSU’s proposed program necessarily includes some coursework pertaining to athletic administration, the focus is strongly on leadership training from the coaching perspective. In contrast, the program at ISU maintains a predominate focus on athletic administration, not on coaching. Coaching is much more than knowledge of X’s and O’s. It is leadership at its finest and student-athletes deserve quality leadership to extract significant value from their sport experiences. Quality coaching education programs, such as BSU’s proposed program, are needed to prepare coaches to be better leaders. As Cary Cada, Head Boys Basketball Coach at Borah High School observed in his letter of support:

*Whenever I interview an aspiring young coach, I always ask them why they believe that they will be a good basketball coach. More often than not, their response is “because I’ve played a lot of basketball and know a lot about the game.” Obviously, one needs to know a lot about*
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the sport they wish to coach, however, way too many upcoming coaches are ill-prepared because they don't grasp the reality of being a "leader." Their focus is generally on ability, and talent, drills, concepts, and measurable evaluations while the little things are overlooked . . . I maintain that we can do more to better prepare upcoming coaches and teachers for the reality of the life they are choosing and hope you will consider endorsing the Master of Athletic Leadership program at Boise State University.

Programs with a focus on coaching education from a leadership perspective are few in number across the country. The BSU program is designed to provide the leadership training and support to help coaches become leaders, not just coaches who know their respective sports.

As noted above, the BSU program will also include material related to athletic administration. After considering the NASPE and NASSM standards and in consultation with both coaches and athletic administrators at the interscholastic and intercollegiate levels, it became clear that athletic administrators and coaches each need broad-based training to understand the professional practices needed for success in both positions. In other words, coaches must also understand the day-to-day operations and leadership responsibilities of athletic administrators and vice versa. The main thrust of the proposed program is the development of leadership competencies for implementation in the context of sport. More specifically, the proposed program will enable leaders of sport programs to create and maintain the social, cultural, and psychological environment that supports and aligns with an athlete-centered philosophy of leadership.

Second, the curriculum of BSU's proposed program is focused on practical experience, requiring 10 total credit hours (nearly one-third of the total credits required) of practical experience under the guidance of a qualified professional mentor. In contrast, the ISU program does not have a requirement for any sort of practical experience, although internships could be included as approved electives. The qualified mentors used in BSU's program will be leaders of athletic teams or programs (coaches or athletic administrators) who have demonstrated a consistent, long-standing commitment to an athlete-centered philosophy of leadership and who have earned a level of respect and admiration from peers in the field. Because the proposed program emphasizes development of leadership competencies, coursework is designed to provide a rich blend of classroom and practical experiences. Without practical experience, leadership skills and competencies are not likely to grow and develop. Qualified mentors are needed to guide and direct students in their practical experiences to help them become better leaders. For example, a student in the program may work under the guidance of a (a) head or assistant coach of a Boise State University athletic team or (b) athletic administrator in Boise State University athletics. Mentors will be carefully chosen who clearly exemplify the principles of an athlete-centered philosophy of leadership. In addition, a faculty supervisor from the program will also provide regular consultation with the student during the practical experience with the purpose of bridging the gap between theory and practice.

Third, each course in the program will be taught by multiple instructors. This instructional model is favorable because it (a) provides diverse perspectives related to course content, and (b) offers more networking opportunities for students.

Fourth, the curriculum will be created as an integrated whole. A handful of faculty members with
expertise to teach in the program will be invited to participate in course development workshops to design learning outcomes, assessments, and learning activities for each course in the curriculum. The purpose of the course development workshops will be to ensure that learning outcomes, assessments, and learning activities are blended across each course in the curriculum. By way of participation in the course development workshops, faculty members will see how each course in the program funnels into the overarching theme of athletic leadership.

Describe the methodology for determining enrollment projections. If a survey of student interest was conducted, attach a copy of the survey instrument with a summary of results as Appendix B. This question is not applicable to requests for discontinuance.

Two primary factors in determining enrollment projections: pedagogically-appropriate cohort size and a survey of potential students.

First, we believe that limiting the cohort size to 20 will a high quality program. A new cohort of 20 will begin each summer, and each cohort will be expected to complete in two years.

Second, results from a needs-assessment survey conducted in the Treasure Valley earlier this year suggested a strong demand for the proposed program that will provide well more than 20 potential students per cohort. The survey was emailed to (a) K-12 teachers in the Boise, Meridian, Nampa, and Kuna school districts, (b) all high school athletic directors associated with the Idaho High School Activities Association, and (c) all of the main athletic departments at each of the main institutions of higher education in the Treasure and Magic valleys. Three-hundred and fifteen people responded to the online survey that asked questions about their interest in the proposed program. The sample of respondents included professionals in K-12 public and private schools and institutions of higher learning who were teachers, coaches, athletic trainers, athletic directors, administrators, and graduate assistants. Sixty-five percent of respondents indicated that the proposed program would be 'very likely' or 'likely' to help them reach their professional goals. Additionally, 50 percent of respondents indicated that they would be 'very likely' or 'likely' to enroll in the proposed program sometime in the next three years. As these data suggest, a graduate degree in athletic leadership is likely to be a valuable educational program for many current and prospective teachers, coaches, and administrators in K-12 and post-secondary settings. It was quite clear from the needs assessment that respondents are very interested in the proposed program. For example, one respondent observed:

"I think that there is a very high need for this program in order for coaches to pursue high collegiate levels of coaching. I value the pursuit of this degree and would enroll immediately."

Another respondent to the needs assessment declared:

"I know for a fact that many coaches and AD's would love to enroll in this program. I've already received information from other universities about similar programs, but I would much rather take it from BSU."

These and other similar comments and the remaining results of the needs assessment can be found in Appendix C.
Enrollment and Graduates. Using the chart below, provide a realistic estimate of enrollment at the time of program implementation and over three year period based on availability of students meeting the criteria referenced above. Include part-time and full-time (i.e., number of majors or other relevant data) by institution for the proposed program, last three years beginning with the current year and the previous two years. Also, indicate the projected number of graduates and graduation rates.

Discontinuations. Using the chart below include part-time and full-time (i.e., number of majors or other relevant data) by institution for the proposed discontinuation, last three years beginning with the current year and previous two years. Indicate how many students are currently enrolled in the program for the previous two years, to include number of graduates and graduation rates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Relevant Enrollment Data</th>
<th>Number of Graduates</th>
<th>Graduate Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Athletic Leadership (proposed)</td>
<td>Projected Enrollment: 20 will begin each cohort. A cohort will begin each summer.</td>
<td>Projected # of Graduates: We project that 14 students will complete from each cohort, therefore we project 14 graduates per year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Physical Education/ Athletic Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCSC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OWI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EITC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Will this program reduce enrollments in other programs at your institution? If so, please explain.

Some current students enrolled in graduate programs in the Department of Kinesiology may decide to transfer to the new program depending on their academic and professional goals. A number of Graduate Assistants (approximately 10-12) will likely enroll in this new program instead of the current Master of Science in Kinesiology degree programs. It is expected that numbers in the existing graduate programs in Kinesiology may drop the first year or two. However, demand for the existing programs is still high and will likely return to current numbers after initiation of the new proposed program.

9. Provide verification of state workforce needs such as job titles requiring this degree. Include State and National Department of Labor research on employment potential.

Using the chart below, indicate the total projected job openings (including growth and replacement demands in your regional area, the state, and nation. Job openings should represent positions which require graduation
from a program such as the one proposed. Data should be derived from a source that can be validated and must be no more than two years old. This question is not applicable to requests for discontinuance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local (Regional)</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nation</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Describe the methodology used to determine the projected job openings. If a survey of employment needs was used, please attach a copy of the survey instrument with a summary of results as Appendix.

State and federal labor data is very rough at best. The named classifications include professions not relevant to the proposed program, and they do not include a number of professions that are relevant to the proposed program. The numbers in the table above were derived as follows: (i) based on federal information, the need is estimated at 15,000 openings per year. The state need is then estimated by multiplying the national need by 5%, the proportion of US population residing in Idaho. The local need is then calculated by multiplying the state need by 50%, the rough percentage of Idaho’s population that can be considered “local.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOC Code</th>
<th>2010 National Employment Matrix title</th>
<th>Annual Job openings due to growth and replacement needs, 2010-20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27-2020</td>
<td>Athletes, Coaches, Umpires, and Related Workers</td>
<td>14,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-2022</td>
<td>Coaches and Scouts</td>
<td>13,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IDAHO JOB PROJECTIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOC Code</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Annual Openings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27-2022</td>
<td>Coaches and Scouts</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Describe how the proposed change will act to stimulate the state economy by advancing the field, providing research results, etc.

c. Is the program primarily intended to meet needs other than employment needs, if so, please provide a brief rationale.

It is expected that most participants in the program will already be employed in K-12 public or private schools or in the Department of Athletics at Boise State University and who are looking for additional training to improve their leadership competencies to administer athlete-centered athletic programs. This program will help them receive this additional training and will likely bolster the number of leaders available locally and regionally to
facilitate the continued growth and development of the youth sport industry, where leadership is needed to provide training and guidance for the numerous volunteer coaches.

10. **Will any type of distance education technology be utilized in the delivery of the program on your main campus or to remote sites? Please describe.** This question is not applicable to requests for discontinuance.

   N/A

11. **Describe how this request is consistent with the State Board of Education’s strategic plan and institution’s role and mission.** This question is not applicable to requests for discontinuance.

   The Master of Athletic Leadership program is designed to provide a high-quality educational experience for students who desire to become leaders of athletic programs in a variety of employment settings. A distinguishing characteristic of the program is the numerous opportunities for experiential learning across various disciplines (e.g., philosophy, communication, leadership, sociology, etc.). The program will contribute to the state by ensuring future leaders of athletic programs who have the development of student-athletes as their primary focus.

   Those outcomes will serve the following aspects of the SBOE strategic plan:
   **GOAL 1: A WELL EDUCATED CITIZENRY**
   The educational system will provide opportunities for individual advancement.
   - **Objective A: Access** [The proposed program will provide online access to a valuable program relevant to a wide range of professionals]
   - **Objective C: Adult Learner Re-Integration** – [The proposed program will meet the needs of professionals seeking credentialing in victim services]

   The following bolded passages show the relevance of the program to Boise State University’s Mission:

   *Boise State University is a public, metropolitan, research university offering an array of undergraduate and graduate degrees and experiences that foster student success, lifelong learning, community engagement, innovation and creativity. Research and creative activity advance new knowledge and benefit students, the community, the state and the nation. As an integral part of its metropolitan environment the university is engaged in professional and continuing education programming, policy issues, and promoting the region’s economic vitality and cultural enrichment.*

   Sport is an important social and cultural vehicle for educating and training future generations of young people. The state needs quality leaders of athletic programs to ensure that sport programs for young people (i.e., youth sport, interscholastic, and collegiate) are of the highest quality and that they prepare young people for future leadership roles in other community and business-related activities.
12. Describe how this request fits with the institution's vision and/or strategic plan. This question is not applicable to requests for discontinuance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals of Institution Strategic Mission</th>
<th>Proposed Program Plans to Achieve the Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal 1 – Create a signature, high quality educational experience for all students</td>
<td>Multi-disciplinary program with educational experiences related to leadership advancement, communication training, and philosophy and ethics exploration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 4 – Align university program and activities with community needs</td>
<td>Provide meaningful practicum experiences that prepare future leaders of athletic programs to create and maintain athlete-centered programs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Is the proposed program in your institution's Five-Year plan? Indicate below. This question is not applicable to requests for discontinuance.

Yes X No ____

14. Explain how students are going to learn about this program and where students are going to be recruited from (i.e., within institution, out-of-state, internationally). For requests to discontinue a program, how will continuing students be advised of impending changes and consulted about options or alternatives for attaining their educational goals?

Approximately 10-12 hired graduate assistants (GA) in the Department of Athletics at Boise State University are expected to enroll in the program each year. Each of these GA’s must choose a Master’s program to pursue. Results from a needs assessment conducted with current and prospective GA’s indicated a strong interest to enroll in the proposed program. Other potential participants will be recruited from K-12 public and private schools.

As a result of the needs assessment conducted earlier this year, some potential students already know about the proposed program and have been in correspondence with the program director about the progress of the proposed program. One such potential student recently related the following via email correspondence:

“I am super interested in starting to work on my masters in coaching and athletic administration and this looks like something that would be good for me. I had intended on going somewhere else to do so but would love to come back to BSU if the opportunity is there.”

Another potential student said:

“I am still really excited about the future potential of a graduate coaching program. I want you to know that I will not be finishing my current masters program and will be done in a couple weeks. That being said I really want to enroll in the coaching education program.”

These comments from potential students are quite common. It is clear that many potential students have already heard about the proposed program via “word of mouth” and already anticipate participating in this program.

To inform others about the program, marketing materials (e.g., emails, brochures, mailings, etc.) will be disseminated to K-12 teachers in Idaho to inform them of the program. The Boise State University Athletics department has agreed to host a “Learn about the Program” night where athletic directors and coaches from K-12 schools would be invited to learn about the program and meet faculty and professional mentors involved with the program. In addition, a program website would also be created to give potential participants the opportunity to learn about the program and obtain answers to questions.
15. In accordance with Board Policy III.G., an external peer review is required for any new doctoral program. Attach the peer review report as Appendix D.

N/A

18. Program Resource Requirements. Using the Excel spreadsheet provided by the Office of the State Board of Education indicate all resources needed including the planned FTE enrollment, projected revenues, and estimated expenditures for the first three fiscal years of the program. Include reallocation of existing personnel and resources and anticipated or requested new resources. Second and third year estimates should be in constant dollars. Amounts should reconcile budget explanations below. If the program is contract related, explain the fiscal sources and the year-to-year commitment from the contracting agency(ies) or party(ies). Provide an explanation of the fiscal impact of the proposed discontinuance to include impacts to faculty (i.e., salary savings, re-assignments).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY2015</th>
<th>FY2015</th>
<th>FY2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Spring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total enrollment</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of courses running</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of credits per course</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit Hours Produced</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student FTE</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grad cost per credit</td>
<td>$340</td>
<td>$340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Income</td>
<td>$40,800</td>
<td>$34,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. Planned Student Enrollment (FTE calculated as 1 FTE = 24 credit hours per year for grad programs; Headcount calculated as 1/3 of total registrations for year; assumes each student takes 3 courses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY14</th>
<th>FY15</th>
<th>FY16</th>
<th>FY17</th>
<th>Cumulative Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TTE</td>
<td>Headcount</td>
<td>TTE</td>
<td>Headcount</td>
<td>TTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. New Enrollments</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Shifting Enrollments</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY14</th>
<th>FY15</th>
<th>FY16</th>
<th>FY17</th>
<th>Cumulative Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>One-time</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>One-time</td>
<td>On-going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Appropriated-Reallocation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Appropriated new</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Federal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Tuition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Student Fees</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$107,100</td>
<td>$201,620</td>
<td>$201,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Other (Local Account)</td>
<td>$24,163</td>
<td>$32,954</td>
<td>-$39,112</td>
<td>-$18,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenue</td>
<td>$24,163</td>
<td>$140,054</td>
<td>$162,508</td>
<td>$183,615</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### III. Expenditures

**A. Personnel Costs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 14</th>
<th>FY 15</th>
<th>FY 16</th>
<th>FY 17</th>
<th>Cumulative Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. FTE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Faculty</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$33,774</td>
<td>$67,549</td>
<td>$67,549</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Administrators</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$5,800</td>
<td>$5,800</td>
<td>$5,800</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Adjunct Faculty</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Instructional Assts</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Research Personnel</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Support personnel</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Fringe benefits</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$15,905</td>
<td>$27,389</td>
<td>$27,389</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Other</td>
<td>$15,466</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total FTE personnel and costs</strong></td>
<td><strong>$15,466</strong></td>
<td><strong>$101,480</strong></td>
<td><strong>$116,737</strong></td>
<td><strong>$116,737</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B. Operating Expenditures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 14</th>
<th>FY 15</th>
<th>FY 16</th>
<th>FY 17</th>
<th>Cumulative Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Travel</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Communications</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Materials and Supplies</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Rentals</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Miscellaneous</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL OPERATING EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>$8,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$8,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$8,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**C. Capital Outlay**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 14</th>
<th>FY 15</th>
<th>FY 16</th>
<th>FY 17</th>
<th>Cumulative Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Library resources</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Equipment</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Physical facilties construction</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Indirect costs (overhead)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$12,148</td>
<td>$25,771</td>
<td>$25,771</td>
<td>$63,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td><strong>$24,163</strong></td>
<td><strong>$140,054</strong></td>
<td><strong>$162,508</strong></td>
<td><strong>$162,508</strong></td>
<td><strong>$465,070</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Net Income (Deficit) per year**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 15</th>
<th>FY 16</th>
<th>FY 17</th>
<th>Cumulative Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$21,107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$21,107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ongoing is defined as ongoing operating budget for the program which will become part of the base.
One-time is defined as one-time funding in a fiscal year and not part of the base.

Budget Notes:

II.4. Revenue from student fees will consist of $340 per credit.
II.5. Local funds totaling $57,117 will be provided to fund the development and initiation of the program. Those funds will be repaid to the appropriate local accounts by the end of the third year of the program.
III.A.7. Fringe benefits are calculated at the rate of 34% of salary for faculty and administrators and 35% for support staff.
III.A.8. In FY14, $15,466 will be used to buy out two courses for Director of the program Tyler Johnson, who will use the resulting time to develop the program. In FY15, course development costs are covered at the rate of $5,000 for each of seven courses. Mentors will be funded at a cost of $4,000, $9,000, and $9,000 in FY15, FY16, and FY17, respectively.
III.E. Indirect costs are calculated as 10% of expenditures for university administrative fees and 6% of revenue for Division of Extended Studies administrative fees.

**a. Personnel Costs**
a. Personnel Costs

Faculty and Staff Expenditures
Project for the first three years of the program the credit hours to be generated by each faculty member (full-time and part-time), graduate assistant, and other instructional personnel. Also indicate salaries. After total student credit hours, convert to an FTE student basis. Please provide totals for each of the three years presented. Salaries and FTE students should reflect amounts shown on budget schedule.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2015 Name, Position &amp; Rank</th>
<th>Annual Salary Rate</th>
<th>FTE Assignment to this Program</th>
<th>Projected Student Credit Hours</th>
<th>FTE Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tyler Johnson, Program Director, Associate Professor</td>
<td>$58,002</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>4.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Track Faculty</td>
<td>$58,002</td>
<td>0.267</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>6.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Faculty Member</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2016 Name, Position &amp; Rank</th>
<th>Annual Salary Rate</th>
<th>FTE Assignment to this Program</th>
<th>Projected Student Credit Hours</th>
<th>FTE Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tyler Johnson, Program Director, Associate Professor</td>
<td>$58,002</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Track Faculty</td>
<td>$58,002</td>
<td>0.633</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>13.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Faculty Member</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>0.267</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>5.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2017 Name, Position &amp; Rank</th>
<th>Annual Salary Rate</th>
<th>FTE Assignment to this Program</th>
<th>Projected Student Credit Hours</th>
<th>FTE Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tyler Johnson, Program Director, Associate Professor</td>
<td>$58,002</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Track Faculty</td>
<td>$58,002</td>
<td>0.633</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>13.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Faculty Member</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>0.267</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>5.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project the need and cost for support personnel and any other personnel expenditures for the first three years of the program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name, Position &amp; Rank</th>
<th>Annual Salary Rate</th>
<th>FTE Assignment to this Program</th>
<th>Program Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admin Assistant</td>
<td>$28,000</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The support personnel expenditures are expected to remain consistent across FY 2015, 2016, and 2017.

Administrative Expenditures
Describe the proposed administrative structure necessary to ensure program success and the cost of that
support. Include a statement concerning the involvement of other departments, colleges, or other institutions and the estimated cost of their involvement in the proposed program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name, Position &amp; Rank</th>
<th>Annual Salary Rate</th>
<th>FTE Assignment to this Program</th>
<th>Value of FTE Effort to this Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tyler Johnson, Program Director, Associate Professor</td>
<td>$58,002</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>$5,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Operating Expenditures
Briefly explain the need and cost for operating expenditures (travel, professional services, etc.)

Operating expense for FY 2015 will consist of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Costs</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>$2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guest Speakers</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion (Website Development)</td>
<td>$3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
<td>$1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room Rentals</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>$1000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Travel expenses have been included for the program director and a clinical instructor to travel to professional conferences related to Master of Athletic Leadership program.

Guest speaker expenses have been included to fund four prominent guest speakers to come to present information to program participants. Guest speakers will be provided airfare and hotel accommodations, meals, and a stipend.

Promotion expenses have been included to fund the creation of a professional website, a program brochure, and other promotion and marketing materials.

Room rentals expenses have been included to fund program meetings that may be held in an off-campus venue.

c. Capital Outlay

(1) Library resources

(a) Evaluate library resources, including personnel and space. Are they adequate for the operation of the present program? If not, explain the action necessary to ensure program success.

Yes, existing library resources are adequate.

(b) Indicate the costs for the proposed program including personnel, space, equipment, monographs, journals, and materials required for the program.

Boise State University already has access to the necessary scholarly resources.
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needed to administer the program.

(c) For off-campus programs, clearly indicate how the library resources are to be provided.

N/A

(2) Equipment/Instruments

Describe the need for any laboratory instruments, computer(s), or other equipment. List equipment, which is presently available and any equipment (and cost) which must be obtained to support the proposed program.

Existing equipment and instruments in the Department of Kinesiology are adequate

d. Revenue Sources

(1) If funding is to come from the reallocation of existing state appropriated funds, please indicate the sources of the reallocation. What impact will the reallocation of funds in support of the program have on other programs?

Self-support program

(2) If the funding is to come from other sources such as a donation, indicate the sources of other funding. What are the institution’s plans for sustaining the program when funding ends?

N/A - Self-support program

(3) If an above Maintenance of Current Operations (MCO) appropriation is required to fund the program, indicate when the institution plans to include the program in the legislative budget request.

N/A - Self-support program

(4) Describe the federal grant, other grant(s), special fee arrangements, or contract(s) to fund the program. What does the institution propose to do with the program upon termination of those funds?

N/A - Self-support program

(5) Provide estimated fees for any proposed professional or self-support program.

$350 per credit hour
Appendix A: Proposed Curriculum and Listing of Courses

Master of Athletic Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Number and Title</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requirements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIN-AL 501 Foundations of Athletic Leadership</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIN-AL 502 Athletic Organizational Communication</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIN-AL 503 Athletic Program Management</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIN-AL 504 Philosophy of Sport &amp; Athletic Leadership</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIN-AL 505 Sociology of Sport &amp; Athletic Leadership</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIN-AL 506 Psychological Aspects of Athletic Leadership</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIN-AL 507 Athletic Leadership Academy</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIN-AL 508 Athletic Leadership Practicum I</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIN-AL 509 Athletic Leadership Practicum II</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culminating Activity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIN-AL 592 Portfolio</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KIN-AL 501 FOUNDATIONS OF ATHLETIC LEADERSHIP (3-0-3)(SU).** Emphasizes the knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed of leaders in athletic programs. Includes a study of advanced leadership theory and its application to athletic programs and a focus on personal leadership development. PREREQ: ADM/PROG

**KIN-AL 502 ATHLETIC ORGANIZATIONAL COMMUNICATION (3-0-3)(SU).** Analysis of organizational communication theory and research as related to athletic leadership. Examines communicative practices associated with relationship development, leadership, and collaboration. PREREQ: ADM/PROG

**KIN-AL 503 ATHLETIC PROGRAM MANAGEMENT (3-0-3)(SU).** Examines managerial responsibilities of athletic leaders including legal liability, sport law, finance and marketing, personnel management, and program evaluation. PREREQ: ADM/PROG

**KIN-AL 504 PHILOSOPHY OF SPORT & ATHLETIC LEADERSHIP (3-0-3)(F/S).** Examines philosophical and ethical issues within sport and society and their corresponding relevancy to athletic leadership settings. PREREQ: ADM/PROG

**KIN-AL 505 SOCIOLOGY OF SPORT & ATHLETIC LEADERSHIP (3-0-3)(F/S).** Examines sociological and cultural issues within sport and society and their corresponding relevancy to athletic leadership settings. PREREQ: ADM/PROG

**KIN-AL 506 PSYCHOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF ATHLETIC LEADERSHIP (3-0-3)(SU).** Examines individual differences and environmental factors relevant to athletic leadership as identified by sport and exercise psychology theory and research. Focuses on applying psychological skills training programs to athletes, coaches, and administrators. PREREQ: ADM/PROG
KIN-AL 507 ATHLETIC LEADERSHIP ACADEMY (2-0-2)(F/S). Provides training and mentoring from current and former athletic leaders from Boise State University and other institutions regarding various facets of athletic leadership. PREREQ: ADM/PROG

KIN-AL 508 ATHLETIC LEADERSHIP PRACTICUM I (0-5-5)(F/S). Provides students with a supervised practical experience in athletic leadership under the direct supervision of a qualified mentor. PREREQ: ADM/PROG

KIN-AL 509 ATHLETIC LEADERSHIP PRACTICUM II (0-5-5)(F/S). Continuation of KIN-AL 508. PREREQ: KIN-AL 508
Appendix B – Proposed Catalog Statement

Master of Athletic Leadership

Program Director: Tyler Johnson
Bronco Gymnasium, Room 208, Mail Stop 1710
Telephone: (208) 426-5870
E-mail: tylerjohnson6@boisestate.edu

General Information

The Master of Athletic Leadership is designed to enhance the leadership skills of current and future athletic leaders for service in intercollegiate, interscholastic, and/or youth sport athletic programs. The program is practitioner-oriented with a strong emphasis on participant development of essential leadership competencies for creating and maintaining athlete-centered athletic programs.

Application Requirements

An applicant must satisfy the minimum admission requirements of the Graduate College (see Graduate Admission Regulations).

Admission Requirements

The student must apply for admission to and be accepted by the Athletic Leadership Admissions Committee. Enrollment is competitive with a new cohort beginning the program each summer. The following admission materials must be submitted to the program director by February 1.

1. Letter of application describing the applicant’s background and professional goals and aspirations.
2. A current resume.
3. Three letters of reference regarding the applicant’s professional competencies, potential for leadership, personal and professional integrity, and any other information that will help the selection committee make an informed decision.
4. Official scores from the verbal, quantitative, and analytical reports of the Graduate Record Examination (GRE) have been received. The GRE must have been taken within five years of application. Applicants posting verbal and quantitative scores of 33% and above will receive favorable attention.
Appendix C: Letters of Support

Sandpoint High School
410 S. Division St. • Sandpoint, Idaho 83864
kris.knowles@lpsd.org
208.263.3034, ext. 4017

Kris Knowles, M.Ed., M.A. - Assistant Principal

Unleash Your Potential

Idaho State Board of Education
650 West State Street, Room #307
Boise, ID 83702

November 12, 2013

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing this letter in support of the proposed Master of Athletic Leadership program at Boise State University. It has been my experience, through 15 years of athletic and educational service at the high school and collegiate level within the State of Idaho, that there is a great need for a masters program to enhance professional development and prepare future leaders in the fields of coaching and athletics. I believe that currently, leadership training in athletics at the interscholastic and intercollegiate level is underdeveloped. Very few opportunities to attain leadership competencies in these areas exist in our state. Athletics is a growing industry, and developing a masters program to foster leadership skills through research of current, historical and legal issues in athletics, providing expert instruction by current professionals working in the industry, and developing mentor relationships with coaches and athletic personnel at Boise State, as well as throughout Idaho is greatly needed.

I can speak from experience about the value of an Athletic Leadership program, such as the one proposed at BSU. In 2011, I graduated with a Master of Arts in Coaching and Athletic Administration from Concordia University Irvine. I researched long and hard for a program which would provide an experience useful in my coaching career at the time and my desire to move into a leadership role as an athletic director. I was surprised with the lack of qualified programs, not only in our region, but throughout The West. I chose CU because it met my needs with a practical and usable curriculum and provided the leadership training I desired. My experience at Concordia helps me nearly every day in my current role as Assistant Principal and Activities Director at Sandpoint High School. I rely heavily on the information researched as well as connections made with mentors through the program. I also chose CU due to the lack of a suitable program locally. I wish such a program would have been in place at BSU when I was researching, as I would have more than likely enrolled.

It is my opinion that many future athletic leaders would benefit from this program. I speak to coaches and athletic leaders throughout our region on a regular basis, and one common thread continues to arise during our conversations: We have a lack of a true leadership development in the field of athletics, and it is hurting our profession. The time is right for such a program to develop at BSU, and I strongly encourage you to consider approving the proposed Master of Athletic Leadership program. Many teachers, coaches, student-athletes and athletic personnel would benefit greatly.

Thank you for your consideration, and please feel free to contact me with any further questions or assistance.

Sincerely,

Kris Knowles
Sandpoint High School
Assistant Principal for Student Activities and Athletics
kris.knowles@lpsd.org
208-263-3032 ext. 4017
Cell: 208-641-9073

~we will empower and encourage all students to achieve their full potential~
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To whom it may concern,

I am writing this letter with great excitement and support of the proposed Master of Athletic Leadership program at Boise State University. I have had the privilege of coaching for 34 years and in that time have watched the role of a coach evolve into an entirely different arena than it was when I started at Cascade, Id. in 1980 fresh out of college. I have seen many coaches succeed and unfortunately many fail in that time frame.

Whenever I interview an aspiring young coach, I always ask them why they believe that they will be a good basketball coach. More often than not, their response is "because I've played a lot of basketball and know a lot about the game." Obviously, one needs to know a lot about the sport they wish to coach, however, way too many upcoming coaches are ill prepared because they don't grasp the reality of being a "leader." Their focus is generally on ability, and talent, and drills, and concepts and measurable evaluations while the little things are overlooked. For example, one of the greatest lessons I learned to be a more effective coach was through my wife. Early in my career and after a tough loss, I was complaining to my wife about one of the players and apparently I crossed the line in my criticism because she snapped me off with "You are talking about someone's son!!" Honestly, from that point on I was a better coach. I communicate better with students, players, assistant coaches, and especially with parents and quite simply, it put my role as a coach and leader into a perspective that I have never lost sight of.

There truly is so much more to being an effective coach aside from knowing the game and certainly so many little things involved in being a strong leader that others want to follow. We learn a great deal about the sports that we participate in and hopefully we learn a certain amount of leadership skills if we are fortunate enough to have strong role models as coaches and teachers. However, I maintain that we can do more to better prepare upcoming coaches and teachers for the reality of the life they are choosing and hope you will consider endorsing the Master of Athletic Leadership program at Boise State University.

Sincerely,

Cary Cada
Counselor/Head Boys Basketball Coach
Borah High School

Bonita Hammer
Principal

Rich Clements
Assistant Principal

Kelly Fossecco
Assistant Principal
### Appendix D – Needs Assessment Results

#### Initial Report

Last Modified: 11/04/2013

1. Please indicate your current employment setting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Public K-12 school</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Private K-12 school</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Community college</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Four-year college or university</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sports club</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Professional sports</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Health care Community or youth organization (e.g., YMCA)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Recreation industry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Other (please indicate in general terms)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2. Please indicate the primary functions of your current position (or most recent position if unemployed). Please select all that apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Athletic Trainer</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Teacher or educator</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Medical provider</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Other (please indicate in general terms)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. What degrees do you hold (regardless of discipline)? Please select all that apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Master’s degree</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Doctoral degree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I do not hold any of the degrees listed above</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. People who pursue graduate education do so for a variety of reasons. What would most likely motivate you to seek additional education at the graduate level? Please choose your top three reasons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Help me better understand my chosen field</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Help me be an agent of change in my chosen field</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improve my performance in my current position</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. How likely would a master’s degree program in athletic leadership help you meet your professional goals? We realize that program details are important, but we ask that you answer from an overall perspective. You will have a chance to express your program preferences in subsequent questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Very Likely</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Somewhat Likely</th>
<th>Somewhat Unlikely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Very Unlikely</th>
<th>Total Responses</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>102</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. The broad discipline of athletic leadership can encompass different emphases. Please choose one emphasis that best identifies with your interests.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Athletic administration</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Coaching leadership</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. What structural features of a master’s degree program in athletic leadership would be most important to you? Please rank the following features from 1 to 6, with 1 indicating your highest priority and 6 indicating your lowest priority.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Face-to-face courses only</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Online courses only</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mix of face-to-face and online courses (hybrid model)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Credit for internships (including with my current employer)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Reasonably flexible course order (not dominated by prerequisites)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Time to degree (number of years for students following the recommended schedule)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>232</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. What additional features of a master’s program in athletic leadership would be most important to you? Please select a feature from the following options given below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Essential feature</th>
<th>Important feature</th>
<th>Worthwhile feature</th>
<th>Unimportant feature</th>
<th>Total Responses</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strong academic and professional background of the faculty</th>
<th>Guidance by one or more practicing mentors in Boise State athletics</th>
<th>Development of close relationships with the faculty and fellow students</th>
<th>Notable guest speakers from the world of athletics</th>
<th>Generation of contacts with prospective employers</th>
<th>Affordability of the program Program cost covered by employer’s reimbursement policy</th>
<th>Course content and activities reflect both theory and practice Cohort model (the same students start and finish together)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. If part of the program was delivered in a summer face-to-face block of graduate instruction on the Boise State campus (M-F, morning and afternoon attendance), what is the maximum number of weeks that you could participate in this format? Assume that the university can provide reasonably priced housing if necessary.

10. How many online courses at the graduate level do you think that you could successfully complete during an academic year? Each course is a 3 credit course. (An academic year consists of the fall and spring semesters together.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>One course</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Two courses</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Three courses</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Four courses</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>More than four courses</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. The cost per credit of a professional master’s programs depends on type of institution, discipline, program design, number of students, method of course delivery, required facilities, and many other factors. Please choose the maximum cost per credit that you would consider feasible given your personal circumstances. (We anticipate a master’s program requiring a total of about 30 credits. It is important to keep in mind that the university does not guarantee its ability to deliver the program at all of these costs per credit.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$350 per credit</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$375 per credit</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. Assuming that a master’s program in athletic leadership is available that meets your needs, how likely are you to seek admission to that program sometime in the next three years?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Very Likely</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Somewhat Likely</th>
<th>Somewhat Unlikely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Very Unlikely</th>
<th>Total Responses</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Please provide any additional comments in the box below.

Text Response

This sounds like an outstanding program. I look forward to learning more about it!
-What will differentiate this from other similar Master programs? -Who will "need" this type of Master degree?

This really sounds like an amazing opportunity. Since I live over 250 miles away this would need to be offered online for me to participate. If this was the case I would absolutely take advantage of this program!!

I think that there is a very high need for this program in order to coaches to pursue high collegiate levels of coaching. I value the pursuit of this degree and would enroll immediately. A hybrid design would be very advantageous for students currently coaching or working.
This would be valuable to me if I was interested in coaching or becoming an AD, but my interest lies in becoming a better teacher, so I am actually looking into curriculum and instruction. Thank you, anyway, though. :)
I'm within 5 years of retiring. If this would of been available to me earlier in my career I would participate.
I would highly consider this program for my masters. It would be extremely beneficial for me as an educator and coach
I did not answer the question about cost per credit because I have been away from the University System for the past 6 years. I do understand that a master's program should cost more than other programs because the level of education I am receiving is higher. By the same token, being a current teacher in the treasure valley, it needs to be feasible to attend. I have been seeking a way to get a master's done since I began teaching, though the cost is always the main deterrent. If this program does pan out with the University I would seriously consider it.
Without sport business emphasis options, I wouldn't consider this program.
I am a single mom of 8 kids and a full-time student renting in Moscow, and looking to buy a house. Three semesters before I graduate with a teach certificate as a physical ed major with a minor in biology.
I would hope that if you already have a masters and also your administrative certificate that some classes would be waived or that you would provide a "short track" to complete the degree. There is a need in our area for athletic leaders. It is offered at U of I and most of our locals take the course through U of I.
Would prefer to get my masters thru BSU. But price is an issue. It would need to be competitively priced with the ISU masters program.
I think it would be great to have a master's program in athletic leadership at Boise State. I already have a master's degree in Sports Management so I probably would not be interested in getting another one in athletic leadership. I would, however, be interested in taking some of the individual classes without seeking to earn another degree.
Already have a degree in Athletic Administration.
My biggest thing with being a coach is having the time to take classes. Living in Twin Falls, I believe having internet classes or even classes were we can see the professor and the professor can see us would be my best solution. Also when you are coaching you don't really know how long you will be at that school. Next, keep in mind if you have to pay out of your pocket you only get an extra 1000 dollars a year when you have a masters degree. At 400 dollars a credit it will take me 12 years until my master starts to benefit my pay. I do understand this is to further my education and make me a better coach, but it is something to think about.
I have a Masters in Educational Leadership "Principal", and I am a full time Health and PE teacher. I think it would be nice if there was a way to take a few additional courses to add the Athletic Admin Masters without needing to retake a lot of courses similar to ones I have taken. Possibly 12-15 credits to add the endorsement without needing to take 30 more credits some of which may be very similar or overlap what I already have with an Admin Degree. Without this option, I foresee a lot of teachers with an Admin Masters working towards a PH.D if they are interested in additional schooling instead of getting another 30 credit Admin masters just to encompass the athletic side when we can already be an Athletic Director without the Athletic Admin degree.
I have seen credits offered at a reasonably lower price. Maybe lower the credit price a little more.
Already have a Masters degree in Athletic Administration. I would look into a degree in Recreational Sport Management or some type of Director of Operations for a specific sport.
I have an earned master's degree from Idaho State in athletic administration. Otherwise I would be highly interested in this program.

I think that this is a really great idea. If it is available in the next year or two, I will probably apply for it.

For those of us in North Idaho the program has to us access from our current location BSU needs to keep in mind the potential participants outside of the Boise area. I know for a fact that many coaches and AD's would love to take these types of courses. I've already received information from other universities about such a course, but I would much rather take it from BSU.

I am currently in a master's program that centers around Athletic Administration. I find being in the program a very worthwhile and rewarding part of being an Athletic Director. It teaches a lot of things that you may not know, and (by being an AD and in the program at the same time) helps me understand and adapt more to the changing athletic world.

I am highly unlikely to enroll in this program given my admission to a different Masters program through a different University. That being said, I am curious about one of the aspects. The previous page asked about the importance of a practicing mentor. Is this in the context of a more advanced along the track student, someone in the sports marketing department, or what? There are several different interpretations of that in my mind, and some clarification would help with that.

I do not see myself needing an additional degree in athletics. If I do go back for my Doctorate it would be in general admin.

I am too far along in my educational career to go after a Master's in Athletic Leadership. It wouldn't help me to pursue it at this time.

Would really like to see this happen

I'm a secondary art and computer teacher and I entered my input to help in designing this program. I think it can be a great program and especially, any effort to develop leadership qualities will benefit us all.

If I were younger and not already a skilled professional I would seriously consider this option. This would be a great program, I really hope there is a way that Boise State can get this up and running. I think even adding an undergraduate program that is similar to this would be amazing also!

I am very excited about the program. If I can be of any other help you can email me at sjnaugle@yahoo.com. Thanks

I already have my Master's degree in Athletic Administration. I received it from BSU/ISU in May 2001.

This is something I have been looking to do. I am considering doing it through Concordia online but I would do BSU if the cost were lower than Concordia.

After already getting a Master's Degree the most important factor by far would be minimizing costs.

I have coached on both the college and high school level for over 25 years. I also coached 20 years of wrestling. I would like to help in athletic's from a leadership position.

I am currently seeking a Master's Degree in an alternative program at an alternative institution. (Master's in Instruction and Curriculum - Emphasis in TESOL and Bilingual Education at the College of Idaho.)

I have 2 master's degrees and zero interest in athletic leadership.

SJM TEST SURVEY - DO NOT INCLUDE IN DATA ANALYSIS~~

March 16, 2012

Page 31
I already hold a master's in Athletic Administration. I really enjoyed this area of study and would recommend it to others. I would be considering further education and answered this survey with that in mind.

Most people looking to go into this program would be coaching a sport. Having a block of classes in the summer would need to be able to work with the sport they are coaching. For instance basketball has several June tournaments, and Football has several in June and they start in August so structuring a block of classes that fits into those schedules would be important. For me and many of my fellow coaches, many of us came into teaching in a field other than Physical Education but would like to earn certification in this area so that we could teach physical education and weight lifting to our athletes. Having a masters program that would end with certification in P.E. would be something that I and many of my fellow coaches would be interested in. Having it gain knowledge towards an athletic administration would be a plus as well. I could see several people taking a course that met the needs of both of these areas.

This sounds like the exact program I am looking for. I like the location a lot considering I used to live there, and still live near by.

I think it is very important to have the class delivered online to accomodate those already in the field of education. I have looked at several other universities that do this. I also feel it is important to have work it so all educators, not just PE teachers be able to earn the requirements for this masters program.

I work at Lewis-Clark State College and I am already looking at a graduate program in Educational Leadership. However, athletic centered leadership would better fit my field. It is also key that I could use my benefit of continued education discount. Thanks

I think it is a great idea for those that need a masters in an athletic based career. A masters for me would not directly move me up the pay scale but if it could prove that I would gt some new ideas that could make my performance better or more efficient in the long run I might find it beneficial.

Sports management as an option track also? Coaching leadership, athletic administration (education side), add in sports management (business side). I'd be interested in athletic administration or sports management. I'd rather stay at Boise State then have to move over to ISU - Meridian for athletic administration graduate programs.

I coach basketball and June is busy with basketball camps, tourneyments, and practices. This might be something to be aware of for summer scheduling. Morning classes would work best during the summer. Coaching during the school year and having a family is very difficult. Flexibility with the class work load is essential. During the school year, it would be best to have night and online courses. When do expect to offer this program? I am looking to enroll into something for this fall.

I am close to retirement so my answers reflect that it is too late in my life to do a program like this.

I already have my masters in Sports Administration and Leadership, but I answered the questions if I had not already had it.

I am very interested in this program... also I really do not have any idea what a master's program usually costs per class.

Though I have a Master's Degree related to my career choice in Intercollegiate Athletics, if I were in a position of needing to start the process again I would have much preferred a degree of the type listed in this questionnaire--Athletic Leadership/Administration.
I am extremely interested in Boise State offering a Masters program. I have been putting off starting the program at Idaho State in the hopes that Boise State would offer one. With my current position within the Athletic Department, I would be looking for something that is very flexible, and gives credit/allows for credit to be given for the current work I am doing. Thank you.

I believe that a master's program in Athletic Leadership will help fill the void that was left when the Athletic Administration master's program from Idaho State was removed a couple years ago. This will also help us to appeal to a broader field of applicants not only for graduate assistant positions, but also for continuing education within our current employees.

Practical application and credit for prior learning
I feel this is a very necessary addition to our degree programs at Boise State.

