



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

**APPROVED MINUTES
STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
August 13-14, 2014
Idaho State University
Pond Student Union Building
Salmon River Suite
1065 South Cesar Chavez Avenue
Pocatello, Idaho**

Present:

Emma Atchley, President
Don Soltman, Secretary
Richard Westerberg
Bill Goesling

Tom Luna, State Superintendent arrived at 1:10 pm
Dave Hill
Debbie Critchfield

Absent:

Rod Lewis, Vice President

Wednesday, August 13, 2014

The Board met for its regularly scheduled meeting on August 13-14, 2014 in the Pond Student Union Building at Idaho State University in Pocatello, Idaho. Board President Emma Atchley called the meeting to order at 1:00 pm and introduced two new Board members, Debbie Critchfield and Dave Hill. Idaho State University President Art Vailas welcomed the Board to the campus and gave a warm welcome to the new Board members.

BOARDWORK

1. Agenda Review / Approval

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Soltman/Goesling): To approve the agenda as amended. The motion carried six to zero. Mr. Luna was absent from voting.

2. Minutes Review / Approval

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Soltman/Goesling): To approve the minutes from the June 18-19 regular Board meeting as submitted. The motion carried six to zero. Mr. Luna was absent from voting.

3. Rolling Calendar

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Soltman/Westerberg): To set August 19-20, 2015 as the date and Idaho State University as the location for the August 2015 regularly scheduled Board meeting and to amend the date for the February 2015 regularly scheduled Board meeting to February 18-19, 2015. The motion carried six to zero. Mr. Luna was absent from voting.

OPEN FORUM

Mr. Jim Stratton, Eastern Idaho Technical College's (EITC) former Vice President of Finance and Administration, addressed the Board to recommend EITC be disestablished as a state agency and that its property, equipment, and its responsibilities for professional technical education be transferred to Idaho State University (ISU). He commented that the estimated annual savings from this action would be between \$1.7 million and \$2 million in personnel costs, and about \$250,000 in operating expenses. He indicated that EITC's mission is limited by state law and its programs and offerings are restricted by those laws. Enrollments are flat or falling and part-time enrollment is low. He felt EITC's small size is what makes it uneconomical and prevents the college from helping with Idaho's go-on rates. He listed a number of programs EITC does not participate in, including Complete College Idaho. Mr. Stratton pointed out that ISU is already at EITC and in Idaho Falls, and has permanent faculty available, adding that ISU is familiar with the PTE programs and in many cases PTE programs are already taught by ISU. He felt EITC's business model no longer works, the college should be disestablished, and the Board should divert the \$2 million in cost savings to other educational programs.

Ms. Casey Bartrem, a Ph.D. candidate from the University of Idaho (UI) in the Environmental Science program addressed the Board about the program prioritization at UI. She indicated she represents almost 300 environmental science and water resources students, 63 of whom have signed a letter detailing concerns with program prioritization. She listed highlights of the program which included that the Environmental Sciences program is one of the strongest at the university and is a top ranked program in the country, and that the program is interdisciplinary. She pointed out that through program prioritization, it is proposed to move the program into the College of Natural Resources which will result in decreased participation from other parts of the university, specifically the College of Agriculture. Ms. Bartrem pointed out that the announcement to move the program came as a surprise to students, faculty and staff. She also expressed concern

that students were not given an opportunity to gain information or provide feedback on program prioritization and why the program would be moved. Ms. Bartrem requested on behalf of the students, that the Board suspend moving the program into the College of Natural Resources. Short of that, she requested close monitoring of the transition of the program, and to allow students to report to the Board in one year on performance criteria.

At this time Superintendent Luna joined the meeting.

Ms. Emily Rankin, a junior at the University of Idaho, addressed the Board on program prioritization at UI. She pointed out that she specifically came to UI to participate in the Environmental Sciences program. She felt the Environmental Sciences program should not be moved to the College of Natural Resources because it will severely impact the number of faculty that participate in it, as well as it putting more of an emphasis on natural resource management. She expressed frustration with the process and that students were not kept informed or involved. She also requested the Board reconsider and urge the university to keep the program where it currently is.

At this time President Atchley introduced the Board's two newest members; Debbie Critchfield from Oakley, ID, and David Hill from Eagle, ID. She offered then a warm welcome and thanked them for their future service to the Board.

WORKSESSION

Instruction, Research & Student Affairs/Business Affairs & Human Resources (IRSA/BAHR)

A. Program Prioritization

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Soltman/Westerberg): To approve the program prioritization process executed by Idaho State University as fulfillment of the Governor's zero-base budgeting mandate, and to direct the University to work with IRSA and BAHR to begin implementation of recommendations as set forth in Attachment 2. The motion carried six to zero. Mr. Luna was absent from voting.

M/S (Soltman/Goesling): To approve the program prioritization process executed by the University of Idaho as fulfillment of the Governor's zero-base budgeting mandate, and to direct the University to work with IRSA and BAHR to begin implementation of recommendations as set forth in Attachment 3. The motion carried seven to zero.

M/S (Soltman/Westerberg): To approve the program prioritization process executed by Boise State University as fulfillment of the Governor's zero-base budgeting mandate, and to direct the University to work with IRSA and BAHR to begin

implementation of recommendations as set forth in Attachment 4. The motion carried seven to zero.

M/S (Soltman/Westerberg): To approve the program prioritization process executed by Lewis-Clark State College as fulfillment of the Governor's zero-base budgeting mandate, and to direct the College to work with IRSA and BAHR to begin implementation of recommendations as set forth in Attachment 5. The motion carried seven to zero.

Board member Don Soltman introduced the work session item. Mr. Freeman and Dr. Mathias from the Board office provided a summary and history of the program prioritization process and progress. Mr. Freeman provided an informative overview of the whole process and the details of the Dickeson model for the benefit of the new Board members. He pointed out the process of program prioritization required the institutions to conduct an evaluation of programs and services with specific and tangible objectives (goals), and with a focus on specific evaluation criteria rather than generalized across-the-board cuts. Mr. Freeman pointed out that the program prioritization process was not intended to be a budgetary housecleaning exercise.

Mr. Freeman remarked that the process provides the Board with assurances of consistency and presents the institutions with a unique opportunity to objectively evaluate program efficiency and effectiveness, with a specific focus on their Mission, Core Themes, and Strategic Plans. Additionally, program prioritization serves a critical dual purpose by fulfilling the requirements of the Governor's ZBB mandate.

Mr. Freeman provided a timeline of Board action and progress reports, pointing out that for the past nine months program prioritization has been a standing agenda item for the Instruction, Research, and Student Affairs (IRSA) and Business Affairs and Human Resources (BAHR) committees. This has provided Board members with a regular checkpoint, and institutions with a forum for technical questions and inter-institutional comparison and dialog. A system-wide summary of requested findings and outcomes was included in Board agenda materials.

Dr. Mathias discussed implementation and proposed next steps in the program prioritization process. He discussed streamlining of the process and the proposed three strand template. He reviewed the relationship of program prioritization with the five year plans and remarked that five year planning was suspended last year to focus on program prioritization.

Dr. Laura Woodworth-Ney and Jim Fletcher provided a review of ISU's progress. Dr. Woodworth-Ney reported on the academic programs centered on ISU's integrated education system. She reminded the Board that ISU is in the process of their academic assessment which will occur in October.

Dr. Woodworth-Ney reported on the process, stating that ISU included faculty senate and the dean's council in feedback, scoring, and quintiling the criteria in each area of analysis.

They identified data indicators for each area and scored programs based on the data. Dr. Woodworth-Ney reported on their outcomes and recommendations, that recommendations have been refined, and they are in the process of creating a program actions spreadsheet to manage program proposals and action plans. Some recommendations have been or are in the process of being implemented; others are being evaluated. Recommendations fall into the following categories: Program and administrative restructures, consolidations, program improvement plans, program eliminations, program expansions, and new programs.