SOUNDS LIKE AN EXCELLENT PROGRAM THAT I WOULD BE VERY INTERESTED IN BEING A PART OF IF IT WAS WITHIN MY REACH.

I am already currently a student in the MK program here at BSU. Had something like this been offered when I began my masters degree it would have been my first choice to enroll in, and not the program I am currently in. Unfortunately, I am already halfway done with my masters degree, so while this seems like an excellent idea and something I would have had great interest in, it seems as though it is too late for me to viably attain to.

Something like this would have been really valuable earlier in my career; today, I am 62 and retired from teaching but still coaching.

This is something I have been looking for in my pursuit of a Masters.
I believe this Master's program would be very beneficial to many coaches and/or educators. For me individually it would allow me to enhance my abilities in both teaching and coaching.

As an athletic trainer, we are required/strongly recommended to have a master's degree to be working at a collegiate setting and I am not sure if having another master's degree would help advance my career or even increase my salary since we get paid similar or less than other departments that do not require/strongly recommend having a master's degree. Therefore, paying tuition and spending time away from work setting does not seem to benefit my situation, but may be a great opportunity for undergraduates who are seeking a master's degree and wanting to work in an athletic setting.

This program is essential. Especially if instructors such as Dr. Johnson are involved. This program is relevant to the career path I am choosing and would be of great benefit.
I would have been "Very Likely" to have pursued a master's degree in athletic administration from Boise State had I not already earned a similar degree from another institution.

I think this is a great idea! I pursued a masters in Sport Psychology (and loved it), but would have definitely considered Athletic Leadership, had that been an available option!
I would be VERY interested and likely if I did not already have my masters degree in athletic administration. I am excited to see this might be in store for Boise State University students. make it happen asap!!!!!!!!!!! please and good luck
This graduate program sounds very specific to what a bunch of students in the K-12 field would need to gain more knowledge in. I am very intrigued by this opportunity.
January 21, 2014

Christopher Mathias  
Chief Academic Officer  
Idaho State Board of Education  
650 West State Street, Suite 307  
PO Box 83720  
Boise, ID 83720-0037

Dear Dr. Mathias:

Idaho State University appreciated the opportunity to review Boise State University’s Master of Athletic Leadership Proposal for Graduate and Doctoral Degree Program.

Idaho State University (ISU) has four major concerns regarding Boise State University’s (BSU) Master of Athletic Leadership program proposal and are therefore not supportive of this program. Those concerns include: 1) existence of a 20 year partnership between ISU and BSU in delivering a cooperative master’s degree program in Athletic Administration and a desire from ISU to continue the partnership; 2) clear duplication of program already in existence at ISU; 3) inaccuracies in the program proposal; and 4) financial sustainability of the proposed self-support model.

With regard to our first concern, ISU and BSU had a cooperative master’s degree program in Athletic Administration for 20 years in the Treasure Valley. It began in 1990 and was dissolved in 2010 due to the structure of the cooperative agreement not meeting federal financial aid and credit reporting requirements. When ISU faculty and staff met with BSU faculty and staff, Administrators at BSU recommended that the partnership be restructured in the form of a dual degree program. At that time, ISU proposed a dual degree program that would be similar in function and would meet the structure that was suggested. ISU faculty made over a dozen attempts to work with BSU to reestablish a shared delivery model for our Athletic Administration program.

With regard to our second concern of duplication. The proposed program by BSU is a duplication of ISU’s master’s degree in Athletic Administration, which is offered both on the Pocatello campus and the Meridian campus. Not only is this program a duplication but it will be recruiting from the same student population base. Our program generally maintains an enrollment of approximately 40 students per semester; which is demonstrative of a successful graduate level program. With regard to curriculum duplication, below is a comparison of the curriculum of the master’s degree in Athletic Administration from ISU and the proposed master’s degree in Athletic Leadership from BSU. It is apparent from this comparison that there is curricular redundancy. With the exception of one course (Athletic Organizational Communication) six of the seven courses being proposed are reflected in the ISU MPE-AA curriculum.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISU MPE-AA Curriculum</th>
<th>BSU Masters of Athletic Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE 6605, Leadership in Administration</td>
<td>Foundations of Athletic Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE 6615, Philosophy of Athletics,</td>
<td>Philosophy of Sport &amp; Athletic Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE 6631, Athletics and the Law,</td>
<td>NO COURSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE 6635, Management of Athletics</td>
<td>Athletic Program Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE 6640, Research and Writing</td>
<td>NO COURSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE 6649, Issues in Administration</td>
<td>Sociology of Sport and Athletic Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE 6655, Internship in PE</td>
<td>Athletic Leadership Practicum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students)</td>
<td>Athletic Organizational Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE 5599, Adv. Sport Marketing</td>
<td>NO COURSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO COURSE</td>
<td>Athletic Organizational Communication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding our third concern of inaccuracies in the proposal, ISU would like to provide clarification. The BSU proposal states that, “While some of BSU’s coursework pertains to athletic administration, the focus is strongly on leadership training from the coaching perspective. In contrast, the program at ISU maintains a predominate focus on athletic administration, not on coaching.” But then the proposal also indicates that “…coaches must also understand the day-to-day operations and leadership responsibilities of athletic administrators and vice versa. The main thrust of the proposed program is the development of leadership competencies for implementation in the context of sport.” These two programs are near identical, and both address administration and leadership training. Many of ISU’s graduates go on to pursue careers in coaching. In fact, our program is currently serving many faculty and staff within BSU’s coaching program.

Further, the proposal states that, “BSU’s proposed program is focused on practical experience. In contrast, the ISU program does not have a requirement for any sort of practical experience.” It further indicates that students in the proposed BSU program may work under qualified mentors such as a head or assistant coach at Boise State University or an athletic administrator at Boise State University. Students in ISU’s program are required to take three credits of Internship, and can take an additional three units of Internship as an elective. These internships are under the supervision and guidance of a high school head coach, a college head coach, a high school athletic administrator, a college athletic administrator, or a youth sports professional. In fact, many of our students on the Meridian campus complete their internships within the athletic department at BSU. Further, many of the current staff members who are employed within the athletic department at BSU are graduates of the Athletic Administration program at ISU-Meridian.

Regarding our final concern of the self-support model as proposed by BSU, there are four components: 1) faculty time devoted to sustain a master’s level program; 2) how a program can be self-support when the fees being charged are only $16 more than their current graduate per credit fee; 3) clarification of the “other revenue” in the budget on page 13; and 4) does not meet all components of Board Policy V.R. for self-support programs.

Our first concern relates to page 15 of the proposal and the fact the program is only allocating .534 faculty and administrative time to the program (.20 for Tyler Johnson, Program Director/Associate Professor, .267 for a Tenure Track Faculty member, and .067 for a Clinical Faculty) to which they will be responsible for delivery of one, five to six credit course per semester (Summer, Fall, Spring). There seems to be limited faculty and administrative time allocated to make this a successful, and rigorous master’s level program. Additionally, the program as proposed by BSU will only offer one course that is
five to six credits per semester for students, in contrast the program at ISU provides greater access as we offer three, three credit courses in the fall and spring, and two, three credit courses in the summer.

Our second concern relates to the self-support fees being proposed. BSU’s current graduate per credit hour fee is $324, and the propose self-support model is only $340 per credit: a $16 difference. We question how a master’s level program (even one that does not have significant equipment requirements) can be successful at this rate and still ensure rigor and quality in a program like this. Our third concern just requests additional clarification regarding the “other (local account)” fees under Revenue on page 16. We would request further clarification of those resources to ensure they meet the requirements of a self-support program.

Our fourth concern addresses Board Policy V.R.3.b.v.a) 3) specifically. We have concerns regarding the student enrollment population being proposed for this program. On page 9 BSU indicates that, “Some students enrolled in graduate programs in the Department of Kinesiology may decide to transfer...” and “[a] number of Graduate Assistants (approximately 10-12) will likely enroll...” This seems to be in direct conflict with the aforementioned Board policy that states “The Self-support program shall be distinct from the traditional offerings of the institution by serving a population that does not access the same activities, services and features as full-time, tuition paying students, such as programs designed specifically for working professionals, programs offered off-campus, or programs delivered completely online.” The proposed Master of Athletic Leadership is a very traditional program offered on many campuses across the country, including ISU on the Pocatello and Meridian campus.

Sincerely,

Laura Woodworth-Ney
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

cc: Lyle Castle, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs
Selena Grace, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs
Margaret Johnson, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs
Connie Tillotson, Management Assistant
January 27, 2014

Dr. Chris Mathias
Chief Academic Officer
Idaho State Board of Education
Boise, ID

Dear Chris:

We appreciate that Idaho State University (ISU) has carefully reviewed Boise State University’s (BSU) proposal to create a new program leading to a Master of Athletic Leadership degree. The purpose of this letter is to address the four concerns raised by ISU regarding that proposal.

The first concern is that ISU approached BSU repeatedly regarding the creation of a dual degree program of some sort. Until recently, however, it has not been possible for BSU to participate in a dual degree program because BSU could not have the necessary overlapping expertise. Looking forward, it is necessary that BSU maintain complete control over its degree program in any sort of agreement that might be created with ISU because BSU’s program will enroll a number of graduate assistants and student athletes. Thus, to remain in compliance with NCAA rules regarding institutional control, BSU must have sole control of any academic program in which its graduate assistants and student athletes are enrolled.

The second concern is regarding duplication. ISU presents a chart depicting the two curricula and at first blush it appears that there is, indeed, significant overlap of the curricula. However, despite the fact that the same word exists in two of the course titles, the respective courses differ significantly. The appended table illustrates where overlap in the specific courses offered by BSU and ISU does and does not exist. That table, which is based on the non-thesis option of ISU, can be summarized as follows:

- The ISU and BSU programs require 33 and 32 credits total, respectively.
- Courses totaling 6 credits are labeled as duplicates because of substantial overlap.
- Courses totaling another six credits have partial overlap: these courses address the same broad field (e.g., “Philosophy”) but have significantly different foci: administration for ISU and coaching for BSU.
- Courses totaling 0 to 6 credits have the potential for overlap, depending on student choice of electives. Thus, ISU requires 3 credits of internship for students without a year of professional experience and students may take another 3 credits of internship as electives. We note that neither “professional experience” nor “internship” will necessarily equate with BSU’s Athletic Leadership Academy.
- Courses totaling 15 to 21 credits are required by ISU but have no equivalent in BSU’s curriculum.
- Courses totaling 14 to 20 credits are required by BSU but have no equivalent in ISU’s curriculum.

Thus, BSU’s curriculum differs substantially from that of ISU’s.

The third concern is that there are inaccuracies in the proposal regarding the claim that the foci of the two programs are different. We hope that this concern has been alleviated above, but emphasize that while the BSU program includes some coursework on administration, administration is not the focus of the program. And while both programs are designed to train leaders, ISU’s program is focused on the development of leadership in athletic administrators while BSU’s program is focused on the development of leadership for coaches.
Regarding the issue of “substantial practical experience,” BSUs’ program requires 10 credits of “Athletic Leadership Practicum, in which the students will be mentored by leaders of athletic teams or programs who have demonstrated a consistent, long-standing commitment to an athlete-centered philosophy and who have earned a level of respect and admiration from peers in the field. ISU’s practical experience consist of (i) a minimum one-year of professional experience or an internship of 3 credits and (ii) the possibility that a student may take an additional 3 internship credits as elective. This requirement is stated in the ISU catalog as follows: “All students must document professional experience in an athletic setting by prior administrative experience (minimum one year) or by completing an approved internship while completing the MPE/AA program.” We reassert that the level of practical experience required by the BSU program is significantly greater, with the inclusion of 10 credits of structured mentoring versus the ISU requirement of “professional experience” or a 3-credit internship.

The fourth concern has to do with the self-support nature of the proposed program. The arguments are broken down as follows:

i. **Insufficient faculty time is devoted to the program.** Regarding the question of offering a program with only 0.533 FTE devoted to teaching for an entire year, this is only for the first year of the program when only half of the curriculum will be offered. However, we did find an error in this figure, which should be 0.667 FTE, and that has been corrected in the budget model. When the program is up and running, a total of 1.33 faculty FTE will be devoted to the program. The FTE is calculated by equating one 3 credit class per year with 0.125 faculty FTE, an equation that is derived from our workload policy and includes service obligations associated with the program. The teaching of 16 credits associated with this FTE (16cr/(12cr/FTE) = 1.33 FTE) is possible through the design of a tightly prescribed program without electives.

ii. **The revenue generated by a $340 per credit hour fee will be insufficient to support the program.** It is important to realize that the entire $340 per credit would go to the self-support program, and none to student fees. The $340 per credit compares with $166 per credit charged to university student in an academic program supported by state funds.

iii. **The involvement of a “local account” in the budget is unclear.** Funds to initiate the program would be provided by a college-level local account and would be repaid to the local fund by the end of the third year of the program, as required by board policy. This is a common practice for starting new self-support programs in the past, which have been approved by the State Board.

iv. **Isolation of the self-support program from other programs on campus.** The proposed program will be in full compliance with board policy. Students in the program form a distinct group, separate from other students on campus, taking courses only in the program. There will be no co-mingling of funding sources or students in state-supported programs.

Sincerely,

*Marty Schimpf*
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Cc: Laura Woodworth-Ney, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs at Idaho State Univ.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISU: Master of Physical Education/Athletic Administration</th>
<th>Degree of overlap</th>
<th>BSU: Master of Athletic Leadership</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE 6606 Leadership in Administration (3 cr)</td>
<td>Partial overlap: one program focuses on administration, the other on coaching</td>
<td>KIN-AL 501 Foundations of Athletic Leadership (3 cr)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE 6635 Management Aspects of Athletics (3 cr)</td>
<td>No overlap</td>
<td>KIN-AL 502 Athletic Organizational Communication (3 cr)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE 6615 Philosophy and Principles of Athletics in Administration (3 cr)</td>
<td>Partial overlap: one program focuses on administration, the other on coaching</td>
<td>KIN-AL 504 Philosophy of Sport &amp; Athletic Leadership (3 cr)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE 6610 Advanced Sport Psychology (3 cr)</td>
<td>Substantial overlap</td>
<td>KIN-AL 505 Sociology of Sport &amp; Athletic Leadership (3 cr)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional experience or approved internship (0 to 3 cr)</td>
<td>Potential for overlap. Experience may substitute for ISU internship, which may or may not have structured mentorship. Also: 3 cr vs. 5 cr</td>
<td>KIN-AL 508 Athletic Leadership Practicum I (5 cr)</td>
<td>0 to 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional overlap if student chooses additional internship (up to 3 cr) as elective.</td>
<td>Potential for overlap. Elective, not required. Also, ISU internship may or may not have structured mentorship. Also: 3 cr vs. 5 cr</td>
<td>KIN-AL 509 Athletic Leadership Practicum II (5 cr)</td>
<td>0 to 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE 6631 Athletics &amp; the Law (3 cr)</td>
<td>No overlap</td>
<td>KIN-AL 592 Portfolio (2 cr)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE 6640 Research &amp; Writing (3 cr)</td>
<td>No overlap</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE 6649 Issues in PED and Athletic Administration (3 cr)</td>
<td>No overlap</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE 6645 Sports Medicine (3 cr)</td>
<td>No overlap</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved electives (3 to 9 cr)</td>
<td>No overlap</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 to 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals:**

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ISU cr</td>
<td>BSU cr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0 to 6</td>
<td>15 to 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 to 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT

THIS MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT, effective the first day of June, 2014, by and between IDAHO STATE UNIVERSITY (ISU), and BOISE STATE UNIVERSITY (BSU).

WHEREAS, the Idaho State Board of Education, ('the Board') has directed the institutions under its governance to avoid unnecessary duplication of programs; and

WHEREAS, no institution in Idaho has been assigned the statewide responsibility for offering graduate programs in education in general and in athletic administration and leadership in particular; and

WHEREAS, BSU has the service region responsibility for offering programs in its ten-county service region in southwestern Idaho; and

WHEREAS, ISU presently offers a Master of Physical Education/Athletic Administration program at its Pocatello and Meridian campuses, a program that has focus primarily in administration of athletic programs; and

WHEREAS, BSU proposes to offer a new Master of Athletic Leadership program that will focus primarily on the development of coaches of athletic programs; and

WHEREAS, potential students in the Treasure Valley would be best served by being able to choose the program that best meets their interests and needs; and

WHEREAS, ISU delivers its program at the Meridian campus largely through video conferencing, and BSU would deliver its program face-to-face; and

WHEREAS, potential students in the Treasure Valley would be best served by being able to choose the program that is delivered in a format that their needs; and

WHEREAS, Graduate Assistant-Coaches fall under NCAA rules and regulations that pertain to institutional control, and to avoid any possibility of transgression of NCAA rules and regulations, (i) Graduate Assistant-Coaches must enroll in the program located at the institution at which they are employed and (ii) the program at which they are employed must offer the entire array of courses required for the program; and

WHEREAS, ISU and BSU desire to support a common vision and understanding of graduate education in athletic administration and athletic leadership through the development of set of courses that are common between the two programs;

NOW THEREFORE, subject to any required approvals, including by the Idaho State Board of Education Council of Academic Standards and the Council of Academic Affairs and Programs and the Board, ISU and BSU hereby agree to act in accordance with the following:
1. The administration and faculties of ISU and BSU will agree upon a set of four courses that are required of both programs, that may be taught by either of the programs, and that may be enrolled in by students in either program, with the exception of Graduate Assistant-Coaches, who must enroll in courses at the institution at which they are employed. The mutual offering of a set of courses will enhance availability of graduate education in athletic leadership and athletic administration to students in the Treasure Valley, and will eliminate unnecessary duplication of coursework offerings.

2. BSU and ISU agree to provide, as possible, access to one another’s graduate courses in athletic administration and athletic leadership beyond the core set of courses so as to provide students with a greater array of possible course choices.

3. The institutions will develop agreement upon administrative issues such as tuition, registration, transcripting, transfer credit, and other issues related to students enrolled in the program of one institution being able to easily enroll in courses of the other institution.

4. Individuals who are not Graduate Assistant-Coaches at either institution will be given a choice as to which program to enroll in. Those students who are primarily interested in athletic administration will be advised by both institutions, but not required, to enroll in the ISU program because of its greater focus on administration. Individuals who are primarily interested in the development of coaches will be advised by both institutions, but not required, to enroll in the BSU program because of its greater focus on coaching.

5. Individuals who are Graduate Assistant-Coaches at either institution will be required to enroll in the program at the institution at which they are employed.

6. ISU will support the proposal of BSU to develop its new Master of Athletic Leadership program.

7. BSU and ISU and their respective administrators, staff and faculty will work jointly in good faith to address issues that may arise in the implementation of this agreement.

8. Either institution may act to terminate this agreement, but must give the other institution at least six months’ notice before doing so.

IDAHO STATE UNIVERSITY
Laura Woodworth-Ney, PhD
Provost
3/20/14

BOISE STATE UNIVERSITY
Martin Schimpf, PhD
Provost
3/18/14
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TAB</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>AMENDMENT TO BOARD POLICY</td>
<td>Motion to approve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Section II.H. – Coaching Personnel – Second Reading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO</td>
<td>Motion to approve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-Year Employment Agreement - Head Women’s Soccer Coach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUBJECT
Board Policy II.H. – Coaches and Athletic Directors – second reading

REFERENCE
October 2013    Motion to approve first reading failed on a tie vote with two Board members absent

December 2013    Athletics Committee discussed coach annual leave issue and directed staff to bring revised policy changes to Board for first reading at February 2014 meeting

February 2014    Board approved first reading

APPLICABLE STATUTES, RULE OR POLICY
Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies & Procedures, Section II.F. and II.H.
Idaho Code §59-1606

BACKGROUND / DISCUSSION
At the February 2014 Board meeting, the Board approved the first reading of changes to Board policy II.H. which allows institutions two options to account for leave for coaches: 1) Annual leave may be earned and accrued consistent with that of other non-classified employees; or 2) coaches do not accrue leave, but may take leave with prior written approval from the athletic director.

IMPACT
The proposed policy change would authorize the institutions to use a new leave code similar to elected officials whereby coaches would not accrue vacation or sick leave. Athletic Directors would be required to approve a coach’s leave.

ATTACHMENTS
Attachment 1 – Section II.H. – second reading

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
This policy change would be effective prospectively for new hires and contract renewals. All existing contracts and accrued leave held by coaches at the institutions on the effective date of this policy revision would be grandfathered for purposes of accruing annual leave until the coaches’ contract renewal.

If this policy is approved, staff recommends the Board revise the model contract to reflect this leave policy.

One change was made between first and second reading at the request of the State Controller’s Office. Under II.H.6.b.ii, the controlling Idaho Code citation was included, and a second sentence was added to provide that “any accrued annual leave balance at the time of the coach’s contract renewal shall be forfeited or paid off, and the new contract shall document the forfeiture or
compensation of that leave.” The purpose of this new sentence is to make clear what happens to any accrued leave balance if a coach were to switch to the new leave model.

State Controller’s Office staff has already successfully tested the new leave code in its simulation environment. No programming costs will be necessary.

Staff recommends approval.

BOARD ACTION
I move to approve the second reading of proposed amendments to Board policy section II.H. Coaches and Athletic Directors, with all revisions as presented and to direct staff to bring forward amendments to the model contract for consideration.

Moved by__________ Seconded by__________ Carried Yes____ No____
1. Agreements Longer Than One Year

The chief executive officer of an institution is authorized to enter into a contract for the services of a head coach or athletic director with that institution for a term of more than one (1) year, but not more than three (3) years, subject to approval by the Board as to the terms, conditions, and compensation there under, and subject further to the condition that the contract of employment carries terms and conditions of future obligations of the coach or athletic director to the institution for the performance of such contracts. All such contracts must contain a liquidated damages clause provision in favor of the institution, applicable in the event that the coach or athletic director terminates the contract for convenience, in an amount which is a reasonable approximation of damages which might be sustained if the contract is terminated. A contract in excess of three (3) years, or a rolling three (3) year contract, may be considered by the Board upon the documented showing of extraordinary circumstances. All contracts must be submitted for Board approval prior to the contract effective date. Each contract for the services shall follow the general form approved by the Board as a model contract. Such contract shall define the entire employment relationship between the Board and the coach or athletic director and may incorporate by reference applicable Board and institutional policies and rules, and applicable law. The April 2013 Board revised and approved multiyear model contract is adopted by reference into this policy. The model contract may be found on the Board’s website at http://boardofed.idaho.gov/.

2. Agreements For One Year Or Less

The chief executive officer of an institution is authorized to enter into a contract for the services of a head coach or athletic director with that institution for a term of one (1) year or less and an annual salary of $150,000 or less without Board approval. Each contract shall follow the general form approved by the Board as a model contract. Such contract shall define the entire employment relationship between the Board and the coach or athletic director and may incorporate by reference applicable Board and institutional policies and rules, and applicable law. The December 9, 2010 Board revised and approved single-year model contract is adopted by reference into this policy. The single-year model contract may be found on the Board’s website at http://boardofed.idaho.gov/.

3. Academic Incentives

Each contract for a head coach shall include incentives, separate from any other incentives, based upon the academic performance of the student athletes whom the coach supervises. The chief executive officer of the institution shall determine such incentives.
4. Part-time Coaches Excepted

The chief executive officer of an institution is authorized to hire part-time head coaches as provided in the policies of the institution. Applicable Board policies shall be followed.

5. Assistant Coaches

The chief executive officer of the institution is authorized to hire assistant coaches as provided in the policies of the institution. Applicable Board policies shall be followed.

6. Annual Leave

a. All existing contracts and accrued leave held by coaches at the institutions on the effective date of this policy shall be grandfathered under policy II.F. for purposes of accruing annual leave until the coach’s contract renewal.

b. Following the effective date of this policy, the institutions shall have the authority to negotiate annual leave for all coach contract renewals and new hires using one of the two options below:

   i. Annual leave may be earned and accrued consistent with non-classified employees as set forth in policy II.F.; or

   ii. Pursuant to section 59-1606(3), Idaho Code, coaches do not accrue leave, but may take leave with prior written approval from the athletic director. Under this option, any accrued annual leave balance at the time of the coach’s contract renewal shall be forfeited or paid off, and the new contract shall document the forfeiture or compensation of that leave.
SUBJECT
University of Idaho new hire - three-year contract for Women’s Soccer Team Head Coach.

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY
Idaho State Board of Education Governing Polices & Procedures Section II.H.1.

DISCUSSION
The University of Idaho requests Regents’ approval for the employment contract for the new Women’s Soccer Team Head Coach for a term of three years, through January 31, 2017.

The University submits the attached multi-year contract (Attachment 1) to the Regents for approval. The primary terms of the agreement are set forth below. A redlined version showing changes from the Board model contract is contained in Attachment 2.

IMPACT
The annual base salary is $40,019.20 with the coach eligible to receive University-wide changes in employee compensation approved by the Athletic Director and the President. In addition, there is an annual media payment in the amount of $15,000.

Academic incentive pay may be earned for academic achievement and behavior of team based on annual APR national score as follows:
Exceeding 950 = $750
Exceeding 970 = $1,000

The most recent national ranking data for the Women’s Soccer Team is as follows:
- National Single Year AVG (2011-12): 983
  - University of Idaho: 988
  - Percentile within sport: 30th-40th
- National Multi-year AVG (2011-12): 981
  - University of Idaho: 976
- The University scores for 2012-13¹ are:
  - Single year APR: 989
  - Multi-Year APR: 982

¹ National information for 2012-13 is not yet available.
Athletic incentive pay may be earned as follows:

1. Conference champions or co-champion or team becomes eligible for the NCAA tournament = $1,000
2. Conference Coach of the Year or Conference Co-Coach of the year = $1,000
3. Team finishes in the top 20 in the NCAA championship = $1,000
4. Team qualifies for play in the Big Sky Conference tournament = $2,000
5. Team Winning Record = $500
6. 12 or more team wins in regular season = $500

Maximum potential annual compensation (base salary, media payment and estimated maximum potential incentive) is $62,019.20.

Coach may also participate in youth soccer camps as follows:
- Remaining income from any University operated camp, less $500, after all claims, insurance, and expenses of camp have been paid, OR
- In the event the University elects not to operate a camp, coach may do so within Board guidelines for such camps.

ATTACHMENTS
Attachment 1 – Employment Contract – clean Page 5
Attachment 2 – Employment Contract – redline Page 21

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
Board policy II.H.1. provides that “[a]ll contracts must be submitted for Board approval prior to the contract effective date.” The proposed effective date of this contract is February 1, 2014.

The maximum academic incentive amount is equivalent to the incentive for a conference championship. The Athletic Committee has informally determined that is an appropriate level for the academic incentive in coach contracts.

In the event the coach terminates the agreement for convenience, he will be liable to pay the following sums: (1) if the Agreement is terminated on or before January 31, 2015, the sum of $15,000; (2) if the Agreement is terminated between February 1, 2015 and January 31, 2016 inclusive, the sum of $10,000.

The proposed contract conforms to the Board-approved model contract. Staff recommends approval.
BOARD ACTION

I move to approve the University of Idaho’s multi-year employment contract for the Women’s Soccer Team Head Coach, Derek Pittman, for a term commencing retroactively on February 1, 2014 and expiring on January 31, 2017, with an annual base salary of $40,019.20, and such supplemental compensation provisions in substantial conformance with the terms of the agreement set forth in Attachment 1.

Moved by __________  Seconded by ___________  Carried  Yes _____ No ___
THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK
This Employment Agreement (Agreement) is entered into by and between the University of Idaho (University), and Derek Pittman (Coach).

ARTICLE 1

1.1. Employment. Subject to the terms and conditions of this Agreement, the University shall employ Coach as the head coach of its intercollegiate women’s soccer team (Team). Coach represents and warrants that Coach is fully qualified to serve, and is available for employment, in this capacity.

1.2. Reporting Relationship. Coach shall report and be responsible directly to the University’s Director of Athletics (Director) or the Director’s designee. Coach shall abide by the reasonable instructions of Director or the Director’s designee and shall confer with the Director or the Director’s designee on all administrative and technical matters. Coach shall also be under the general supervision of the University’s President (President).

1.3. Duties. Coach shall manage and supervise the Team and shall perform such other duties in the University’s athletic program as the Director may assign and as may be described elsewhere in this Agreement. The University shall have the right, at any time, to reassign Coach to duties at the University other than as head coach of the Team, provided that Coach’s compensation and benefits shall not be affected by any such reassignment, except that the opportunity to earn supplemental compensation as provided in sections 3.2.1 through 3.2.7 shall cease.

ARTICLE 2

2.1. Term. This Agreement is for a fixed-term appointment of three (3) years commencing on February 1, 2014, and terminating, without further notice to Coach, on January 31, 2017, unless sooner terminated in accordance with other provisions of this Agreement.

2.2. Extension or Renewal. This Agreement is renewable solely upon an offer from the University and an acceptance by Coach, both of which must be in writing and signed by the parties. Any renewal is subject to the prior approval of University's Board of Regents. This Agreement in no way grants to Coach a claim to tenure in employment, nor shall Coach’s service pursuant to this agreement count in any way toward tenure at the University.
ARTICLE 3

3.1 Regular Compensation.

3.1.1 In consideration of Coach’s services and satisfactory performance of this Agreement, the University shall provide to Coach:

a) An annual salary of $40,019.20 per year, payable in biweekly installments in accordance with normal University procedures. Coach will be eligible to receive University-wide changes in employee compensation approved by the Director and President;

b) The opportunity to receive such employee benefits as the University provides generally to non-faculty exempt employees; and

c) The opportunity to receive such employee benefits as the University’s Department of Athletics (Department) provides generally to its employees of a comparable level. Coach hereby agrees to abide by the terms and conditions, as now existing or hereafter amended, of such employee benefits.

3.2 Supplemental Compensation

3.2.1. Each year the Team is the conference champion or co-champion and if Coach continues to be employed as University's head coach of its intercollegiate women’s soccer team as of the ensuing July 1st, the University shall pay to Coach supplemental compensation of $1,000 during the fiscal year immediately following the year in which the championship is achieved. The University shall determine the appropriate manner in which it shall pay Coach any such supplemental compensation.

3.2.2. Each year Coach is named Conference Coach of the Year or Conference Co-Coach of the year, and if Coach continues to be employed as University's head women’s soccer coach as of the ensuing July 1st, Coach shall receive supplemental compensation of $1,000. The University shall determine the appropriate manner in which it shall pay Coach any such supplemental compensation.

3.2.3. Each year the Team finishes in the top 20 in the NCAA championships and if Coach continues to be employed as University's head coach of its intercollegiate women’s soccer team as of the ensuing July 1st, the University shall pay to Coach supplemental compensation of $1,000. The University shall determine the appropriate manner in which it shall pay Coach any such supplemental compensation.

3.2.4. Each year the Team qualifies for play in the Big Sky Conference (BIG SKY) tournament, and if Coach continues to be employed as University's head
coach of its intercollegiate women’s soccer team as of the ensuing July 1st, the University shall pay to Coach supplemental compensation of $2,000. The University shall determine the appropriate manner in which it shall pay Coach any such supplemental compensation.

3.2.5. Each year the Team achieves a winning record at the end of the regular season (excluding any exhibition and BIG SKY tournament games), and if Coach continues to be employed as University's head coach of its intercollegiate women’s soccer team as of the ensuing July 1st, the University shall pay to Coach supplemental compensation of $500. The University shall determine the appropriate manner in which it shall pay Coach any such supplemental compensation.

3.2.6. Each year the Team achieves twelve (12) wins in regular season games (excluding exhibition games), and if Coach continues to be employed as University's head coach of its intercollegiate women’s soccer team as of the ensuing July 1st, the University shall pay to Coach supplemental compensation of $500. The University shall determine the appropriate manner in which it shall pay Coach any such supplemental compensation.

3.2.7. Each year Coach shall be eligible to receive supplemental compensation based on the academic achievement and behavior of Team members. If the Team’s annual APR exceeds 950 and if Coach continues to be employed as University's head women’s soccer coach as of the ensuing July 1st, Coach shall receive supplemental compensation of $750. This amount shall increase to $1,000 in any year the Team’s annual APR exceeds 970 and if Coach continues to be employed as University's head women’s soccer coach as of the ensuing July 1st. Any such supplemental compensation paid to Coach shall be accompanied with a justification for the supplemental compensation based on the factors listed above, and such justification shall be separately reported to the Board of Regents as a document available to the public under the Idaho Public Records Act.

3.2.8. The Coach shall receive the sum of $15,000 from the University or the University's designated media outlet(s) or a combination thereof each year during the term of this Agreement in compensation for participation in media programs and public appearances (Programs). Each year, one-half of this sum shall be paid prior to the first contest, and one-half shall be paid no later than two weeks after the last contest. Coach’s right to receive the second half of such payment shall vest on the date of the Team’s last regular season or post-season competition, whichever occurs later, provided Coach has fully participated in media programs and public appearances through that date. Coach’s right to receive any such media payment under this Paragraph is expressly contingent upon the following: (1) academic achievement and behavior of Team members; (2) appropriate behavior by, and supervision of, all assistant coaches, as determined by the Director; and (3) Coach’s compliance with University’s financial stewardship policies as set forth in University’s Administrative Procedures Manual Chapter 25. Agreements requiring the Coach to participate in Programs related to his duties as an employee of University are the property of the University. The University shall have the exclusive
right to negotiate and contract with all producers of media productions and all parties desiring public appearances by the Coach. Coach agrees to cooperate with the University in order for the Programs to be successful and agrees to provide his services to and perform on the Programs and to cooperate in their production, broadcasting, and telecasting. It is understood that neither Coach nor any assistant coaches shall appear without the prior written approval of the Director on any competing radio or television program (including but not limited to a coach’s show, call-in show, or interview show) or a regularly scheduled news segment, except that this prohibition shall not apply to routine news media interviews for which no compensation is received. Without the prior written approval of the Director, Coach shall not appear in any commercial endorsements that are broadcast on radio or television that conflict with those broadcast on the University’s designated media outlets.

3.2.9 Coach agrees that the University has the exclusive right to operate youth soccer camps on its campus using University facilities. The University shall allow Coach the opportunity to earn supplemental compensation by assisting with the University’s camps in Coach's capacity as a University employee. Coach hereby agrees to assist in the marketing, supervision, and general administration of the University’s youth soccer camps. Coach also agrees that Coach will perform all obligations mutually agreed upon by the parties. In exchange for Coach’s participation in the University’s youth soccer camps, the University shall pay Coach the remaining income from the youth soccer camps, less $500, after all claims, insurance, and expenses of such camps have been paid.

Alternatively, in the event the University notifies Coach, in writing that it does not intend to operate youth soccer camps for a particular period of time during the term of this Agreement, then, during such time period, Coach shall be permitted to operate youth soccer camps on the University’s campus and using its facilities under the following terms and conditions:

a) The summer youth camp operation reflects positively on the University of Idaho and the Department;

b) The summer youth camp is operated by Coach directly or through a private enterprise owned and managed by Coach. The Coach shall not use University of Idaho personnel, equipment, or facilities without the prior written approval of the Director;

c) Assistant coaches at the University of Idaho are given priority when the Coach or the private enterprise selects coaches to participate;

d) The Coach complies with all NCAA, Conference, and University of Idaho rules and regulations related, directly or indirectly, to the operation of summer youth camps;
e) The Coach or the private enterprise enters into a contract with University of Idaho and Sodexho for all campus goods and services required by the camp.

f) The Coach or private enterprise pays for use of University of Idaho facilities; such rate to be set at the rate charged as if the camp were conducted by the University of Idaho.

g) Within thirty days of the last day of the summer youth camp(s), Coach shall submit to the Director a preliminary "Camp Summary Sheet" containing financial and other information related to the operation of the camp. Within ninety days of the last day of the summer youth camp(s), Coach shall submit to Director a final accounting and "Camp Summary Sheet." A copy of the "Camp Summary Sheet" is attached to this Agreement as an exhibit.

h) The Coach or the private enterprise shall provide proof of liability insurance as follows: (1) liability coverage: spectator and staff--$1 million; (2) catastrophic coverage: camper and staff--$1 million maximum coverage with $100 deductible.

i) To the extent permitted by law, the Coach or the private enterprise shall defend and indemnify the University of Idaho against any claims, damages, or liabilities arising out of the operation of the summer youth camp(s).

j) All employees of the summer youth camp(s) shall be employees of the Coach or the private enterprise and not the University of Idaho while engaged in camp activities. The Coach and all other University of Idaho employees involved in the operation of the camp(s) shall be on annual leave status or leave without pay during the days the camp is in operation. The Coach or private enterprise shall provide workers’ compensation insurance in accordance with Idaho law and comply in all respects with all federal and state wage and hour laws.

In the event of termination of this Agreement, suspension, or reassignment, University of Idaho shall not be under any obligation to permit a summer youth camp to be held by the Coach after the effective date of such termination, suspension, or reassignment, and the University of Idaho shall be released from all obligations relating thereto.
3.2.10 Coach agrees that the University has the exclusive right to select footwear, apparel and/or equipment for the use of its student-athletes and staff, including Coach, during official practices and games and during times when Coach or the Team is being filmed by motion picture or video camera or posing for photographs in their capacity as representatives of University. Coach recognizes that the University is negotiating or has entered into an agreement with Nike to supply the University with athletic footwear, apparel and/or equipment. Coach agrees that, upon the University’s reasonable request, Coach will consult with appropriate parties concerning Nike products’ design or performance, shall act as an instructor at a clinic sponsored in whole or in part by Nike, or give a lecture at an event sponsored in whole or in part by Nike, or make other educationally-related appearances as may be reasonably requested by the University. Notwithstanding the foregoing sentence, Coach shall retain the right to decline such appearances as Coach reasonably determines to conflict with or hinder his duties and obligations as head women’s soccer coach. In order to avoid entering into an agreement with a competitor of Nike, Coach shall submit all outside consulting agreements to the University for review and approval prior to execution. Coach shall also report such outside income to the University in accordance with NCAA rules. Coach further agrees that Coach will not endorse any athletic footwear, apparel and/or equipment products, including Nike, and will not participate in any messages or promotional appearances which contain a comparative or qualitative description of athletic footwear, apparel or equipment products.

3.3 General Conditions of Compensation. All compensation provided by the University to Coach is subject to deductions and withholdings as required by law or the terms and conditions of any fringe benefit in which Coach participates. However, if any fringe benefit is based in whole or in part upon the compensation provided by the University to Coach, such fringe benefit shall be based only on the compensation provided pursuant to section 3.1.1, except to the extent required by the terms and conditions of a specific fringe benefit program.

ARTICLE 4

4.1. Coach’s Specific Duties and Responsibilities. In consideration of the compensation specified in this Agreement, Coach, in addition to the obligations set forth elsewhere in this Agreement, shall:

4.1.1. Devote Coach’s full time and best efforts to the performance of Coach’s duties under this Agreement;

4.1.2. Develop and implement programs and procedures with respect to the evaluation, recruitment, training, and coaching of Team members which enable them to compete successfully and reasonably protect their health, safety, and well-being;

4.1.3. Observe and uphold all academic standards, requirements, and policies of the University and encourage Team members to perform to their highest academic potential and to graduate in a timely manner; and
4.1.4. Know, recognize, and comply with all applicable laws and the policies, rules and regulations of the University, the University's governing board, the conference, and the NCAA; supervise and take appropriate steps to ensure that Coach’s assistant coaches, any other employees for whom Coach is administratively responsible, and the members of the Team know, recognize, and comply with all such laws, policies, rules and regulations; and immediately report to the Director and to the Department's Director of Compliance if Coach has reasonable cause to believe that any person or entity, including without limitation representatives of the University’s athletic interests, has violated or is likely to violate any such laws, policies, rules or regulations. Coach shall cooperate fully with the University and Department at all times. The names or titles of employees whom Coach supervises are attached as Exhibit C. The applicable laws, policies, rules, and regulations include: (a) State Board of Education and Board of Regents of the University of Idaho Governing Policies and Procedures and Rule Manual; (b) University's Handbook; (c) University's Administrative Procedures Manual; (d) the policies of the Department; (e) NCAA rules and regulations; and (f) the rules and regulations of the soccer conference of which the University is a member.

Outside Activities. Coach shall not undertake any business, professional or personal activities, or pursuits that would prevent Coach from devoting Coach’s full time and best efforts to the performance of Coach’s duties under this Agreement, that would otherwise detract from those duties in any manner, or that, in the opinion of the University, would reflect adversely upon the University or its athletic program. Subject to the terms and conditions of this Agreement, Coach may, with the prior written approval of the Director, who may consult with the President, enter into separate arrangements for outside activities and endorsements which are consistent with Coach's obligations under this Agreement. Coach may not use the University’s name, logos, or trademarks in connection with any such arrangements without the prior written approval of the Director and the President.

4.3 NCAA Rules. In accordance with NCAA rules, Coach shall obtain prior written approval from the University’s President for all athletically related income and benefits from sources outside the University and shall provide a written detailed account of the source and amount of all such income and benefits to the University’s President whenever reasonably requested, but in no event less than annually before the close of business on June 30th of each year or the last regular University work day preceding June 30th. The report shall be in a format reasonably satisfactory to University. Sources of such income include, but are not limited to, the following:
(a) Income from annuities;
(b) Sports camps;
(c) Housing benefits, including preferential housing arrangements;
(d) Country club memberships;
(e) Complimentary ticket sales;
(f) Television and radio programs; and
(g) Endorsement or consultation contracts with athletics shoe, apparel or equipment manufacturers.
In no event shall Coach accept or receive directly or indirectly any monies, benefits, or gratuities whatsoever from any person, association, corporation, University booster club, University alumni association, University foundation, or other benefactor, if the acceptance or receipt of the monies, benefits, or gratuities would violate applicable law or the policies, rules, and regulations of the University, the University's governing board, the conference, or the NCAA.

4.4 **Hiring Authority.** Coach shall have the responsibility and the sole authority to recommend to the Director the hiring and termination of assistant coaches for the Team, but the decision to hire or terminate an assistant coach shall be made by the Director and shall, when necessary or appropriate, be subject to the approval of President and the University’s Board of Regents.

4.5 **Scheduling.** Coach shall consult with, and may make recommendations to, the Director or the Director’s designee with respect to the scheduling of Team competitions, but the final decision shall be made by the Director or the Director’s designee.

4.6 **Other Coaching Opportunities.** Coach shall not, under any circumstances, interview for, negotiate for, or accept employment as a coach at any other institution of higher education or with any professional sports team, requiring performance of duties prior to the expiration of this Agreement, without the prior approval of the Director. Such approval shall not be unreasonably withheld.

**ARTICLE 5**

5.1 **Termination of Coach for Cause.** The University may, in its discretion, suspend Coach from some or all of Coach’s duties, temporarily or permanently, and with or without pay; reassign Coach to other duties; or terminate this Agreement at any time for good or adequate cause, as those terms are defined in applicable rules and regulations.