Dr. Goesling asked about student input. Dr. Woodworth-Ney responded the student input received was at the department and program levels, and they plan to visit with student leadership throughout the process once recommendations are established. Mr. Soltman asked about their IT resources for this process. Dr. Woodworth-Ney responded they created a separate system with its own servers in order to handle the information without altering the functions of the other data systems on campus, making it a sustainable operation going forward.

Ms. Atchley asked how they plan to link the implementation of the original prioritization process and the continuing evaluation process together going forward. Dr. Woodworth-Ney responded that they hope to use the same process they use with the five year plan where it is a five year process, but it is updated annually.

Dr. Goesling asked about what would happen with a program that is rated low by one department, but rated much higher by a different department. Dr. Woodworth-Ney responded they have a check and balance system in place at the dean level to evaluate recommendations based on the college need. Ms. Atchley asked if they found significant efficiencies or dollars, etc. Dr. Woodworth-Ney responded they also concluded a budget analysis during the process and would be reallocating resources from one program to another. They will have resources for high need areas over the three year period.

Mr. Fletcher discussed the non-academic areas. He reported that ISU has established two key objectives that the university is funding as a result of program prioritization. One is an on-going university wide compensation plan for faculty and staff, the second is for students. Mr. Fletcher reported on measurement criteria for non-academic programs which included such things as cost effectiveness, importance to the institution, internal and external demand, quality, and opportunity. He also discussed the quintilization process they used for non-academic areas. Mr. Fletcher indicated they have proceeded to implement the results of the program prioritization in the non-academic areas.

Potential cost savings identified include action on 14 identified programs which equates to over \$650,000 over the next three years. Additionally, there has been an additional \$250,000 in savings that has been immediately realized and booked into the current year budget. For future planning, vice presidents are preparing plans to identify all of the various elements and what they can do. Mr. Fletcher remarked this has been a good process and has created a better environment of accountability.

Dr. Katherine Aiken and Ron Smith from the University of Idaho reported on the progress of their program prioritization. Dr. Aiken highlighted UI's overarching goals for program prioritization which are to engage in a large scale evaluation of all academic and non-academic programs; prioritize the faculty and staff hiring process; and to enhance operational efficiency. She remarked on the units of analysis used and that they used the same criteria and weighting for both academic and non-academic programs. Centrality and quality were the highest weighted criteria. She reported on their overview of findings for both degree and non-degree programs where some will be restructured, eliminated, watched, etc. Immediate steps have included a new employee classification system, closure of the campus pharmacy, moving degree programs to other administrative locations in the university, and examining their funding options for post employment benefits.

Dr. Aiken reported on the timeline and next steps that include restructuring and evaluating efficiencies. She also pointed out that they would be reviewing their IT functionality and efficiencies which should realize some cost savings. She also commented on compliance areas that they identified which require more attention. Dr. Aiken reported that they will conduct a rigorous evaluation of vacant faculty lines for strategic planning, ongoing program review (both academic and non-academic), and engagement in a continuous process improvement to make best use of resources and to sustain momentum.

Dr. Goesling asked about what process they will use to share information between institutions on efficiencies. Mr. Soltman responded that there would be a considerable amount of review in CAAP.

Mr. Westerberg asked about their findings on cost savings. Dr. Aiken responded that they feel very positive about this process in becoming more efficient, and have already realized a considerable amount of savings with the steps they have taken.

Ms. Atchley asked about faculty workload. Dr. Aiken responded they looked at student/teacher ratios and with clear criteria they will be more productive and efficient. Ms. Atchley asked about the Environmental Science Program and the concerns that were raised during open forum. Dr. Aiken responded that they are engaged in a thoughtful review process for this program. She did not feel that its placement administratively has any impact on the interdisciplinary nature of the program. They are convinced it will enhance educational experience for their students.

Dr. Marty Schimpf presented Boise State University's (BSU) progress on program prioritization and introduced Jim Munger, Associate Provost for Academic Planning, to assist with the presentation. Dr. Schimpf reviewed the phases of their program prioritization and the programs evaluated. He clarified the criterion used and the metrics developed. Metrics relied on quantitative data, relevance, quality, productivity and efficiency. They also included data from student surveys that asked questions about value, quality, relevancy, and the like.