5.1.1 In addition to the definitions contained in applicable rules and regulations, University and Coach hereby specifically agree that the following shall constitute good or adequate cause for suspension, reassignment, or termination of this Agreement:

a) A deliberate or major violation of Coach’s duties under this agreement or the refusal or unwillingness of Coach to perform such duties in good faith and to the best of Coach’s abilities;

b) The failure of Coach to remedy any violation of any of the terms of this agreement within 30 days after written notice from the University;

c) A deliberate or major violation by Coach of any applicable law or the policies, rules or regulations of the University, the University’s governing board, the conference or the NCAA, including but not limited to any such violation which may have occurred during the
employment of Coach at another NCAA or NAIA member institution;

d) Ten (10) working days' absence of Coach from duty without the University’s consent;

e) Any conduct of Coach that constitutes moral turpitude or that would, in the University’s judgment, reflect adversely on the University or its athletic programs;

f) The failure of Coach to represent the University and its athletic programs positively in public and private forums;

g) The failure of Coach to fully and promptly cooperate with the NCAA or the University in any investigation of possible violations of any applicable law or the policies, rules or regulations of the University, the University's governing board, the conference, or the NCAA;

h) The failure of Coach to report a known violation of any applicable law or the policies, rules or regulations of the University, the University's governing board, the conference, or the NCAA, by one of Coach’s assistant coaches, any other employees for whom Coach is administratively responsible, or a member of the Team; or

i) A violation of any applicable law or the policies, rules or regulations of the University, the University's governing board, the conference, or the NCAA, by one of Coach’s assistant coaches, any other employees for whom Coach is administratively responsible, or a member of the Team if Coach knew or should have known of the violation and could have prevented it by ordinary supervision.

5.1.2 Suspension, reassignment, or termination for good or adequate cause shall be effectuated by the University as follows: before the effective date of the suspension, reassignment, or termination, the Director or his or her designee shall provide Coach with notice, which notice shall be accomplished in the manner provided for in this Agreement and shall include the reason(s) for the contemplated action. Coach shall then have an opportunity to respond. After Coach responds or fails to respond, University shall notify Coach whether, and if so when, the action will be effective.

5.1.3 In the event of any termination for good or adequate cause, the University’s obligation to provide compensation and benefits to Coach, whether direct, indirect, supplemental or collateral, shall cease as of the date of such termination, and the University shall not be liable for the loss of any collateral business opportunities or other
benefits, perquisites, or income resulting from outside activities or from any other sources.

5.1.4 If found in violation of NCAA regulations, Coach shall, in addition to the provisions of Section 5.1, be subject to disciplinary or corrective action as set forth in the provisions of the NCAA enforcement procedures, including suspension without pay or termination of employment for significant or repetitive violations. This section applies to violations occurring at the University or at previous institutions at which the Coach was employed.

5.2 Termination of Coach for Convenience of University.

5.2.1 At any time after commencement of this Agreement, University, for its own convenience, may terminate this Agreement by giving ten (10) days prior written notice to Coach.

5.2.2 In the event that University terminates this Agreement for its own convenience, University shall pay to Coach the salary set forth in section 3.1.1(a), excluding all deductions required by law, on the regular paydays of University until the term of this Agreement ends or until Coach obtains reasonably comparable employment, whichever occurs first, provided however, in the event Coach obtains lesser employment after such termination, then the amount of compensation University pays will be adjusted and reduced by the amount of compensation paid Coach as a result of such lesser employment, such adjusted compensation to be calculated for each University pay-period by reducing the gross salary set forth in section 3.1.1(a) (before deductions required by law) by the gross compensation paid to Coach under the lesser employment, then subtracting from this adjusted gross compensation deductions according to law. In addition, Coach will be entitled to continue his health insurance plan and group life insurance as if he remained a University employee until the term of this Agreement ends or until Coach obtains reasonably comparable employment or any other employment providing Coach with a reasonably comparable health plan and group life insurance, whichever occurs first. Coach shall be entitled to no other compensation or fringe benefits, except as otherwise provided herein or required by law. Coach specifically agrees to inform University within ten business days of obtaining other employment and to advise University of all relevant terms of such employment, including without limitation the nature and location of the employment, salary, other compensation, health insurance benefits, life insurance benefits, and other fringe benefits. Failure to so inform and advise University shall constitute a material breach of this Agreement and University’s obligation to pay compensation under this provision shall end. Coach further agrees to repay to University all compensation paid to him by University after the date he obtains other employment, to which he is not entitled under this provision.

5.2.3 University has been represented by legal counsel, and Coach has either been represented by legal counsel or has chosen to proceed without legal counsel, in the contract negotiations. The parties have bargained for and agreed to the foregoing
provision, giving consideration to the fact that the Coach may lose certain benefits, supplemental compensation, or outside compensation relating to his employment with University that are extremely difficult to determine with certainty. The parties further agree that the payment of such compensation by University and the acceptance thereof by Coach shall constitute adequate and reasonable compensation to Coach. Such compensation is not, and shall not be construed to be, a penalty.

5.3 Termination by Coach for Convenience.

5.3.1 The Coach recognizes that his promise to work for University for the entire term of this Agreement is of the essence of this Agreement. The Coach also recognizes that the University is making a highly valuable investment in his employment by entering into this Agreement and that its investment would be lost were he to resign or otherwise terminate his employment with the University before the end of the contract term.

5.3.2 The Coach, for his own convenience, may terminate this Agreement during its term by giving prior written notice to the University. Termination shall be effective ten (10) days after notice is given to the University.

5.3.3 If the Coach terminates this Agreement for convenience at any time, all obligations of the University shall cease as of the effective date of the termination. If the Coach terminates this Agreement for his convenience he shall pay to the University the following sums: (a) if the Agreement is terminated on or before January 31, 2015, the sum of $15,000; (b) if the Agreement is terminated between February 1, 2015 and January 31, 2016 inclusive, the sum of $10,000; (c) if the Agreement is terminated between February 1, 2016 and January 31, 2017 inclusive, there will be no buyout payment. Sums shall be due and payable within twenty (20) days of the effective date of the termination, and any unpaid amount shall bear simple interest at a rate eight (8) percent per annum until paid.

5.3.4 University has been represented by legal counsel, and Coach has either been represented by legal counsel or has chosen to proceed without legal counsel in the contract negotiations. The parties have bargained for and agreed to the foregoing provision, giving consideration to the fact that the University will incur administrative and recruiting costs in obtaining a replacement for Coach, in addition to potentially increased compensation costs if Coach terminates this Agreement for convenience that are extremely difficult to determine with certainty. The parties further agree that the payment of such sums by Coach and the acceptance thereof by University shall constitute adequate and reasonable compensation to University. Such payments are not, and shall not be construed to be, a penalty. This section 5.3.4 shall not apply if Coach terminates this Agreement because of a material breach by the University.

5.3.5. Except as provided elsewhere in this Agreement, if Coach terminates this Agreement for convenience, he shall forfeit to the extent permitted by law his right to receive all supplemental compensation and other payments.
5.4 Termination due to Disability or Death of Coach.

5.4.1 Notwithstanding any other provision of this Agreement, this Agreement shall terminate automatically if Coach becomes totally or permanently disabled as defined by the University's disability insurance carrier, becomes unable to perform the essential functions of the position of head coach, or dies.

5.4.2 If this Agreement is terminated because of Coach's death, Coach’s salary and all other benefits shall terminate as of the last day worked, except that the Coach's personal representative or other designated beneficiary shall be paid all compensation due or unpaid and death benefits, if any, as may be contained in any fringe benefit plan now in force or hereafter adopted by the University and due to the Coach's estate or beneficiaries thereunder.

5.4.3 If this Agreement is terminated because the Coach becomes totally or permanently disabled as defined by the University's disability insurance carrier, or becomes unable to perform the essential functions of the position of head coach, all salary and other benefits shall terminate, except that the Coach shall be entitled to receive any compensation due or unpaid and any disability-related benefits to which he is entitled by virtue of employment with the University.

5.5 Interference by Coach. In the event of termination, suspension, or reassignment, Coach agrees that Coach will not interfere with the University’s student-athletes or otherwise obstruct the University’s ability to transact business or operate its intercollegiate athletics program.

5.6 No Liability. The University shall not be liable to Coach for the loss of any collateral business opportunities or any other benefits, perquisites or income from any sources that may ensue as a result of any termination of this Agreement by either party or due to death or disability or the suspension or reassignment of Coach, regardless of the circumstances.

5.7 Waiver of Rights. Because the Coach is receiving a multi-year contract and the opportunity to receive supplemental compensation and because such contracts and opportunities are not customarily afforded to University employees, if the University suspends or reassigns Coach, or terminates this Agreement for good or adequate cause or for convenience, Coach shall have all the rights provided for in this Agreement but hereby releases the University from compliance with the notice, appeal, and similar employment-related rights provide for in the State Board of Education and Board or Regents of the University of Idaho Rule Manual (IDAPA 08) and Governing Policies and Procedures Manual, and the University Faculty-Staff Handbook.

ARTICLE 6
6.1 **Board Approval.** This Agreement shall not be effective until and unless approved of the University’s Board of Regents and executed by both parties as set forth below. In addition, the payment of any compensation pursuant to this agreement shall be subject to the approval of the University’s Board of Regents, the President, and the Director; the sufficiency of legislative appropriations; the receipt of sufficient funds in the account from which such compensation is paid; and the Board of Regents and University's rules regarding financial exigency.

6.2 **University Property.** All personal property (excluding vehicle(s) provided through the Vandal Wheels program), material, and articles of information, including, without limitation, keys, credit cards, personnel records, recruiting records, team information, films, statistics or any other personal property, material, or data, furnished to Coach by the University or developed by Coach on behalf of the University or at the University’s direction or for the University’s use or otherwise in connection with Coach’s employment hereunder are and shall remain the sole property of the University. Within twenty-four (24) hours of the expiration of the term of this agreement or its earlier termination as provided herein, Coach shall immediately cause any such personal property, materials, and articles of information in Coach’s possession or control to be delivered to the Director.

6.3 **Assignment.** Neither party may assign its rights or delegate its obligations under this Agreement without the prior written consent of the other party.

6.4 **Waiver.** No waiver of any default in the performance of this Agreement shall be effective unless in writing and signed by the waiving party. The waiver of a particular breach in the performance of this Agreement shall not constitute a waiver of any other or subsequent breach. The resort to a particular remedy upon a breach shall not constitute a waiver of any other available remedies.

6.5 **Severability.** If any provision of this Agreement is determined to be invalid or unenforceable, the remainder of the Agreement shall not be affected and shall remain in effect.

6.6 **Governing Law.** This Agreement shall be subject to and construed in accordance with the laws of the state of Idaho as an agreement to be performed in Idaho. Any action based in whole or in part on this Agreement shall be brought in the courts of the state of Idaho.

6.7 **Oral Promises.** Oral promises of an increase in annual salary or of any supplemental or other compensation shall not be binding upon the University.

6.8 **Force Majeure.** Any prevention, delay or stoppage due to strikes, lockouts, labor disputes, acts of God, inability to obtain labor or materials or reasonable substitutes therefore, governmental restrictions, governmental regulations, governmental controls, enemy or hostile governmental action, civil commotion, fire or other casualty, and other causes beyond the reasonable control of the party obligated to perform
(including financial inability), shall excuse the performance by such party for a period equal to any such prevention, delay or stoppage.

6.9 **Confidentiality.** The Coach hereby consents and agrees that this document may be released and made available to the public after it is signed by the Coach. The Coach further agrees that all documents and reports he is required to produce under this Agreement may be released and made available to the public at the University's sole discretion.

6.10 **Notices.** Any notice under this Agreement shall be in writing and be delivered in person or by public or private courier service (including U.S. Postal Service Express Mail) or certified mail with return receipt requested or by facsimile. All notices shall be addressed to the parties at the following addresses or at such other addresses as the parties may from time to time direct in writing:

the University: Director of Athletics
University of Idaho
P.O. Box 442302
Moscow, Idaho 83844-2302

with a copy to: President
University of Idaho
P.O. Box 443151
Moscow, ID 83844-3151

the Coach: Derek Pittman
Last known address on file with
University's Human Resource Services

Any notice shall be deemed to have been given on the earlier of: (a) actual delivery or refusal to accept delivery, (b) the date of mailing by certified mail, or (c) the day facsimile delivery is verified. Actual notice, however and from whomever received, shall always be effective.

6.11 **Headings.** The headings contained in this Agreement are for reference purposes only and shall not in any way affect the meaning or interpretation hereof.

6.12 **Binding Effect.** This Agreement is for the benefit only of the parties hereto and shall inure to the benefit of and bind the parties and their respective heirs, legal representatives, successors and assigns.

6.13 **Non-Use of Names and Trademarks.** The Coach shall not, without the University's prior written consent in each case, use any name, trade name, trademark, or
other designation of the University (including contraction, abbreviation or simulation), except in the course and scope of his official University duties.

6.14 **No Third Party Beneficiaries.** There are no intended or unintended third party beneficiaries to this Agreement.

6.15 **Entire Agreement; Amendments.** This Agreement constitutes the entire agreement of the parties and supersedes all prior agreements and understandings with respect to the same subject matter. No amendment or modification of this Agreement shall be effective unless in writing, signed by both parties, and approved by University's Board of Regents.

6.16 **Opportunity to Consult with Attorney.** The Coach acknowledges that he has had the opportunity to consult and review this Agreement with an attorney and has either consulted with legal counsel or chosen not to. Accordingly, in all cases, the language of this Agreement shall be construed simply, according to its fair meaning, and not strictly for or against any party.

**UNIVERSITY**

Chuck Staben  Date  
President

**COACH**

Derek Pittman  Date 

Approved by the Board of Regents on the ___ day of ____________, 2014.
This Employment Agreement (Agreement) is entered into by and between __________________________ (the University (College) of Idaho (University), and __________________________ Derek Pittman (Coach).

ARTICLE 1

1.1. **Employment.** Subject to the terms and conditions of this Agreement, the University (College) shall employ Coach as the head coach of its intercollegiate (Sport) women’s soccer team (Team). Coach represents and warrants that Coach is fully qualified to serve, and is available for employment, in this capacity.

1.2. **Reporting Relationship.** Coach shall report and be responsible directly to the University (College)’s Director of Athletics (Director) or the Director’s designee. Coach shall abide by the reasonable instructions of Director or the Director's designee and shall confer with the Director or the Director’s designee on all administrative and technical matters. Coach shall also be under the general supervision of the University’s (College)’s President (President).

1.3. **Duties.** Coach shall manage and supervise the Team and shall perform such other duties in the University (College)’s athletic program as the Director may assign and as may be described elsewhere in this Agreement. The University (College) shall have the right, at any time, to reassign Coach to duties at the University (College) other than as head coach of the Team, provided that Coach’s compensation and benefits shall not be affected by any such reassignment, except that the opportunity to earn supplemental compensation as provided in sections 3.2.1 through (Depending on supplemental pay provisions used) 3.2.7 shall cease.

ARTICLE 2

2.1. **Term.** This Agreement is for a fixed-term appointment of three (3) years, commencing on February 1, 2014, and terminating, without further notice to Coach, on January 31, 2017, unless sooner terminated in accordance with other provisions of this Agreement.

2.2. **Extension or Renewal.** This Agreement is renewable solely upon an offer from the University (College) and an acceptance by Coach, both of which must be in writing and signed by the parties. Any renewal is subject to the prior approval of University (College)’s Board of Regents or Trustees). This Agreement in no way grants to Coach a claim to tenure in employment, nor shall Coach’s service pursuant to this agreement count in any way toward tenure at the University (College).
ARTICLE 3

3.1 Regular Compensation

3.1.1 In consideration of Coach’s services and satisfactory performance of this Agreement, the University (College) shall provide to Coach:

a) An annual salary of $40,019.20 per year, payable in biweekly installments in accordance with normal University (College) procedures, and such salary increases as may be determined appropriate procedures. Coach will be eligible to receive University-wide changes in employee compensation approved by the Director and President and approved by the University (College)’s Board of (Regents or Trustees);

b) The opportunity to receive such employee benefits as the University (College) provides generally to non-faculty exempt employees; and

c) The opportunity to receive such employee benefits as the University (College)’s Department of Athletics (Department) provides generally to its employees of a comparable level. Coach hereby agrees to abide by the terms and conditions, as now existing or hereafter amended, of such employee benefits.

3.2 Supplemental Compensation

3.2.1. Each year the Team is the conference champion or co-champion and also becomes eligible for a (bowl game pursuant to NCAA Division I guidelines or post-season tournament or post-season playoffs), if Coach continues to be employed as University's head coach of its intercollegiate women’s soccer team as of the ensuing July 1st, the University shall pay to Coach supplemental compensation of $1,000 during the fiscal year immediately following the year in which the championship is achieved. The University shall determine the appropriate manner in which it shall pay Coach any such supplemental compensation.

3.2.2. Each year Coach is named Conference Coach of the Year or Conference Co-Coach of the year, and if Coach continues to be employed as University’s (College)’s head (Sport)’s women’s soccer coach as of the ensuing July 1st, the University (College) Coach shall pay to Coach supplemental compensation in an amount equal to (amount or computation) of Coach’s Annual Salary during the fiscal year in which the championship and (bowl or other)
post-season) eligibility are achieved, of $1,000. The University (College) shall determine the appropriate manner in which it shall pay Coach any such supplemental compensation.

3.2.2 Each year the Team is ranked in the top 25 in the (national rankings, such as final ESPN/USA Today coaches poll of Division IA football teams)—finishes in the top 20 in the NCAA championships and if Coach continues to be employed as University (College)'s head (Sport) coach of its intercollegiate women’s soccer team as of the ensuing July 1st, the University (College) shall pay to Coach supplemental compensation in an amount equal to (amount or computation) of Coach's Annual Salary in effect on the date of the final poll. of $1,000. The University (College) shall determine the appropriate manner in which it shall pay Coach any such supplemental compensation.

3.2.3 Each year the Team qualifies for play in the Big Sky Conference (BIG SKY) tournament, and if Coach continues to be employed as University's head coach of its intercollegiate women’s soccer team as of the ensuing July 1st, the University shall pay to Coach supplemental compensation of $2,000. The University shall determine the appropriate manner in which it shall pay Coach any such supplemental compensation.

3.2.4 Each year the Team achieves a winning record at the end of the regular season (excluding any exhibition and BIG SKY tournament games), and if Coach continues to be employed as University's head coach of its intercollegiate women’s soccer team as of the ensuing July 1st, the University shall pay to Coach supplemental compensation of $500. The University shall determine the appropriate manner in which it shall pay Coach any such supplemental compensation.

3.2.5 Each year the Team achieves twelve (12) wins in regular season games (excluding exhibition games), and if Coach continues to be employed as University's head coach of its intercollegiate women’s soccer team as of the ensuing July 1st, the University shall pay to Coach supplemental compensation of $500. The University shall determine the appropriate manner in which it shall pay Coach any such supplemental compensation.

3.2.6 Each year Coach shall be eligible to receive supplemental compensation in an amount up to (amount or computation) based on the academic achievement and behavior of Team members. The determination of whether Coach will receive such supplemental compensation.

3.2.7 Each year Coach shall be eligible to receive supplemental compensation in an amount up to (amount or computation) based on the academic achievement and behavior of Team members. The determination of whether Coach will receive such supplemental compensation.

Team's annual APR exceeds 950 and if Coach continues to be employed as University's head women’s soccer coach as of the ensuing July 1st, Coach shall receive such supplemental compensation.
compensation and the timing of the payment(s) shall be at the discretion of the President in consultation with the Director. The determination shall be based on the following factors: grade point averages; difficulty of major course of study; honors such as scholarships; designation as Academic All-American, and conference academic recognition; progress toward graduation for all athletes, but particularly those who entered the University (College) as academically at-risk students; the conduct of Team members on the University (College) campus, at authorized University (College) activities, in the community, and elsewhere of $750. This amount shall increase to $1,000 in any year the Team’s annual APR exceeds 970 and if Coach continues to be employed as University's head women’s soccer coach as of the ensuing July 1st. Any such supplemental compensation paid to Coach shall be accompanied with a detailed justification for the supplemental compensation based on the factors listed above, and such justification shall be separately reported to the Board of (Regents or Trustees) as a document available to the public under the Idaho Public Records Act.

3.2.4 Each year Coach shall be eligible to receive supplemental compensation in an amount up to ___(amount or computation)____ based on the overall development of the intercollegiate (men's/women's) _(Sport)_ program; ticket sales; fundraising; outreach by Coach to various constituency groups, including University (College) students, staff, faculty, alumni and boosters; and any other factors the President wishes to consider. The determination of whether Coach will receive such supplemental compensation and the timing of the payment(s) shall be at the discretion of the President in consultation with the Director.

3.2.8 The Coach shall receive the sum of ___(amount or computation)____-15,000 from the University (College) or the University (College)'s designated media outlet(s) or a combination thereof each year during the term of this Agreement in compensation for participation in media programs and public appearances (Programs). Coach’s right to receive the second half of such a payment shall vest on the date of the Team’s last regular season or post-season competition, whichever occurs later. This sum shall be paid (terms or conditions of payment) _____. provided Coach has fully participated in media programs and public appearances through that date. Coach’s right to receive any such media payment under this Paragraph is expressly contingent upon the following: (1) academic achievement and behavior of Team members; (2) appropriate behavior by, and supervision of, all assistant coaches, as determined by the Director; and (3) Coach’s compliance with University’s financial stewardship policies as set forth in
University’s Administrative Procedures Manual Chapter 25. Agreements requiring the Coach to participate in Programs related to his duties as an employee of University (College) are the property of the University (College). The University (College) shall have the exclusive right to negotiate and contract with all producers of media productions and all parties desiring public appearances by the Coach. Coach agrees to cooperate with the University (College) in order for the Programs to be successful and agrees to provide his services to and perform on the Programs and to cooperate in their production, broadcasting, and telecasting. It is understood that neither Coach nor any assistant coaches shall appear without the prior written approval of the Director on any competing radio or television program (including but not limited to a coach’s show, call-in show, or interview show) or a regularly scheduled news segment, except that this prohibition shall not apply to routine news media interviews for which no compensation is received. Without the prior written approval of the Director, Coach shall not appear in any commercial endorsements which are broadcast on radio or television that conflict with those broadcast on the University (College)’s designated media outlets.

3.2.6 (SUMMER CAMP—OPERATED BY UNIVERSITY (COLLEGE) ) 3.2.9 Coach agrees that the University (College) has the exclusive right to operate youth (Sport)—soccer camps on its campus using University (College) facilities. The University (College) shall allow Coach the opportunity to earn supplemental compensation by assisting with the University (College)’s camps in Coach’s capacity as a University (College) employee. Coach hereby agrees to assist in the marketing, supervision, and general administration of the University (College)’s football’s youth soccer camps. Coach also agrees that Coach will perform all obligations mutually agreed upon by the parties. In exchange for Coach’s participation in the University (College)’s summer football’s youth soccer camps, the University (College) shall pay Coach (amount) per year as supplemental compensation during each year of his employment as head (Sport) coach at the University (College). This amount shall be paid (terms of payment) the remaining income from the youth soccer camps, less $500, after all claims, insurance, and expenses of such camps have been paid.

(SUMMER CAMP—OPERATED BY COACH) Alternatively, in the event the University notifies Coach, in writing that it does not intend to operate youth soccer camps for a particular period of time during the term of this Agreement, then, during such time period, Coach shall be permitted to operate a summer youth (Sport) camp at soccer camps on the University (College)’s campus and using its facilities under the following terms and conditions:

a) The summer youth camp operation reflects positively on the University (College) of Idaho and the Department;

b) The summer youth camp is operated by Coach directly or through a private enterprise owned and managed by Coach. The Coach shall not use University (College) of Idaho
personnel, equipment, or facilities without the prior written approval of the Director;

c) Assistant coaches at the University (College) of Idaho are given priority when the Coach or the private enterprise selects coaches to participate;

d) The Coach complies with all NCAA (NAIA), Conference, and University (College) of Idaho rules and regulations related, directly or indirectly, to the operation of summer youth camps;

e) The Coach or the private enterprise enters into a contract with University (College) and __________ (campus-concessionaire) of Idaho and Sodexho for all campus goods and services required by the camp.

f) The Coach or private enterprise pays for use of University (College) facilities including the __________ of Idaho facilities; such rate to be set at the rate charged as if the camp were conducted by the University of Idaho.

g) Within thirty days of the last day of the summer youth camp(s), Coach shall submit to the Director a preliminary "Camp Summary Sheet" containing financial and other information related to the operation of the camp. Within ninety days of the last day of the summer youth camp(s), Coach shall submit to Director a final accounting and "Camp Summary Sheet." A copy of the "Camp Summary Sheet" is attached to this Agreement as an exhibit.

h) The Coach or the private enterprise shall provide proof of liability insurance as follows: (1) liability coverage: spectator and staff--$1 million; (2) catastrophic coverage: camper and staff--$1 million maximum coverage with $100 deductible;

i) To the extent permitted by law, the Coach or the private enterprise shall defend and indemnify the University (College) of Idaho against any claims, damages, or liabilities arising out of the operation of the summer youth camp(s).

j) All employees of the summer youth camp(s) shall be employees of the Coach or the private enterprise and not the University (College) of Idaho while engaged in camp.
activities. The Coach and all other University (College) of Idaho employees involved in the operation of the camp(s) shall be on annual leave status or leave without pay during the days the camp is in operation. The Coach or private enterprise shall provide workers' compensation insurance in accordance with Idaho law and comply in all respects with all federal and state wage and hour laws.

In the event of termination of this Agreement, suspension, or reassignment, University (College) shall not be under any obligation to permit a summer youth camp to be held by the Coach after the effective date of such termination, suspension, or reassignment, and the University (College) shall be released from all obligations relating thereto.

3.2.7 3.2.10 Coach agrees that the University (College) has the exclusive right to select footwear, apparel and/or equipment for the use of its student-athletes and staff, including Coach, during official practices and games and during times when Coach or the Team is being filmed by motion picture or video camera or posing for photographs in their capacity as representatives of University (College). Coach recognizes that the University (College) is negotiating or has entered into an agreement with (Company Name) Nike to supply the University (College) with athletic footwear, apparel and/or equipment. Coach agrees that, upon the University (College)'s reasonable request, Coach will consult with appropriate parties concerning an (Company Name) products Nike products' design or performance, shall act as an instructor at a clinic sponsored in whole or in part by (Company Name) Nike, or give a lecture at an event sponsored in whole or in part by (Company Name) Nike, or make other educationally-related appearances as may be reasonably requested by the University (College). Notwithstanding the foregoing sentence, Coach shall retain the right to decline such appearances as Coach reasonably determines to conflict with or hinder his duties and obligations as head (Sport) women’s soccer coach. In order to avoid entering into an agreement with a competitor of (Company Name) Nike, Coach shall submit all outside consulting agreements to the University (College) for review and approval prior to execution. Coach shall also report such outside income to the University (College) in accordance with NCAA (or NAIA) rules. Coach further agrees that Coach will not endorse any athletic footwear, apparel and/or equipment products, including (Company Name) Nike, and will not participate in any messages or promotional appearances which contain a comparative or qualitative description of athletic footwear, apparel or equipment products.

3.3 General Conditions of Compensation. All compensation provided by the University (College) to Coach is subject to deductions and withholdings as required by law or the terms and conditions of any fringe benefit in which Coach participates. However, if any fringe benefit is based in whole or in part upon the compensation provided by the University (College) to Coach, such fringe benefit shall be based only on the compensation provided pursuant to section 3.1.1, except to the extent required by the terms and conditions of a specific fringe benefit program.
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ARTICLE 4

4.1. **Coach’s Specific Duties and Responsibilities.** In consideration of the compensation specified in this Agreement, Coach, in addition to the obligations set forth elsewhere in this Agreement, shall:

4.1.1. Devote Coach’s full time and best efforts to the performance of Coach’s duties under this Agreement;

4.1.2. Develop and implement programs and procedures with respect to the evaluation, recruitment, training, and coaching of Team members which enable them to compete successfully and reasonably protect their health, safety, and well-being;

4.1.3. Observe and uphold all academic standards, requirements, and policies of the University *(College)* and encourage Team members to perform to their highest academic potential and to graduate in a timely manner; and

4.1.4. Know, recognize, and comply with all applicable laws and the policies, rules and regulations of the University *(College)*, the University *(College)*’s governing board, the conference, and the NCAA *(or NAIA)*; supervise and take appropriate steps to ensure that Coach’s assistant coaches, any other employees for whom Coach is administratively responsible, and the members of the Team know, recognize, and comply with all such laws, policies, rules and regulations; and immediately report to the Director and to the Department's Director of Compliance if Coach has reasonable cause to believe that any person or entity, including without limitation representatives of the University *(College)*’s athletic interests, has violated or is likely to violate any such laws, policies, rules or regulations. Coach shall cooperate fully with the University *(College)* and Department at all times. The names or titles of employees whom Coach supervises are attached as Exhibit C. The applicable laws, policies, rules, and regulations include: (a) State Board of Education and Board of Regents of the University of Idaho Governing Policies and Procedures and Rule Manual; (b) University *(College)*'s Handbook; (c) University *(College)*'s Administrative Procedures Manual; (d) the policies of the Department; (e) NCAA *(or NAIA)* rules and regulations; and (f) the rules and regulations of the *(Sport)*—soccer conference of which the University *(College)* is a member.

4.2 **Outside Activities.** Coach shall not undertake any business, professional or personal activities, or pursuits that would prevent Coach from devoting Coach’s full time and best efforts to the performance of Coach’s duties under this Agreement, that would otherwise detract from those duties in any manner, or that, in the opinion of the University *(College)*, would reflect adversely upon the University *(College)* or its athletic program. Subject to the terms and conditions of this Agreement, Coach may, with the prior written approval of the Director, who may consult with the President, enter into separate arrangements for outside activities and endorsements which are consistent with Coach's obligations under this Agreement. Coach may not use the University *(College)*’s
name, logos, or trademarks in connection with any such arrangements without the prior written approval of the Director and the President.

4.3 **NCAA (or NAIA) Rules.** In accordance with NCAA (or NAIA) rules, Coach shall obtain prior written approval from the University (College)’s President for all athletically related income and benefits from sources outside the University (College) and shall report provide a written detailed account of the source and amount of all such income and benefits to the University (College)’s President whenever reasonably requested, but in no event less than annually before the close of business on June 30th of each year or the last regular University (College)-work day preceding June 30th. The report shall be in a format reasonably satisfactory to University (College). **Sources of such income include, but are not limited to, the following:**

(a) Income from annuities;
(b) Sports camps;
(c) Housing benefits, including preferential housing arrangements;
(d) Country club memberships;
(e) Complimentary ticket sales;
(f) Television and radio programs; and
(g) Endorsement or consultation contracts with athletics shoe, apparel or equipment manufacturers.

In no event shall Coach accept or receive directly or indirectly any monies, benefits, or gratuities whatsoever from any person, association, corporation, University (College)-booster club, University (College)-alumni association, University (College)-foundation, or other benefactor, if the acceptance or receipt of the monies, benefits, or gratuities would violate applicable law or the policies, rules, and regulations of the University, (College), the University (College)’s governing board, the conference, or the NCAA (or NAIA).

4.4 **Hiring Authority.** Coach shall have the responsibility and the sole authority to recommend to the Director the hiring and termination of assistant coaches for the Team, but the decision to hire or terminate an assistant coach shall be made by the Director and shall, when necessary or appropriate, be subject to the approval of President and the University (College)’s Board of [(Trustees or Regents)]

4.5 **Scheduling.** Coach shall consult with, and may make recommendations to, the Director or the Director’s designee with respect to the scheduling of Team competitions, but the final decision shall be made by the Director or the Director’s designee.

4.6 **Other Coaching Opportunities.** Coach shall not, under any circumstances, interview for, negotiate for, or accept employment as a coach at any other institution of higher education or with any professional sports team, requiring performance of duties prior to the expiration of this Agreement, without the prior approval of the Director. Such approval shall not be unreasonably be withheld.

ARTICLE 5
5.1 **Termination of Coach for Cause.** The University *(College)* may, in its discretion, suspend Coach from some or all of Coach’s duties, temporarily or permanently, and with or without pay; reassign Coach to other duties; or terminate this Agreement at any time for good or adequate cause, as those terms are defined in applicable rules and regulations.

5.1.1 In addition to the definitions contained in applicable rules and regulations, University *(College)* and Coach hereby specifically agree that the following shall constitute good or adequate cause for suspension, reassignment, or termination of this Agreement:

a) A deliberate or major violation of Coach’s duties under this agreement or the refusal or unwillingness of Coach to perform such duties in good faith and to the best of Coach’s abilities;

b) The failure of Coach to remedy any violation of any of the terms of this agreement within 30 days after written notice from the University *(College)*;

c) A deliberate or major violation by Coach of any applicable law or the policies, rules or regulations of the University *(College)*, the University *(College)*’s governing board, the conference or the NCAA *(NAIA)*, including but not limited to any such violation which may have occurred during the employment of Coach at another NCAA or NAIA member institution;

d) Ten (10) working days' absence of Coach from duty without the University *(College)*’s consent;

e) Any conduct of Coach that constitutes moral turpitude or that would, in the University *(College)*’s judgment, reflect adversely on the University *(College)* or its athletic programs;

f) The failure of Coach to represent the University *(College)* and its athletic programs positively in public and private forums;

g) The failure of Coach to fully and promptly cooperate with the NCAA *(NAIA)* or the University *(College)* in any investigation of possible violations of any applicable law or the policies, rules or regulations of the University *(College)*, the University *(College)*’s governing board, the conference, or the NCAA *(NAIA)*;

h) The failure of Coach to report a known violation of any applicable law or the policies, rules or regulations of the University *(College)*, the University *(College)*’s governing board, the conference, or the NCAA *(NAIA)*, by one of Coach’s assistant
coaches, any other employees for whom Coach is administratively responsible, or a member of the Team; or

i) A violation of any applicable law or the policies, rules or regulations of the University (College), the University (College)’s governing board, the conference, or the NCAA (NAIA), by one of Coach’s assistant coaches, any other employees for whom Coach is administratively responsible, or a member of the Team if Coach knew or should have known of the violation and could have prevented it by ordinary supervision.

5.1.2 Suspension, reassignment, or termination for good or adequate cause shall be effectuated by the University (College) as follows: before the effective date of the suspension, reassignment, or termination, the Director or his or her designee shall provide Coach with notice, which notice shall be accomplished in the manner provided for in this Agreement and shall include the reason(s) for the contemplated action. Coach shall then have an opportunity to respond. After Coach responds or fails to respond, University (College) shall notify Coach whether, and if so when, the action will be effective.

5.1.3 In the event of any termination for good or adequate cause, the University (College)’s obligation to provide compensation and benefits to Coach, whether direct, indirect, supplemental or collateral, shall cease as of the date of such termination, and the University (College) shall not be liable for the loss of any collateral business opportunities or other benefits, perquisites, or income resulting from outside activities or from any other sources.

5.1.4 If found in violation of NCAA (NAIA) regulations, Coach shall, in addition to the provisions of Section 5.1, be subject to disciplinary or corrective action as set forth in the provisions of the NCAA (NAIA)-enforcement procedures, including suspension without pay or termination of employment for significant or repetitive violations. This section applies to violations occurring at the University (College) or at previous institutions at which the Coach was employed.
5.2 Termination of Coach for Convenience of University (College).

5.2.1 At any time after commencement of this Agreement, University (College), for its own convenience, may terminate this Agreement by giving ten (10) days prior written notice to Coach.

5.2.2 In the event that University (College) terminates this Agreement for its own convenience, University (College) shall be obligated to pay to Coach, as liquidated damages and not a penalty, the salary set forth in section 3.1.1(a), excluding all deductions required by law, on the regular paydays of University (College) until the term of this Agreement ends, or until Coach obtains reasonably comparable employment, whichever occurs first, provided, however, in the event Coach obtains lesser employment of any kind or nature after such termination, then the amount of compensation the University pays will be adjusted and reduced by the amount of compensation paid Coach as a result of such lesser employment, such adjusted compensation to be calculated for each University pay-period by reducing the gross salary set forth in section 3.1.1(a) (before deductions required by law) by the gross compensation paid to Coach under the lesser employment, then subtracting from this adjusted gross compensation according to law. In addition, Coach will be entitled to continue his health insurance plan and group life insurance as if he remained a University (College) employee until the term of this Agreement ends or until Coach obtains reasonably comparable employment or any other employment providing Coach with a reasonably comparable health plan and group life insurance, whichever occurs first. Coach shall be entitled to no other compensation or fringe benefits, except as otherwise provided herein or required by law. Coach specifically agrees to inform University within ten business days of obtaining other employment, and to advise University of all relevant terms of such employment, including without limitation the nature and location of the employment, salary, other compensation, health insurance benefits, life insurance benefits, and other fringe benefits. Failure to so inform and advise University shall constitute a material breach of this Agreement and University’s obligation to pay compensation under this provision shall end. Coach agrees not to accept employment for compensation at less than the fair value of Coach’s services, as determined by all circumstances existing at the time of employment. Coach further agrees to repay to University all compensation paid to him by University after the date he obtains other employment, to which he is not entitled under this provision.

5.2.3 The parties have both been represented by legal counsel, and Coach has either been represented by legal counsel or has chosen to proceed without legal counsel, in the contract negotiations. The parties have bargained for and agreed to the foregoing liquidated damages provision, giving consideration to the fact that the Coach may lose certain benefits, supplemental compensation, or outside compensation relating to his employment with University (College), which damages are extremely difficult to determine with certainty. The parties further
agree that the payment of such liquidated damages compensation by University (College) and the acceptance thereof by Coach shall constitute adequate and reasonable compensation to Coach for the damages and injury suffered by Coach because of such termination by University (College). The liquidated damages are. Such compensation is not, and shall not be construed to be, a penalty.

5.3 Termination by Coach for Convenience.

5.3.1 The Coach recognizes that his promise to work for University (College) for the entire term of this Agreement is of the essence of this Agreement. The Coach also recognizes that the University (College) is making a highly valuable investment in his employment by entering into this Agreement and that its investment would be lost were he to resign or otherwise terminate his employment with the University (College) before the end of the contract term.

5.3.2 The Coach, for his own convenience, may terminate this Agreement during its term by giving prior written notice to the University (College). Termination shall be effective ten (10) days after notice is given to the University (College).

5.3.3 If the Coach terminates this Agreement for convenience at any time, all obligations of the University (College) shall cease as of the effective date of the termination. If the Coach terminates this Agreement for his convenience he shall pay to the University (College), as liquidated damages and not a penalty, the following sums: _________________. The liquidated damages are the following sums: (a) if the Agreement is terminated on or before January 31, 2015, the sum of $15,000; (b) if the Agreement is terminated between February 1, 2015 and January 31, 2016 inclusive, the sum of $10,000; (c) if the Agreement is terminated between February 1, 2016 and January 31, 2017 inclusive, there will be no buyout payment. Sums shall be due and payable within twenty (20) days of the effective date of the termination, and any unpaid amount shall bear simple interest at a rate eight (8) percent per annum until paid.

5.3.4 The parties have both University has been represented by legal counsel, and Coach has either been represented by legal counsel or has chosen to proceed without legal counsel in the contract negotiations. The parties have bargained for and agreed to the foregoing liquidated damages provision, giving consideration to the fact that the University (College) will incur administrative and recruiting costs in obtaining a replacement for Coach, in addition to potentially increased compensation costs if Coach terminates this Agreement for convenience, which damages that are extremely difficult to determine with certainty. The parties further agree that the payment of such liquidated damages sums by Coach and the acceptance thereof by University (College) shall constitute adequate and reasonable compensation to University (College) for the damages and injury suffered by it because of such termination by Coach. The liquidated damages. Such payments are not, and shall not be construed to be, a penalty. This section 5.3.4 shall not apply if Coach terminates this Agreement because of a material breach by the University (College).
5.3.5. Except as provided elsewhere in this Agreement, if Coach terminates this Agreement for convenience, he shall forfeit to the extent permitted by law his right to receive all supplemental compensation and other payments.

5.4 **Termination due to Disability or Death of Coach.**

5.4.1 Notwithstanding any other provision of this Agreement, this Agreement shall terminate automatically if Coach becomes totally or permanently disabled as defined by the University (College)'s disability insurance carrier, becomes unable to perform the essential functions of the position of head coach, or dies.

5.4.2 If this Agreement is terminated because of Coach's death, Coach's salary and all other benefits shall terminate as of the last day worked, except that the Coach's personal representative or other designated beneficiary shall be paid all compensation due or unpaid and death benefits, if any, as may be contained in any fringe benefit plan now in force or hereafter adopted by the University (College) and due to the Coach's estate or beneficiaries thereunder.

5.4.3 If this Agreement is terminated because the Coach becomes totally or permanently disabled as defined by the University (College)'s disability insurance carrier, or becomes unable to perform the essential functions of the position of head coach, all salary and other benefits shall terminate, except that the Coach shall be entitled to receive any compensation due or unpaid and any disability-related benefits to which he is entitled by virtue of employment with the University (College).

5.5 **Interference by Coach.** In the event of termination, suspension, or reassignment, Coach agrees that Coach will not interfere with the University (College)'s student-athletes or otherwise obstruct the University (College)'s ability to transact business or operate its intercollegiate athletics program.

5.7 **No Liability.** The University (College) shall not be liable to Coach for the loss of any collateral business opportunities or any other benefits, perquisites or income from any sources that may ensue as a result of any termination of this Agreement by either party or due to death or disability or the suspension or reassignment of Coach, regardless of the circumstances.

5.8 **Waiver of Rights.** Because the Coach is receiving a multi-year contract and the opportunity to receive supplemental compensation and because such contracts and opportunities are not customarily afforded to University (College) employees, if the University (College) suspends or reassigns Coach, or terminates this Agreement for good or adequate cause or for convenience, Coach shall have all the rights provided for in this Agreement but hereby releases the University (College) from compliance with the notice, appeal, and similar employment-related rights provide for in the State Board of Education and Board or Regents of the University of Idaho Rule Manual (IDAPA 08) and Governing Policies and Procedures Manual, and the University (College) Faculty-Staff Handbook.
ARTICLE 6

6.1 **Board Approval.** This Agreement shall not be effective until and unless approved of the University (College)’s Board of (Regents or Trustees) and executed by both parties as set forth below. In addition, the payment of any compensation pursuant to this agreement shall be subject to the approval of the University (College)’s Board of (Regents or Trustees), the President, and the Director; the sufficiency of legislative appropriations; the receipt of sufficient funds in the account from which such compensation is paid; and the Board of (Regents or Trustees) and University (College)’s rules regarding financial exigency.

6.2 **University (College) Property.** All personal property (excluding vehicle(s) provided through the Vandal Wheels program), material, and articles of information, including, without limitation, keys, credit cards, personnel records, recruiting records, team information, films, statistics or any other personal property, material, or data, furnished to Coach by the University (College) or developed by Coach on behalf of the University (College) or at the University (College)’s direction or for the University (College)’s use or otherwise in connection with Coach’s employment hereunder are and shall remain the sole property of the University (College). Within twenty-four (24) hours of the expiration of the term of this agreement or its earlier termination as provided herein, Coach shall immediately cause any such personal property, materials, and articles of information in Coach’s possession or control to be delivered to the Director.

6.3 **Assignment.** Neither party may assign its rights or delegate its obligations under this Agreement without the prior written consent of the other party.

6.4 **Waiver.** No waiver of any default in the performance of this Agreement shall be effective unless in writing and signed by the waiving party. The waiver of a particular breach in the performance of this Agreement shall not constitute a waiver of any other or subsequent breach. The resort to a particular remedy upon a breach shall not constitute a waiver of any other available remedies.

6.5 **Severability.** If any provision of this Agreement is determined to be invalid or unenforceable, the remainder of the Agreement shall not be affected and shall remain in effect.

6.6 **Governing Law.** This Agreement shall be subject to and construed in accordance with the laws of the state of Idaho as an agreement to be performed in Idaho. Any action based in whole or in part on this Agreement shall be brought in the courts of the state of Idaho.

6.7 **Oral Promises.** Oral promises of an increase in annual salary or of any supplemental or other compensation shall not be binding upon the University (College).
6.8 **Force Majeure.** Any prevention, delay or stoppage due to strikes, lockouts, labor disputes, acts of God, inability to obtain labor or materials or reasonable substitutes, governmental restrictions, governmental regulations, governmental controls, enemy or hostile governmental action, civil commotion, fire or other casualty, and other causes beyond the reasonable control of the party obligated to perform (including financial inability), shall excuse the performance by such party for a period equal to any such prevention, delay or stoppage.

6.9 **Confidentiality.** The Coach hereby consents and agrees that this document may be released and made available to the public after it is signed by the Coach. The Coach further agrees that all documents and reports he is required to produce under this Agreement may be released and made available to the public at the University's (College)'s sole discretion.

6.10 **Notices.** Any notice under this Agreement shall be in writing and be delivered in person or by public or private courier service (including U.S. Postal Service Express Mail) or certified mail with return receipt requested or by facsimile. All notices shall be addressed to the parties at the following addresses or at such other addresses as the parties may from time to time direct in writing:

the University-(College): Director of Athletics
________________ University of Idaho
________________ P.O. Box 442302
Moscow, Idaho 83844-2302

with a copy to: President
________________ University of Idaho
________________ P.O. Box 443151
Moscow, ID 83844-3151

the Coach: Derek Pittman
________________ Last known address on file with
University-(College)'s Human Resource Services

Any notice shall be deemed to have been given on the earlier of: (a) actual delivery or refusal to accept delivery, (b) the date of mailing by certified mail, or (c) the day facsimile delivery is verified. Actual notice, however and from whomever received, shall always be effective.

6.11 **Headings.** The headings contained in this Agreement are for reference purposes only and shall not in any way affect the meaning or interpretation hereof.
6.12 **Binding Effect.** This Agreement is for the benefit only of the parties hereto and shall inure to the benefit of and bind the parties and their respective heirs, legal representatives, successors and assigns.

6.13 **Non-Use of Names and Trademarks.** The Coach shall not, without the University (College)'s prior written consent in each case, use any name, trade name, trademark, or other designation of the University (College) (including contraction, abbreviation or simulation), except in the course and scope of his official University (College) duties.

6.14 **No Third Party Beneficiaries.** There are no intended or unintended third party beneficiaries to this Agreement.

6.15 **Entire Agreement: Amendments.** This Agreement constitutes the entire agreement of the parties and supersedes all prior agreements and understandings with respect to the same subject matter. No amendment or modification of this Agreement shall be effective unless in writing, signed by both parties, and approved by University (College)'s Board of Regents or Trustees.

6.16 **Opportunity to Consult with Attorney.** The Coach acknowledges that he has had the opportunity to consult and review this Agreement with an attorney and has either consulted with legal counsel or chosen not to. Accordingly, in all cases, the language of this Agreement shall be construed simply, according to its fair meaning, and not strictly for or against any party.

UNIVERSITY (COLLEGE)  

COACH

Chuck Staben  
—— President

Derek Pittman  

— Date

— Date

Approved by the Board of Regents or Trustees on the ___ day of ____________, 2010-2014.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TAB</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>AMENDMENT TO BOARD POLICY</td>
<td>Motion to approve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Section V.I. – Real and Personal Property and Services - First Reading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>AMENDMENT TO BOARD POLICY</td>
<td>Motion to approve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Section V.K. – Construction Projects - First Reading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>AMENDMENT TO BOARD POLICY</td>
<td>Motion to approve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Section V.W. – Litigation - First Reading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>AMENDMENT TO BOARD POLICY</td>
<td>Motion to approve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Section V.X. – Intercollegiate Athletics - Second Reading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>FY2015 APPROPRIATIONS</td>
<td>Motion to approve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS</td>
<td>Motion to approve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY2015 Athletics General Fund Limits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS</td>
<td>Motion to approve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY2015 Gender Equity Reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>FY2016 BUDGET GUIDELINES</td>
<td>Motion to approve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>BOISE STATE UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>Motion to approve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Six-Year Capital Improvement Plan Amendment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO</td>
<td>Motion to approve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Integrated Research Center Project – Finance Plan and Construction Phase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO</td>
<td>Motion to approve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College of Education – Renovation and Improvements Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAB</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>ACTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>IDAHO STATE UNIVERSITY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Property Sale – East Terry Street,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pocatello</td>
<td>Motion to approve</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


SUBJECT
Board Policy V.I. – Real and Personal Property and Services – first reading

APPLICABLE STATUTES, RULE OR POLICY
Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies & Procedures, Section V.I.

BACKGROUND / DISCUSSION
The Business Affairs and Human Resources Committee has been working with staff and the institutions to align authorization thresholds in several policy sections, namely Board policy V.I. Real and Personal Property and Services and V.K. Construction Projects.

IMPACT
Proposed amendments to Board Policy V.I. increases the thresholds for the purchase of real property, personal property and services to be consistent with the thresholds outlined in Board Policy V.K. which provide authorization by the executive director between $500,000 and $1,000,000 for capital projects. This increases the authorization of the institutions from $250,000 to $500,000. The thresholds for the purchase of personal property and services are outlined in the table on page 5.

This revision also clarifies authorization thresholds when the project budget for a purchase or the renewal cost for a service agreement increases above the originally approved amount.

ATTACHMENTS
Attachment 1 – Board policy V.I. – first reading

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
The revisions to Board policy as outlined in Attachment 1 will provide consistent authorization thresholds for the acquisition of real property, the purchase of personal property and services, and the disposal of personal property.

Staff recommends approval.

BOARD ACTION
I move to approve the first reading of proposed amendments to Board Policy V.I. Real and Personal Property and Services.

Moved by____________ Seconded by____________ Carried Yes____ No____
1. Authority

   a. The Board may acquire, hold, and dispose of real and personal property pursuant to Article IX, Section 2 and Article IX, Section 10, Idaho Constitution, pursuant to various sections of Idaho Code.

   b. Leases of office space or classroom space by any institution, school or agency except the University of Idaho are acquired by and through the Department of Administration pursuant to Section 67-5708, Idaho Code.

   c. All property that is not real property must be purchased consistent with Sections 67-5715 through 67-5737, Idaho Code, except that the University of Idaho may acquire such property directly and not through the Department of Administration. Each institution, school and agency must designate an officer with overall responsibility for all purchasing procedures.

   d. Sale, surplus disposal, trade-in, or exchange of property must be consistent with Section 67-5722, Idaho Code, except that the University of Idaho may dispose of such property directly and not through the Department of Administration.

   e. If the Executive Director finds or is informed that an emergency exists, he or she may consider and approve a purchase or disposal of equipment or services otherwise requiring prior Board approval. The institution, school or agency must report the transaction in the Business Affairs and Human Resources agenda at the next regular Board meeting together with a justification for the emergency action.

2. Acquisition of Real Property

   a. Acquisition of a real property interest, other than a leasehold interest, with a purchase price between two-five hundred fifty thousand dollars ($250,000) and five-hundred thousand one million dollars ($500,000,000) requires prior approval by the Executive Director. A purchase exceeding five-hundred thousand one million dollars ($500,000,000) requires prior Board approval.

   b. Any interest in real property acquired for the University of Idaho must be taken in the name of the Board of Regents of the University of Idaho.

   c. Any interest in real property acquired for any other institution, school or agency under the governance of the Board must be taken in the name of the State of Idaho by and through the State Board of Education.

   d. This does not preclude a foundation or other legal entity separate and apart from an institution, school or agency under Board governance from taking title to real
property in the name of the foundation or other organization for the present or future benefit of the institution, school or agency. (See Section V.E.)

e. Acquisition of a leasehold interest in real property by or on behalf of an institution, school or agency requires prior Executive Director approval if the cost exceeds five hundred thousand dollars ($500,000) over the term, or by the Board if the term of the lease exceeds five (5) years or if the cost exceeds one million dollars ($1,000,000) over the term.

f. Appraisal.

An independent appraiser must be hired to give an opinion of fair market value before an institution, school or agency acquires fee simple title to real property.

g. Method of sale - exchange of property.

The Board will provide for the manner of selling real property under its control, giving due consideration to Section 33-601(4), applied to the Board through Section 33-2211(5), and to Chapter 3, Title 58, Idaho Code. The Board may exchange real property under the terms, conditions, and procedures deemed appropriate by the Board.

h. Execution.

All easements, deeds, and leases excluding easements, deeds, and leases delegated authority granted to the institutions and agencies must be executed and acknowledged by the president of the Board or another officer designated by the Board and attested to and sealed by the secretary of the Board as being consistent with Board action.

3. Acquisition of Personal Property and Services

a. Purchases of equipment, data processing software and equipment, and all contracts for consulting or professional services either in total or through time purchase or other financing agreements, between two--five hundred fifty thousand dollars ($250,000) and five hundred thousand--one million dollars ($500,000) require prior approval by the executive director. The executive director must be expressly advised when the recommended bid is other than the lowest qualified bid. Purchases exceeding five hundred thousand--one million dollars ($500,000) require prior Board approval. If the project budget for a purchase or the renewal cost for a service agreement increases above the approved amount, then the institution or agency may be required to seek further authorization, as follows:
b. Acquisition or development of new administrative software or systems that materially affect the administrative operations of the institution by adding new services must be reviewed with the executive director before beginning development. When feasible, such development will be undertaken as a joint endeavor by the four institutions and with overall coordination by the Office of the State Board of Education.

4. Hold of Personal Property

a. Inventory

An inventory of all items of chattel property valued at two thousand dollars ($2,000) or limits established by Department of Administration owned or leased by any agency or institution must be maintained in cooperation with the Department of Administration as required by Section 67-5746, Idaho Code.

b. Insurance

Each agency and institution must ensure that all insurable real and personal property under its control is insured against physical loss or damage and that its employees are included under any outstanding policy of public liability insurance maintained by the state of Idaho. All insurance must be acquired through the State Department of Administration or any successor entity.
c. Vehicle Use

Vehicles owned or leased by an institution or agency must be used solely for institutional or agency purposes. Employees may not, with certain exceptions, keep institutional vehicles at their personal residences. Exceptions to this policy include the chief executive officers and other employees who have received specific written approval from the chief executive officer of the institution or agency.

5. Disposal of Real Property

a. Temporary Permits

Permits to make a temporary and limited use of real property under the control of an institution or agency may be issued by the institution or agency without prior Board approval.

b. Board approval of other transfers

i. Leases to use real property under the control of an institution, school or agency require prior Board approval - if the term of the lease exceeds five (5) years or if the lease revenue exceeds two hundred fifty thousand dollars ($250,000).

ii. Easements to make a permanent use of real property under the control of an institution, school or agency require prior Board approval - unless easements are to public entities for utilities.

iii. The transfer by an institution, school or agency of any other interest in real property requires prior Board approval.

6. Disposal of Personal Property

Sale, surplus disposal, trade-in, or exchange of property with a value greater than two–five hundred fifty–thousand dollars ($250,000) and less than five hundred thousandone million dollars ($51,000,000) requires prior approval by the Executive Director. Sale, surplus disposal, trade-in, or exchange of property with a value greater than five hundred thousandone million dollars ($51,000,000) requires prior Board approval. All disposals approved by the Executive Director shall be reported quarterly to the Board.
a. First Refusal

When the property has a value greater than five thousand dollars ($5,000), the institution, school or agency must first make a good faith effort to give other institutions, school and agencies under Board governance the opportunity of first refusal to the property before it turns the property over to the Department of Administration or otherwise disposes of the property.

b. Sale of Services

The sale of any services or rights (broadcast or other) of any institution, school or agency requires prior approval of the Board when it is reasonably expected that the proceeds of such action may exceed two hundred fifty thousand dollars ($250,000). Any sale of such services or rights must be conducted via an open bidding process or other means that maximizes the returns in revenues, assets, or benefits to the institution, school or agency.

c. Inter-agency Transfer

Transfer of property from one Board institution, school or agency to another institution, school or agency under Board governance may be made without participation by the State Board of Examiners or the Department of Administration, but such transfers of property with a value greater than two hundred fifty thousand dollars ($250,000) require prior Board approval.
SUBJECT
Board Policy V.K. – Construction Projects – first reading

APPLICABLE STATUTES, RULE OR POLICY
Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies & Procedures, Section V.K.

BACKGROUND / DISCUSSION
The Business Affairs and Human Resources Committee has been working with staff and the institutions to determine the authorization thresholds required when a capital project increases above the original Board-approved amount.

IMPACT
Proposed amendments to Board policy V.K. would require an institution to seek further approval when the budget for a major capital project increases above the total authorized amount by more than 5% (up to a maximum of $499,999).

Regardless of the authorization level required (i.e. institution, executive director, or Board), the institution must provide the Board with the amount and reason(s) for the cost overruns and the source of funds. The authorization levels are shown in the table on page 3.

ATTACHMENTS
Attachment 1 – Board policy V.K. – first reading Page 3

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
The revisions to Board policy as outlined in Attachment 1 will clarify the approval level necessary when the budget for a capital project increases above the total amount originally authorized.

BOARD ACTION
I move to approve the first reading of proposed amendments to Board policy V.K. Real and Personal Property and Services.

Moved by______________ Seconded by______________ Carried Yes____ No____
1. Authorization Limits

Without regard to the source of funding, before any institution or agency under the governance of the Board begins to make capital improvements, either in the form of alteration and repair to existing facilities or construction of new facilities, it must be authorized based on the limits listed below. Projects requiring executive director or Board approval must include a separate budget line for architects, engineers, or construction managers and engineering services for the project cost.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Originally Authorized By</th>
<th>Original Project Cost</th>
<th>Cumulative Value of Change(s)</th>
<th>Aggregate Revised Project Cost</th>
<th>Change Authorized By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Agency</td>
<td>&lt; $500,000</td>
<td>Any</td>
<td>&lt; $500,000</td>
<td>Local Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Agency</td>
<td>&lt; $500,000</td>
<td>Any</td>
<td>$500,000-$1,000,000</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Agency</td>
<td>&lt; $500,000</td>
<td>Any</td>
<td>&gt; $1,000,000</td>
<td>SBOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>$500,000-$1,000,000</td>
<td>&lt;= $500,000</td>
<td>&lt;= $1,000,000</td>
<td>Local Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>$500,000-$1,000,000</td>
<td>Any</td>
<td>&gt; $1,000,000</td>
<td>SBOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBOE</td>
<td>&gt; $1,000,000</td>
<td>&lt; $500,000</td>
<td>Any</td>
<td>Local Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBOE</td>
<td>&gt; $1,000,000</td>
<td>$500,000-$1,000,000</td>
<td>Any</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBOE</td>
<td>&gt; $1,000,000</td>
<td>&gt; $1,000,000</td>
<td>Any</td>
<td>SBOE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Major Projects - Capital Construction Plans

a. Institutions and agencies under the governance of the Board wishing to undertake capital construction projects shall submit to the Board for its approval a six-year capital construction plan (the “Plan”). The Plan shall span six fiscal years going forward starting at the fiscal year next. The Plan shall include only capital construction projects for which the total cost is estimated to exceed one million dollars ($1,000,000) without regard to the source of funding (hereinafter, “major projects”). A Plan shall constitute notice to the Board that an institution or agency may bring a request at a later date for Board approval of one or more of the projects included in its approved Plan. Board approval of a Plan shall not constitute approval of a project included in the Plan.

b. Before any institution or agency under the governance of the Board solicits, accepts or commits a gift or grant in support of a specific major project, such project must first be included on the institution’s or agency’s Board-approved six-year Plan.

c. If a major project is not included in a Plan and an institution or agency under the governance of the Board desires to obtain approval of the major project, before
seeking approval, it shall first bring an amended plan to the Board for approval at a regularly scheduled meeting of the Board. If a potential donor offers an unsolicited gift to an institution or its affiliated foundation in support of a major project which is not in an institution’s or agency’s Plan, prior to acceptance of the gift, the institution or agency shall notify the Board’s executive director in writing of the offer, which notice shall include an explanation and justification for the exigency; a detailed statement of purpose and fiscal impact; and a summary of the terms and conditions of the gift. This notice shall also certify to the executive director that the donor understands and acknowledges that construction of the major project is subject to the review and approval of the Board.

3. Major Projects Approval Process - Design-Bid-Build Projects

a. Planning and Design

Board approval is required before any institution or agency begins planning and design on a major project carried out under the traditional "design-bid-build" method. For design-bid-build projects, planning and design encompasses the preparation of architectural and engineering documents and associated budget and schedule information through the completion of the construction documents for bidding. This approval may not be requested concurrently with any other step in the major project approval process. As part of the Board’s approval process for planning and design, the Board may request the institution or agency to submit a preliminary project budget and financing plan (including pro forma financials, debt/operating expenses ratios, pledges, strategic facilities fees, and other material financial information).

b. Major Project Approval Process – Project Budget and Financing Plan

Board approval of a project budget and financing plan (including pro forma financials, debt/operating expenses ratios, pledges, strategic facilities fees, and other material financial information) is required for a major project. This approval may be requested only after completion of the design and planning process and may be requested concurrently with approval for construction.

c. Major Project Approval Process – Construction

Board approval is required to proceed with the construction of a major project. In order to obtain Board approval for construction of a major project, the Board must approve the project budget and financing plan. This approval may be requested concurrently with approval of the project’s budget and financing plan.

d. Major Project Approval Process – Final Approval – Financing and Incurrence of Debt
Board approval for financing capital projects via the issuance of bonds, or incurrence of any other indebtedness, is required pursuant to Board policy V.F. for a project that has previously received approval for construction. (All other projects financed entirely without indebtedness do not need separate approval for financing.) The Board will not consider concurrent requests for approval for construction and debt financing for the same project. Therefore, institutions seeking approval for project debt financing must bring a request for said approval to a Board meeting subsequent to the meeting at which project construction is approved.

4. Design-Build Projects

Although design and build projects are performed by one team, design-build contracts can also allow a series of options to proceed (or not) at the design phase and at the construction phase. The approval process for major projects using a design-build contract shall be the same as the approval process required for a design-bid-build contract. Board approval shall first be required to undertake the design and planning phase, including selection of the design-build team. For purposes of such approval, the Board may request a preliminary project budget and financing plan. This approval may not be obtained concurrently with subsequent required approvals. Once the design-build team completes the design and construction cost estimates, the institution or agency must then obtain Board approval of the project budget and financing plan and of construction of the project. If debt financing is needed, the institution or agency must submit a request for approval at a subsequent meeting of the Board in the manner set forth in paragraph 3.d., above.

5. Fiscal Revisions to Previously Approved Projects

If a project budget increases above the total Board-authorized amount by the lesser of 5% or $500,000, then the institution or agency shall be required to seek further authorization based on the limits established in paragraph 1, above. Regardless of the authorization level required, the institution shall provide the Board with the amount and reason(s) for the cost overruns and the source of funds.

6. Project Acceptance

Projects under the supervision of the Department of Administration are accepted by the Department on behalf of the Board and the state of Idaho. Projects under the supervision of an institution or agency are accepted by the institution or agency and the project architect. Projects under the supervision of the University of Idaho are accepted by the University on behalf of the Board of Regents.
7. Statute and Code Compliance

a. All projects must be in compliance with Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and must provide access to all persons. All projects must be in compliance with applicable state and local building and life-safety codes and applicable local land-use regulations as provided in Chapter 41, Title 39, and Section 67-6528, Idaho Code.

b. In designing and implementing construction projects, due consideration must be given to energy conservation and long-term maintenance and operation savings versus short-term capital costs.
SUBJECT
   Board Policy V.W. Litigation – First Reading

REFERENCE
   December 2009  Board approved 1st Reading of amendments delegating authority to the CEO to initiate litigation up to specific limits.
   February 2010  Board approved 2nd Reading of proposed amendments to policy.

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY
   Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies & Procedures, Section V.W.

BACKGROUND / DISCUSSION
   Proposed changes will clarify for the institutions that the limits and reporting requirements contained within Board Policy V.W. pertains to all settlements, not just settlements after initiation of litigation.

IMPACT
   Proposed changes will allow for more consistent reporting and oversight of legal settlements entered into by the institutions.

ATTACHMENTS
   Attachment 1 - Governing Policy Section V.W – 1st Reading  Page 3

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
   Board staff recommends approval of the first reading of Board Policy V.W. as submitted.

BOARD ACTION
   I move to approve the first reading of Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies & Procedures V.W. – Litigation as submitted.

   Moved ____________ Seconded ____________ Carried Yes _____ No ______
Idaho State Board of Education
GOVERNING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES
SECTION: V. FINANCIAL AFFAIRS
Subsection: W. Litigation
February 2010

1. General

When a lawsuit, legal document, or other official notice is instituted against an institution and/or the Board, an institution’s president or its general counsel, or the executive director of the Board, is authorized to accept service of process of such matter on behalf of the institution and/or Board. This authority to accept service pertains only to attempted service upon the institution and/or Board, and not to any attempt to serve the Idaho secretary of state or the Idaho attorney general. An institution president or general counsel who accepts service of any matter on behalf of such institution and/or the Board pursuant to this authority must promptly forward a copy of any such matter to the Board office, and in appropriate circumstances, should also forward a copy of such matter to the State of Idaho Department of Administration, Division of Internal Management Systems, Risk Management Program.

2. Initiation of Litigation

An institution or agency under the governance of the Board may initiate a legal action with respect to any matter in which the amount in controversy does not exceed one hundred thousand dollars ($100,000). With the prior approval of the executive director, an institution, agency, or school under the governance of the Board may initiate a legal action with respect to any matter in which the amount in controversy does not exceed two hundred thousand dollars ($200,000). Any other proposed legal action may not be instituted without the prior approval and authorization of the Board.

a. Notwithstanding the authority to initiate litigation provided above, any legal action involving the exercise of the right of eminent domain must have the prior approval of the Board.

b. Pursuant to Idaho Code §33-3804, an institution is permitted to initiate legal action in its own name.

3. Settlement of Litigation

The chief executive officer has authority to settle a legal matter involving the payment or receipt of up to one hundred thousand dollars ($100,000) of institution or agency funds. The executive director may authorize the settlement of a legal matter involving the payment or receipt of up to two hundred thousand dollars ($200,000) of institution, agency, or school funds. Any settlement of a legal matter that is in
excess of two hundred thousand dollars ($200,000) in institution or agency funds must be approved by the Board prior to any binding settlement commitment.

34. Litigation Reporting by Institutions

Legal counsel for the institutions shall provide monthly attorney–client privileged litigation reports to the members of the Board, with a copy to the Board office (to the attention of the Board’s legal counsel) for distribution to members of the Board. Such reports should include a description of all claims and legal actions filed against the institution since the date of the last report (and identify legal counsel for the parties involved, for conflict analysis purposes); a summary of the current status of all claims and pending litigation; risk analysis pertaining to all such claims and pending litigation; and the settlement of any legal claims or actions matters since the date of the last report, including settlements of matters handled by the State of Idaho Department of Administration, Division of Internal Management Systems, Risk Management Program. With respect to the reporting of a legal settlement, such report shall describe the amount of institution funds that were used, and the amount and source of any other funds that were provided in connection with such settlement, including funds from the Office of Insurance Management or from any other parties. Legal counsel for the institutions should also include in the report any significant incident occurring since the last report that is reasonably expected to give rise to a claim, as well as probable claims or legal actions the institution is aware of which have been threatened but not yet instituted.
SUBJECT
     Board Policy V.X. – Intercollegiate Athletics – second reading

REFERENCE
     February, 2014          Board approved first reading of Policy V.X.

APPLICABLE STATUTES, RULE OR POLICY
     Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies & Procedures, Section V.X.

BACKGROUND / DISCUSSION
     At the February 2014 Board meeting, the Board approved the first reading of
     changes to Board policy V.X. which allow an institution to exceed the institutional
     funds limit in a year when it experiences athletic conference entry and/or exit
     fees.

IMPACT
     Removing entry or exit fees from the institutional limits will provide a better
     picture of the ongoing athletics operations.

ATTACHMENTS
     Attachment 1 – Board Policy V.X. – second reading  Page 3

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
     The revisions to Board policy as outlined in Attachment 1 would require an
     institution to include a footnote to their annual Intercollegiate Athletics Reports of
     Revenues and Expenditures for any year in which an institution experienced
     entry and/or exit fees. The footnote would include the expense category and
     revenue sources (e.g. contributions, other revenues, and/or institutional funds).
     The footnote would also indicate any amount of institutional funds above the
     Board-approved limit for institutional funds used as a source for the entry and/or
     exit fees.

     There were no changes between first and second reading. Staff recommends
     approval.

BOARD ACTION
     I move to approve the second reading of proposed amendments to Board policy
     V.X. Intercollegiate Athletics, with all revisions as presented.

     Moved by___________ Seconded by_____________ Carried Yes____ No____
1. Philosophy

The Board reaffirms the role of intercollegiate athletics as a legitimate and significant component of institutional activity. The responsibility for and control of institutional activities in this area rest with the Board.

In the area of intercollegiate athletics, the Board seeks to establish programs which:

a. provide opportunities for student athletes to attend college and participate in athletic programs while pursuing and completing academic degrees;

b. reflect accurately the priorities and academic character of its institutions;

c. fuel school spirit and community involvement;

d. serve the needs of the institutions as they seek, through their athletic programs, to establish fruitful and sustaining relationships with their constituencies throughout the state and nation; and

e. actively and strategically progress toward compliance with Title IX of the Higher Education Amendments Act of 1972.

Given these goals, the Board has a continuing concern and interest in the academic success of student athletes, the scope and level of competition, and the cost of athletic programs administered by its institutions. Consequently, the Board will, from time to time in the context of this policy statement, promulgate, as necessary, policies governing the conduct of athletic programs at its institutions.

2. Policies

The day-to-day conduct of athletic programs is vested in the institutions and in their chief executive officers. Decision making at the institutional level must be consistent with the policies established by the Board and by those national organizations and conferences with which the institutions are associated. In the event that conflicts arise among the policies of these governance groups, it is the responsibility of the institution's chief executive officer to notify the Board in a timely manner. Likewise, any knowledge of NCAA or conference rule infractions involving an institution should be communicated by the athletic department to the chief executive officer of the institution.

The Board recognizes that the financing of intercollegiate athletics, while controlled at the institutional level, is ultimately the responsibility of the Board itself. In assuming that responsibility, the sources of funds for intercollegiate athletics shall be defined in the following categories:
a. State General Funds – means state General Funds (as defined in section 67-1205, Idaho Code) appropriated to the institutions.

b. Student Athletic Fee Revenue – means revenue generated from the full-time and part-time student activity fee that is dedicated to the intercollegiate athletics program pursuant to policy V.R.3.b.ii.

c. Program Funds – means revenue generated directly related to the athletic programs, including but not limited to ticket sales/event revenue, tournament/bowl/conference receipts, media/broadcast receipts, concessions/parking/advertisement, game guarantees and foundation/booster donations.

d. Institutional Funds – means any funds generated by the institution outside the funds listed in a., b. and c. above. Institutional Funds do not include tuition and fee revenue collected under policy V.R.3. Examples of Institutional Funds include, but are not limited to, auxiliaries, investment income, interest income, vending, indirect cost recovery funds on federal grants and contracts, and administrative overhead charged to revenue-generating accounts across campus.

3. Funds allocated and used by athletics from the above sources are limited as follows:

a. State General Funds –

   i. The limit for State General Funds shall be allocated in two categories: General Funds used for athletics and General Funds used to comply with Title IX.

   ii. The Board set the following FY 2013 General Fund limits:

   1) General Funds for Athletics:
      a) Universities $2,424,400
      b) Lewis-Clark State College $ 901,300

   2) General Funds for Gender Equity:
      a) Boise State University $1,069,372
      b) Idaho State University $ 707,700
      c) University of Idaho $ 926,660
      d) Lewis-Clark State College $ 0

   iii. The methodology for computing the limits for both categories of State General Funds shall be to calculate the rate of change for the next fiscal year ongoing State General Funds compared to the ongoing State General Funds in the current fiscal year, and then apply the rate of change to both limits approved
by the Board in the previous year. Such limits shall be approved annually by the Board.

b. Institutional funds –
   i. The Board set the following FY 2013 limits:

   1) Boise State University $ 386,100
   2) Idaho State University $ 540,400
   3) University of Idaho $ 772,100
   4) Lewis-Clark State College $ 154,300

   ii. The methodology for computing the limits for Institutional Funds shall be to calculate the rate of change for the next fiscal year ongoing Appropriated Funds compared to the ongoing Appropriated Funds in the current fiscal year, and then apply the rate of change to the limit approved by the Board in the previous year. Such limits shall be approved annually by the Board. For purposes of this paragraph, “Appropriated Funds” means all funds appropriated by the Legislature to the institutions, including but not limited to, State General Funds, endowment funds, and appropriated tuition and fees.

c. Student Activity Fee Revenue – shall not exceed revenue generated from student activity fee dedicated for the athletic program. Institutions may increase the student fee for the athletic program at a rate not more than the rate of change of the total student activity fees.

d. Program funds – the institutions can use the program funds generated, without restriction.

The president of each institution is accountable for balancing the budget of the athletic department on an annual basis. In accounting for the athletic programs, a fund balance for the total athletic program must be maintained. In the event that revenue within a fiscal year exceeds expenses, the surplus would increase the fund balance and would be available for future fiscal years. In the event that expenses within a fiscal year exceed revenue, the deficit would reduce the fund balance. If the fund balance becomes negative, the institutions shall submit a plan for Board approval that eliminates the deficit within two fiscal years. Reduction in program expenditures and/or increase revenue (program funds only) can be used in an institutional plan to eliminate a negative fund balance. If substantial changes in the budget occur during the year resulting in a deficit for that year, the president shall advise the Board of the situation at the earliest opportunity.
Donations to athletics at an institution must be made and reported according to policy V.E. The amount of booster money donated to and used by the athletic department shall be budgeted in the athletic department budget.

It is the intent of the Board that increases in program revenues should be maximized before increases to the athletic limits under subsection 3 will be considered.

4. Gender Equity

a. Gender equity means compliance with Title IX of the Higher Education Amendments Act of 1972 which prohibits discrimination on the basis of gender in any education program or activity receiving federal financial assistance, including athletics. Congress delegated authority to promulgate regulations (34 C.F.R. §106.41) for determining whether an athletics program complies with Title IX. The U.S. Department of Education, through its Office of Civil Rights (OCR) is responsible for enforcing Title IX.

b. Title IX measures gender equity in athletics in three distinct areas: participation, scholarships, and equivalence in other athletics benefits and opportunities.

c. The chief executive officer of each institution shall prepare a gender equity report for review and formal approval by the Board in a format and time to be determined by the Executive Director. The gender equity report will show the status of an institution’s compliance with Title IX. The gender equity report will show the changes to the athletics programs necessary to comply with Title IX over time.


The Board requires that the institutions adopt certain reporting requirements and common accounting practices in the area of intercollegiate athletic financing. The athletic reports shall contain revenues, and expenditures, in the detail prescribed by the Board office, including all revenue earned during a fiscal year. A secondary breakdown of expenditures by sport and the number of participants will also be required. The fund balances as of June 30 shall be included in the report. The general format of the report will be consistent with the format established by the Executive Director. The revenue and expenditures reported on these reports must reconcile to the NCAA Agreed Upon Procedures Reports that are prepared annually and reviewed by the external auditors. The institutions will submit the following reports to the Board:

a. The institutions shall submit an operating budget for the upcoming fiscal year beginning July 1 in a format and time to be determined by the Executive Director.
i. Actual revenues and expenditures for the fiscal year most recently completed.

ii. Estimated revenues and expenditures for the current fiscal year.

iii. Proposed operating budget for the next budget year beginning July 1.

b. The following fiscal year’s financial information will be reported by each institution in a format and time to be determined by the Executive Director:
   i. Actual revenues and expenditures for the prior four (4) fiscal years

   ii. Estimated revenues and expenditures for the current fiscal year.

   c. In a year in which an institution experiences conference entry and/or exit fees, any amount the institution uses from institutional funds will not be subject to the limit in paragraph 3.b. The institution shall include a footnote: (1) explaining the amount and expense category for the entry/exit fees and the amount of each revenue source (e.g. contributions, institutional funds, etc.); (2) indicating any amount of institutional funds above the Board approved limit for institutional funds used as a source for the entry and/or exit fees.
THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK
SUBJECT
FY 2015 Appropriation Information – Institutions and Agencies of the State Board of Education

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY
Applicable Legislative Appropriation Bills

BACKGROUND/ DISCUSSION
The 2014 Legislature has passed appropriation bills for the agencies and institutions of the Board.

The table on Tab 5a page 3 lists the FY 2015 appropriation bills related to the State Board of Education.

IMPACT
Appropriation bills provide funding and spending authority for the agencies and institutions of the State Board of Education allowing them to offer programs and services to Idaho’s citizens.

ATTACHMENTS
Attachment 1 – FY 2015 Appropriations List Page 3

STAFF COMMENTS
Staff comments and recommendations are included for each specific institution and agency allocation.

BOARD ACTION
Motions for the allocations for College and Universities, Community Colleges, and Professional-Technical Education are found on each specific institution and agency allocation.
## State Board of Education
### FY 2015 Appropriations to Institutions and Agencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allocations</th>
<th>General Fund</th>
<th>% Δ From FY 2014</th>
<th>Total Fund</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College and Universities</td>
<td>$251,223,200</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>$498,576,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Colleges</td>
<td>32,978,500</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>33,578,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional-Technical Education</td>
<td>53,079,000</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>62,954,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agencies</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Research &amp; Extension Service</td>
<td>26,453,700</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>26,479,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Education Programs</td>
<td>11,355,700</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>11,655,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Programs</td>
<td>9,346,400</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>11,069,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the State Board of Education</td>
<td>2,289,200</td>
<td>(5.1%)</td>
<td>5,672,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Broadcasting System</td>
<td>2,200,700</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>8,068,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Rehabilitation, Division</td>
<td>7,493,900</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>23,966,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Department of Education</td>
<td>8,523,200</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>34,303,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Superintendent of Public Instruction)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Statewide Issues

- **Permanent Building Fund: Major Capital Projects**
  - University of Idaho: College of Education Building  $2,000,000

- **Higher Education Stabilization Fund**
  - College and Universities  $1,379,000
  - Community Colleges and Eastern Idaho Technical College  $621,000
SUBJECT
FY 2015 College and Universities Appropriation Allocation

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY
Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies & Procedures, Section V.S.
Senate Bill 1417 (2014)

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION
The Legislature appropriates to the State Board of Education and the Board of Regents monies for the general education programs at Boise State University (BSU), Idaho State University (ISU), University of Idaho (UI), Lewis-Clark State College (LCSC), and system-wide needs. The Board allocates the appropriation to the four institutions based on legislative intent and Board Policy, Section V.S.

According to Board policy, the allocation is made in the following order: 1) each institution shall be allocated its prior year budget base; 2) funds for the Enrollment Workload Adjustment (EWA); 3) funds for new occupancy costs; 4) funding of special allocations; and 5) a general allocation based on proportionate share to total budget request.

IMPACT
This action allocates the FY 2015 College and Universities appropriation to the institutions for general education programs, and system-wide needs. These funds allocated along with revenue generated from potential fee increases will establish the operating budgets for the general education program for FY 2015. The allocation for FY 2015 is shown on Tab 5b page 3. The FY 2015 general fund appropriation includes the following items:

- Ongoing base funding for benefit cost increases $3,535,000
- Reduction for statewide cost allocation (79,300)
- 1% one-time Change in Employee Compensation (CEC) 1,861,600
- 1% ongoing Change in Employee Compensation (CEC) 1,861,600
- Reduction for Enrollment Workload Adjustment (EWA) (1,304,200)
- Board’s 60% Goal 2,759,700
- Occupancy costs 421,300
- University of Idaho 2nd year College of Law in Boise 400,000
- Higher Education Research Council EPSCoR match 200,000
- Center for Advanced Energy Studies 1,000,000
- Transfer to OSBE for web developer position (79,300)
- One-time replacement capital 4,085,800

The $2,759,700 for the Board’s 60% Goal is approximately 20% of the original total request of $14,006,200. The Business and Human Resources Committee (BAHR) recommends allocating the appropriated funds in the same proportion as the original request as the most equitable approach.
The $4,085,800 in one-time funds is the exact amount requested by the college and universities in General Funds for replacement capital. After much deliberation, BAHR determined that these one-time funds should be allocated based on the original Board-approved request which includes $1,689,600 to BSU and $2,396,200 to UI.

The Legislature took separate action to offset the $1,304,200 reduction for negative EWA, by transferring $1,379,000 to the Higher Education Stabilization Fund.

ATTACHMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachment</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attachment 1 - C&amp;U FY 2015 Appropriation Allocation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment 2 - Statement of Purpose/Fiscal Note</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment 3 - Appropriation Bill (S1417)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STAFF COMMENTS

Staff recommends approval of the FY 2015 College and Universities allocation as presented in Attachment 3.

BOARD ACTION

I move to approve the allocation of the FY 2015 appropriation for Boise State University, Idaho State University, University of Idaho, Lewis-Clark State College, and system-wide needs, as presented on Tab 5b, Page 3.

Moved by__________ Seconded by__________ Carried Yes_____ No_____
## FY 2015 College and University Allocation
### Based on JFAC Action
#### March 17, 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appropriation:</th>
<th>FY14 Appr</th>
<th>FY15 Appr</th>
<th>% Chge</th>
<th>Sys Needs:</th>
<th>FY14 Appr</th>
<th>FY15 Appr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Educ Approp: Bill No. SB1417</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HERC</td>
<td>1,435,500</td>
<td>1,635,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Account</td>
<td>236,543,600</td>
<td>251,223,200</td>
<td>6.21%</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>942,600</td>
<td>863,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment Funds</td>
<td>10,729,200</td>
<td>12,528,000</td>
<td>16.77%</td>
<td>Sys Nds</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>140,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Gen Acct &amp; Endow Funds</td>
<td>247,272,800</td>
<td>263,751,200</td>
<td>6.66%</td>
<td>IGEM</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Fees/Misc Revenue</td>
<td>226,704,200</td>
<td>234,825,500</td>
<td>3.58%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-time Student Fees:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Gen Educ Approp</td>
<td>473,977,000</td>
<td>498,576,700</td>
<td>5.19%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Allocation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allocation:</th>
<th>BSU</th>
<th>ISU</th>
<th>UI</th>
<th>LCSC</th>
<th>SYS-WIDE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY14 General Account</td>
<td>77,310,300</td>
<td>64,540,600</td>
<td>76,719,800</td>
<td>13,460,700</td>
<td>4,518,100</td>
<td>236,543,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY14 Endowment Funds</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,227,800</td>
<td>7,166,400</td>
<td>1,335,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,729,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY15 Budget Base</td>
<td>83,049,600</td>
<td>69,845,700</td>
<td>90,481,200</td>
<td>15,735,900</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>263,751,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY15 Gen Acct &amp; Endow Allocation</td>
<td>83,049,600</td>
<td>69,845,700</td>
<td>90,481,200</td>
<td>15,735,900</td>
<td>4,638,800</td>
<td>263,751,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change From FY14 Adjusted Budget Base</td>
<td>7.42%</td>
<td>4.61%</td>
<td>7.87%</td>
<td>6.35%</td>
<td>2.67%</td>
<td>6.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY15 Estimated Student Fee Revenue</td>
<td>85,255,200</td>
<td>59,563,500</td>
<td>74,917,500</td>
<td>15,089,300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>234,825,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY15 Operating Budget</td>
<td>168,304,800</td>
<td>129,409,200</td>
<td>185,398,700</td>
<td>30,825,200</td>
<td>4,638,800</td>
<td>498,576,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional Funding for FY15:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MCO Adjustments:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Benefits</td>
<td>1,058,900</td>
<td>1,146,500</td>
<td>1,211,500</td>
<td>244,400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,061,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflation including Library B&amp;P</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66,800</td>
<td>185,800</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEC: 1.0% one-time</td>
<td>589,200</td>
<td>582,500</td>
<td>564,800</td>
<td>102,000</td>
<td>1,928,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEC: 1.0% ongoing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>17,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payline Adjustment</td>
<td>15,700</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment Fund Adjustments</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>292,700</td>
<td>890,000</td>
<td>170,200</td>
<td>1,352,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonstandard Adjustments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Mgmt/Controller/Treasurer</td>
<td>(31,200)</td>
<td>4,700</td>
<td>(40,800)</td>
<td>(12,000)</td>
<td>(79,300)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Nonstandard Adjustments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment Workload Adjustment (EWA)</td>
<td>(219,200)</td>
<td>(562,500)</td>
<td>(591,200)</td>
<td>68,700</td>
<td>(1,304,200)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Items</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60% Goal Allocation</td>
<td>1,379,000</td>
<td>610,800</td>
<td>573,200</td>
<td>196,700</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,759,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy Costs</td>
<td>334,800</td>
<td>86,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>421,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UI College of Law - Boise 2nd Yr</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HERC EPSCoR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Advanced Energy Studies</td>
<td>333,300</td>
<td>333,300</td>
<td>333,400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSBE Web Developer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(79,300)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund One-Time Allocation</td>
<td>1,689,600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,366,200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,065,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Addl Funding</td>
<td>17,704,300</td>
<td>6,017,300</td>
<td>6,500,000</td>
<td>940,200</td>
<td>120,700</td>
<td>263,751,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY15 Gen Acct &amp; Endow Allocation</td>
<td>83,049,600</td>
<td>69,845,700</td>
<td>90,481,200</td>
<td>15,735,900</td>
<td>4,638,800</td>
<td>263,751,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### General Fund Increase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Increase</th>
<th>9.2%</th>
<th>4.2%</th>
<th>7.1%</th>
<th>5.2%</th>
<th>-27.5%</th>
<th>6.2%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Fund Increase - ongoing</td>
<td>4,825,900</td>
<td>2,143,200</td>
<td>2,406,600</td>
<td>601,200</td>
<td>-1,244,700</td>
<td>8,732,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Increase</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>-27.5%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund Increase - ongoing less benefit increases</td>
<td>3,767,000</td>
<td>1,018,900</td>
<td>1,282,300</td>
<td>358,800</td>
<td>-1,244,700</td>
<td>5,070,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Increase</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>-27.5%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

RS23133

This is the FY 2015 appropriation to the State Board of Education for College and Universities in the amount of $498,576,700. This appropriation provides for increased cost of benefits, inflationary adjustments, replacement items, and a reduction for statewide cost allocation. The budget also provides for the equivalent of a 2% change in employee compensation (1% ongoing and 1% one-time). Additionally, it provides a non-discretionary statutory adjustment for enrollment workload decreases and an adjustment for endowment earnings. Finally, this budget includes seven line items. Line item 2 provides $2,759,700 ongoing from the General Fund for the Complete College Idaho 60% goal within the Systemwide Program to be allocated to the institutions by the State Board of Education. Line item 3 provides 2.39 FTP and $421,300 ongoing from the General Fund for occupancy costs at the following three facilities: BSU- The University Drive Annex building, 1.74 FTP and $272,700, BSU- The BoDo Center, 0.34 FTP and $62,100, and ISU- Meridian building anatomy and physiology lab, 0.31 FTP and $86,500. Line item 4 provides 3.0 FTP and $400,000 ongoing from the General Fund for personnel and operating costs to expand the second year of the University of Idaho's College of Law to Boise. Line Item 5 provides $200,000 ongoing from the General Fund for an increase in matching fund requirements for the recent five-year, $20 million, grant awarded to the University of Idaho from the National Science Foundation, Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (EPSCoR). Research partners include Boise State University and Idaho State University. Line item 9 provides $1,000,000 ongoing from the General Fund to be divided equally among Boise State University, Idaho State University, and the University of Idaho for continued participation at the Center for Advanced Energy Studies (CAES) in Idaho Falls. Line item 10 is a decrease of $79,300 ongoing from the General Fund from the Systemwide Program. There is a corresponding increase in the Office of the State Board of Education's budget in this same amount to be used to hire a web developer and to maintain the online credit transfer portal. Line item 11 provides $4,085,800 one-time from the General Fund to the Systemwide Program for the State Board of Education to allocate among the institutions. Overall, this budget is a 7.0% increase above the FY 2014 appropriation.