Dr. Schimpf reported that of the 163 counted programs, 135 were evaluated and 28 were excluded. They were all ranked based on metrics that delivered them into one of five quintiles. Those programs that ended up below the threshold are required to develop a plan for provost approval. Dr. Schimpf reviewed some lessons learned in the creation of new instructional programs and indicated the process provided context for evaluation of proposed new programs, helped re-evaluate the five year plan, and helped them determine a sunset clause for new programs if found insufficient.

Dr. Schimpf reviewed the next phase which evaluated efficiency of the academic departments. He reported that 45 departments were evaluated, and 11 departments were required to develop action plans for improvement. Program prioritization also enabled BSU to restructure colleges and move various academic units into more appropriate areas. Nearly 1/3 of their departments are being moved or consolidated as a result of program prioritization.

Dr. Schimpf reported on the benefits they have realized from this process and the results that illuminated several opportunities, interdependencies, and the identification of duplicative functions. Dr. Schimpf reported on sustaining the process which would enhance analytic capability to support decision making, and enhance evaluation of instructional programs and academic departments. He reported that they intend to create a new College of Innovation and Design which will be an incubator for trans-disciplinary programs.

Provost Lori Stinson and Financial Vice President Chet Herbst provided a report on Lewis-Clark State College's (LSCS) program prioritization. She identified the overarching goals that guided them through the process which supports their strategic plan. She noted the five criteria used by LCSC which were also approved by the faculty, staff, and students. The greatest weight was on mission essentiality, and internal and external demand. She remarked on the process which included campus meetings, establishment of criteria, questionnaires developed, documents open for campus-wide review, campus presentations, quintiling of programs, and ongoing campus communication.

Provost Stinson reported they reviewed the results for the instructional and non-instructional programs which were 115 in total. They identified and reviewed actions for each quintile which ranged from additional resources for highly successful programs, to major review and restructuring for those programs that are struggling. They are requiring action plans from all quintile three and four programs (46 programs). Quintile five programs (23 programs) all require major review or restructuring and their action plans must be approved by the provost or president. Ms. Stinson provided a few examples of actions they have already implemented as a result of this exercise. Those examples included advising, summer school, a possible in-state partnership in a dental hygiene program, region II outreach centers, and the relocation of web development to their IT department.

Ms. Stinson reported on some of the benefits and lessons learned from this process that included alignment with NWCCU review, benefit to the realignment of the assessment

process, sustainability with action plans, data to include more and stronger program level data, collaboration, and the creation of framework for upcoming budget cycle and resource allocation.

In summary, each of the institutions felt the exercise on program prioritization has been helpful and that it is resulting in meaningful changes at the institutions. It has also resulted in good collaboration between departments and the sharing of ideas between institutions.

The meeting recessed at 3:55 pm.

Thursday, August 14, 2014, 8:00 a.m., Idaho State University, Pond Student Union Building, Pocatello, Idaho.

The Board convened for its regularly scheduled business at 8:00 a.m. at Idaho State University in Pocatello. Board President Emma Atchley called the meeting to order at 8:00 a.m. and thanked Dr. Vailas and ISU for their hospitality. Board member Rod Lewis was absent from the meeting. New Board members Debbie Critchfield and Dave Hill gave brief introductions and backgrounds of themselves.

OPEN FORUM

President Atchley indicated there were several individuals who requested to speak during open forum.

Ms. Jana Johnson, an ISU AP US History student, expressed concern over how the course content that becomes effective this Fall semester has been changed to retell a dark account of US History. The revised course content omits such key figures as the founding fathers, the pilgrims, James Madison, Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin, John Winthrop and others. She remarked that students will now be taught that instead of being an exemplary model that other settlements would emulate, these early settlers were rigid, racial bigots who brought widespread deadly epidemics, and subjected Africans and American Indians to their white superiority and disruption of the ecological balance of the land. Ms. Johnson provided a visual aid of the previous course documents in contrast to the new course documents; for instance a five page course description has gone to 124 pages. Ms. Johnson expressed great disheartenment over Americans being cast as villainous, heartless individuals, particularly the founding fathers and those Americans from the "greatest generation".