FISCAL NOTE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2014 Original Appropriation</th>
<th>FTP</th>
<th>4,031.63</th>
<th>236,543,600</th>
<th>229,358,400</th>
<th>465,902,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reappropriation</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>98,221,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>98,221,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2014 Total Appropriation</td>
<td>4,031.63</td>
<td>236,543,600</td>
<td>327,579,900</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>564,123,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncognizable Funds and Transfers</td>
<td>90.80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17,564,700</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17,564,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2014 Estimated Expenditures</td>
<td>4,122.43</td>
<td>236,543,600</td>
<td>345,144,600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>581,688,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removal of One-Time Expenditures</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(107,711,200)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(107,711,200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Adjustments</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2015 Base</td>
<td>4,122.43</td>
<td>236,543,600</td>
<td>237,433,400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>473,977,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit Costs</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,535,000</td>
<td>2,537,800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,072,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflationary Adjustments</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,561,700</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,561,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement Items</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,782,700</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,782,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statement of Purpose / Fiscal Note S1417
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>Change from FY 2014</th>
<th>% Chg from FY 2014 Orig Approp.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statewide Cost Allocation</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(79,300)</td>
<td>96.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Employee Compensation</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,685,000</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nondiscretionary Adjustments</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment Adjustments</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,352,900</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2015 Program Maintenance</td>
<td>4,122.43</td>
<td>242,435,700</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Fund Shift for Benefits/CEC</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 60% Goal (BSU, ISU, UI, LCSC)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,759,700</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Occupancy Costs (BSU, ISU)</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. UI College of Law - Boise 2nd Year</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Higher Education Research Council</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Deferred Maintenance</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Mill Fund/RADAR Center (BSU)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Center for Advanced Energy Studies</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Move to OSBE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(79,300)</td>
<td>96.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Board Allocation</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2015 Total</td>
<td>4,127.82</td>
<td>251,223,200</td>
<td>96.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contact:
Paul Headlee
Budget and Policy Analysis
(208) 334-4746
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BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF IDAHO:

SECTION 1. There is hereby appropriated to the State Board of Education and the Board of Regents of the University of Idaho for college and universities, and the Office of the State Board of Education, the following amounts to be expended according to the designated programs and expense classes, from the listed funds for the period July 1, 2014, through June 30, 2015:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For Personnel Costs</th>
<th>For Operating Expenditures</th>
<th>For Capital Outlay</th>
<th>For Trustee and Benefit Payments</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$68,531,200</td>
<td>$7,692,000</td>
<td>$3,757,800</td>
<td></td>
<td>$79,981,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$64,721,800</td>
<td>$19,615,600</td>
<td>$917,800</td>
<td></td>
<td>$85,255,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$133,253,000</td>
<td>$27,307,600</td>
<td>$4,675,600</td>
<td>$165,236,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. IDAHO STATE UNIVERSITY:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>General Fund</th>
<th>Charitable Institutions Endowment Income Fund</th>
<th>Normal School Endowment Income Fund</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$65,831,400</td>
<td>$804,300</td>
<td>$1,027,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$66,635,700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,027,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,572,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### III. UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FROM:</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Agricultural College Endowment Income</th>
<th>Scientific School Endowment Income</th>
<th>University Endowment Income</th>
<th>Unrestricted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fund</td>
<td>$69,903,800</td>
<td>$5,717,100</td>
<td>$3,534,100</td>
<td>$1,572,000</td>
<td>$39,987,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund</td>
<td>$824,400</td>
<td>56,200</td>
<td>283,400</td>
<td>1,007,800</td>
<td>$2,858,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund</td>
<td>$2,316,800</td>
<td>214,200</td>
<td>795,400</td>
<td>3,326,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund</td>
<td>$39,987,300</td>
<td>$34,190,400</td>
<td>$739,800</td>
<td>1,321,700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$115,890,900</td>
<td>$40,177,900</td>
<td>$6,360,500</td>
<td>3,866,400</td>
<td>$162,429,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### IV. LEWIS-CLARK STATE COLLEGE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FROM:</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Normal School Endowment Income</th>
<th>Unrestricted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fund</td>
<td>$12,183,600</td>
<td>$1,349,600</td>
<td>$3,132,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund</td>
<td>$1,572,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,321,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund</td>
<td>$10,635,300</td>
<td>3,132,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$22,818,900</td>
<td>$6,053,900</td>
<td>1,755,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### V. SYSTEMWIDE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FROM:</th>
<th>General</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fund</td>
<td>$2,681,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAND TOTAL</td>
<td>$375,161,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 2. EMPLOYEE COMPENSATION. It is the intent of the Legislature, working cooperatively with the Governor's Office, the Division of Human Resources, and the Division of Financial Management, to progress toward the goal of funding a competitive salary and benefit package that will attract qualified applicants, retain employees committed to public service excellence, motivate employees to maintain high standards of productivity, and reward employees for outstanding performance by:

1) Adjusting the compensation schedule upwards by 1% to move the salary structure toward market; and

2) Continuing the job classifications that are currently on payline exception to address specific recruitment or retention issues; and

3) Funding an ongoing 1% salary increase for state employees, and funding the equivalent of a one-time 1% bonus for state employees, based upon employee merit, with flexibility in distribution as determined by the agency directors.

The Legislature also finds that investing in state employee compensation should remain a high priority even in tough economic times, and therefore strongly encourages agency directors, institution executives and the Division of Financial Management to approve the use of salary savings to provide either one-time or ongoing merit increases for deserving employees and also to target employees who are below policy compensation. Such salary savings could result from turnover and attrition, or be the result of innovation and reorganization efforts that create savings. Such savings should be reinvested in employees. Agencies are cautioned to use one-time funding for one-time payments and ongoing funding for permanent pay increases.

SECTION 3. NON-GENERAL FUND REAPPROPRIATION AUTHORITY. There is hereby reappropriated to the State Board of Education and the Board of Regents of the University of Idaho for college and universities any unexpended and unencumbered balances of moneys categorized as dedicated funds appropriated for fiscal year 2014, to be used for nonrecurring expenditures, for the period July 1, 2014, through June 30, 2015.

SECTION 4. LEGISLATIVE INTENT. It is the intent of the Legislature that of the amount appropriated from the General Fund in Section 1, Subsection V. of this act, the following amounts may be used as follows: (1) An amount not to exceed $140,000 may be used by the Office of the State Board of Education for systemwide needs; (2) An amount of approximately $1,435,500 may be used for the mission and goals of the Higher Education Research Council as outlined in State Board of Education policy III.W., which includes awards for infrastructure, matching grants, and competitive grants through the Idaho Incubation Fund program; and (3) An amount not to exceed $863,300 may be used by the State Board of Education for instructional projects designed to foster innovative learning approaches using technology, to promote accountability and information transfer throughout the higher education system including longitudinal student-level data and program/course transferability and to promote the Idaho Electronic Campus.
SECTION 5. LEGISLATIVE INTENT. It is the intent of the Legislature that of the amount appropriated from the General Fund in Section 1, Subsection V. of this act, $2,759,700 of ongoing funds provided for Complete College Idaho 60% goal and $4,085,800 of one-time funds provided shall be allocated by the State Board of Education for either personnel, operating or one-time capital outlay costs.

SECTION 6. EXEMPTIONS FROM OBJECT AND PROGRAM TRANSFER LIMITATIONS. For fiscal year 2014, the State Board of Education and the Board of Regents of the University of Idaho for college and universities is hereby exempted from the provisions of Section 67-3511(1), (2) and (3), Idaho Code, allowing unlimited transfers between object codes and between programs, for all moneys appropriated to it for the period July 1, 2014, through June 30, 2015. Legislative appropriations shall not be transferred from one fund to another fund unless expressly approved by the Legislature.
SUBJECT
Community Colleges FY 2015 Appropriation Allocation

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY
Senate Bill 1415 (2014)

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION
The Legislature makes an annual appropriation to the State Board of Education for community college support. The allocation to the colleges includes the current year (FY 2014) base allocation plus each college’s respective share in any annual budget adjustments according to the normal budgeting process.

IMPACT
This action allocates the FY 2015 Community Colleges appropriation to the institutions. The funds allocated along with revenue generated from other non-appropriated sources will establish the operating budgets. The FY 2015 Allocation is shown on Tab 5c, page 3.

The FY 2015 appropriation includes ongoing base funding for health insurance increases, 1% one-time and 1% ongoing Change in Employee Compensation (CEC) increases, a net increase for Enrollment Workload Adjustment (EWA), occupancy costs, and the following additional line item enhancements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College of Southern Idaho</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho Falls Outreach Center</td>
<td>$143,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEM Faculty</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Western Idaho</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing Faculty and Staff</td>
<td>$302,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Idaho College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandpoint Outreach Center</td>
<td>$302,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ATTACHMENTS
Attachment 1 – FY 2015 CC Appropriations Allocation Page 3
Attachment 2 – Statement of Purpose/Fiscal Note Page 5
Attachment 3 – Appropriation Bill (S1415) Page 7

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
Staff recommends approval of the FY 2015 Community College allocation.

BOARD ACTION
I move to approve the allocation of the FY 2015 appropriation for the College of Southern Idaho, College of Western Idaho and North Idaho College, as presented on Tab 5c, Page 3.

Moved by__________ Seconded by__________ Carried Yes_____ No_____
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 14 Total Appropriation</th>
<th>CSI</th>
<th>CWI</th>
<th>NIC</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Funds</td>
<td>11,948,200</td>
<td>8,248,800</td>
<td>10,029,600</td>
<td>30,226,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated Funds</td>
<td>200,800</td>
<td>205,700</td>
<td>204,500</td>
<td>611,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total FY14 Total Appropriation</td>
<td>12,149,000</td>
<td>8,454,500</td>
<td>10,234,100</td>
<td>30,837,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| FY 15 Base                | -        |
| General Funds             | 11,948,200 | 8,248,800 | 10,029,600 | 30,226,600 |
| Dedicated Funds           | 200,800   | 205,700   | 204,500   | 611,000   |
| Total FY 14 Base          | 12,148,200 | 8,448,800 | 10,229,600 | 30,826,600 |

| FY 15 Maintenance Items   | -        |
| Benefit Cost Increases   | 38,400   | 100,400   | 117,100   | 255,900   |
| CEC: 1% ongoing, 1% one-time | 170,600 | 92,800    | 166,400   | 429,800   |
| Enrollment Workload Adjustment | (346,300) | 746,800   | (274,300) | 126,200   |
| Total FY 14 Maintenance   | 12,010,900 | 9,388,800 | 10,238,800 | 31,638,500 |

| FY 15 Line Items          | -        |
| Occupancy Costs           | 210,800   | 880,400   | -        | 1,091,200  |
| Idaho Falls Outreach      | 143,600   | -        | -        | 143,600    |
| STEM Faculty              | 100,000   | -        | -        | 100,000    |
| Nursing Faculty & Staff   | -        | 302,900   | -        | 302,900    |
| Sandpoint Outreach        | -        | -        | 302,300   | 302,300    |
| Total Line Items          | 454,400   | 1,183,300 | 302,300   | 1,940,000  |

| FY 15 Total Appropriation | -        |
| General Funds             | 12,265,300 | 10,372,100 | 10,341,100 | 32,978,500 |
| Dedicated Funds           | 200,000   | 200,000   | 200,000   | 600,000    |
| Total FY 15 Total Appropriation | 12,465,300 | 10,572,100 | 10,541,100 | 33,578,500 |

| GF Change from FY 14 Total | 2.7%   | 25.7%   | 3.1%   | 9.1%    |

| GF Appropriation Allocation | -        |
| PC                         | 9,908,200 | 6,482,600 | 9,411,400 | 25,802,200 |
| OE                         | 1,749,700 | 3,888,900 | 914,700   | 6,553,300   |
| CO                         | 607,400   | 600       | 15,000    | 623,000     |
| TB                         | -        | -        | -        | 0         |
| Total General Funds        | 12,265,300 | 10,372,100 | 10,341,100 | 32,978,500 |
STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

RS23134

This is the FY 2015 appropriation to the State Board of Education for Community Colleges in the amount of $33,578,500. This appropriation provides for increased cost of benefits. The budget also provides for the equivalent of a 2% change in employee compensation (1% ongoing and 1% one-time). Additionally, it provides a non-discretionary adjustment for enrollment workload net increases. Finally, this budget includes five line items. Line item 1, provides $1,091,200 ongoing from the General Fund for occupancy costs at the following facilities: CSI - The Advanced Technology and Innovation facility, $210,800, and CWI - Micron Center for Professional-Technical Education, $880,400. Line item 3 provides $143,600 ongoing from the General Fund to the College of Southern Idaho to provide lower division courses in the Idaho Falls area. Line item 5 provides $100,000 from the General Fund to the College of Southern Idaho to hire STEM (science, technology, engineering, and math) faculty to assist with developing and retaining highly qualified instructors in STEM subjects. Line item 6 provides $302,900 ongoing from the General Fund to the College of Western Idaho to transition the PTE nursing program to a CWI-funded program. Line item 9 provides $302,300 ongoing from the General Fund to North Idaho College to expand the Sandpoint Outreach Center to provide more comprehensive services to that area. Overall, this budget is a 8.9% increase above the FY 2014 appropriation.

FISCAL NOTE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2014 Original Appropriation</th>
<th>FTP</th>
<th>Gen 30,226,600</th>
<th>Ded 611,000</th>
<th>Fed 0</th>
<th>Total 30,837,600</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noncognizable Funds and Transfers</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>30,226,600</td>
<td>611,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30,837,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2014 Estimated Expenditures</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>30,226,600</td>
<td>611,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30,837,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removal of One-Time Expenditures</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(11,000)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(11,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2015 Base</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>30,226,600</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30,826,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit Costs</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>255,900</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>255,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflationary Adjustments</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement Items</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Employee Compensation</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>429,800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>429,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nondiscretionary Adjustments</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>126,200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>126,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2015 Program Maintenance</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>31,038,500</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31,638,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Occupancy Costs, CSI, CWI</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,091,200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,091,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Accountability Framework, CSI, CWI, NIC</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Idaho Falls Center - CSI</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>143,600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>143,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Graduation Rate Improvement - CSI</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. STEM Initiative - CSI</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Nursing Support Staff - CWI</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>302,900</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>302,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Virtual One-Stop Services - CWI</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Expansion of Dual Credit - CWI</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Expand Sandpoint Center - NIC</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>302,300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>302,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Establish Veteran's Center, NIC</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statement of Purpose / Fiscal Note  S1415
| FY 2015 Total | 0.00 | 32,978,500 | 600,000 | 0 | 33,578,500 |
| Chg from FY 2014 Orig Approp | 0.00 | 2,751,900 | (1,000) | 0 | 2,740,900 |
| % Chg from FY 2014 Orig Approp. | 0.0% | 9.1% | (1.8%) | 0.0% | 8.9% |

Contact:
Paul Headlee
Budget and Policy Analysis
(208) 334-4746
AN ACT
APPROPRIATING MONEYS TO THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGES
FOR 2015; EXEMPTING APPROPRIATION OBJECT AND PROGRAM TRANSFER LIMITATIONS;
PROVIDING GUIDANCE FOR EMPLOYEE COMPENSATION; AND PROVIDING
LEGISLATIVE INTENT RELATING TO SYSTEM-WIDE EXPENDITURES.

Be It Enacted by the Legislature of the State of Idaho:

SECTION 1. There is hereby appropriated to the State Board of Educa-
tion for Community Colleges, the following amounts to be expended according
to the designated programs and expense classes, from the listed funds for the
period July 1, 2014, through June 30, 2015:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOR PERSONNEL</th>
<th>FOR OPERATING COSTS</th>
<th>FOR CAPITAL EXPENDITURES</th>
<th>FOR OUTLAY</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. COLLEGE OF SOUTHERN IDAHO (CSI):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FROM:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund</td>
<td>$9,908,200</td>
<td>$1,749,700</td>
<td>$607,400</td>
<td>$12,265,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund</td>
<td>163,900</td>
<td>27,300</td>
<td>8,800</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$10,072,100</td>
<td>$1,777,000</td>
<td>$616,200</td>
<td>$12,465,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. COLLEGE OF WESTERN IDAHO (CWI):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FROM:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund</td>
<td>$6,482,600</td>
<td>$3,888,900</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>$10,372,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$6,482,600</td>
<td>$4,088,900</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>$10,572,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. NORTH IDAHO COLLEGE (NIC):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FROM:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund</td>
<td>$9,411,400</td>
<td>$914,700</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$10,341,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 2. EXEMPTIONS FROM OBJECT AND PROGRAM TRANSFER LIMITATIONS.
For fiscal year 2015, the State Board of Education for Community Colleges is hereby exempted from the provisions of Section 67-3511(1), (2) and (3), Idaho Code, allowing unlimited transfers between object codes and between programs, for all moneys appropriated to it for the period July 1, 2014, through June 30, 2015. Legislative appropriations shall not be transferred from one fund to another fund unless expressly approved by the Legislature.

SECTION 3. EMPLOYEE COMPENSATION. It is the intent of the Legislature, working cooperatively with the Governor's Office, the Division of Human Resources, and the Division of Financial Management, to progress toward the goal of funding a competitive salary and benefit package that will attract qualified applicants, retain employees committed to public service excellence, motivate employees to maintain high standards of productivity, and reward employees for outstanding performance by:

1) Adjusting the compensation schedule upwards by 1% to move the salary structure toward market; and

2) Continuing the job classifications that are currently on payline exception to address specific recruitment or retention issues; and

3) Funding an ongoing 1% salary increase for state employees, and funding the equivalent of a one-time 1% bonus for state employees, based upon employee merit, with flexibility in distribution as determined by the agency directors.

The Legislature also finds that investing in state employee compensation should remain a high priority even in tough economic times, and therefore strongly encourages agency directors, institution executives and the Division of Financial Management to approve the use of salary savings to provide either one-time or ongoing merit increases for deserving employees and also to target employees who are below policy compensation. Such salary savings could result from turnover and attrition, or be the result of innovation and reorganization efforts that create savings. Such savings should be reinvested in employees. Agencies are cautioned to use one-time funding for one-time payments and ongoing funding for permanent pay increases.

SECTION 4. LEGISLATIVE INTENT. It is the intent of the Legislature that of the amount appropriated from the General Fund in Section 1 of this act, an amount not to exceed $70,000 may be expended by the Office of the State Board
of Education for system-wide needs including, but not limited to, projects
to promote accountability and information transfer throughout the higher
education system.
DIVISION OF PROFESSIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION

SUBJECT
Allocation of the State Division of Professional-Technical Education Appropriation

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY
Senate Bill 1416 (2014)

BACKGROUND
The Legislature appropriates funds for professional-technical education to the Division of Professional-Technical Education (PTE) in five designated programs: State Leadership and Technical Assistance, General Programs, Postsecondary Programs, Underprepared and Unprepared Adults/Displaced Homemakers, and Related Services. The PTE requests approval of the FY2015 appropriation allocation detailed on Page 3 (Attachment 1).

DISCUSSION
The allocation is based on the level of funding in Senate Bill 1416 and the provisions of the State Plan for Professional-Technical Education. The General Fund appropriation reflects an overall increase of 4.6% from the original FY2014 appropriation. The Legislature funded employee benefit increases; maintenance level increases in the statewide cost allocation for PTE and EITC; maintenance level increase for professional-technical school added cost support units; and one-time funds for replacement operating expenses and capital outlay at PTE and the six technical colleges. The Legislature also funded an ongoing increase for secondary added cost programs; ongoing funds for six (6) FTP at the technical colleges to start new Advanced Manufacturing Programs; and one-time funds for operating expenses and capital outlay for the new Advanced Manufacturing Programs.

IMPACT
Establish the FY 2015 operating budget.

ATTACHMENTS
Attachment 1 - FY15 Appropriation Allocation Page 3
Attachment 2 - FY15 Statement of Purpose/Fiscal Note Page 5
Attachment 3 - FY15 Appropriation Bill (S1416) Page 7

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
Staff recommends approval of the FY 2015 Division of Professional-Technical Education allocation.
BOARD ACTION
I move to approve the request from the Division of Professional-Technical Education for the FY 2015 appropriation allocation as detailed on Tab 7d page 3 (Attachment 1).

Moved by    Seconded by    Yes    No
## DIVISION OF PROFESSIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION

Allocation of State Division of Professional-Technical Education

**FY 2014 Appropriation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program 01 (State Leadership and Technical Assistance)</th>
<th>FY14 Allocation</th>
<th>FY15 Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By Standard Class:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Costs</td>
<td>$1,896,700</td>
<td>$1,966,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenses</td>
<td>344,900</td>
<td>533,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td>35,500</td>
<td>13,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,277,100</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,513,900</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Source of Revenue:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Funds</td>
<td>1,908,800</td>
<td>1,954,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-time General Funds</td>
<td>43,700</td>
<td>226,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Funds</td>
<td>324,600</td>
<td>330,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-time Federal Funds</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,277,100</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,513,900</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program 02 (General Programs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Major Program Area:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Formula</td>
<td>$9,185,651</td>
<td>$9,968,149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional-Technical School Added Cost</td>
<td>3,056,900</td>
<td>3,100,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Programs Leadership</td>
<td>212,900</td>
<td>220,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Leadership</td>
<td>650,348</td>
<td>637,698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Learning Partnership</td>
<td>544,341</td>
<td>536,993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult/Retraining</td>
<td>766,442</td>
<td>771,442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support and Improvement Services</td>
<td>1,055,918</td>
<td>1,050,918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>$15,472,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>$16,286,200</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By Source of Revenue:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Funds</th>
<th>$10,965,000</th>
<th>$11,770,900</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One-time General Funds</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Funds</td>
<td>4,439,700</td>
<td>4,444,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-time Federal Funds</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated Funds</td>
<td>67,800</td>
<td>67,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>$15,472,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>$16,286,200</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program 03 (Postsecondary Programs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Technical College:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College of Southern Idaho</td>
<td>5,550,484</td>
<td>6,132,904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Western Idaho</td>
<td>6,636,014</td>
<td>7,190,154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Idaho Technical College</td>
<td>5,925,591</td>
<td>6,473,431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho State University</td>
<td>9,606,598</td>
<td>10,397,898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis-Clark State College</td>
<td>3,779,397</td>
<td>4,124,917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Idaho College</td>
<td>4,079,816</td>
<td>4,308,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>$35,577,700</strong></td>
<td><strong>$38,628,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By Source of Revenue:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Funds</th>
<th>$34,931,300</th>
<th>$36,311,200</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One-time General Funds</td>
<td>136,400</td>
<td>1,836,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted Funds</td>
<td>510,000</td>
<td>480,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>$35,577,700</strong></td>
<td><strong>$38,628,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Program 04 (Underprepared Adults/Displaced Homemaker Program)

#### By Major Program:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY14 Allocation</th>
<th>FY15 Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Postsecondary Formula</td>
<td>$1,747,300</td>
<td>$1,747,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displaced Homemaker Program</td>
<td>$170,000</td>
<td>$170,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,917,300</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,917,300</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### By Source of Revenue:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>FY14 Allocation</th>
<th>FY15 Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Funds</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Funds</td>
<td>$1,747,300</td>
<td>$1,747,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated Funds</td>
<td>$170,000</td>
<td>$170,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,917,300</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,917,300</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Program 05 (Related Services)

#### By Standard Class:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>FY14 Allocation</th>
<th>FY15 Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Costs</td>
<td>$381,300</td>
<td>$398,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenses</td>
<td>$232,700</td>
<td>$195,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustee Payments</td>
<td>$2,879,700</td>
<td>$3,014,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,493,700</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,608,600</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### By Source of Revenue:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>FY14 Allocation</th>
<th>FY15 Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Funds</td>
<td>$972,200</td>
<td>$976,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-time General Funds</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Funds</td>
<td>$2,136,500</td>
<td>$2,237,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-time Federal Funds</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated Funds</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Revenue</td>
<td>$245,000</td>
<td>$251,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-time Miscellaneous Revenue</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,493,700</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,608,600</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### By Source of Revenue:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>FY14 Allocation</th>
<th>FY15 Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Funds</td>
<td>$48,777,300</td>
<td>$51,012,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-time General Funds</td>
<td>$180,100</td>
<td>$2,066,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Funds</td>
<td>$8,648,100</td>
<td>$8,759,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-time Federal Funds</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td>$4,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated Funds</td>
<td>$377,800</td>
<td>$377,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted Funds</td>
<td>$510,000</td>
<td>$480,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Revenue</td>
<td>$245,000</td>
<td>$251,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-time Miscellaneous Revenue</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>$58,738,300</strong></td>
<td><strong>$62,954,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STATEMENT OF PURPOSE
RS23135

This is the FY 2015 appropriation to the Division of Professional-Technical Education in the amount of $62,954,000. This appropriation provides for increased cost of benefits, replacement items, a reduction for statewide cost allocation, and the network billing proposal for the Department of Administration. Additionally, it provides a non-discretionary statutory adjustment for enrollment workload increases. The budget provides for the equivalent of a 2% change in employee compensation (1% ongoing and 1% one-time). This budget also includes two line items. Line item 1 provides 6 full-time equivalent positions and $1,334,600 for the advanced manufacturing initiative. Of this amount, the six FTP would be divided equally among the six technical colleges, $416,500 would be ongoing for salaries and benefits, $169,200 would be one-time for operating expenditures, and $748,900 would be one-time for capital outlay. This funding is to be allocated as follows: College of Southern Idaho's Food Processing Technology Program, $298,900; College of Western Idaho's Advanced Manufacturing Program, $235,000; Eastern Idaho Technical College's Welding Fabrication and Advanced Manufacturing Technologies, $300,800; Idaho State University's Advanced Manufacturing Technology Program, $310,100; Lewis-Clark State College's Electronic Engineering Technology Program, $126,800; and North Idaho College's Advanced Manufacturing Aerospace Instruction Program, $63,000. Line item 2 provides $756,400 to increase PTE's secondary schools added-cost unit values. Specifically, the Agriculture Science and Technology Programs and the Agriculture Science/Mechanics Programs unit values are directed be increased from $10,260 to $15,000 and all other programs at the high school level will see a 5% increase in their unit cost values. Overall, this budget is a 7.2% increase above the FY 2014 appropriation.

FISCAL NOTE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2014 Original Appropriation</th>
<th>FTP</th>
<th>Gen</th>
<th>Ded</th>
<th>Fed</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reappropriation</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2014 Total Appropriation</td>
<td>515.96</td>
<td>48,957.40</td>
<td>1,132,800</td>
<td>8,648,100</td>
<td>58,738,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncognizable Funds and Transfers</td>
<td>(7.87)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>99,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2014 Estimated Expenditures</td>
<td>508.09</td>
<td>48,957.40</td>
<td>1,493,600</td>
<td>8,974,700</td>
<td>59,425,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removal of One-Time Expenditures</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(180,100)</td>
<td>(360,800)</td>
<td>(326,600)</td>
<td>(867,500)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Adjustments</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(30,000)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(30,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2015 Base</td>
<td>508.09</td>
<td>48,777,300</td>
<td>1,102,800</td>
<td>8,747,600</td>
<td>58,627,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit Costs</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>727,700</td>
<td>4,400</td>
<td>10,200</td>
<td>742,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement Items</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>852,200</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>852,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide Cost Allocation</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(5,900)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(2,200)</td>
<td>(8,100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Employee Compensation</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>592,600</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>8,600</td>
<td>604,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nondiscretionary Adjustments</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>43,400</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>43,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2015 Program Maintenance</td>
<td>508.09</td>
<td>50,987,300</td>
<td>1,110,800</td>
<td>8,764,200</td>
<td>60,862,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Advanced Manufacturing Initiative</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>1,334,600</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,334,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Secondary Schools Unit Cost Increase</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>756,400</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>756,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statement of Purpose / Fiscal Note  S1416
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Network Billing Adjustment</th>
<th>0.00</th>
<th>700</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>700</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2015 Total</td>
<td>514.09</td>
<td>53,079,000</td>
<td>1,110,800</td>
<td>8,764,200</td>
<td>62,954,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chg from FY 2014 Orig Approp</td>
<td>(1.87)</td>
<td>4,121,600</td>
<td>(22,000)</td>
<td>116,100</td>
<td>4,215,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Chg from FY 2014 Orig Approp.</td>
<td>(0.4%)</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>(1.9%)</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contact:
Paul Headlee
Budget and Policy Analysis
(208) 334-4746
LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF IDAHO
Sixty-second Legislature Second Regular Session - 2014

IN THE SENATE

SENATE BILL NO. 1416

BY FINANCE COMMITTEE

AN ACT

APPROPRIATING MONEYS TO THE DIVISION OF PROFESSIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015; PROVIDING GUIDANCE FOR EMPLOYEE COMPENSATION; EXEMPTING APPROPRIATION OBJECT TRANSFER LIMITATIONS FOR THE POSTSECONDARY PROGRAM; PROVIDING NON-GENERAL FUND REAPPROPRIATION FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014; AND PROVIDING LEGISLATIVE INTENT.

Be It Enacted by the Legislature of the State of Idaho:

SECTION 1. There is hereby appropriated to the Division of Professional-Technical Education, the following amounts to be expended according to the designated programs and expense classes, from the listed funds for the period July 1, 2014, through June 30, 2015:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOR TRUSTEE AND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERSONNEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COSTS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. STATE LEADERSHIP & TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE:

FROM:

General

| Fund | $1,694,200 | $473,200 | $13,700 | $2,181,100 |

Federal Grant

| Fund | 272,600 | 60,200 | 0 | 332,800 |

TOTAL | $1,966,800 | $533,400 | $13,700 | $2,513,900 |

II. GENERAL PROGRAMS:

FROM:

General

| Fund | $198,700 | $22,000 | $11,551,900 | $11,772,600 |

Hazardous Materials/Waste Enforcement

| Fund | 67,800 | 67,800 |

Federal Grant

| Fund | 178,600 | 14,800 | 4,252,400 | 4,445,800 |

TOTAL | $377,300 | $36,800 | $15,872,100 | $16,286,200 |
SECTION 2. EMPLOYEE COMPENSATION. It is the intent of the Legislature, working cooperatively with the Governor's Office, the Division of Human Resources, and the Division of Financial Management, to progress toward the goal of funding a competitive salary and benefit package that will attract qualified applicants, retain employees committed to public service excellence, motivate employees to maintain high standards of productivity, and reward employees for outstanding performance by:
1) Adjusting the compensation schedule upwards by 1% to move the salary structure toward market; and

2) Continuing the job classifications that are currently on payline exception to address specific recruitment or retention issues; and

3) Funding an ongoing 1% salary increase for state employees, and funding the equivalent of a one-time 1% bonus for state employees, based upon employee merit, with flexibility in distribution as determined by the agency directors.

The Legislature also finds that investing in state employee compensation should remain a high priority even in tough economic times, and therefore strongly encourages agency directors, institution executives and the Division of Financial Management to approve the use of salary savings to provide either one-time or ongoing merit increases for deserving employees and also to target employees who are below policy compensation. Such salary savings could result from turnover and attrition, or be the result of innovation and reorganization efforts that create savings. Such savings should be reinvested in employees. Agencies are cautioned to use one-time funding for one-time payments and ongoing funding for permanent pay increases.

SECTION 3. EXEMPTIONS FROM OBJECT TRANSFER LIMITATIONS. For fiscal year 2015, the Division of Professional-Technical Education, Postsecondary Program, is hereby exempted from the provisions of Section 67-3511(1) and (3), Idaho Code, allowing unlimited transfers between object codes, for all moneys appropriated to it for the period July 1, 2014, through June 30, 2015. Legislative appropriations shall not be transferred from one fund to another fund unless expressly approved by the Legislature.

SECTION 4. NON-GENERAL FUND REAPPROPRIATION AUTHORITY. There is hereby reappropriated to the Division of Professional-Technical Education, any unexpended and unencumbered balances of moneys categorized as dedicated funds and federal funds as appropriated for fiscal year 2014, to be used for nonrecurring expenditures, for the period July 1, 2014, through June 30, 2015.

SECTION 5. LEGISLATIVE INTENT. It is the intent of the Legislature that within General Programs, ongoing funding provided in this act be used to increase the secondary schools added-cost unit values for the Agriculture Science and Technology Programs and the Agriculture Science/Mechanics Programs from $10,260 to $15,000 and to increase the secondary schools added-cost unit values by 5% for all other secondary programs.
SUBJECT
FY 2015 Athletics Limits

REFERENCE
August 2012 Board approved second reading of new section V.X. Intercollegiate Athletics which set athletics and gender equity limits

February 2014 Board approved first reading to exclude conference entry/exit fees from institutional funds limit

APPLICABLE STATUTES, RULE OR POLICY
Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies & Procedures, Section V.X.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION
Board Policy V.X. clarifies “sources of funds” and “gender equity” as defined terms, requires an annual gender equity report, and requires Board approval of all annual limits on athletics expenditures. The General Fund appropriation is used for the purpose of calculating the limit on state General Funds for the athletics program as a whole and funds used for gender equity. For the purpose of computing the limit on Institutional Funds, the policy uses the rate of change of total Appropriated Funds as the calculator. Funds allocated and used by athletics are limited as follows:

a. State General Funds –
   i. The limit for State General Funds shall be allocated in two categories: General Funds used for athletics and General Funds used to comply with Title IX (gender equity).

   ii. FY 2014 vs. FY 2015 General Fund limits:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) General Funds for Athletics:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Universities</td>
<td>$2,515,800</td>
<td>$2,671,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Lewis-Clark State College</td>
<td>$ 935,300</td>
<td>$ 993,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) General Funds for Gender Equity:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Boise State University</td>
<td>$1,109,700</td>
<td>$1,178,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Idaho State University</td>
<td>$ 734,400</td>
<td>$ 780,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) University of Idaho</td>
<td>$ 961,600</td>
<td>$1,021,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Lewis-Clark State College</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   iii. The methodology used for computing the limits for both categories of State General Funds is calculating the rate of change for the next fiscal year ongoing state General Funds compared to the ongoing state General Funds in the current fiscal year, and then apply the rate of change to both limits approved by the Board in the previous year. These limits are approved annually by the Board.
b. Institutional funds –
   i. FY 2014 vs. FY 2015 limits:
      
      | Institution                  | FY 2014 | FY 2015 |
      |----------------------------|---------|---------|
      | 1) Boise State University  | $406,400| $430,200|
      | 2) Idaho State University  | $568,900| $602,200|
      | 3) University of Idaho     | $812,800| $860,400|
      | 4) Lewis-Clark State College| $162,400| $171,900|

   ii. The methodology used to compute the limits for Institutional Funds is to calculate the rate of change for the next fiscal year ongoing Appropriated Funds compared to the ongoing Appropriated Funds in the current fiscal year, and then apply the rate of change to the limit approved by the Board in the previous year. These limits are also approved annually by the Board. “Appropriated Funds” means all funds appropriated by the Legislature to the institutions, including but not limited to, State General Funds, endowment funds, and appropriated tuition and fees.

IMPACT

General Funds Limit
The recommended FY 2015 General Funds limit shown in Attachment 1, lines 28-31 (columns f and g) represents a 6.21% increase as shown on line 9 under the “JFAC Action FY15” column.

Institutional Funds Limit
The institutional fund limits, as shown in Attachment 1, lines 14-21, represents a 5.86% increase as shown on line 8 under the “JFAC Action FY15” column.

ATTACHMENTS
Attachment 1 – FY 2015 Athletics Limits

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
Board agenda item Tab 7 includes the gender equity plans for each institution. Included in that agenda item, an institution could request additional funding to add a new sport or to address other compliance issues. It should be noted that an increase in students fees may be required should the Board request an increase in the limit.

Staff recommends approval of the limits as recommended.

BOARD ACTION
I move to approve the FY 2015 athletics limits for General Funds as listed in Attachment 1 lines 28-31 and the FY 2015 athletics limits for Institutional Funds as listed in Attachment 1 lines 14-21.

Moved by____________ Seconded by____________ Carried Yes____ No____
## Calculation of Limits:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY08</th>
<th>FY09</th>
<th>FY10</th>
<th>FY11</th>
<th>FY12</th>
<th>FY13</th>
<th>FY14</th>
<th>FY15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appropriated Funds:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>FY09</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>FY12</td>
<td>FY13</td>
<td>FY14</td>
<td>FY15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Funds</td>
<td>259,296,600</td>
<td>276,181,100</td>
<td>243,278,100</td>
<td>217,510,800</td>
<td>208,237,100</td>
<td>227,950,500</td>
<td>236,543,600</td>
<td>251,223,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment</td>
<td>7,851,500</td>
<td>8,595,000</td>
<td>9,616,400</td>
<td>9,616,400</td>
<td>9,616,600</td>
<td>9,927,400</td>
<td>10,729,200</td>
<td>12,528,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Fee Revenue</td>
<td>124,329,300</td>
<td>127,108,700</td>
<td>133,651,800</td>
<td>146,341,600</td>
<td>177,262,700</td>
<td>202,268,900</td>
<td>216,048,800</td>
<td>226,704,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Appropriated Funds</td>
<td>391,477,400</td>
<td>411,884,800</td>
<td>386,546,300</td>
<td>373,468,800</td>
<td>395,116,400</td>
<td>440,146,800</td>
<td>463,321,600</td>
<td>490,455,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Growth: Appropriated Funds</td>
<td>5.47%</td>
<td>5.21%</td>
<td>-6.15%</td>
<td>-3.38%</td>
<td>5.80%</td>
<td>11.40%</td>
<td>5.27%</td>
<td>5.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Growth: General Funds</td>
<td>6.39%</td>
<td>6.51%</td>
<td>-11.91%</td>
<td>-10.59%</td>
<td>-4.26%</td>
<td>9.47%</td>
<td>3.77%</td>
<td>6.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Growth: Student Fees</td>
<td>3.76%</td>
<td>2.24%</td>
<td>5.15%</td>
<td>9.49%</td>
<td>21.13%</td>
<td>14.11%</td>
<td>6.81%</td>
<td>4.93%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Institutional Funds:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY08</th>
<th>FY09</th>
<th>FY10</th>
<th>FY11</th>
<th>FY12</th>
<th>FY13</th>
<th>FY14</th>
<th>FY15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Limits:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boise State University</td>
<td>383,300</td>
<td>382,200</td>
<td>358,700</td>
<td>346,600</td>
<td>346,600</td>
<td>386,100</td>
<td>406,400</td>
<td>430,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho State University</td>
<td>508,500</td>
<td>535,000</td>
<td>502,100</td>
<td>485,100</td>
<td>485,100</td>
<td>540,400</td>
<td>568,900</td>
<td>602,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Idaho</td>
<td>726,500</td>
<td>764,400</td>
<td>717,400</td>
<td>693,100</td>
<td>693,100</td>
<td>772,100</td>
<td>812,800</td>
<td>860,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis-Clark State College</td>
<td>145,300</td>
<td>152,900</td>
<td>143,500</td>
<td>138,600</td>
<td>138,500</td>
<td>154,300</td>
<td>162,400</td>
<td>171,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Growth from Prior Year</td>
<td>5.48%</td>
<td>5.21%</td>
<td>-6.15%</td>
<td>-3.39%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>11.40%</td>
<td>5.27%</td>
<td>5.85%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## General Fund Limit Detail

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(a) FY 2014 General Account Limits</th>
<th>(b) FY 2015 General Account Limits</th>
<th>(a x 6.21%)</th>
<th>(b x 6.21%)</th>
<th>(a + d)</th>
<th>(b + e)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boise State University</td>
<td>2,515,800</td>
<td>1,109,700</td>
<td>156,100</td>
<td>68,900</td>
<td>171,200</td>
<td>77,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho State University</td>
<td>2,515,800</td>
<td>734,400</td>
<td>156,100</td>
<td>45,600</td>
<td>201,700</td>
<td>121,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Idaho</td>
<td>2,515,800</td>
<td>961,600</td>
<td>156,100</td>
<td>59,700</td>
<td>215,800</td>
<td>128,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis-Clark State College</td>
<td>935,300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>58,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>93,300</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8,482,700</td>
<td>2,805,700</td>
<td>526,300</td>
<td>174,200</td>
<td>9,009,000</td>
<td>2,979,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUBJECT
Gender Equity Reports

REFERENCE
August 2012 Board approved revisions to policy V.X., Intercollegiate Athletics, which requires a gender equity report

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY
Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies & Procedures Section V.X.