Ms. Stephanie Gifford addressed the Board regarding the K-12 student level data collection system known as the Idaho System for Educational Excellence (ISEE). She expressed concern about the amount of data collected on students, and that it is becoming a dangerous trend. Ms. Gifford expressed concern over the policies being created and that there was not enough parental consent written into the policies to allow for the protection of privacy. She felt that trends in student outcomes could be derived from aggregate data, and that individual data was not necessary. She also expressed

concern over the security of the data being collected. Ms. Gifford sought for parents the option to opt out of the data collection of their children. She felt a parents' right of privacy and input are being compromised, and does not feel the data collection is in the best interest of the children.

Ms. Mandy Baker from Cassia School District in Burley remarked to the Board that she has many questions regarding the origin, the funding, and the lack of transparency that has accompanied the Common Core Standards. She indicated that her remarks today would be focused in regards to the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC). She clarified that she chose to not have her children take the SBAC test last Spring. She felt there were questions irrelevant to a student's knowledge, as well as data seeking questions contained in the test. She was concerned that there is not an opt-out option for students to not take the test. She expressed her parental authority should trump all others. Ms. Baker felt that Idaho educators, parents, and Idaho leaders should develop and approve the standards and tests. She felt being in a consortium with other states prevents Idaho from having the flexibility to adjust and adapt the testing for the needs of Idaho's students. She expressed concern that Idaho is not in charge of its own testing, that renaming the test to the ISAT-II is deceptive, and urged the Board to repeal the SBAC testing and withdraw from the consortium.

Ms. Lindsey Ten Eyck, a registered nurse, addressed the Board regarding concerns with the Common Core. She shared with the Board the fact that she is particularly concerned with the Math and English standards being too low. Regarding Math, she felt it was detrimental to students to not be taught Algebra until the 9th grade, and not be introduced to pre-calculus until college. She remarked that the Common Core standards are not aligned with expectations at the collegiate level, and that students do not arrive at a college campus with a solid foundation in math. She pointed out this gives students much less of a chance of successfully obtaining a college degree in a STEM skillset which is largely in the definition of 21st century job skills. She expressed grave concern that the standards are too low to be college and career ready. She urged the Board to listen to the parents and students and that the Common Core is not what it says it is.

Ms. Patricia Anderson addressed the Board regarding the Common Core. Ms. Anderson felt it was unconstitutional in the way the Common Core standards were created. She also expressed concern about how it was brought to the state and other states, the high-stakes testing tied to teacher evaluation, and the data collection. She pointed out her greatest concern is that parents are being cut out of the decision making or input-giving process. She remarked that despite numerous parental concerns, the policy was passed in a heavy handed manner anyway, and felt that parents are being cut out deliberately. Ms. Anderson felt that children are now considered human capital with no parental input being accepted. She urged the Board to keep parents in consideration and seek their input when making decisions regarding the children's education.

Ms. Emilee Murdoch, a parent from Blackfoot, addressed the Board regarding the Common Core and the SBAC. She felt that through the adoption of the Common Core and through data mining, Idaho is losing what is right and good about public education.

Ms. Murdoch felt the Federal government is too involved in local decision making and parental input, and that we are losing ground as it relates to local decision making. She expressed concern over the Federal Government's funding and oversight of the Common Core and the testing content. She felt we are losing out on children actually becoming educated, and focusing too much on teaching to the test, test scores, and school ratings. She felt children should be assessed on their personal growth. She urged the Board to seek to end Idaho's contract with the SBAC.

Ms. Becky Foster addressed the Board regarding the Common Core, education reform, and the collection of student data. She was concerned over the amount of Federal stimulus dollars behind education reform and felt parents are losing the ability to make the best educational decisions for their children. She asked why so much emphasis is being placed on testing, which is replacing the benefit of a well-rounded curriculum, and asked if Idaho's leaders could answer what the consequences are of Idaho's system conforming to uniformity and forced standardization. She indicated that teachers don't feel they have a voice to speak to the testing and felt the SBAC testing is a complete intrusion of parental authority.