BACKGROUND/ DISCUSSION
The Board last reviewed the gender equity reports at the August 2013 meeting. Since that time, the Athletics Committee and the institutions have worked together in improving the gender equity report. The institutions used varying allocation methodologies to determine the costs for various program benefits (e.g. locker rooms, equipment, tutoring) and to allocate revenues to women’s sports. Most revenues such as student fees, booster support, and institutional funds are not directly linked to women’s sports only. It was determined that strict compliance to Title IX cannot be shown on a one-page report. The template can only show strict mathematical compliance with financial aid. For these reasons, the revised gender equity report includes the following features:

1. Maintains the first three sections of the report for Accommodations of Interests and Abilities, Financial Aid, and Participants by Sport.

2. Shows the total direct cost of all women’s sports. This amount is shown in the regular February athletic compensation and June budget reports and eliminates the need for the institutions to make an arbitrary allocation of indirect costs.

3. Eliminates the historical cost of the sports added since 1998, athletic financial aid, the costs for eleven program benefit areas, and the allocation of revenue sources. Instead, the report shows the total direct cost of women’s sports compared to the total direct cost of men’s sports. The percentage of the gender equity limit to total direct cost of woman’s sports is shown.

4. Continues to show prior year actual, current year forecast, and four years’ projection. Also continues to show any new sports and its effect on the Accommodations of Interest test, Financial Aid test, and participants by sport. New sports show the effect over time to the mix between men and women sports and to the funding sources between the gender equity limit
and all other sources. A narrative outlines any increase to the gender equity limit and other sources of revenue.

It was determined this information would be more informative than the historical cost of sports added since 1998 as the limit on General Funds is small compared to the total direct cost for all women’s sports. The comparison of total direct costs for women and men and the allocation between the gender equity limit and total direct costs were also considered to be a better gauge in determining how much support should be provided to women’s sports.

While the first section of the revised report shows how the institution is progressing toward mathematical compliance for Accommodations and Interests, an institution can also be in compliance by showing a history and continuing practice of program expansion or demonstrating the interests of the underrepresented gender have been fully accommodated by the current sports offered. This information, and compliance with the eleven program benefit areas, will be reviewed by the Athletics Committee from existing documentation provided by each institution. This includes existing National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) compliance and similar reports. These can be available to the full Board upon request.

Finally, the number of years included in the forecast was reduced considerably to five out-years which should be more meaningful in showing an institution’s plan to address any issues with gender equity compliance.

**IMPACT**

Calculated increases to the gender equity limits provide funding to cover rising costs for inflation, scholarships, and other athletics costs. The gender equity limits were reviewed by the Board in a prior agenda.

**ATTACHMENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachment</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Boise State University narrative</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>BSU gender equity report</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Idaho State University narrative</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ISU gender equity report</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>University of Idaho narrative</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>UI gender equity report</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Lewis-Clark State College narrative</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>LCSC gender equity report</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
The Accommodations and Interests section includes information on average squad size by gender and the number needed for mathematical compliance. Per the Office of Civil Right’s 1996 Policy Clarification, determining how close is "close enough" can be done using the following formula:

1) Identify the average number of participants per team of the under-represented gender; and
2) Identify the number of participants that is needed to be added to the current program to achieve strict proportionality.

If the average number in 1) is larger, then there is compliance with the substantial proportionality factor of part three of the test. If the number to be added in 2) above is larger, then there is noncompliance with the substantial proportionality factor of part three of the test.

The Financial Aid section shows whether an institution is in compliance. Financial assistance must be substantially proportionate to the ratio of male and female athletes. Institutions within 1% variance are considered compliant.

A narrative describing the current status of gender equity compliance is provided along with the gender equity report for each institution.

Board policy states it is the intent of the Board that increases in program revenues should be maximized before increases to the athletic limits will be considered.

BOARD ACTION
I move to approve the Gender Equity Reports for Boise State University, Idaho State University, University of Idaho and Lewis-Clark State College as submitted.

Moved by __________ Seconded by __________ Carried Yes _____ No _____
Title IX Compliance – Boise State Athletics

At Boise State University, the Athletic Department, with oversight from the Intercollegiate Athletic Advisory Committee (IAAC) Gender-Equity Subcommittee, conducts an annual Gender-Equity Review for Compliance with Title IX in Athletics. The outcome of this report includes recommendations to the university that help achieve and maintain compliance in areas where gender differences may currently exist or may be developing. The recommendations that have been made between FY10 and FY13 are outlined in the Summary of Recommendations and Progress submitted to the Athletics Committee. Progress towards completion of each recommendation was last updated March 2014.

Additionally, the Boise State Athletic Department currently has consultant, Good Sports Inc., Title IX and Gender Equity Specialists, under contract to review our department in the areas of Accommodation of Interests and Abilities, Athletic Financial Assistance, and Locker Rooms, Practice and Competitive Facilities. The consultant’s scope of work, scheduled to be completed May 2014, includes: (a) Review of FY13 and FY14 data for analysis of participation opportunities and financial aid; (b) Review of the FY10-FY13 Gender-Equity Review for Compliance with Title IX in Athletics reports; and (c) Campus visit in April to view all athletic facilities.

I. Participation Opportunities

In regards to participation opportunities, Boise State University complies with this program component by providing women and men with participation opportunities at rates that are at or near proportionate to their respective rates of enrollment as full-time undergraduate students.

The athletic participation review is in progress for FY14, but in FY13 athletic participation was 51.37% women to 48.63% men. Boise State’s fulltime undergraduate enrollment combined total was 51% female and 49% male. The FY13 comparison of undergraduate enrollment to athletic participation opportunities indicating that males were the underrepresented gender (in the previous year males were also under-represented).

While Boise State does not meet strict proportionality (athletic participation rates match exact undergraduate enrollment rates for each gender), the OCR’s 1996 Policy Clarification explains how to determine “how close is close enough.” OCR evaluators identify:

- A. The average number of participants per team in the underrepresented gender;
- B. The number of participants in the underrepresented gender to be added to the current program to achieve strict proportionality; and
- C. Determine which of the two numbers is larger.

If the average number of participants per team of the underrepresented gender is larger, compliance with test one (proportionality) is achieved.

For Boise State, the average number of participants per men’s team in FY13 was 35 (277 male participants, 8 men’s teams). In order to meet strict proportionality, using the 2012-2013 athletic participation and undergraduate enrollment numbers, 9 additional male participants would be needed to reach 49% athletic participation. Because the average number of participants per
men’s team is larger than the number of male participants to be added to the current program to achieve strict proportionality (35 versus 9), Boise State is in compliance with test one of the three part test regarding participation opportunities.

Further, to ensure continued compliance in this program area, head coaches are provided guidelines for roster size maximums and minimums annually. Each roster size is based on the head coach’s input on their ideal roster size with consideration of the overall program participation rates. This practice will be continued in upcoming years and represents the Athletic Department’s continued effort to provide equal participation opportunities with respect to undergraduate enrollment.

II. Financial Aid
In regards to athletic scholarships, Boise State University complies with this program component by providing women and men athletic financial aid at rates that are within one percentage point to their respective rates of financial aid participation (unduplicated count).

In FY13, the variance between unduplicated participation and the NCAA Squad List Athletic Grant Amount¹ was 0.73% (an improvement from the 1.66% variance the previous year) with favor to males. However, continued compliance in this area should be considered. The current athletic programs offered at Boise State University allows an NCAA imposed maximum of 129.5 athletic scholarships that can be awarded to male participants and a NCAA maximum of 111 athletic scholarships that can be awarded to female participants. In 2011-12, NCAA imposed penalties that altered the maximum scholarships that were to be awarded for both men and women. With the outstanding penalties in place in FY13, 104.82 of the 111 scholarships were awarded to females and 122.56 of the 129.5 were awarded to male participants. Of the women’s programs (not under NCAA penalty), golf (5.98 of 6.0), soccer (13.87 of 14.0), softball (10.92 of 12.0), and swimming and diving (13.26 of 14.0) awarded fewer than their maximum allowable scholarships. Each coach provided explanation as to why maximum scholarships were not awarded for the FY13 academic term. All four coaches had explanations that would be considered “reasonable professional decisions,” softball was the only program that awarded less than the maximum number of scholarships due to budget restrictions. It continues to be a recommendation that the Athletic Department require coaches to fully award female athletic scholarship dollars unless there is a reasonable professional decision to do otherwise.

III. Summary of Recommendations and Progress
With regard to remaining eleven program areas under Athletic Benefits and Opportunities, the Gender-Equity Subcommittee has made new recommendations to continue improving program areas in order to maintain or achieve equity between male and female student-athletes. Those recommendations and progress towards completion are outlined in the report submitted to the Athletics Committee.

¹ Note: NCAA Squad List Athletic Grant Amount and actual budget amounts for athletic aid differ. For example, in FY13, actual dollars awarded to females for financial aid was $1,062,184, while the NCAA Squad List Athletic Grant Amount was $2,727,884.
### Title IX Compliance: Accommodations of Interests & Abilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY13 ACT</th>
<th>FY14 PROJ</th>
<th>FY15</th>
<th>FY16</th>
<th>FY17</th>
<th>FY18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FT Students (undergraduate student body) Male</td>
<td>5,851</td>
<td>5,883</td>
<td>6,101</td>
<td>6,223</td>
<td>6,347</td>
<td>6,474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%: Female</td>
<td>6,309</td>
<td>6,297</td>
<td>6,388</td>
<td>6,516</td>
<td>6,646</td>
<td>6,779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athlete % Male</td>
<td>48.12%</td>
<td>48.30%</td>
<td>48.85%</td>
<td>48.85%</td>
<td>48.85%</td>
<td>48.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%: Female</td>
<td>51.88%</td>
<td>51.70%</td>
<td>51.15%</td>
<td>51.15%</td>
<td>51.15%</td>
<td>51.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Participants Male</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%: Female</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Title IX Definition of Participant %: Male</td>
<td>48.26%</td>
<td>48.50%</td>
<td>50.82%</td>
<td>50.82%</td>
<td>50.82%</td>
<td>50.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>51.74%</td>
<td>51.50%</td>
<td>49.18%</td>
<td>49.18%</td>
<td>49.18%</td>
<td>49.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance between FT and Athletics Male</td>
<td>0.14%</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
<td>1.97%</td>
<td>1.97%</td>
<td>1.97%</td>
<td>1.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Sports Teams at Institution by Gender: Male</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Squad Size Average</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Student Athletes Needed</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>22.17</td>
<td>22.18</td>
<td>22.19</td>
<td>22.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Squad Size Average</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Title IX Compliance: Athletic Financial Aid

| Financial Aid Participants Male | 225     | 209     | 222  | 222  | 222  | 222  |
| Female | 213     | 193     | 185  | 185  | 185  | 185  |
| New Sports (unduplicated) Female | 0       | 0       | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    |
| Subtotal Female Participants %: Male | 51.37%  | 51.99%  | 54.55%| 54.55%| 54.55%| 54.55%|
| Female | 48.63%  | 48.01%  | 45.45%| 45.45%| 45.45%| 45.45%|
| Athletic Financial Aid Totals Male | $2,967,193 | $3,247,158 | $3,489,803 | $3,699,191 | $3,921,143 | $4,156,411 |
| Female | $2,727,884 | $2,846,899 | $2,977,756 | $3,156,421 | $3,345,807 | $3,546,555 |
| New Sports Female | -       | -       | -    | -    | -    | -    |
| Subtotal Female %: Male | $2,727,884 | $2,846,899 | $2,977,756 | $3,156,421 | $3,345,807 | $3,546,555 |
| Female | 51.10%  | 53.28%  | 53.96%| 53.96%| 53.96%| 53.96%|
| Female | 47.90%  | 46.72%  | 46.04%| 46.04%| 46.04%| 46.04%|
| Variance between Financial Aid & Undup Participants | -0.73%  | -1.29%  | 0.59%| 0.59%| 0.59%| 0.59%|

### Participants by Sport:

#### Men’s Programs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>FY13 ACT</th>
<th>FY14 PROJ</th>
<th>FY15</th>
<th>FY16</th>
<th>FY17</th>
<th>FY18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Track</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Track</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Country</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrestling</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Male Participants</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Women’s Programs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>FY13 ACT</th>
<th>FY14 PROJ</th>
<th>FY15</th>
<th>FY16</th>
<th>FY17</th>
<th>FY18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand Volleyball</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnastics</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming and Diving</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skiing</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Track</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Track</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Country</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Female Participants</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SPORTS COSTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FY13 ACT</th>
<th>FY14 PROJ</th>
<th>FY15</th>
<th>FY16</th>
<th>FY17</th>
<th>FY18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Direct Costs of Women's Sports, including financial aid</td>
<td>5,223,765</td>
<td>5,219,225</td>
<td>5,419,225</td>
<td>5,619,225</td>
<td>5,819,225</td>
<td>6,019,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Costs of New Women's Sports, including financial aid</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Direct Costs for Women's Sports</td>
<td>5,223,765</td>
<td>5,244,225</td>
<td>5,489,225</td>
<td>5,659,225</td>
<td>5,859,225</td>
<td>6,059,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Equity Limit</td>
<td>976,872</td>
<td>1,109,700</td>
<td>1,178,600</td>
<td>1,278,600</td>
<td>1,378,600</td>
<td>1,478,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Gender Equity Limit to Total Direct Costs for Women's Sports</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gender Equity Report – Narrative
Idaho State University
3/17/2014

Throughout the history of Idaho State University, the Department of Athletics has been through three cycles of the NCAA Certification Program. On each of the occasions, the cycles were successfully concluded with “certified” status being awarded by the NCAA Committee on Athletic Certification. After successfully completing the third cycle, on March 10, 2011, the Idaho State University Athletic Department was fully certified. Anticipating the next cycle of NCAA certification, the Athletic Department has self-identified areas to focus on and monitor to ensure its on-going certification.

In 2010, University President Arthur Vailas appointed a Gender Equity Committee/Focus Group. The group membership consists of the Vice-President for Associated Students of ISU, the Vice-President for Academic Affairs, the Director for NCAA Athletic Certification, the Executive Director of the Student Union, the Assistant Vice-President for Finance and Administration, the Associate Athletic Director/SWA, the Director Office of Affirmative Action, the Vice-President of Facilities Operations and Services, the Director for Institutional Research, and any Community member/ISU Alumnus. This committee meets quarterly and has oversight to address the status and ongoing progress of the athletics department’s gender equity initiatives.

The ISU President and his senior administration have dedicated support and resources to Gender Equity and have made a financial commitment to maintain compliance in this area. The university has hired Valerie McMurtrie Bonnett, a Title IX and Gender Equity Specialist, to review and advise in the areas of financial aid and participation. The findings will be reported to the University by the end of the fiscal year. In regards to athletic participant proportionality, Idaho State University has achieved proportionality in two of the last three fiscal years, and internal projections indicate that proportionality will be maintained for the foreseeable future.

In addition, the Athletic Department continues to monitor and evaluate the eleven areas of gender equity.
1. Equipment and Supplies
2. Scheduling of Games and Practice Times
3. Team Travel and Per Diem allowances
4. Tutors
5. Coaches
6. Locker room, Practice and Competition Services
7. Medical and Training Facilities and Services
8. Housing and Dining Facilities
9. Publicity/Marketing
10. Support Services
11. Recruitment of Student-Athletes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FT Students</th>
<th>FY13 ACT</th>
<th>FY14 PROJ</th>
<th>FY15</th>
<th>FY16</th>
<th>FY17</th>
<th>FY18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3,633</td>
<td>3,444</td>
<td>3,444</td>
<td>3,444</td>
<td>3,444</td>
<td>3,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3,745</td>
<td>3,525</td>
<td>3,525</td>
<td>3,525</td>
<td>3,525</td>
<td>3,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>49.24%</td>
<td>49.42%</td>
<td>49.42</td>
<td>49.42</td>
<td>49.42</td>
<td>49.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>50.76%</td>
<td>50.58%</td>
<td>50.58</td>
<td>50.58</td>
<td>50.58</td>
<td>50.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>50.24%</td>
<td>47.46%</td>
<td>48.65</td>
<td>48.65</td>
<td>48.65</td>
<td>48.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>49.76%</td>
<td>52.54%</td>
<td>51.35</td>
<td>51.35</td>
<td>51.35</td>
<td>51.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title IX Definition of Participant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance between FT and Athletics</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
<td>1.96%</td>
<td>-0.77</td>
<td>-0.77</td>
<td>-0.77</td>
<td>-0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Sports Teams at Institution by Gender:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Student Athletes Needed</td>
<td>-8.16</td>
<td>16.01</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>6.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Squad Size Average</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Student Athletes Needed</td>
<td>8.41</td>
<td>-16.39</td>
<td>-6.34</td>
<td>-6.34</td>
<td>-6.34</td>
<td>-6.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Squad Size Average</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TITLE IX COMPLIANCE: Athletics Financial Aid**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial Aid Participants</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Subtotal Female Participants</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>New Sports (unduplicated)</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Athletic Financial Aid Total</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>131</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>51.57%</td>
<td>50.20%</td>
<td>48.62%</td>
<td>48.62%</td>
<td>$1,268,029</td>
<td>$1,265,470</td>
<td>$1,258,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current (unduplicated)</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>51.57%</td>
<td>50.20%</td>
<td>48.62%</td>
<td>48.62%</td>
<td>$1,106,493</td>
<td>$1,074,420</td>
<td>$1,074,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Female Participation</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>51.57%</td>
<td>50.20%</td>
<td>48.62%</td>
<td>48.62%</td>
<td>$1,106,493</td>
<td>$1,074,420</td>
<td>$1,074,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>51.57%</td>
<td>48.43%</td>
<td>49.80%</td>
<td>51.38%</td>
<td>$1,268,029</td>
<td>$1,265,470</td>
<td>$1,258,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Financial Aid Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,268,029</td>
<td>$1,265,470</td>
<td>$1,258,588</td>
<td>$1,283,760</td>
<td>$1,290,435</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PARTICIPANTS BY SPORT:**

**Men's Programs:**

- Football: 88
- Basketball: 15
- Indoor Track: 41
- Outdoor Track: 46
- Cross Country: 10
- Tennis: 8
- Wrestling: 10
- Golf: 10
- Total Male Participants: 208

**Women's Programs:**

- Basketball: 15
- Volleyball: 13
- Sand Volleyball: 15
- Gymnastics: 15
- Swimming and Diving: 15
- Skiing: 15
- Soccer: 24
- Golf: 9
- Tennis: 10
- Indoor Track: 48
- Outdoor Track: 48
- Cross Country: 20
- Softball: 19
- Total Female Participants: 206

**Total Participants:** 414

**SPORTS COSTS**

- Current Direct Costs of Women's Sports, including financial aid: 2,760,542
- Direct Costs of New Women's Sports, including financial aid: 0
- Total Direct Costs for Women's Sports: 2,760,542
- Gender Equity Limit: 707,700
- Percentage of Gender Equity Limit to Total Direct Costs for Women's Sports: 25.6%

BAHR - SECTION II
University of Idaho Gender Equity Narrative

The University of Idaho’s student-athlete participation numbers closely align with the University’s undergraduate enrollment distribution. The 54% male and 46% female athletic participation percentages and the 54% male 46% female undergraduate enrollment percentages allow the University to comply with the Prong One of Title IX’s compliance test which states, “Provide participation opportunities for women and men that are substantially proportionate to their respective rates of enrollment as full-time undergraduate students.”

As indicated in the attached spreadsheet, the University of Idaho dedicates significant resources toward gender equity compliance. In fact, the SBOE approved gender equity funding only accounts for 23.9% of our FY14 gender equity obligations. It is unlikely that the University of Idaho will add additional women’s programs in the near future and will rely on future Title IX compliance through Prong One. To ensure greater female participation we strongly encourage coaches in our nine women’s sports; Basketball, Volleyball, Soccer, Swimming, Outdoor Track, Indoor Track, Cross Country, Tennis and Golf to identify and actively recruit walk-ons or non-scholarship athletes. In addition, we have adopted a roster management plan and have capped the number of male participants in male sports.

The University of Idaho annually conducts a gender equity assessment that includes interviews with all head coaches and some student-athletes. The results of these conversations have produced resource reallocation and adjustments to specific sports budgets. Gender equity issues are taken seriously by the Department of Athletics and the University of Idaho.
### Title IX Compliance: Accommodations of Interests & Abilities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY13 ACT</th>
<th>FY14 PROJ</th>
<th>FY15</th>
<th>FY16</th>
<th>FY17</th>
<th>FY18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FT Students:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4,395</td>
<td>4,260</td>
<td>4,303</td>
<td>4,346</td>
<td>4,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3,743</td>
<td>3,667</td>
<td>3,704</td>
<td>3,741</td>
<td>3,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>54.01%</td>
<td>53.74%</td>
<td>53.74%</td>
<td>53.74%</td>
<td>53.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Athletic Participants:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>54.00%</td>
<td>52.41%</td>
<td>52.05%</td>
<td>51.47%</td>
<td>51.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Variance between FT and Athletics:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>-1.33%</td>
<td>-1.69%</td>
<td>-2.27%</td>
<td>-2.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Title IX Compliance: Athletic Financial Aid

| Financial Aid Participants | | | | | |
| Male | 129 | 130 | 130 | 130 | 130 | 130 |
| Female | 109 | 111 | 113 | 115 | 117 | 117 |
| % | 54.02% | 53.94% | 53.50% | 53.06% | 52.63% | 52.63% |

### Participation by Sport:

#### Men's Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>FY13 ACT</th>
<th>FY14 PROJ</th>
<th>FY15</th>
<th>FY16</th>
<th>FY17</th>
<th>FY18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Track</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Track</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Country</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrestling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Male Participants</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Women's Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>FY13 ACT</th>
<th>FY14 PROJ</th>
<th>FY15</th>
<th>FY16</th>
<th>FY17</th>
<th>FY18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand Volleyball</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnastics</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming and Diving</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skating</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Country</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Female Participants</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>444</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sports Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Description</th>
<th>FY13 ACT</th>
<th>FY14 PROJ</th>
<th>FY15</th>
<th>FY16</th>
<th>FY17</th>
<th>FY18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Direct Costs for Women's Sports</td>
<td>3,894,173</td>
<td>4,030,469</td>
<td>4,191,688</td>
<td>4,359,355</td>
<td>4,533,730</td>
<td>4,715,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Equity Limit</td>
<td>926,660</td>
<td>961,600</td>
<td>1,021,300</td>
<td>1,021,300</td>
<td>1,021,300</td>
<td>1,021,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Gender Equity Limit to Total Direct Costs for Women's Sports</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lewis-Clark State College (LCSC) has, from the beginning of the Gender Equity limit initiative, used out-of-state waivers in order to pursue equity. In the first years of this initiative LCSC set a goal of 50-50. To date, LCSC has not requested funding beyond the waiver limits to attain gender equity goals but reserves the right to do so in the future if necessary.
### TITLE IX COMPLIANCE: Accommodations of Interests & Abilities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY13 ACT</th>
<th>FY14 PROJ</th>
<th>FY15</th>
<th>FY16</th>
<th>FY17</th>
<th>FY18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FT Students</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>821</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1,346</td>
<td>1,140</td>
<td>1,174</td>
<td>1,209</td>
<td>1,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%:</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>37.29%</td>
<td>37.29%</td>
<td>37.29%</td>
<td>37.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>62.11%</td>
<td>62.71%</td>
<td>62.71%</td>
<td>62.71%</td>
<td>62.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Participants</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%:</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>47.55%</td>
<td>47.96%</td>
<td>47.69%</td>
<td>47.69%</td>
<td>47.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>52.45%</td>
<td>52.04%</td>
<td>52.31%</td>
<td>52.31%</td>
<td>52.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title IX Definition of Participant</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Student Athletes Needed</td>
<td></td>
<td>-31.73</td>
<td>-37.61</td>
<td>-32.36</td>
<td>-32.34</td>
<td>-32.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Student Athletes Needed</td>
<td></td>
<td>52.03</td>
<td>63.23</td>
<td>54.42</td>
<td>54.38</td>
<td>54.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Squad Size Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Squad Size Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TITLE IX COMPLIANCE: Athletic Financial Aid

|                      | Male     | 80       | 96    | 85    | 85   | 85   | 85   |
|                      | Female   | 72       | 65    | 75    | 75   | 75   | 75   |
| Subtotal Female Participants |               | 72       | 65    | 75    | 75   | 75   | 75   |
| %:                   | Male     | 52.63%   | 59.63%| 53.13%| 53.13%| 53.13%| 53.13%|
|                      | Female   | 47.37%   | 40.37%| 46.88%| 46.88%| 46.88%| 46.88%|
| Athletic Financial Aid Totals | Male   | $779,457 | $846,900| $863,838| $885,434| $907,570| $930,260|
|                      | Female   | $792,778 | $737,790| $752,546| $771,360| $790,644| $810,410|
| Subtotal Female       | Male     | -        | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     |
|                      | Female   | $792,778 | $737,790| $752,546| $771,360| $790,644| $810,410|
| %:                   | Male     | 49.58%   | 54.34%| 53.44%| 53.44%| 53.44%| 53.44%|
|                      | Female   | 50.42%   | 46.56%| 46.56%| 46.56%| 46.56%| 46.56%|
| Variance between Financial Aid & Undup Participants |               | 3.06%   | 6.18% | -0.32%| -0.32%| -0.32%| -0.32%|

### PARTICIPANTS BY SPORT:

#### Men's Programs

- Football
- Baseball
- Basketball
- Indoor Track
- Outdoor Track
- Cross Country
- Tennis
- Wrestling
- Golf
- Total Male Participants: 97

#### Women's Programs:

- Basketball
- Volleyball
- Sand Volleyball
- Gymnastics
- Swimming and Diving
- Skiing
- Soccer
- Golf
- Tennis
- Indoor Track
- Outdoor Track
- Cross Country
- Softball
- Total Female Participants: 107

### SPORTS COSTS

- Current Direct Costs of Women's Sports, including financial aid: $768,987
- New Direct Costs of Women's Sports, including financial aid: 0
- Total Direct Costs for Women's Sports: $768,987
- Gender Equity Limit: 0
- Percentage of Gender Equity Limit to Total Direct Costs for Women's Sports: 0.0%
SUBJECT
Discussion of FY 2016 Budget Request Process (Line Items)

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY
Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies & Procedures Policy, Section V.B.1.

BACKGROUND/ DISCUSSION
Board-approved budget requests for FY 2016 must be submitted to the executive and legislative branches [Division of Financial Management (DFM) and Legislative Services Office (LSO)] on September 2, 2014. To meet this deadline, the Board has established a process for developing agency and institutional requests. The first step is the establishment of line item request guidelines at the April Board meeting. The institutions then use these guidelines to develop line item requests which are evaluated by the Board at its June meeting. The final budget request including line items and maintenance of current operations items is then approved in August. As indicated, budget requests are developed in two parts as directed by the DFM/LSO Budget Development Manual: maintenance of current operations (MCO) items and line items.

MCO requests are calculated using state budget guidelines and Board policy. The Board’s budget request guidelines have historically focused upon the development of line item requests, capital budget requests, special one-time requests (if any), and the timeframe for presenting and approving these requests.

A MCO request includes funding for Change in Employee Compensation (CEC), health insurance cost increases, inflationary increases for operating expenses (including utilities), and central state agency cost areas (Treasurer, Controller, etc.). These items are calculated using rates established by DFM. Other MCO items include replacement capital (i.e. equipment), and external non-discretionary adjustments such as enrollment workload adjustment (EWA) and health education contract adjustments. Although replacement capital is calculated from a capital outlay base, institutions may request for one-time replacement capital in General Funds based on the B-7 Replacement Capital form.

An MCO budget is considered the minimum to maintain operations while line items are funded for new or expanded programs, occupancy costs, and other initiatives deemed important by the Board, institution/agency, Legislature or Governor.

The capital building budget request is a separate process which flows through the Permanent Building Fund Advisory Council with funding provided by the Permanent Building Fund. Agencies and institutions seek funding for major capital projects and major maintenance projects through that process.
STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
The Presidents Council met on March 10, 2014 to discuss FY 2016 budget priorities. The institutions' Vice Presidents for Finance & Administration and Governmental Affairs Directors also attended and participated in the conversation. The consensus of the group was to recommend the following line item categories for the college and universities:

Systemwide
- Complete College Idaho
- Deferred Maintenance
- Financial Aid (merit and need based)
- One-time funding for philanthropic matching program

Institution-level
- Salary Competitiveness
- Institution-specific Initiatives (up to two)

In addition to salary competitiveness, each institution could submit up to two (2) line item requests at the institutional level. This would provide the Governor and Legislature statewide Board priority initiatives and institution specific line items.

BOARD ACTION
I move to direct the college and universities to use the following categories to develop FY 2016 Line Item budget requests:

Systemwide
1. Complete College Idaho
2. Deferred Maintenance
3. Financial Aid (merit and need based)
4. One-time funding for philanthropic matching program

Institution-level
1. Salary Competitiveness
2. Institution-specific Initiatives (up to two)

Moved by____________ Seconded by____________ Carried Yes____ No____
BOISE STATE UNIVERSITY

SUBJECT
Six-Year Capital Improvement Plan Amendment

REFERENCE
August 2013 Board approved Six-Year Capital Improvement Plan for FY 2015 - 2020

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY
Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies & Procedures, Section V.K.2.c.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION
The ongoing evaluation of facility needs and development of Boise State University’s (BSU) Capital Improvement Plan have led to the identification of a new project to be included in the Six-Year Capital Improvement Plan. To keep the Board apprised of planning efforts and consistent with V.K.2.c., the University is requesting approval of its amended Six-Year Capital Improvement Plan.

Revisions to the plan include the addition of a new biology greenhouse project ($1.5 million), moving the Parking Structures costs from FY2015 to FY2016, and moving the Administrative Services building planning costs from FY2019 to FY2015. Changes are highlighted on the attached plan.

IMPACT
University planning staff and independent consultants (as necessary) will complete studies necessary to develop space plans and confirm budget projections to inform required requests for approval from the Board for individual projects as specified in Section V.K. Inclusion of the project in BSU’s Plan will allow BSU to seek approval of the project at a future meeting.

ATTACHMENTS
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STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
BSU desires to begin fundraising to cover the cost, in whole or in part, of the biology greenhouse project. Board policy provides that “[b]efore any institution or agency under the governance of the Board solicits, accepts or commits a gift or grant in support of a specific major project, such project must first be included on the institution’s or agency’s Board-approved six-year Plan.” As such, BSU is seeking to amend its Six-Year Capital Improvement Plan.

While Board policy does permit an institution to bring an amended Plan to the Board for approval, staff reminds the Board that the institutions’ Six-Year Capital
Improvement Plan are reviewed and approved annually at the Board’s regular August meeting. Since the purpose of the Plan is to assist with long-range planning for major capital projects, Plan amendments should be limited to extraordinary circumstances.

Staff reminds the Board that policy also provides that “[a] Plan shall constitute notice to the Board that an institution or agency may bring a request at a later date for Board approval of one or more of the projects included in its approved Plan. Board approval of a Plan shall not constitute approval of a project included in the Plan.”

BOARD ACTION
I move to approve the Six-year Capital Improvement Plan Amendment (FY 2015 – 2020) for Boise State University as presented in Attachment 1.

Moved by __________ Seconded by __________ Carried Yes _____ No _____
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts Building</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science &amp; Research Building (3rd of 4 building science complex)</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demo Facilities Vacated by CWI, New Athletic Green Field</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni Center (comprehensive campaign)</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Structures (750 space @ 16,000 X 2)</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runoate Liberal Arts (Planning &amp; Design)</td>
<td>900</td>
<td></td>
<td>900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMDC Interior &amp; Exterior Renovations (Planning &amp; Design)</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Student Housing (900 beds @$40,000)</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics/Kinesiology Multi-Use Facility</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronco Stadium Expansion and Improvements</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science &amp; Research Building (3rd of 4 building science complex)</td>
<td>70,600</td>
<td></td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences Building</td>
<td>30,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>30,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Services Building(s)</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, not currently scheduled priorities</td>
<td>365,500</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>64,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Events Center Upgrade</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Building Improvements for Research</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential West of Capitol Partnership Development</td>
<td>not defined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology Greenhouses</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Academic Quad Spaces</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Management Building</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Union Food Service Expansion</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; Technology Room 103 &amp; 110</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO

SUBJECT

REFERENCE
June 16, 2005 Board approved initial pre-planning work
April 18, 2012 Institution provided project update
December 13, 2012 Board approved Capital project planning and design

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY
Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies & Procedures, Sections V.B.10, V.K.1, V.K.3.a, and V.K.b.

BACKGROUND/ DISCUSSION
The University of Idaho (UI) is currently in the design process of an effort aimed at constructing an Integrated Research and Innovation Center (previously known as the Science and New Technologies Laboratory) on the Moscow campus. This proposed new building will be sited at a central location in the heart of the campus. This proposed facility will establish modern and capable science spaces supporting interdisciplinary research and provide core visualization and computing labs. The project has been cited as a key priority in our multi-year capital plans and state funding requests since 1999.

The University received a federal grant supporting conceptual planning of the facility in 2005, and subsequently hired NBBJ as the design agent through a competitive qualifications-based selection process. Initial work included a review of current campus research capabilities, and an evaluation of options to build new versus remodel existing science spaces. Site analysis and selection and initial architectural programming work followed. This initial program work and subsequent program iterations yielded a refined and tested vision of a $49M project providing state of the art new science and research space.

In December of 2012, the University obtained Board of Regents authorization for the planning and design phases of the project. The architectural firm NBBJ was retained for the design process. NBBJ has assembled a highly competent and professional team of sub consultants and design is now well underway. The design team has completed the conceptual design, schematic design, and design development phases of the design process, and is approximately 50% complete with the construction document phase. At this point, the documents envision a three story structure of 70,800 gsf.
The design and project administration team working together has determined that the project is best delivered in two major phases. The first phase consists of site clearing, site excavation, site utilities, footings and foundations, under floor utilities, first floor slab-on-grade, and the erection of steel framing. This first phase will be funded by a $5 million contribution to the overall project by the State of Idaho through the Permanent Building Fund (PBF). Given the PBF funding, the initial phase of the project will be delivered and administered by the State of Idaho Division of Public Works (DPW) under the direction and guidance of Tim Mason, Administrator. DPW is currently seeking appropriate authorizations through the policies and processes of the Permanent Building Fund Advisory Council (PBFAC) in parallel to this request action.

Subsequent to the PBF funded, DPW administered phase of the project, the University will take over and administer a second phase that will complete the build-out of the project. A coordinated milestone schedule for this transfer of project administrative responsibilities is being developed in cooperation between DPW, the University and the design team. While an exact date is yet to be determined, it is generally assumed that this handoff will occur approximately late 2014/early 2015. The UI administered phase of the project will be funded through bond proceeds developed by the University of Idaho.

A rough timeline for the anticipated design and construction process, to include future board authorizations, follows:

- **Dec 2012**  Regents authorized planning and design phase, and The design process was initiated
- **Apr 2014**  Seek authorization for project construction
- **Jun 2014**  Seek authorization for issuance of construction bonds
- **Jul 2014**  Begin construction of the PBF funded, DPW administered phase of the project—24 months construction overall, to include building commissioning and move in
- **Fall 2016**  Building operational

The project is expected to be funded through a combination of Permanent Building Funds allocated for this purpose and agency funding.

In the December, 2012 authorization request for the planning and design phases, the University indicated that the planning and design phase expenditures of $3.6 million would be funded through the use of existing cash reserves. Further, the University indicated that those cash reserves would be restored and replenished through the proposed construction phase bond sale anticipated to occur following indebtedness authorization in June, 2014. The funding summary below and as detailed in the Capital Project Tracking Sheet reflects this intent.

This project directly supports the University’s strategic plan and its education, research, and outreach goals and is fully consistent with the University’s Long
Range Campus Development Plan (LRCDP), and the Campus Infrastructure Master Plan.

IMPACT

The Planning, Design and Construction Phase is anticipated to be $49,000,000. It is the intent of the University to return to the Board of Regents in June, 2014 to seek the appropriate indebtedness authorization related to the bond proceeds as a component of the funding mix.

The overall project impact, to include the pre-planning expenditures, planning and design phases, and assuming this construction phase is authorized, is $49,938,600.

Prior Authorized Expenditures (Pre-Planning/Pre-Design)
(As reported in April, 2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>$938,600</th>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>$936,427</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Anticipated Project (Planning, Design and Construction)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Estimate Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State (FY14 &amp; 15) $ 5,000,000</td>
<td>Construction $38,018,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal (Grant) $ 0</td>
<td>A/E &amp; Consultant Fees $3,736,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (UI/Bond) $ 44,000,000</td>
<td>Fixtures, Furn., &amp; Equip. $1,365,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private $ 0</td>
<td>Commissioning $125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $ 49,000,000</td>
<td>Testing and Surveys $280,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plan Check &amp; Fees $105,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional Support $41,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contingency $5,328,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total $49,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ATTACHMENTS
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STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This proposed facility is the University’s top priority on its FY 2015 PBF request and Six Year Capital Improvement Plan.

Pursuant to Board Policy, “a facility or project specifically identified by name and approved by the Legislature and the Governor in the capital projects category of the Permanent Building Fund appropriation bill satisfies the notice requirement for purposes of requesting occupancy costs.” This facility received line item funding in the FY 2014 and FY 2015 PBF appropriation.

Staff recommends approval.
BOARD ACTION

I move to approve the request by the University of Idaho to implement the construction phase for the Integrated Research & Innovations Center, pursuant to the budget set forth in Attachment 1. Approval includes the authority to execute all necessary consultant, vendor, and construction contracts to fully implement construction of the project.

Moved by __________ Seconded by __________ Carried Yes _____ No ______
History Narrative

1. Institution/Agency: University of Idaho
2. Project Description: This proposed facility will establish modern and capable science spaces supporting interdisciplinary research and provide core visualization and computing labs. The project has been cited as a key priority in our multi-year capital plans and state funding requests since 1999.
3. Project Use: The facility will be designed to foster interdisciplinary research collaboration and interaction and will include flexible systems and support infrastructure, allowing reconfiguration of spaces supporting changes in programs and research needs over time.
4. Project Size: Approximately 70,800 gross square feet. The Design and Construction phase of the project is currently estimated at $49M. Overall project cost to include the pre-Planning/Pre-design Phase expenditures is currently estimated at $49.9M.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Funds</th>
<th>Use of Funds</th>
<th>Total Sources</th>
<th>Planning Use of Funds</th>
<th>Const</th>
<th>Other **</th>
<th>Total Uses*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PBF</td>
<td>ISBA</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$ 892,800</td>
<td>$ 892,800</td>
<td>$ 892,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of Revisions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report of Actual Preliminary Planning and Programming Expenditures, Apr 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL, PreDesign and Feasibility Phase:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 936,427</td>
<td>$ 936,427</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 936,427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Design through Construction Documents, Dec 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 3,600,000</td>
<td>$ 3,600,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 3,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Cost Estimate, Capital Project Budget and Finance Plan and Construction Phase Authorization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 5,000,000</td>
<td>$ 40,400,000</td>
<td>$ 45,400,000</td>
<td>$ 136,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL, Planning, Design and Construction Phases:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 5,000,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 44,000,000</td>
<td>$ 49,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 5,000,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 44,936,427</td>
<td>$ 49,936,427</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

History of Funding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Authorization, Jun 05</th>
<th>PBF</th>
<th>ISBA</th>
<th>Institutional Funds (Gifts/Grants)</th>
<th>Student Revenue</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total Other</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 892,800</td>
<td>$ 892,800</td>
<td>$ 892,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Auth within Delegated Limits, Jul 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 30,000</td>
<td>$ 30,000</td>
<td>$ 30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Auth within Delegated Limits, Dec 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 15,800</td>
<td>$ 15,800</td>
<td>$ 15,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL, PreDesign and Feasibility Phase:</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 938,600</td>
<td>$ 938,600</td>
<td>$ 938,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regents Authorization, Planning and Design, Dec 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 3,600,000</td>
<td>$ 3,600,000</td>
<td>$ 3,600,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Project Budget and Finance Plan and Construction Phase Authorization, Apr 14</td>
<td>$ 5,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 40,400,000</td>
<td>$ 40,400,000</td>
<td>$ 45,400,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL, Planning, Design and Construction Phases:</td>
<td>$ 5,000,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 44,000,000</td>
<td>$ 44,000,000</td>
<td>$ 49,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$ 5,000,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 44,938,600</td>
<td>$ 44,938,600</td>
<td>$ 49,938,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Estimate based on planning and design phase cost estimates. UI will report back to the Board of Regents for the requisite indebtedness authorization.
** Advertisement Costs, Plan Check Fees, Surveys, Commissioning, Material Testing During Construction, and Construction & Project Contingency
UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO

SUBJECT
Capital Project Budget and Finance Plan and Construction Phase Authorization, College of Education Building, Renovation and Improvements

REFERENCE
May 15, 2013 Information Item Presented to the Board
June 20, 2013 Board approved Planning and Design Phases, Resolution for Expenditure of Project Funds and Reimbursement from Future Bond

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY
Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies & Procedure, Section V.K.1, Section V.K.3.b, and Section V.K.3.c.
House Bill 635 (2014)

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION
This agenda item is an Authorization Request to allow the University of Idaho (UI) to proceed with the construction phase of a complete renovation of the College of Education Building.

This effort is modeled after the successful asbestos remediation and whole building renovation of the former University Classroom Center (UCC), now the Teaching and Learning Center (TLC), completed at the University of Idaho in 2005. The UCC presented the very same issues associated with steel framing covered by ACM fire-proofing in an otherwise sound structure that was equipped with a non-compliant, non-ducted open plenum return HVAC system. Just as with the College of Education Building, the conclusion in the case of the UCC was that a whole-building renovation approach provided the best and most efficient solution for the University and the State. The UCC-to-TLC renovation and improvement was completed in 2005 to great success.

When complete, the project will result in the complete revitalization and renewal of the existing structure with the intent of providing a safe, clean, efficient, sustainable, aesthetic, technology capable, flexible environment in which the College of Education can deliver programs and pedagogies designed to support current, technologically-supported, educational content to the students of the College and future educational professionals on behalf of the citizens of the State of Idaho.

The University desires to proceed with the project led and administered by the State Division of Public Works. Funding is envisioned to be a combination of State Permanent Building Funds (PBF) as well as bond funds procured by the University of Idaho, and donated gifts.
Planning and Design Phases Summary
Since obtaining Planning and Design Phases Authorization, the university has worked in collaboration with the State of Idaho Division of Public Works (DPW) to drive the project forward.

DPW issued a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) to identify a suitable Architectural Design Consultant. Miller Hull Architects of Seattle, Washington, was selected by DPW to lead the design of the project. In accordance with protocol for DPW administered projects, the selection of Miller Hull was confirmed in the September, 2013 meeting of the Permanent Building Fund Advisory Council (PBFAC).

An initial program verification phase in late fall of 2013 confirmed the general scope of the project is to:

- abate and remove all of the Asbestos Containing Materials (ACM) and ACM contaminated systems in the building;
- create a weather-tight shell by correcting the current issues with the existing roof and the failed curtain wall/fiberglass composite panel exterior skin;
- address the HVAC issues and install a code complaint, ducted return HVAC system;
- increase building energy consumption/use efficiency by installing modern, digital HVAC controls, eliminating air infiltration through gaps in the current skin, increasing U values at the curtain wall skin;
- update, refresh, and modernize finishes and system in the building to current standards;
- improve efficiencies in the use of space within the building;
- leverage investment in the structure and provide value to the project by retaining those systems that are sound, solid, and in good condition, and which can be retained and reused such as foundations, structure, and the clay brick masonry skin;
- provide the needed and necessary programmatic renovations and improvements necessary and critical to the on-going success of the College of Education;
- reflect in the physical manifestation of the built environment the continuing commitment of the University and the College of Education to the training and development of educational professionals in the State of Idaho.

The design phase is now well underway. The design and project administration team working together has determined that the project is best delivered in two major phases. The first phase consists of abatement of hazardous materials and demolition and the second phase will consist of the renovation and restoration of the College of Education Building.

The abatement and demolition phase is estimated to have a performance period of 8 to 9 months given the character and the amount of contaminated materials
and systems present in the existing building. Schedule constraints drive the need to begin the abatement and demolition phase during the summer of 2014. Design work on the renovation and restoration phase will continue in parallel with the implementation of the hazardous materials and demolition phase. The Division of Public Works is seeking appropriate authorizations through the policies and processes of the PBFAC in parallel to this request action.

**Project Delivery Schedule Summary**
In general, the overall milestones anticipate that the building is off-line for renovation and unoccupied beginning mid-summer of 2014 through summer of 2016. The goal is that the renovated and improved College of Education Building will be fully functional and operational for the Fall Semester, 2016.

**Authorization Request**
This request is for Capital Project Construction Authorization to implement a project which provides for asbestos remediation and whole building renovation, improvements and restoration of the College of Education Building, University of Idaho, Moscow, Idaho.

Funding for this project will include PBF A&R category funds, the $3.75 million in additional PBF A&R category funds received from the State of Idaho appropriations received for FY14, an additional $2M PBF allocation for FY15, bond proceeds procured by the University of Idaho, and gifted funds raised by the University of Idaho and the College of Education for this purpose.

The project will be delivered and administered by the State of Idaho Division of Public Works under the direction and guidance of Tim Mason, Administrator.

The project is consistent with the strategic goals and objectives of the College of Education. The project is fully consistent with the University’s strategic plan, specifically, **Goal One, Teaching and Learning Activity**, **Goal 3, Outreach and Engagement** and **Goal Four, Community and Culture**, and the University’s Long Range Capital Development Plan (LRCDP).

**IMPACT**
The immediate fiscal impact of this effort is to fund the abatement, demolition and phase costs of the project. The total budget for this project effort is currently set at $17,160,000, to include design and construction costs and appropriate and precautionary contingency allowances. This is an increase over the amount indicated in the initial Planning and Design Phases Authorization and is the result of successful fund raising efforts spearheaded by the Dean of the College of Education. This additional amount will be used to secure the full scope of the project and to ensure the desired level of fit and finish.
It is the intent of the university to return to the Board of Regents in June, 2014 to seek the appropriate indebtedness authorization related to the bond proceeds as a component of the funding mix.

### Overall Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Estimate Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>HazMat &amp; Demo Phase $2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 13 A&amp;R</td>
<td>Construction Phase $12,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 14 A&amp;R</td>
<td>A/E, IH &amp; Consultant Fees $2,050,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 14 Appr.</td>
<td>Commissioning $77,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 15 Appr.</td>
<td>Testing and Surveys $72,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Plan Check &amp; Fees $15,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UI Bond Funds</td>
<td>Contingency $645,226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UI Gift Funds</td>
<td>Total $17,160,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$17,160,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Staff Comments and Recommendations

The College of Education building is already vacated. Occupants were relocated to several sites on campus. As such, the University does not have any ongoing leases costs associated with swing space during the remodel of this facility.

If the building renovation results in increased “eligible space” as defined in Board policy V.b.10.a.ii., the University could request occupancy costs for that space. Board policy provides that “a facility or project specifically identified by name and approved by the Legislature and the Governor in the capital projects category of the Permanent Building Fund appropriation bill satisfies the notice requirement for purposes of requesting occupancy costs.” Since the “Education Building at the University of Idaho” is a named project in H635 (2014), staff believes the notification requirement for future occupancy costs is met, but will confirm with Legislative and Governor’s staff.

Staff recommends approval.

### Board Action

I move to approve the request by the University of Idaho to implement the construction phase for the College of Education Building Asbestos Remediation and Whole Building Renovation and Improvements pursuant to the Estimated Budget set forth in the materials submitted to the Board.

Moved by__________ Seconded by__________ Carried Yes_____ No______
History Narrative

1 Institution/Agency: University of Idaho

2 Project Description: A Capital Project which provides for asbestos remediation and whole building renovation, improvements and restoration of the College of Education Building, University of Idaho, Moscow, Idaho.

3 Project Use: This project effort that will provide for asbestos remediation and whole building renovation and improvements within the College of Education Building, University of Idaho, Moscow, Idaho. This project effort is modeled after the successful asbestos remediation and whole building renovation of the former University Classroom Center (UCC), now the Teaching and Learning Center (TLC) completed at the University of Idaho in 2005. The UCC presented the very same issues associated with steel framing covered by ACM fire-proofing in and otherwise sound structure that was equipped with a non-compliant, non-ducted open plenum return HVAC system.

4 Project Size: 62,700 GSF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Funds</th>
<th>Use of Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PBF</strong></td>
<td>ISBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4,947,500</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$6,947,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

History of Funding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>History of Funding</th>
<th>PBF</th>
<th>ISBA</th>
<th>Institutional Funds (Gifts/Grants)</th>
<th>Student Revenue</th>
<th>Other*</th>
<th>Total Other</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial Authorization Request, Planning and Design Phase Only, June 2013</td>
<td>$4,947,500</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$5,347,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Project Budget and Finance Plan and Construction Phase Authorization, April 2014</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$2,660,000</td>
<td>$7,152,500</td>
<td>$9,812,500</td>
<td>$11,812,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$6,947,500</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$2,660,000</td>
<td>$7,552,500</td>
<td>$10,212,500</td>
<td>$17,160,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27 * Bond Proceeds. Includes repayment of Internal Strategic Reserves Committed to the project during the planning and design phases.
28 ** Advertisement Costs, Plan Check Fees, Surveys, Commissioning, Material Testing During Construction, and Construction & Project Contingency
IDAHO STATE UNIVERSITY

SUBJECT
   Approval to sell undeveloped property located just off of East Terry Street in Pocatello, Idaho

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY
   Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies & Procedures, Sections V.I.1 and V.I.5.
   Idaho Code §33-107
   Idaho Code §58-331, 335

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION
   The subject property; which is located immediately south of Franklin Middle School, 2271 East Terry Street, Pocatello, Idaho 83201; consists of 2 contiguous parcels of undeveloped property. Parcel #1 (ID# RPCPP087105) consists of 8.68 acres and lies immediately south of and adjoins the Franklin Middle School property. Parcel #2 (ID# RPCPP108806,) consisting of 4.20 acres, lies immediately south and adjoins the first parcel. Together, the two parcels comprise 12.88 acres and were appraised for $135,500 in February 2014, as described (including legal descriptions) in the attached report (Attachment 1.) Hereinafter, the combined parcels are referred to as the “Subject Property.”

Pocatello School District 25 initially approached Idaho State University (ISU) with a request to purchase parcel #1 in 2009, with the plan to eventually construct an elementary school adjacent to the existing middle school. Shortly thereafter the District placed the land purchase on hold due to budget constraints. The District renewed its request to purchase parcel #1, as well as parcel #2, early in 2014.

The Subject Property is bounded in such a way that potential uses other than as a school adjacent to the middle school are limited, even to ISU (see images in Restricted Use Appraisal Report Attachment 1.) It does not face an existing street and, other than through the middle school property, is only accessible via a narrow parcel of property owned by ISU. It is bounded on the west by interstate 15, on the south by a narrow triangular parcel of land owned by ISU, and on the north by the Franklin Middle School. Directly to the east are an additional undeveloped parcel and two partially developed parcels, both owned by ISU. There is a steep vertical rise in elevation within these three parcels, sloping up to flatter terrain along Alvin Ricken Drive. The Veterans Service Division and the Southeastern District Health facility are housed on two of these three parcels and face Alvin Ricken Drive, with the rear facing down the slope to the Subject Property.

ISU has sufficient land on the flat terrain adjacent to our existing facilities, as well
as across Alvin Ricken Drive to accommodate future expansion needs.

Because an appraisal was completed in 2009 when the District first approached ISU about the property, the appraisal conducted in February 2014 is a Restricted Use Appraisal Report that leverages upon and references the appraisal conducted in 2009, and adds parcel #2 to the assessment. Accordingly, both appraisals are attached (Attachments 1 and 2.)

School District 25 and ISU have agreed on a selling price at the appraised value of $135,500, as indicated in the attached appraisal. The District has approached their Board about this purchase and have received a favorable response. Ultimately, the purchase will have to be approved by their Board.

IMPACT

It is the considered opinion of the University that the natural and man-made boundaries surrounding the Subject Property make it highly improbable the land will be of any relevant benefit to the University in satisfying its core missions, but is very suitable for an elementary school adjacent to the middle school. The Subject Property does not contribute to the primary mission or programs of the University and it makes financial sense to sell the property. Of equal importance, making the property available to School District 25 to purchase will enhance and improve K-12 education in the Pocatello area, which the University strongly supports.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – February 2014, Restricted Use Appraisal Report Page 5
Attachment 2 – April 2009, Appraisal Report Page 21

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The State Board of Education has statutory authority to acquire or dispose of real estate pursuant to section 33-107, Idaho Code. However, section 58-331, Idaho Code requires that surplus real property owned by state agencies is to be transferred to the Land Board of Land Commissioners (“Land Board”) and then disposed of by the Land Board. In consultation with Land Board staff, ISU counsel has determined that the Subject Property does not constitute “surplus real property” as that term is used in Code, and therefore the Board has its own organic authority to dispose of the Subject Property.

Staff recommends approval.
BOARD ACTION

I move to approve the request by Idaho State University to sell the Subject Property located just off Terry Street in Pocatello, Idaho for $135,500, and to authorize ISU’s Vice President for Finance and Administration to sign all necessary documents to complete the sale on behalf of the State Board of Education in its capacity as the Board of Trustees for the University.

Moved by__________ Seconded by__________ Carried Yes_____ No _____
Under USPAP Standards Rule -2(c), this is a Restricted Use Appraisal Report, and is intended only for the sole use of the named client. There are no other intended users. The client must clearly understand that the appraiser’s opinions and conclusions may not be understood properly without additional information in the appraiser’s work file, and the attached copy of Appraisal Report of the Subject Property for Idaho State University, dated April 1, 2009.

This report is a REVISED UPDATE of a prior appraisal assignment of the Subject Property completed for the Client by the undersigned appraiser with Date of Value of April 1, 2009. The Client and Users of this report requested a current value of the Subject Property that was valued nearly five years before the effective date of the following opinion of value.

The Client and the Proposed Buyer have requested the inclusion of a second parcel of land directly south of and contiguous with the south boundary of the original subject property. The effect of this assembly of two separately described parcels resulted in a Revised Subject Property of 12.88 acres; 8.68 acres plus 4.20 acres, more or less.

CLIENT:

Idaho State University  
Campus Stop 8219  
Pocatello, ID 83209-8219

Attention: Roger H. Egan, CPA  
Director, Treasury, Tax, Investments, Policy, & Real Estate  
Phone: (208) 282-2512  
Email: eganroge@isu.edu

PROPOSED BUYER:

School District No. 25  
3115 Poleline Road  
Pocatello, ID 83201

APRAISER:

Paul R. Smith  
Certification No.: CGA-110
INTENDED USE:

The use of this report is Limited and Restricted to assisting the Client in making a financial decision. This appraisal is intended to assist the Client, Idaho State University, in determining a reasonable market value for possible sale of the subject property to another public entity.

INTENDED USERS:

The intended Users of this report are the Client, Idaho State University, and its duly appointed representatives. No other users are authorized nor anticipated. No other use of this report is approved nor anticipated without appraisers consent.

INTEREST APPRAISED:

The property was appraised as if free and clear of all encumbrances. The FEE simple estate was valued.

The Fee Simple Estate is the Absolute Ownership of property, real or personal, unencumbered by any other interest or estate, subject only to the four powers of government. The subject appeared to have some encumbrances, the effect of which are discussed in the incorporated report.

EFFECTIVE DATE OF VALUE: December 31, 2013

DATE OF REPORT: January 14, 2014*
Resubmitted: February 3, 2014
Revised: February 20, 2014

* Additional vacant land sales data became available after the original submission of this Update of the 2009 appraisal. Additional analysis was necessary and a small upward adjustment of the opinion of the market value of the Subject Property was concluded.

REAL ESTATE INVOLVED:

An 8.68 acre parcel land in the SE¼ SE¼ Tax 55, Section 25, Township 6 South, Range 34 East, Boise Meridian, and a 4.20 acre parcel of land in the E½NE¼ Tax 270 of Section 36, Township 6 South, Range 34 East, Boise Meridian, all in Pocatello, Bannock County, Idaho.
REAL ESTATE INVOLVED: (continued)

Please see attached Appraisal Report, dated April 1, 2009 for detailed Location Description and Legal description of the original 8.68 acre parcel. A complete metes and bounds description of the 4.20 acre parcel was not available, the map in the attached Map exhibits accurately depicts the location and relative size of the additional parcel.

For the purpose of this revised, updated appraisal, the two parcels will be identified by the Bannock County Assessor’s file information and referred to as Original Subject Parcel 1 and Additional Site Parcel 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel Number</th>
<th>Parcel 1</th>
<th>Parcel 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Idaho State College</td>
<td>Idaho State Board of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Description</td>
<td>Tr SE¼SE¼ Tax 55  S25-T6S-R34E</td>
<td>Tr E½NE¼ Tax 270 S 36-T6S-R34E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Size</td>
<td>8.68 Acres</td>
<td>4.20 Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuation and Taxes</td>
<td>Not Assessable</td>
<td>Not Assessable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We caution users of this report that we are not experts in rendering legal descriptions or in regarding issues of this property's title. The legal description cited in the April 1, 2009 report was from a copy of the deed to the subject Parcel 1 obtained from the official records of the Bannock County Recorder's Office and provided to us by the Client. We caution that appropriate legal council be retained in all matters regarding this property's legal description and issues of title.

REAL PROPERTY INTEREST APPRAISED:

The Fee Simple Estate was valued. The Dictionary of Real Estate Appraisal, Second Addition, defines Fee Simple Estate as the absolute ownership unencumbered by any other interest or estate subject only to the four powers of government.

EFFECTIVE DATE OF VALUE:

Inspection Date: I did not physically visit nor inspect the subject property for this UPDATE assignment. I relied upon my personal data files, public records, and my experience with other appraisal assignments in the near neighborhood to form the opinion that there were no known nor readily discovered conditions or physical changes to the subject property that would have a significant influence in my final value opinion.

Effective Date: December 31, 2013
TYPE OF APPRAISAL and REPORT:

An appraisal of the commercial/residential property identified as ISU property south of Franklin Middle School, 2271 East Terry Street, Pocatello, Idaho 83201, was requested. The most efficient and cost effective means of completing this assignment was to Update my previous appraisal of that property. My Appraisal Report, effective April 1, 2009 and signed on May 12, 2009 is hereby incorporated by attachment to this Restricted Use Appraisal Report to provide information and details necessary to understand my analysis, opinions and conclusions.

In a Restricted Use Appraisal Report it is assumed that the Client has sufficient knowledge of the Subject Property, local market conditions and availability of similar properties, both sold and listed for sale, to use the specific content of the appraisal report to make the necessary financial decisions regarding the Subject Property. The Sales Comparison Approach or Market Approach was the means of determining my opinion of the present and past value of the Subject Property. The client must clearly understand that the appraiser’s opinions and conclusions may not be understood properly without additional information in the appraiser’s work file. In addition to my appraisal of the subject property dated April 1, 2009, the work file includes, but is not limited to, photographs, summaries, maps, sketches, comparable data, assessor records, spreadsheets, and field notes.

USE AS OF DATE OF VALUE:

The subject property was vacant and not occupied. It was undeveloped ground.

DETERMINATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS:

Sales Comparison Approach:

The market activity during the past five years for properties that were directly comparable with the subject property was very slow and erratic. There were few total sales and none that were directly comparable with the subject. I have cited six recent sales that were generally comparable. They bracketed the gross site area of the subject and were supportive of a reasonable opinion of the unit value of the subject property within the upper half of the general market value range.

Analysis of the sales is summarized and exhibited on pages 9 through 16 of this report.
CONCLUDED UNIT VALUE AND OPINION OF MARKET VALUE:

There was insufficient available data from which to obtain quantifiable time adjustments, so none were made. It was reasonable to assume that the unit value of the subject property would not be less than it was in my opinion as concluded in the attached appraisal. An assumption of a final opinion of value in the upper half of the range indicated in my analysis was reasonable. Support for this assumption is a recent history of sales and resales of hillside and ridge top vacant sites in an ongoing commercial development about one mile north of the subject parcels. Three to twelve acre sites have indicated a modest upward trend in the unit values during the past 4 to 5 years.

It is my opinion that the Unit Value of $10,500 per acre and a final present value of $135,500 for the assembled 12.88 acre parcel described in this Revised Update of my 2009 appraisal was reasonable and supported by the available market sales data.

CONCLUDED VALUE:

It is my opinion that the Market Value of the Subject Property, as of December 31, 2013, was

One Hundred Thirty Five thousand, Five Hundred and No/100 ($135,500.00) Dollars.

Respectively submitted,

Paul R. Smith, CGA-110
Certified General Appraiser
License Expires: April 22, 2014

Date of Report: January 14, 2014
Resubmitted: February 3, 2014
Revised: February 20, 2014
STATEMENT OF ASSUMPTIONS & LIMITING CONDITIONS:

— The appraiser will not be responsible for matters of a legal nature that affect either the property being appraised or the title to it. The appraiser assumes that the title is good and marketable and, therefore, will not render any opinions about the title. The property is appraised on the basis of it being under responsible ownership.

— The appraiser may have provided a sketch in the appraisal report to show approximate dimensions of the improvements, and any such sketch is included only to assist the reader of the report in visualizing the property and understanding the appraiser's determination of its size. Unless otherwise indicated, a Land Survey was not performed.

— If so indicated, the appraiser has examined the available flood maps that are provided by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (or other data sources) and has noted in the appraisal report whether the subject site is located in an identified Special Flood Hazard Area. Because the appraiser is not a surveyor, he or she makes no guarantees, express or implied, regarding this determination.

— The appraiser will not give testimony or appear in court because he or she made an appraisal of the property in question, unless specific arrangements to do so have been made beforehand.

— If the cost approach is included in this appraisal, the appraiser has estimated the value of the land in the cost approach at its highest and best use, and the improvements at their contributory value. These separate valuations of the land and improvements must not be used in conjunction with any other appraisal and are invalid if they are so used. Unless otherwise specifically indicated, the cost approach value is not an insurance value, and should not be used as such.

— The appraiser has noted in the appraisal report any adverse conditions (including, but not limited to, needed repairs, depreciation, the presence of hazardous wastes, toxic substances, etc.) observed during the inspection of the subject property, or that he or she became aware of during the normal research involved in performing the appraisal. Unless otherwise stated in the appraisal report, the appraiser has no knowledge of any hidden or unapparent conditions of the property, or adverse environmental conditions (including, but not limited to, the presence of hazardous wastes, toxic substances, etc.) that would make the property more or less valuable, and has assumed that there are no such conditions and makes no guarantees or warranties, express or implied, regarding the condition of the property. The appraiser will not be responsible for any such conditions that do exist or for any engineering or testing that might be required to discover whether such conditions exist. Because the appraiser is not an expert in the field of environmental hazards, the appraisal report must not be considered as an environmental assessment of the property.

— The appraiser obtained the information, estimates, and opinions that were expressed in the appraisal report from sources that he or she considers to be reliable and believes them to be true and correct. The appraiser does not assume responsibility for the accuracy of such items that were furnished by other parties.

— The appraiser will not disclose the contents of the appraisal report except as provided for in the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice, and any applicable federal, state or local laws.

— If this appraisal is indicated as subject to satisfactory completion, repairs, or alterations, the appraiser has based his or her appraisal report and valuation conclusion on the assumption that completion of the improvements will be performed in a workmanlike manner.
STATEMENT OF ASSUMPTIONS & LIMITING CONDITIONS:  (continued)

— An appraiser's client is the party (or parties) who engage an appraiser in a specific assignment. Any other party acquiring this report from the client does not become a party to the appraiser-client relationship. Any persons receiving this appraisal report because of disclosure requirements applicable to the appraiser's client do not become intended users of this report unless specifically identified by the client at the time of the assignment.

— The appraiser's written consent and approval must be obtained before this appraisal report can be conveyed by anyone to the public, through advertising, public relations, news, sales, or by means of any other media, or by its inclusion in a private or public database.

— An appraisal of real property is not a 'home inspection' and should not be construed as such. As part of the valuation process, the appraiser performs a non-invasive visual inventory that is not intended to reveal defects or detrimental conditions that are not readily apparent. The presence of such conditions or defects could adversely affect the appraiser's opinion of value. Clients with concerns about such potential negative factors are encouraged to engage the appropriate type of expert to investigate.

DEFINITION OF MARKET VALUE *:

Market value means the most probable price which a property should bring in a competitive and open market under all conditions requisite to a fair sale, the buyer and seller each acting prudently and knowledgeably, and assuming the price is not affected by undue stimulus.

Implicit in this definition is the consummation of a sale as of a specified date and the passing of title from seller to buyer under conditions whereby:

1. Buyer and seller are typically motivated;
2. Both parties are well informed or well advised and acting in what they consider their own best interests;
3. A reasonable time is allowed for exposure in the open market;
4. Payment is made in terms of cash in U.S. dollars or in terms of financial arrangements comparable thereto; and
5. The price represents the normal consideration for the property sold unaffected by special or creative financing or sales concessions granted by anyone associated with the sale.

* This definition is from regulations published by federal regulatory agencies pursuant to Title XI of the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery, and Enforcement Act (FIRREA) of 1989 between July 5, 1990, and August 24, 1990, by the Federal Reserve System (FRS), National Credit Union Administration (NCUA), Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC), the Office of Thrift Supervision (OTS), and the Office of Comptroller of the Currency (OCC). This definition is also referenced in regulations jointly published by the OCC, OTS, FRS, and FDIC on June 7, 1994, and in the Interagency Appraisal and Evaluation Guidelines, dated October 27, 1994.
STATEMENT OF ASSUMPTIONS & LIMITING CONDITIONS: (continued)

The Scope of Work is the type and extent of research and analyses performed in an appraisal assignment that is required to produce credible assignment results, given the nature of the appraisal problem, the specific requirements of the intended user(s) and the intended use of the appraisal report. Reliance upon this report, regardless of how acquired, by any party or for any use, other than those specified in this report by the Appraiser, is prohibited. The Opinion of Value that is the conclusion of this report is credible only within the context of the Scope of Work, Effective Date, the Date of Report, the Intended User(s), the Intended Use, the stated Assumptions and Limiting Conditions, any Hypothetical Conditions and/or Extraordinary Assumptions, and the Type of Value, as defined herein. The appraiser, appraisal firm, and related parties assume no obligation, liability, or accountability, and will not be responsible for any unauthorized use of this report or its conclusions.

Under USPAP Standards Rule 2-2(c), this is a Restricted Use Appraisal Report, and is intended only for the sole use of the named client. There are no other intended users. The client must clearly understand that the appraiser's opinions and conclusions may not be understood properly without additional information in the appraiser's work file.

In developing this appraisal, the appraiser has incorporated only the Sales Comparison Approach. The appraiser has excluded the Cost and Income Approaches to Value, due to being inapplicable given the limited scope of the appraisal. The appraiser has determined that this appraisal process is not so limited that the results of the assignment are no longer credible, and the client agrees that the limited scope of analysis is appropriate given the intended use.

Additional Comments (Scope of Work, Extraordinary Assumptions, Hypothetical Conditions, etc.):

The Results of this Assignment may be affected by their use or any significant change in the facts or the assumptions. I reserve the right to revise my opinion and conclusions should there be material changes in conditions and facts relating to the subject property or the cited comparable sales.

January 14, 2014
Resubmitted: February 3, 2014
Revised: February 20, 2014
Paul R. Smith, CGA-110
Certified General Appraiser
License Expires: April 22, 2014

File No. 14010863-Revised

Paul Smith Agency
SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The general real estate market in the Greater Pocatello Metropolitan Area has been very erratic during the past ten years. There were sharp value appreciations in most segments of the market until the year 2008. Pocatello experienced sharp depreciation in real property value later than most areas of the nation. The overall average single family dwelling lost about 20% of its value before the market began to stabilize and resume typical annual appreciation of 3 to 4 percent.

The market for small parcels of vacant and undeveloped land suitable for small commercial development or large lot single family dwellings slowed and selling prices varied widely. The Greater Pocatello Association of Realtors, Multiple Listing Service reports from April 2009 through January 2014 that just 32 parcels of land, similar to the subject, and ranging from 4 acres to 15 acres in size were sold. All but two of these were considered to be residential properties. The sales indicated unit values that ranged from $1,000 to $55,000 per acre. After eliminating the extremes of the small sample, the overall average unit value was $10,500 per acre and an adjusted range of $3,600 to $17,400, and a most probable unit value for the subject property of $10,000 to $12,000 per acre.

I have analyzed the scarce available data from Pocatello and surrounding urban areas and concluded that there was insufficient available sales data from which to support any great net changes in vacant land values over the past five years. Six sales that are very generally similar to the subject and bracket the size of the subject are cited below. The direct comparison with the subject resulted in a reasonable unit value for the subject property.

Description of Comparable Sales:

Sale No. 1 - Dekay Rd: Located 6.9 miles north and west of I-15, private well and septic system, electric power and natural gas to site, frontage on dedicated road, average access, 7.30 acres, generally flat, zoned Light Industrial (LI), light industrial uses. Sold 2009, $100,000 cash.

Sale No. 2 - Dekay Rd: Located 6.9 miles north and west of I-15, private well and septic system, electric power and natural gas to site, frontage on dedicated road, average access, 7.30 acres, generally flat, zoned Light Industrial (LI), light industrial uses. Sold 2011, $50,000 Conventional financing.

Sale No. 3 - 100 Cheyenne: Located 2.6 miles south and west of I-15, private well and septic, electric power and natural gas available, minimal frontage on dedicated road, average access, 6.69 acres, gentle slope up from road, very irregular shape, zoned Multiple Use as county property surrounded by city limits. Sold 2011, $95,000 seller financing.
SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS: (continued)

Sale No. 4 - Braxton Dr: Located 5.1 miles south southwest and out of city limit. Private well and septic system, electric power. Frontage on dedicated road, but difficult bad weather access; 4.28 acres, rolling slope up from the road, zoned Residential Suburban, primary residence uses. This property was in a platted residential development in a preferred rural residential areas of the city. Sold 2012, $95,500 cash.

Sale No. 5 - 8855 W Trayis Ridge: Located 2.2 miles northeast. Private well and sewer system, electric power and natural gas to site, frontage on dedicated road, average access, 9.65 acres, gentle rolling slope up from primary county road, zoned Residential Suburban, primary residence uses. This property was in platted residential development in a more recently developed residential area of the city. Sold 2013, $61,000 cash.

Sale No. 6 - E Chubbuck Rd at its intersection with Bench Road: Located in Bannock County just north of the Bannock County Fairgrounds complex and adjacent to Residential Commercial Professional zoning in the city of Pocatello at its easterly boundary. All public utilities were available, but not connected to the site. It was 78.16 acres, gentle rolling topography and a rectangular shape. It was much larger than the subject and had dual frontage along Chubbuck Rd to the north and Bench Rd to the east. It sold for $1,200,000 cash in 2013 and was the site of the proposed Portneuf Wellness Complex.

Vacant Land Sales:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sale</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Utilities</th>
<th>Price-$</th>
<th>AreaAc</th>
<th>$/Ac</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>01/14</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>U/RCP</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>12.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-1</td>
<td>03/09</td>
<td>Dekay Rd</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td>G-P</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>$13,699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-2</td>
<td>11/11</td>
<td>Dekay Rd</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td>G-P</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>$6,849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-3</td>
<td>10/11</td>
<td>100 Cheyenne</td>
<td>MU</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>95,000</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>$14,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-4</td>
<td>05/12</td>
<td>Braxton Dr</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>95,500</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>$22,313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-5</td>
<td>06/13</td>
<td>8855 Trayis Ridge</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>G-P</td>
<td>61,000</td>
<td>9.65</td>
<td>$6,321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-6</td>
<td>10/13</td>
<td>E Chubbuck Rd</td>
<td>RCP</td>
<td>G-P-W-S</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td>78.16</td>
<td>$15,353</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unadjusted Indicated Mean Unit Value $/Ac-SF $13,123
Standard Deviation Unit Value $/Ac-SF $5,942

Unadjusted Indicated Range of Unit Value $7,180 $19,065
SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS: (continued)

Zoning Districts:

- **U** - University
- **RCP** - Residential/Commercial/Professional
- **CG** - Commercial General
- **RS** - Residential Suburban
- **RMS** - Residential Medium Density Single-Family
- **RR** - Rural Residential

Utilities:

- **G** - Natural Gas
- **P** - Electric Power
- **W** - City Water
- **S** - Public Sewer

Sales Comparison Adjustment Chart (Vacant/Under-Improved Property):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Frontage</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Total Adjustmnt</th>
<th>Final</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>Per</td>
<td>Adjusted Rate</td>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>Access</td>
<td>Topo</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-1</td>
<td>$13,699</td>
<td>$13,699</td>
<td>-685</td>
<td>-1,370</td>
<td>-4,288</td>
<td>1,370</td>
<td>-4,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-2</td>
<td>$6,849</td>
<td>$6,849</td>
<td>-342</td>
<td>-685</td>
<td>-2,144</td>
<td>-685</td>
<td>-3,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-3</td>
<td>$14,200</td>
<td>$14,200</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>-710</td>
<td>-3,110</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-3,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-4</td>
<td>$22,313</td>
<td>$22,313</td>
<td>1,116</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-8,211</td>
<td>-223</td>
<td>-7,319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-5</td>
<td>$6,321</td>
<td>$6,321</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>-752</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-6</td>
<td>$15,353</td>
<td>$15,353</td>
<td>-2,303</td>
<td>-1,535</td>
<td>1,766</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2,073</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Indicated Mean Unit Value $/Acre | $9,548 |
| Standard Deviation ±$/Acre | $4,490 |
| Indicated Range of Unit Value $/Acre | $5,057 - $14,038 |
| Most Probable Unit Value | $10,500 |

Summary of Land Value:

- **12.88 Acre @ $10,500 = $135,240**

**ROUNDED TO** $135,500

Time adjustment assumptions:

The random pattern of prices and indicated unit values for vacant land sales in the Pocatello/Chubbuck market over the past 5 to 10 years do not support a realistic time adjustment. Sales No. 1 and 2 were in the same small light industrial complex and two years apart in time. They were very similar in amenities and indicated a 50% loss in value. More recent sales, particularly in the Tuscany Hills developments of commercial sites appear to support a modest unit value increase from the year 2003 to 2010 and a general price consolidation for the next three years.
SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS: (continued)

Time adjustment assumptions: (continued)

There was insufficient available data from which to obtain quantifiable time adjustments, so none were made. It was reasonable to assume that the unit value of the subject property would not be less than it was in my opinion as concluded in the attached appraisal. An assumption of a final opinion of value in the upper half of the range indicated in my analysis was reasonable. Support for this assumption is a recent history of sales and resales of hillside and ridge top vacant sites in an ongoing commercial development about one mile north of the subject parcels. Three to twelve acre sites have indicated a modest upward trend in the unit values during the past 4 to 5 years.

Size Adjustments:

Size adjustments were extrapolated from the Bannock County Assessor’s commercial land schedule and applied as percentages of the time adjusted Rate, or unit value.

All other adjustments:

Location, utility, frontage, access, size, topography, zoning and other adjustments were applied as percentages based upon a 5% differential between Poor, Fair, Average and Good. These adjustments were applied as percentages of the time adjusted Rate, or unit value.

CONCLUDED UNIT VALUE AND OPINION OF MARKET VALUE:

It is my opinion that the Unit Value of $10,500 per acre and a final present value of $135,500 for the assembled 12.88 acre parcel described in this Revised Update of my 2009 appraisal was reasonable and supported by the available market sales data.

Respectfully,
Resubmitted: February 3, 2014
Revised: February 20, 2014

Paul R. Smith
Certified General Appraiser
CGA-110

File No. 14010863-Revised
Paul Smith Agency
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Appraisal Report
For

Idaho State University
Pocatello, Idaho

Property Located
Immediately South of
Franklin Middle School (formerly Jr. High)
2271 East Terry Street (Buckskin Rd)
Pocatello, Idaho 83201

as of
April 1, 2009

Paul Smith Agency
File Number 090102
May 12, 2009

Dr. Kent M. Tingey  
Vice President for Advancement  
Idaho State University  
Campus Box 8024  
Pocatello, ID 83209-8024

Re: Vacant Parcel directly south of  
2271 East Terry Street  
Pocatello, ID 83201

Dear Dr. Tingey:

In accordance with your request for an estimate of the market value of the unencumbered fee simple title to the property located at

A Tract in the SE¼ SE¼, Tax 55, 8.68 Acres,  
Section 25, Township 6 South, Range 34 East,  
Boise Meridian, Bannock County, Idaho,

I have personally inspected the property and have made a careful and detailed analysis of all factors pertinent to the estimate of value.

The accompanying report of 37 pages, including this Letter of Transmittal, contains the results of my investigation and analysis.

In my opinion, the Market Value of the Subject Property as of April 1, 2009 was

NINETY EIGHT THOUSAND AND NO/100 ($98,000.00) DOLLARS.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul R. Smith, CGA  
Certified General Appraiser
SUMMARY OF IMPORTANT CONCLUSIONS

PROPERTY DESCRIPTION: A Tract in SE¼ SE¼ Tax 55, 8.68 Acres, Section 25, Township 6 South, Range 34 East, Boise Meridian, Pocatello, Bannock County, Idaho

SPECIAL ASSUMPTIONS/CONCLUSIONS: Standard, excepted as defined in Appraisal

HIGHEST AND BEST USE: As property assembly tract for adjacent or nearby property owner

AGE OF IMPROVEMENTS: No apparent improvements noted

ESTIMATE OF LAND VALUE: $98,000

VALUE INDICATIONS:

SALES COMPARISON APPROACH: $98,000
COST APPROACH: Not Applicable
INCOME CAPITALIZATION APPROACH: Not Applicable

FINAL ESTIMATE OF DEFINED VALUE: $98,000

ALLOCATION OF VALUE:

LAND VALUE: $98,000
IMPROVEMENT VALUE: 0
TOTAL VALUE: $98,000

DATE OF VALUE: April 1, 2009
DATE OF REPORT: May 12, 2009
APPRAISER: Paul R. Smith, CGA -110
Certified General Appraiser

Paul Smith Agency
General Summary Appraisal Report

Complete Appraisal

This is a Summary Appraisal Report which is intended to comply with the reporting requirements set forth under Standards Rule 2-2(b) of the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice for a Summary Appraisal Report. As such, it presents only summary discussions of the data, reasoning, and analyses that were used in the appraisal process to develop the appraiser's opinion of value. Supporting documentation concerning the data, reasoning, and analyses is retained in the appraiser's file. The depth of discussion contained in this report is specific to the needs of the client and for the intended use stated below. The appraiser is not responsible for unauthorized use of this report.

CLIENT:

Idaho State University
Campus Box 8024
Pocatello, ID 83209-8024

Attention: Dr. Kent Tingey
Vice President for Advancement

BUYER:

School District No. 25
3115 Poleline Road
Pocatello, ID 83201

APPRAISER:

Paul R. Smith
Certification No.: CGA-110

SUBJECT:

An 8.68 acre parcel land in the SE¼ SE¼ of Section 25, Township 6 South, Range 34 East, Boise Meridian, Pocatello, Bannock County, Idaho. See following description and sketches.

PURPOSE OF THE APPRAISAL:

The purpose of this appraisal is to provide the appraiser's best opinion of the market value of the subject real property as of the effective date.
DEFINITION OF MARKET VALUE:

Market value, as defined by the federal financial institutions regulatory agencies, means the most probable price which a property should bring in a competitive and open market under all conditions requisite to a fair sale, the buyer and seller each acting prudently and knowledgeably, and assuming the price is not affected by undue stimulus. Implicit in this definition is the consummation of a sale as of a specified date and the passing of title from seller to buyer under conditions whereby:

1. buyer and seller are typically motivated;
2. both parties are well informed or well advised, and acting in what they consider their own best interests;
3. a reasonable time is allowed for exposure in the open market;
4. payment is made in terms of cash in U.S. dollars or in terms of financial arrangements comparable thereto; and
5. the price represents the normal consideration for the property sold unaffected by special or creative financing or sales concessions granted by anyone associated with the sale.

INTENDED USE:

This appraisal is intended to assist the Client, Idaho State University, in determining a reasonable market value for possible sale of the subject property to another public entity.

INTENDED USERS:

The intended users of this appraisal are the Client, Idaho State University and/or their legal assigns. No other users are anticipated nor are they acknowledged by the appraiser without his prior approval.

INTEREST VALUED:

The property was appraised as if free and clear of all encumbrances. The FEE simple estate was valued.

The Fee Simple Estate is the Absolute Ownership of property, real or personal, unencumbered by any other interest or estate, subject only to the four powers of government. The subject appeared to have some encumbrances, the effect of which are discussed later in this report.

EFFECTIVE DATE OF VALUE: April 1, 2009

DATE OF REPORT: May 12, 2009
SCOPE OF APPRAISAL:

The appraiser visited the subject property and made a basic inventory of the improvements thereon. The current and past market for sales of similar property, both unimproved and improved, in the Pocatello, Chubbuck and south Bannock County market was examined in order to find reasonably comparable sales that occurred within the past three or four years. Current listings of similar properties were also considered. Analysis of these sales and offerings, relative to their comparability with the subject, resulted in the following statements and opinions.

Note: If I did not personally visit each of the comparables cited in this report, I relied upon public records, aerial photos, topographic maps, location maps, multiple listing service records and my personal experience in the general area of the subject property, the listings and the sales.

APPRaisal DEVELOPMENT AND REPORTING PROCESS:

In preparing this appraisal, the appraiser (1) physically and/or visually inspected the subject site and any improvements thereon; (2) gathered information on comparable land sales; (3) confirmed and analyzed the data and applied the sales comparison approach to value. The replacement cost approach and the income approach were not applicable to this assignment and were not used.

To develop the opinion of value, the appraiser performed a complete appraisal process, as defined by the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice.

This Summary Appraisal Report is a brief recapitulation of the appraiser's data, analyses, and conclusions. Supporting documentation is retained in the appraiser's file.

DESCRIPTION OF REAL ESTATE APPRAISED:

Location Description:

The subject property was located in the east central portion of city. It was essentially a “land locked” and vacant site located within an area of the City of Pocatello identified as a “special base zoning district” and subject to specific conditions. It appeared to be bounded on the north by property owned by School District 25 (Franklin Middle School), on the east by property owned by Idaho State College (now Idaho State University), on the south by property owed by the Idaho State Board of Education Trustees and on the west by Interstate 15 highway right of way. There was no known direct access to this parcel, except from and across the adjacent parcels.
DESCRIPTION OF REAL ESTATE APPRAISED: (continued)

Legal Description:

Other than the Bannock County Assessor’s short legal description of “TR SE4SE4 TAX 55 8.68 AC S25-T6S-R34E COUNT PROP IN POCA”, no legal description was furnished by the Client. Through my analysis of the available public records and my knowledge of land descriptions I was able to formulate the following legal description to facilitate the location and valuation of the subject property.

Beginning at the south 1/16 corner on the east line of Section 25, Township 6 South, Range 34 East, Boise Meridian, Bannock County, Idaho, thence South 00°16’ East, 600.0± feet to the true POINT OF BEGINNING; thence South 89°22'00" West, 451.95 feet; thence South 00°20'02" East, 45.00 feet; thence South 89°22'00" West, 125.00 feet; thence North 00°20'02" West, 45.00 feet; thence South 89°22'00" West, 63.45 feet; thence South 16°07'00" East, 745.60 feet; thence North 89°22'00" East, 437.60 feet; thence North 00°20'02" West 718.55 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING. Said tract containing 8.76 acres (381,668.64 square feet) of land, more or less. Perimeter = 2,632.15 feet.

We caution users of this report that we are not experts in rendering legal descriptions or in regarding issues of this property’s title. The legal description cited above is the result of my analysis of available public records, aerial photographs, plat maps and sketches. I have used the Apex sketch program to depict my findings. We caution that appropriate legal council be retained in all matters regarding this property’s legal description and issues of title.

My sketch and analysis resulted in an estimated land area of 8.76 acres for the subject property. The Bannock County Assessor’s office, using the same basic parameters, estimated the subject size as 8.68 acres. The difference of 0.08 acre, 3,484.8 square feet, was relatively minor and would have minimal effect on the final value opinion. The Bannock County Assessor’s estimate is the “official” recorded area of the subject parcel and will be the value used in this appraisal.

Property Description:

The subject parcel was a trapezoidal shape with a small rectangle described out of the area near the northwesterly corner and along the longer of the two parallel sides. It contained a total of 8.68 acres (385,941.60 square feet) more or less. It appeared to have a uniform surface with a moderate slope down from south to the north line, where it was contiguous with the School District 25 (Franklin Middle School) property. The westerly line was bounded by the Interstate 15 right of way identified as Parcel No. RPCPP087104 in the Bannock County Assessor’s records. The south line was bounded by a 4.20 acre parcel owned by the Idaho State Board of Education Trustees and identified as Parcel No. RPCPP108806 in the county records. The eastern line was contiguous with another parcel owned by Idaho State College and identified with several other tracts as Parcel No. RPCPP111005 in the assessor’s records.