Ms. Atchley thanked the speakers who participated during open forum.

CONSENT AGENDA

M/S (Soltman/Goesling): To approve the consent agenda as printed. The motion carried seven to zero.

Mr. Luna requested to speak to the item on the Adoption of Curricular Materials. He pointed out that the state does provide a resource for districts in reviewing curricular material and making recommendations and ultimately districts can choose their own curricula and materials.

Business Affairs & Human Resources (BAHR)

1. Optional Retirement Plan Amendments

BOARD ACTION

By unanimous consent to approve the amendments to the Optional Retirement Plan as set forth in Attachment 1.

2. Boise State University – 403(b) Supplemental Retirement Plan – New Participant

BOARD ACTION

By unanimous consent to approve the request by Boise State University to add Kenneth Petersen as a participant to the 403(b) Supplemental Retirement Plan as presented in Attachment 1.

3. Idaho State University – Enterprise Resource Planning Hardware Replacement Purchase

BOARD ACTION

By unanimous consent to approve the request by Idaho State University to replace Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) hardware at an estimated cost not to exceed \$1,418,244, funded by appropriated funds.

4. University of Idaho – AT&T License Agreement – Theophilus Tower

BOARD ACTION

By unanimous consent to approve the request by the University of Idaho for authority to grant a five year license to AT&T Wireless Services in substantial conformance to the form submitted to the Board in Attachment 1 and to authorize the University's Vice President for Finance and Administration to execute the license and any related documents.

Instruction, Research & Student Affairs (IRSA)

5. Quarterly Report: Programs and Changes Approved by Executive Director

Information item for the Board

6. Higher Education Research Council Appointment

BOARD ACTION

By unanimous consent to appoint Dr. Kelly Beierschmitt to the Higher Education Research Council, effective immediately.

7. Pulled Item (Idaho EPSCoR Committee Appointment)

Planning, Policy & Governmental Affairs (PPGA)

8. Bi-Monthly Report: University Approved Alcohol Permits

Information item for the Board

9. Indian Education Committee Appointment

BOARD ACTION

By unanimous consent to appoint Ms. Kathy Albin, representing the Coeur d'Alene Tribe K-12 tribal education representative and Mr. Bill Picard, representing the Nez Perce Tribe to the Idaho Indian Education Committee, effective immediately.

State Department of Education (SDE)

10. Adoption of Curricular Materials

BOARD ACTION

By unanimous consent to approve the adoption of Professional-Technical Education, English Language Arts 6-12, Limited English Proficiency and Computer Applications curricular materials and related instructional materials as recommended by the Curricular Materials Selection Committee as submitted.

11. Teacher Preparation Program Review Team Report – Lewis-Clark State College

BOARD ACTION

By unanimous consent to accept the State Team Report, and grant program approval of Elementary Education, English Language Arts, Reading (Literacy), Physical Education, Health Education, Mathematics, Social Studies (Foundation Standards), History, Science (Foundation Standards), and Gifted and Talented at Lewis-Clark State College.

By unanimous consent to accept the State Team Report, and grant conditional approval of the Special Education, Biology, Chemistry, Earth and Space Science, and English as a New Language programs at Lewis-Clark State College.

12. Teacher Certification/Endorsement Program Approval – University of Idaho New Endorsement

BOARD ACTION

By unanimous consent to accept the Professional Standards Commission recommendation to conditionally approve the Online Teaching Endorsement program offered through the University of Idaho.

By unanimous consent to accept the Professional Standards Commission recommendation to conditionally approve the English as a New Language Endorsement program offered through the University of Idaho.

PLANNING, POLICY & GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

1. Idaho State University's Annual Report

President Vailas welcomed the Board to ISU for the August meeting. He introduced the newest member of ISU, a young dog named Hero, who is a part of the Veterans Sanctuary. Dr. Vailas thanked ISU staff for all their hard work preparing for and assisting with the meeting.