Paul Smith Agency
DESCRIPTION OF REAL ESTATE APPRAISED: (continued)

Property Description: (continued)

There were no apparent roads or easements that provided access to the subject property without crossing parcels of land owned by others. There were some defacto trails and paths that were assumed to have been used in the site preparation and subsequent construction on nearby sites. None of them appeared to provide direct access to the subject property.

The only reasonable access was from the north, through the School District No. 25 property. Any other access would necessitate easements and road construction that could be economically prohibitive.

The nearest available water connection was a private line that terminated near the center of the east line of the Franklin Middle School property. It was located about 600 feet north of the northeasterly corner of the subject property. A public sewer line was nearer, about 100 feet north northeast from the subject’s northeasterly corner. Getting public water service to the subject site would appear to require agreements for use, easements and installation of a water line extension across the easterly portion of the Middle School property. This may also be economical prohibitive.

Improvement Description:

Inspection Date: April 1, 2009

Type of Improvement: NONE

Typical vacant development sites have public street frontage, guaranteed access, and public utilities available at or very near one or more property line. The subject does not. In order to bring it into line with the most probable comparables the deficiencies must be corrected. The best method of equating the comparables to the subject was to quantify and make adjustments for major differences from direct market comparison of the sale prices expressed as unit values. The next best method was to use estimated costs to cure the deficiencies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assumed Extraordinary Development Costs</th>
<th>Lineal Feet</th>
<th>$/LF</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Power extended to northwest corner</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer extended to northeast corner</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water extended to northeast corner</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>$36,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assumed Extraordinary Development Costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$66,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ZONING:

The specific zoning was:

UNIVERSITY DISTRICT (U):

A. Zoning Map Designation: The "university district" is defined as those lands depicted as such on the zoning map, encompassing properties owned by Idaho State University, specifically what is considered the core campus at the time this title was adopted.

B. Development Plan: Land use on the campus of Idaho State University is governed by state law and the university's development plan. All development is approved, permitted, and regulated by state authority and is to be in accordance with the overall campus development plan, which shall be submitted for city review and comment upon initial creation and/or amendment.

C. Development Review: All development proposals shall be reviewed by the city's site plan review committee. Comments and recommendations shall be forwarded to university officials for consideration. If, in the determination of the city, the proposal is deemed detrimental to the public's health, safety, and welfare, or if the development and its implementation will have adverse impacts on existing or planned public facilities of the city, then the city may refuse to provide city services to said facilities and/or pursue any other remedy provided by law.

D. Changes To Zoning Map Designation: If Idaho State University relinquishes ownership of property to a private or nonpublic entity then the special base zoning district designation, university, becomes immediately null and void. After such nullification the property shall be assigned an appropriate zoning district designation, after hearing in accordance with the hearing process for re-zoning requests as outlined in section 17.02.300, "Decision Making Procedures/Public Hearings", of this title and in accordance with the goals and policies of the comprehensive plan and the provisions of this title. (Ord. 2846 § 1, 2008)

The School District 25 property (Franklin Middle School), just north of the subject was in an RCP zone. Should the subject be sold, re-zoning was most probable. The logical change was to that of the most viable adjacent property and most likely buyer/user of the subject site.

The adjacent zoning was:

Residential/Commercial/Professional District (RCP): The RCP zoning district is intended to accommodate a mix of residential, professional office, and neighborhood commercial uses including business/professional services, convenience retail, personal services, and restaurants, in close proximity to residential areas and major transportation facilities. Residential uses are permitted consistent with the density and requirements of the RH zoning district. Heliports, medical centers, religious institutions and some utilities are conditionally permitted. Developments in the RCP zoning district may be used to serve as a buffer between residential areas and commercial and/or industrial areas.
ASSESSED VALUATION AND TAXES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel No</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Value:</th>
<th>Rate $/Ac</th>
<th>Imprvmnt Value</th>
<th>Total Value</th>
<th>2008 Taxes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RPCPP087105</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>8.68</td>
<td>Non Assessable</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bannock County Assessor’s Legal Description:

A tract in the SE¼ SE¼, Tax 55, 8.68 Acres, Section 25, Township 6 South, Range 34 East, Boise Meridian, Country Property in Pocatello, Bannock County, Idaho.

FEMA FLOOD MAP:

The subject was in an area of the county depicted on FEMA Map 160012 0005 B, effective October 16, 1996. It was in Zone C, and there did not appear to be any special flood hazard.

OWNERSHIP OF RECORD:

Idaho State College, now known as Idaho State University
Campus Box 8024
Pocatello, ID 83209-8024

SALES HISTORY:

There have been no other known sales nor offers on the subject property in the past three years. The subject parcel of land was the remainder of a larger tract of 151.97 acres that was deeded to the University (Idaho State College) in the year 1947. The Warranty Deed from F. A. Nixon (Trustee) et al to Idaho State College was recorded in Book 99, Page 623, Instrument No. 252877, on or about March 7, 1947. Nixon received the property from Myers in November 1914.

Over the past sixty two years other portions of the original tract were deeded to the State of Idaho for Interstate Highway right of way, individuals for residential development and Pocatello School District 25 for Franklin Middle School (Junior Highschool). The remainder result of these various transactions was the relatively small, land locked parcel that is the subject of this appraisal.
IMPEDIMENTS:

Public Rights-of-Way: None Known
Water Rights: None Known
Easement: Possible Power Line Easement along west side
Access: NO apparent direct access

EXPOSURE TIME:

The improved property sales data indicated that exposure time (i.e., the length of time the subject property would have been exposed for sale in the market had it sold at the market value concluded in this analysis as of the date of this valuation) was an important factor in property valuation and analysis. All of the data used were considered to have had sufficient market exposure.

MARKETABILITY:

The subject property was nearly unique in the local market; large enough to attract developers attention, but isolated from direct public access. In my opinion, the marketability of the subject property was severely restricted. It appears that there would be few qualified buyers in the current market who were not adjacent or nearby property owner’s. Other than Idaho State University (formerly Idaho State College), the only nearby property owners of developed tracts of land were School District No. 25, ON Semiconductor (Formerly AMIS) and Ballard Real Estate Holdings Inc.

The Ballard property was not contiguous with the subject but was within 500 feet of the southeasterly corner of the subject. Ballard Medical Products, the former occupant of the Ballard property sold operations to Kimberly Clark who then ceased operations at the site about one year ago. The property appeared to be vacant and the likelihood of interest from Ballard for the subject property was not realistic.

ON Semiconductor has recently scaled back production and imposed significant personnel layoffs. It would appear that they would have no present need for addition site area.

The only remaining apparent qualified buyer was School District No. 25. I am not aware of any planned expansions of the Franklin Middle School campus, but if any were contemplated, the purchase of the subject site would appear to be logical and economically feasible. Re-zoning or Conditional Use permit for school improvements would likely be readily approved by the City and Idaho State University.
CITY DATA:

The Greater Pocatello metropolitan area included two separate cities and the immediate suburban and urban development contiguous with the respective city boundaries. Pocatello, Idaho was a city of about 54,000 population and located in Southeastern Idaho. It was the site of Idaho State University and the location of the most diversified economy in the State of Idaho. The City of Chubbuck was adjacent to the northerly borders of Pocatello and included another 12,100 people. Both cities were located in Bannock County, with a total population in excess of 83,000. The above population figures were as of the 2006 census estimates.

Since mid-1989 Pocatello and Chubbuck have experienced steady population and economic growth with the addition of numerous new jobs annually during the past four years. There were several major employers, those employing more than 350, which included Idaho State University, School District 25, Portneuf Medical Center, ON Semiconductor (formerly AMIS), Convergys Business Services, Heinz Frozen Food Company, Union Pacific Railroad, Pocatello City Government, Bannock County Government, Wal-Mart Retail Stores and J.R. Simplot Company. In addition, more than 1,000 citizens were employed at the Idaho National Energy and Environmental Laboratory. Most of the job growth was observed to have come from existing businesses which survived the dismal 1980's and have added 1 to 2 new jobs each year. There have been periodic, seasonal lay offs andhirings as the businesses continue to adapt to the ever changing economic climate.

Known as the “Gate City” for its location on the Portneuf River at a natural gap between mountains, Pocatello played a significant role in Idaho’s and the nation’s history. Because of its location so near the confluence of the Portneuf River and the Snake River, Pocatello was a natural site for a fur trading post. Fort Hall was established in the early 19th century. During the 1840s, Pocatello was a popular stopping place on the Oregon Trail route, and later became a major railroad hub for the Union Pacific Railroad in the 1880s. Although the railroad transferred many of its operations to other rail centers during the late 1990s and early 2000s, the switching and railyards still provided good transportation options for local agricultural, mining, timber and other bulk products produced and/or processed in the area.

Pocatello’s advantageous location at the intersection of two major Interstate highways, I-15 and I-86, provided good access to major cities throughout the entire Western region of the United States. In addition, Pocatello’s regional airport supplied passenger and air freight service to Salt Lake City, Boise and many other major airports, as well as commuter and connecting flights servicing smaller communities. The close proximity to Yellowstone and Grand Teton National Parks, Sun Valley, the Sawtooth and Bitterroot mountain ranges, Frank Church Wilderness, and many other recreational and vacation destinations made Pocatello a natural stop for travelers and tourists. Local mountains, rivers and reservoirs presented ample opportunities for hiking, biking, skiing (both downhill and cross-country), camping, boating, fishing and hunting within a few minutes drive from the city limits.
Idaho State University provided high-quality undergraduate and graduate programs in various health professions, nursing, pharmacy, dentistry, nuclear sciences, engineering, biology, mathematics, computer science, computer systems technology, as well as in business and the humanities. The combined presence of the University itself, the Idaho Accelerator Center, the ISU Research and Business Park, the new Heart and Vascular Center at Portneuf Medical Center, plus its status as a bedroom community for the Idaho National Lab in Idaho Falls, caused Pocatello’s per capita educational levels and percentage of technical professionals to be much higher than anywhere else in the northern Rocky Mountain region.

Pocatello had an unusually vibrant tradition of the cultural arts despite its railroad town heritage. The new $34,000,000 Stephens Performing Arts Center completed in late 2004 provided new performance venues for the existing local Idaho State Civic Symphony, instrumental and choral ensembles, live theater groups, ballet and opera companies, as well as for the many well-known professional artists and companies who include stops in Pocatello on their concert tours. Pocatello has hosted an International Dance Festival annually for the past few years. Pocatello also has a very strong writers’ community. The Rocky Mountain Writers’ Festival started in Pocatello several years ago and has become a week-long event drawing writers and poets from all over the west. The annual Frank Church Symposium held at ISU brings well-respected, nationally-renowned political speakers and panelists to discuss a variety of political and economic issues. Pocatello also hosts the Dodge National Circuit Finals Rodeo each March, and the Simplot Games features top high school track and field athletes from all around the Western U.S. competing for medals and working with former Olympic champions. Annual wrestling, soccer and horseshoe tournaments attract many other visitors to the area as well.

Since the late 1980s, there had been a noticeable renewed pride in the City and the business community. The City of Pocatello was actively targeting underutilized and vacant areas in both residential and commercial zones for acquisition, demolition and redevelopment into desirable, useable homes and commercial buildings. The original downtown commercial area was designated in the early 1990s as an Historic District, and many of the buildings were being restored to their original facades with updated interiors. Several buildings and old hotels were being converted to upper-story residential units to provide convenient, comfortable housing for those who prefer to live and work within easy walking distance. City water and sewer lines were replaced in 2004 and 2005 under the streets in Old Town Pocatello, and a new Pedestrian Mall was planned. New businesses were opening and others were relocating into the Old Town area. The most recent was the October opening of a new Costco warehouse store just south of the rapidly developing Pocatello Square, the location of Lowes, Staples, Bed, Bath &Beyond, Sportsman’s Warehouse, Texas Roadhouse, and many other big box stores.
CITY DATA: (continued)

The construction industry had been booming in the past few years and was predicted to continue to be strong. In 2004 alone, new home construction increased 41% over 2003; commercial construction increased 37% and home improvement/repairs were up 15%. Major retail chains such as Costco, Home Depot, Lowe’s, and Walgreen’s Drug Stores have all built new stores, and two new large shopping complexes were being developed. Other, smaller complexes were being developed as well, with retail tenants already lined up. Existing businesses were also expanding and building new facilities to accommodate their needs. In 2001, Idaho Farm Bureau built a new $10 million, 93,600 SF office building with a two-level parking garage to house their headquarters office. A new professional office complex was being developed near East Center Street, and included First American Title Company’s new $2 million building which was completed in 2005. In 2004, Superior Modular Systems purchased a new facility on 10 acres, and moved their operations to an 80,000 SF building and rented out the rest of the buildings on the site to other businesses. A new $1 million 11,000 SF facility was under construction on Hospital Way to house the new Child Behavior Center, and was completed in 2005.

Pocatello was served by a very high quality hospital, featuring a top ranked cardiovascular surgery center, and a medical community which provided extensive, quality medical care for nearly all human conditions. A recent agreement with Legacy Hospitals has assured that the completion of the $250,000,000 state of the art hospital consolidation and construction will be completed within 24 to 36 months from April 2009.

The local school system, though expending less per student than 98% of the Idaho school districts, provided quality K through 12 educational services. A bond election approving the funding of a third high school was passed in March 1997, and the new Century High School opened in the Fall of 1999.

The Pine Ridge Mall was a regional mall with good anchors and many quality auxiliary retailers and service tenants. There were other, smaller malls and numerous retail/service centers throughout the city.

The forecast was for continued steady, though slower, economic and population growth in a healthy business climate. The enrollment at Idaho State University was continuing to grow at a pace exceeding the national average. The economic impact of that growth helped to stimulate and sustain the local business community.

It was assumed by the appraiser that the Client and authorised users of this appraisal were familiar the cities of Pocatello and Chubbuck, and Southeastern Idaho. More detailed information of either the cities or the general area was not needed, but may be furnished upon request.
HIGHEST AND BEST USE:

Highest and best use was defined as "The reasonably probable and legal use of vacant land or an improved property, which is physically possible, appropriately supported, financially feasible, and that results in the highest value. The four criteria the highest and best use must meet are Legal Permissibility, Physical Possibility, Financial Feasibility, and Maximum Profitability."

Highest and best use of land or site as though vacant was defined as "The use of a property based on the assumption that a parcel of land is vacant or can be made vacant through demolition of any improvements."

Highest and best use of property as improved is defined as "The use that should be made of a property as it exists."

The above definitions were from “The Dictionary of Real Estate Appraisal,” Second Edition.

Highest and best use as though vacant: the subject site was an addition to one of the several adjacent parcels for future development of clean light industrial or business uses.

It was readily visible from Interstate 15, but not directly accessible.

The were no apparent improvements. Public utilities were not readily available nor accessible without easements across other owned parcels.

The users of this type of property were individuals or investor groups, who desired large parcels that might be developed as a site for light manufacturing, educational and research facilities, or public school amenities.

The demand for this type of property in this kind of location was, in my opinion, low. There were few apparent qualified buyers in the present market.

The supply of like properties in a similar location was limited. However, there were several other sites available for lease or purchase in the near neighborhood. Future demand for parcels similar to the subject in this location would appear to be average to good.

In my opinion, the highest and best use for the subject site, as vacant and available to the general market, was as an addition to the property occupied by Franklin Middle School to facilitate likely expansion of the required building and/or outside activity areas.
SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS:

Cost Approach:

In the typical appraisal of vacant, unimproved or under improved parcels of land, the Replacement Cost Approach was synonymous with the Sales Comparison Approach. It would be redundant to repeat the process.

The Income Approach:

The Income Approach to Value was considered, but not used. There was scarce available information on leased commercial sites and none that were directly or generally comparable with the subject property. Any analysis would result in value indications that would be meaningless in the appraisal of the subject property.

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS:

Sales Comparison Approach (Vacant Land):

The Sales Comparison Approach was a two-phase valuation process with the land valued as if vacant and available for the highest and best use. The directly comparable sales of vacant sites within the original Townsite were sparse, but sufficient to indicate a reasonable range of the unit value of the subject site. A similar process was used to value any significant improvements separately after removing the influence of the variable site values. The Sales Comparison Approach was considered to be a most realistic value indicator. This subject of this appraisal assignment was formerly dry grazing and idle land with no physical improvements other than those normally considered to be part of the land value, including access roads, fences, gates and irrigation ditches. All of the comparable listings and sales cited in this report were assumed to include sufficient basic land elements and there was no necessity to make line item or numerical unit adjustments for these typical attributes.

I have examined the databases of the Greater Pocatello Association of Realtors MLS, the Snake River MLS, and my personal appraisal files in search of more recent, meaningful sales data when compared with the subject.

The value of the site as though vacant was estimated using the Sales Comparison Approach; recent sales of parcels with similar locations and zoning were analyzed. There have been few vacant, or under-improved, land sales of sites similar to the subject. Most of them were smaller and had better access from public rights of way. When analyzed and adjusted for differences, these sales were considered to be best available indicators of the range of unit value for the subject.
SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS: (continued)

Description of Comparable Sales:

Sale No. 1 - Dekay Rd: Located 6.9 miles north and west of I-15, private well and septic system, electric power and natural gas to site, frontage on dedicated road, average access, 7.30 acres, generally flat, zoned Commercial General, light industrial uses. Sold 2009, $100,000 cash.

Sale No. 2 - Deerridge Rd: Located 6.7 miles north and west of I-15, private well and septic system, irrigation water right, electric power and natural gas to site, frontage on dedicated road, average access, 5.11 acres, generally flat, zoned Residential Suburban, large lot residential uses. Sold 2008, $120,000 Cash.

Sale No. 3 - East Elm St: Located 1.3 miles northwest and west of I-15, all public utilities available, electric power and natural gas available, frontage on dedicated road, average access, 5.64 acres, gentle slope up from road, zoned Residential Medium Density Single-family, primary residence uses. This property was incorporated into existing planned residential development in good residential areas of the city. Sold 2006, $130,000 conventional terms.

Sale No. 4 - Country Club Dr: Located 3.4 miles south and west of I-15, all public utilities available, electric power and natural gas available, frontage on dedicated road, average access, 12.00 acres, gentle rolling slope up from the road, zoned Residential Medium Density Single-family, primary residence uses. This property was incorporated into existing planned residential development in one of the most preferred residential areas of the city. Sold 2006, $179,900 cash.

Sale No. 5 - Barton Rd: Located 1.0 mile south and east of I-15, city water and sewer lines had to be extended up Barton Rd to the subject at additional cost to buyers, electric power and natural gas to site, frontage on dedicated road, average access, 14.39 acres, gentle slope up from bluff on west, zoned Residential Medium Density Single-family, primary residence uses. This property was incorporated into existing planned residential development in good residential areas of the city. Sold 2005, $244,000 seller financing.

Sale No. 6 - Barton Rd: Located 1.1 mile southeast and east of I-15, private well and septic system, electric power to site, recorded access easement to dedicated road, fair access, 8.00 acres, gentle slope up from northwest to southeast, zoned Rural Residential, single family uses. Sold 2005, $60,000 cash.
SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS: (continued)

Vacant Land Sales:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sale</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Utilities</th>
<th>Price-$</th>
<th>AreaAc</th>
<th>$/Ac</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>04/09</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>U/RCP</td>
<td>G-P-W-S</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>8.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-1</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Dekay Rd</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td>G-P</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>$13,699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-2</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Deerridge Dr</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>G-P</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>$23,483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-3</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>East Elm St</td>
<td>RMS</td>
<td>G-P-W-S</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>$23,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-4</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Country Club Dr</td>
<td>RMS</td>
<td>G-P-W-S</td>
<td>179,900</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>$14,992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-5</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Barton Rd</td>
<td>RMS</td>
<td>G-P-W-S</td>
<td>244,000</td>
<td>14.39</td>
<td>$16,956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-6</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Barton Rd</td>
<td>RR</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unadjusted Indicated Mean Unit Value $/Ac-SF $16,613

Standard Deviation Unit Value $/Ac-SF $6,048

Unadjusted Indicated Range of Unit Value $10,565 $22,662

Subject Site Area: 8.76 Acres

Zoning Districts:

U - University
RCP - Residential/Commercial/Professional
CG - Commercial General
RS - Residential Suburban
RMS - Residential Medium Density Single-Family
RR - Rural Residential

Utilities:

G - Natural Gas
P - Electric Power
W - City Water
S - Public Sewer
SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS: (continued)

Sales Comparison Adjustment Chart (Vacant/Under-Improved Property):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>SF</th>
<th>Per Adjusted Rate</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Time Adjust</th>
<th>Location Utilities</th>
<th>Time Adjust Frontage</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Adjusmnt Rate</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Final</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S-1</td>
<td>$13,699</td>
<td>0 13,699 13,699</td>
<td>-1,370</td>
<td>-2,055</td>
<td>-1,233 1,370 1,370</td>
<td>-3,288</td>
<td>$10,411</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-3</td>
<td>$23,050 1,729</td>
<td>24,779 -3,717</td>
<td>-3,717</td>
<td>-4,956</td>
<td>-2,478</td>
<td>-14,867</td>
<td>$9,912</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-4</td>
<td>$14,992 1,124</td>
<td>16,116 -4,029</td>
<td>-3,223</td>
<td>2,917</td>
<td>-1,612</td>
<td>-5,947</td>
<td>$10,169</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-5</td>
<td>$16,956 1,696</td>
<td>18,652 -3,730</td>
<td>-3,730</td>
<td>7,032</td>
<td>-1,865</td>
<td>-2,294</td>
<td>$16,357</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-6</td>
<td>$7,500 750</td>
<td>8,250 -206</td>
<td>-413</td>
<td>-314</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-932</td>
<td>$7,318</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicated Mean Unit Value $/Acre $11,307
Standard Deviation ±$/Acre $3,196
Indicated Range of Unit Value $/Acre $8,111 $14,502
Most Probable Unit Value $11,300

Summary of Land Value: 8.68 Acre @ $11,300 $98,084

ROUNDED TO $98,000

Time adjustment assumptions:

Pocatello/Chubbuck and South Bannock County was a relatively small market for greatly diverse commercial and agricultural properties. There were insufficient available data from which to accurately quantify a reliable commercial and agricultural property value adjustment that were attributable to just the passage of time. Typically, the commercial real estate market and the agricultural land investor market lagged behind the residential sales market, for which there was ample overall market data that indicated an average annual increase in value, over the past 30 years, of 3.5% to 5%. It was reasonable to assume that the commercial property sales and resales exhibited a similar trend. Additionally, it was reasonable to assume that agricultural land investments followed the commercial trend. I have assumed a 2.5% annual inflation rate attributable to the passage of time for both vacant commercial and agricultural lands.

All other adjustments:

Location, utility, frontage, access, size, topography, zoning and other adjustments were applied as percentages based upon a 5% differential between Poor, Fair, Average and Good.
SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS: (continued)

RECONCILIATION AND VALUE CONCLUSION:

The appraisal process resulted in a range of Unit Values for the subject property. A simple regression analysis of these estimates indicated a rounded range of $8,100 to $14,500 per acre for the subject property. The most probable Unit Value was $11,300. These were:

- Sales Comparison Approach: $98,000
- Replacement Cost Approach: Not Applicable
- Income Approach: Not Applicable

Each of the value indicators was weighted equally in arriving at the final value estimate. The adjusted range of Unit Value indications was relatively broad but well supported by the line item adjustments. The majority of the indicators in the range of $7,318 to $16,357 supported a final estimate in the lower half of the range. The additional refinement of the range through simple statistical analysis also supported a final opinion in the lower half of the greater range.

Comparable Sales 1, 2, 3 and 4 were considered to be the best value indicators. They supported a final opinion of the Unit Value near $11,050. It is my opinion a unit value of $11,300 per acre was reasonable and a final value opinion of $98,000 was supported by the available market data.

The Sales Comparison Approach indication was considered to be the only appropriate appraisal approach and the foundation for my final opinion of the market value of the subject property.

In my opinion, the market value of the subject property, as of April 1, 2009, was

**NINETY EIGHT THOUSAND AND NO/100 ($98,000.00) DOLLARS.**

Paul R. Smith  
State Certification No.: CGA-110  
May 12, 2009
STATEMENT OF LIMITING CONDITIONS AND APPRAISER'S CERTIFICATION CONTINGENT AND LIMITING CONDITIONS: The appraiser's certification that appears in the appraisal report is subject to the following conditions:

1. The appraiser will not be responsible for matters of a legal nature that affect either the property being appraised or the title to it. The appraiser assumes that the title is good and marketable and, therefore, will not render any opinions about the title. The property is appraised on the basis of it being under responsible ownership.

2. The appraiser has provided a sketch in the appraisal report to show approximate dimensions of the improvements and the sketch is included only to assist the reader of the report in visualizing the property and understanding the appraiser's determination of its size.

3. The appraiser has examined the available flood maps that are provided by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (or other data sources) and has noted in the appraisal report whether the subject site is located in an identified Special Flood Hazard Area. Because the appraiser is not a surveyor, he or she makes no guarantees, express or implied, regarding this determination.

4. The appraiser will not give testimony or appear in court because he or she made an appraisal of the property in question, unless specific arrangements to do so have been made beforehand.

5. The appraiser has estimated the value of the land in the cost approach at its highest and best use and the improvements at their contributory value. These separate valuations of the land and improvements must not be used in conjunction with any other appraisal and are invalid if they are so used.

6. The appraiser has noted in the appraisal report any adverse conditions (such as, needed repairs, depreciation, the presence of hazardous wastes, toxic substances, etc.) observed during the inspection of the subject property or that he or she became aware of during the normal research involved in performing the appraisal. Unless otherwise stated in the appraisal report, the appraiser has no knowledge of any hidden or unapparent conditions of the property or adverse environmental conditions (including the presence of hazardous wastes, toxic substances, etc.) that would make the property more or less valuable, and has assumed that there are no such conditions and makes no guarantees or warranties, express or implied, regarding the condition of the property. The appraiser will not be responsible for any such conditions that do exist or for any engineering or testing that might be required to discover whether such conditions exist. Because the appraiser is not an expert in the field of environmental hazards, the appraisal report must not be considered as an environmental assessment of the property.

7. The appraiser obtained the information, estimates, and opinions that were expressed in the appraisal report from sources that he or she considers to be reliable and believes them to be true and correct. The appraiser does not assume responsibility for the accuracy of such items that were furnished by other parties.

8. The appraiser will not disclose the contents of the appraisal report except as provided for in the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice.

9. The appraiser has based his or her appraisal report and valuation conclusion for an appraisal that is subject to satisfactory completion, repairs, or alterations on the assumption that completion of the improvements will be performed in a workmanlike manner.

10. The appraiser must provide his or her prior written consent before the lender/client specified in the appraisal report can distribute the appraisal report (including conclusions about the property value, the appraiser's identity and professional designations, and references to any professional appraisal organizations or the firm with which the appraiser is associated) to anyone other than the borrower; the mortgagee or its successors and assigns; the mortgage insurer; consultants; professional appraisal organizations; any state or federally approved financial institution; or any department, agency or instrumentality of the United States or any state or the District of Columbia; except that the lender/client may distribute the property description section of the report only to data collection or reporting service(s) without having to obtain the appraiser's prior written consent. The appraiser's written consent and approval must also be obtained before the appraisal can be conveyed by anyone to the public through advertising, public relations, news, sales, or other media.
STATEMENT OF LIMITING CONDITIONS AND APPRAISER'S CERTIFICATION CONTINGENT AND LIMITING CONDITIONS: (continued)

APPRAISER'S CERTIFICATION: The Appraiser certifies and agrees that:

1. I have researched the subject market area and have selected a minimum of three recent sales of properties most similar and proximate to the subject property for consideration in the sales comparison analysis and have made a dollar adjustment when appropriate to reflect the market reaction to those items of significant variation. If a significant item in a comparable property is superior to, or more favorable than, the subject property, I have made a negative adjustment to reduce the adjusted sales price of the comparable and, if a significant item in a comparable property is inferior to, or less favorable than the subject property, I have made a positive adjustment to increase the adjusted sales price of the comparable.

2. I have taken into consideration the factors that have an impact on value in my development of the estimate of market value in the appraisal report. I have not knowingly withheld any significant information from the appraisal report and I believe, to the best of my knowledge, that all statements and information in the appraisal report are true and correct.

3. I stated in the appraisal report only my own personal, unbiased, and professional analysis, opinions, and conclusions, which are subject only to the contingent and limiting conditions specified in this form.

4. I have no present or prospective interest in the property that is the subject of this report, and I have no present or prospective personal interest or bias with respect to the participants in the transaction. I did not base, either partially or completely, my analysis and/or the estimate of market value in the appraisal report on the race, color, religion, sex, handicap, familial status, or national origin of either the prospective owners or occupants of the subject property or of the present owners or occupants of the properties in the vicinity of the subject property.

5. I have no present or contemplated future interest in the subject property, and neither my current or future employment nor my compensation for performing this appraisal is contingent on the appraised value of the property.

6. I was not required to report a predetermined value or direction in value that favors the cause of the client or any related party, the amount of the value estimate, the attainment of a specific result, or the occurrence of a subsequent event in order to receive my compensation and/or employment for performing the appraisal. I did not base the appraisal report on a requested minimum valuation, a specific valuation, or the need to approve a specific mortgage loan.

7. I performed this appraisal in conformity with the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice that were adopted and promulgated by the Appraisal Standards Board of the Appraisal Foundation and that were in place as of the effective date of this appraisal, with the exception of the departure provision of those Standards, which does not apply. I acknowledge that an estimate of a reasonable time for exposure in the open market is a condition in the definition of market value and the estimate I developed is consistent with the marketing time noted in the neighborhood section of this report, unless I have otherwise stated in the reconciliation section.

8. I have personally inspected the interior and exterior areas of the subject property and the exterior of all properties listed as comparables in the appraisal report. I further certify that I have noted any apparent or known adverse conditions in the subject improvements, on the subject site, or on any site within the immediate vicinity of the subject property of which I am aware and have made adjustments for these adverse conditions in my analysis of the property value to the extent that I had market evidence to support them. I have also commented about the effect of the adverse conditions on the marketability of the subject property.
STATEMENT OF LIMITING CONDITIONS AND APPRAISER'S CERTIFICATION CONTINGENT AND LIMITING CONDITIONS: (continued)

9. I personally prepared all conclusions and opinions about the real estate that were set forth in the appraisal report. If I relied on significant professional assistance from any individual or individuals in the performance of the appraisal or the preparation of the appraisal report, I have named such individual(s) and disclosed the specific tasks performed by them in the reconciliation section of this appraisal report. I certify that any individual so named is qualified to perform the tasks. I have not authorized anyone to make a change to any item in the report; therefore, if an unauthorized change is made to the appraisal report, I will take no responsibility for it.

ADDRESS OF PROPERTY APPRAISED: South of 2271 East Terry Street, Pocatello ID 83201

APPRAISER:

Signature: 
Name: Paul R. Smith
Date Signed: May 12, 2009
State Certification #: CGA-110
State: Idaho
Expiration Date of Certification or License: 04/22/2010

Additional Certification:

10. I certify that, as of the date of this report, I have completed the requirements of the continuing education program required by the State of Idaho, Idaho State Certified Real Estate Appraiser Board.

LIMITATION OF INSPECTIONS:
The appraiser assumes the owner is aware that this appraisal on the subject property is not represented or assumed to be a building inspection and does not serve as a warranty on the condition of the property.

The owner is also aware that it is his or her responsibility to examine the property carefully and to take all necessary precautions prior to the closing of the loan transaction, which may include, but are not necessarily limited to, seeking help from a professional engineer and/or other experts in construction, plumbing, or electrical.

Any defects he or she knows about, should know about, or has found by using any experts should be reported to the appraiser, as these findings may have an impact on the value conclusions as they relate to the subject property.

ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION and SIGNATURE:
The appraiser has transmitted this appraisal report via electronic mail. The signatures on the report have been placed there digitally, with the control of the signature only in the possession of the undersigned appraiser. This is fully acceptable under USPAP guidelines.
QUALIFICATIONS OF PAUL R. SMITH, APPRAISER
Idaho Certified General Real Estate Appraiser

EXPERIENCE:
47 Years - Fee and Staff Appraiser (Residential, Apartment, Agricultural, Industrial and Commercial properties in Southern Idaho)
11 Years - Mortgage Banker, Residential Builder and Developer
27 Years - Independent Insurance Agent

PAST EMPLOYMENT:
3 Years - U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Topographic Surveyor
11 Years - Mortgage-Insurance Corporation, Pocatello, Idaho
17 Years - Self-employed Real Estate Appraiser, Real Estate Broker and Independent Insurance Agent, Pocatello, Idaho
19 Years - Self-employed Real Estate Appraiser

EDUCATION:
Pocatello High School
University of Notre Dame - I.S.U., Assoc. Degree, Civil Engr.
Idaho State University, BBA in Business Engineering
Idaho State University, Master Business Administration

Appraisal Courses and Examinations sponsored by:
American Institute of Real Estate Appraisers: Courses taken between 1965 and 1974
  Appraisal I - Basic Real Estate Appraisal;
  Appraisal II - Urban Properties;
Appraisal III - Rural Properties;
  Appraisal VI - Investment Analysis;
Appraisal VII - Industrial properties;
  Appraisal VIII - Residential Properties.

National Association of Independent Fee Appraisers: Courses taken between 1998 and 2004
  Litigation Valuation - Nov 1998;
  FNMA Property & Appraisal - Sep 2003;
  Scope of Work - Sep 2003;
  Fair Lending Requirements - Jan 2004;
  Fraud, Flip and the FBI - Jan 2004;

a la mode, inc.: Technology and the Modern Appraiser - Aug 1999;

The Chicopee Group:
  Professional & Technical Compliance with USPAP I & II - Jul 1998.

Institute for Real Estate and Appraisals Studies:
  National USPAP Update - Oct 2008;

The Idaho Transportation Department:
  Proximity Damage Valuation Model - Jul 2003

Valuation Information Technology:
  Perspectives on 2-4 Unit Appraisals - Apr 1996
  1996 USPAP Update - Feb 1996

Appraisal Institute: Courses taken between 1992 and 2007
  The Professionals Guide to the URAR - Sep 2005;
  Residential Sales Comparison Approach - Sep 2003;
  Rates & Ratios: Making Sens of GIMs, OARs, and DCF - Sep 2003;
  FHA and the Appraisal Process - July 1999;
  Standards of Professional Practice - Aug 1994;
  Basic Income Capitalization - May 1993;
  Appraisal Review - Aug 1992;
  Overview and Practical Application - Apr 1993.

  Disclosures & Disclaimers - Jan 2006

LICENSES: Idaho Certified General Appraiser #110, Expires 04/22/2010
QUALIFICATIONS OF PAUL R. SMITH, APPRAISER (continued)

MEMBERSHIPS:
- Greater Pocatello Association of Realtors - Past Director
- National Association of Realtors - Appraisal Section
- Southern Idaho Chapter - Appraisal Institute - State Certified Associate Member
- Greater Pocatello Chamber of Commerce-Past Treasurer, Director
  - Industrial Development Committee
  - Idaho State University Scholarship-Chairman
  - Fly Pocatello Air Show - Co-chairman
- Idaho State University
  - School of Applied Technology - Chairman, Office Occupations Advisory Committee
  - U.S. Presidential Award Winner
  - Greater Pocatello Chamber of Commerce/School of Applied Technology - Past Chairman
- College of Technology - General Program Advisory Committee
- I.S.U.-Bengal Foundation - Past President & Director
- Rotary Club of Pocatello - Past President 1989-1994, President 1992-93
  - District 5400 Youth Exchange Committee, Chairman 1994-98

CLIENTS SERVED:
Bank of Idaho
Citizens Community Bank
Conseco Bank
Ireland Bank
Key Bank (Idaho Bank & Trust Co.)
Riverview Community Bank
Washington Federal Savings & Loan Association
Wells Fargo Home Mortgage
Department of HUD/FHA
Veterans Administration
  - Fee Appraiser & Inspector
  - Beacon Hill Mortgage
  - Chase Manhattan Mortgage
  - Countrywide Home Loans
  - Federal National Mortgage Association
  - First Financial Corporation
  - First Horizon Home Loan Corporation
  - Greatstone Mortgage
  - New World Mortgage
  - Norwest Mortgage
  - PHH Mortgage Services Corporation
  - Priority Mortgage Corporation
  - Idaho Central Credit Union
  - Idaho State University Federal Credit Union
  - Potelco Credit Union
  - Union Pacific Railroad Employee Federal Credit Union
  - Credit Union
  - Harborside Financial Network
  - State of Idaho
  - Bannock County
  - City of Pocatello
  - City of Chubbuck
  - City of American Falls
  - Pocatello Neighborhood Housing Services
  - Idaho Housing & Finance
  - Eastern Idaho Development Corp
  - Portneuf Greenway Foundation
  - Pocatello School District #25
  - Idaho State University
  - Alliance Insurance Co.
  - Beneficial Life Insurance
  - Farm Bureau Insurance
  - Farmers Insurance Co.
  - Intermountain Claims
  - New York Life Insurance
  - Safeguard Properties
  - State Farm Insurance Co.
  - Uniguard Insurance
  - Associates Relocation Management Co.
  - Cendant Mobility - STARS
  - Coldwell Banker Relocation
  - Merrill Lynch Relocation
  - The Relocation Center
  - Valuation Administrators
  - American Legion
  - Astaris (FMC Corporation)
  - Intermountain Gas Company

COURT TESTIMONY: Sixth District Court, Bannock County, Idaho - United States Bankruptcy Court
PLOT PLAN

East Terry Street (Buckskin Road)

Survey Description

Franklin Middle Sch.
Beginning at a point of the Tract described by Metes and Bounds as follows:
TRENCH South 89° 22' 0" West, a distance of 810.30 Feet;
TRENCH South 16° 7' 0" East, a distance of 622.54 Feet;
TRENCH North 89° 22' 0" East, a distance of 63.45 Feet;
TRENCH South 0° 20' 2" East, a distance of 45.00 Feet;
TRENCH North 89° 22' 0" East, a distance of 125.00 Feet;
TRENCH North 0° 20' 2" West, a distance of 45.00 Feet;
TRENCH North 89° 22' 0" East, a distance of 451.95 Feet;
TRENCH North 0° 16' 45" West, a distance of 599.96 Feet to point of beginning;
Said tract containing 10.12 acres (440796.37 sf) of land, more or less.
Perimeter = 2763.20 Feet
No significant error of closure.

Subject Site
Beginning at a point of the Tract described by Metes and Bounds as follows:
TRENCH South 16° 7' 0" East, a distance of 745.60 Feet;
TRENCH North 0° 20' 2" West, a distance of 718.55 Feet;
TRENCH South 89° 22' 0" East, a distance of 451.95 Feet;
TRENCH South 0° 20' 2" East, a distance of 45.00 Feet;
TRENCH South 89° 22' 0" West, a distance of 125.00 Feet;
TRENCH North 0° 20' 2" West, a distance of 45.00 Feet;
TRENCH South 0° 20' 2" West, a distance of 63.45 Feet to point of beginning;
Said tract containing 8.76 acres (381668.64 sf) of land, more or less.
Perimeter = 2632.15 Feet
No significant error of closure.
PHOTOGRAPHIC EXHIBITS

Looking North from nearby Ballard Property
Subject Property in foreground
PHOTOGRAPHIC EXHIBITS

Subject Property above and left of athletic complex
Photo taken February 2009
SUBJECT TRACT PLAT SKETCH
PLAT MAP SKETCH

PLAT MAP with AERIAL PHOTO OVERLAY

Paul Smith Agency
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COMPARABLE SALES LOCATION MAP
SPECIFIC SITE ZONING MAP
FLOOD MAP

Subject
2271 E Terry St

FLOODSCAPE
Flood Hazards Map
Map Number
160012009B
Effective Date
October 18, 1996

Powered by FloodSource
877.77.FLOOD
www.floodsource.com
PROXIMITY OF PUBLIC SEWER AND WATER
### Commercial Land Size Adjustment Chart - 2009 Small Acreage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sale No.</th>
<th>Sale Price $</th>
<th>Size - Ac Table?</th>
<th>$/Ac T-X</th>
<th>Size Factor</th>
<th>Adjustment</th>
<th>Indicated Unit Values $/Ac</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>8.76 Ac.</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>7952</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8737</td>
<td>-9.0%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>10359</td>
<td>-23.2%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>9943</td>
<td>-20.0%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6733</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>14.39</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5773</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8266</td>
<td>-3.8%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>ERR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>ERR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Line Item Adjustments as % of time adjusted unit value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Sale 1</th>
<th>Sale 2</th>
<th>Sale 3</th>
<th>Sale 4</th>
<th>Sale 5</th>
<th>Sale 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair -5</td>
<td>Fair -5</td>
<td>Fair -5</td>
<td>Gd -15</td>
<td>Avg -10</td>
<td>Poor 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>GP -5</td>
<td>GP -5</td>
<td>GPWS -10</td>
<td>GPWS -10</td>
<td>GPWS -10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontage</td>
<td>None-P</td>
<td>A -10</td>
<td>Fair -5</td>
<td>A -10</td>
<td>A -10</td>
<td>A -10</td>
<td>P - 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>None-P</td>
<td>F -5</td>
<td>F -5</td>
<td>A -10</td>
<td>A -10</td>
<td>A -10</td>
<td>F -5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>8.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topo</td>
<td>M/Slope</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>Slope</td>
<td>Slope</td>
<td>Slope</td>
<td>Slope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>U/RCP</td>
<td>CG +10</td>
<td>RS - 0</td>
<td>RMS -10</td>
<td>RMS -10</td>
<td>RMS -10</td>
<td>RR - 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>-40</td>
<td>-55</td>
<td>-50</td>
<td>-7.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
March 12, 2014

Idaho State University
President Arthur C. Vailas
Idaho State University
921 South 8th Avenue, Stop 8076
Pocatello, Idaho 83209-8076 USA

Dear President Vailas,

The Pocatello/Chubbuck School District No. 25 is appreciative of our recent meetings with you, Dr. Kent Tingeys and other ISU personnel as we have entered into discussions regarding the potential purchase of undeveloped ISU property adjacent to Franklin Middle School.

The District is moving forward with its long-range facility planning recommendations to purchase a future elementary school site which would eventually replace Washington and Bonneville Elementary Schools. The ISU property of interest to the District would provide joint use of outdoor green space, track and football field areas, as well as facilitate bussing transportation for children at Franklin Middle School and a future elementary school.

Therefore, the Pocatello/Chubbuck School District No. 25 is formally requesting to purchase approximately 13 acres of ISU property located south of Franklin Middle School and as legally described in the revised February 20, 2014 appraisal completed by the Paul Smith Agency. The appraised value of the land is $135,500.

We are grateful for your openness to contribute to our ability to identify and secure a future elementary school site.

Sincerely,

Mary M. Vagner
Superintendent

Bart Reed