Dr. Vailas provided a progress report from ISU centered on their core themes, and reported on the upcoming accreditation visit in October. He reported that in order to improve access, they are learning to be rigorous in their management of resources considering the decline in funding experienced over the years. Dr. Vailas indicated they have realized an increase of 7% during the past year in early college enrollment. He reported related to college preparation that ISU offers two programs designed to assist students with navigating the college environment. Those programs are the Bridge Program (with a 78% retention rate) and the START Program (with a 76% retention rate). Dr. Vailas reported on professional-technical education and that they award nearly 500 professional-technical degrees each year.

He reported there are students from 65 nations attending ISU, and remarked on student support services and how the university is committed to student success. Retention rates have increased by 5%, and student athletes retain at a 14% higher rate than the overall student body. He reported on in-demand graduate programs and that they offer programs in key areas such as health care, energy and education. ISU is the only Idaho institution to sponsor accredited graduate medical and dental education programs. He added that passage rates on national exams meet or exceed national averages.

Dr. Vailas reported that ISU continues to lead in research and innovation where the knowledge created has a direct impact on student experience in the classroom and outwardly. He reported on how ISU is changing lives in Idaho, and how the university helps drive state and national economic development. ISU has 15 health teaching clinics serving various communities, and has more than 800 participants in its health fair. They are very proud to contribute to advancing health care in Idaho. He reported that the Bengal Pharmacy, LLC, opened the state's first ever full service tele-pharmacy in Arco, and also provides hands on experience to students. Dr. Vailas shared a short video on the Bengal Pharmacy, LLC, and how it is helping shape the future in rural Idaho.

2. Presidents' Council Report

Mr. Westerberg indicated they would hear from each of the presidents on their security plans after the President's Council report.

Presidents' Council Chair Dr. Joe Dunlap from North Idaho College (NIC) reported on the recent activities of the Presidents' Council. The president's met on August 5th and discussed scholarship legislation being proposed which included three proposals. The first proposal is from Representative Gannon on tuition waivers for students who are interns with the state or political subdivisions of the state; the second proposal is from Representative Nielsen who is on the House Ed Committee, that seeks to provide a

scholarship for students earning an Associate's degree or certificate in high school to go on and complete a baccalaureate degree; and the third is a proposal from Ryan Kirby, who is running for a legislative seat, and Senator Thayne, for scholarships for students at various levels in dual credit, advanced placement and PTE credit courses in high school. Institutions would need to come up with a match from industry for these awards. It was pointed out that Senator Thayne is not supportive of the latter part of that proposal. Dr. Dunlap pointed out that with there being overlap with the scholarship proposals there will likely be discussion about consolidation.

Dr. Dunlap reported that the president's decided upon a President's Council retreat to take place on October 14th in Lewiston at Lewis-Clark State College, the day before the October Board meeting. Dr. Fernandez would be coordinating the retreat planning.

Dr. Dunlap reported the presidents heard from PTE Administrator Dwight Johnson on the Governor's Accelerate Idaho Initiative. The initiative is a K-through-career system that is being proposed and will contribute toward the Board's 60% goal. The president's also reviewed their budgets and proposals for FY16. The guns on campus security funding proposals would be supplemental proposals and not included in the FY16 budget requests.

At this time, each of the presidents reported on their campus security plans.

Dr. Kustra reported that BSU has reviewed their entire campus security operation and have found that with the benchmarks provided – they can ramp up their security officers to meet the recommendations. They will have armed security officers. This new law holds the university responsible if anything goes wrong. They will increase security officers from 13 to 34 security officers over a three year period. There will also be a substantial increase in equipment. For the liability concerns, they will be using metal detectors at the football stadium. They are starting out with metal detectors at two entrances, and will eventually have them at all entrances.

Dr. Staben reported from UI, and with respect to the guns on campus bill they are taking a different approach. They are not putting metal detectors at the stadiums and are relying on the Moscow police department for support. They have taken steps to increase the safety and security of the campus such as surveillance, and have taken steps with the police department to decrease the amount of response time.

Dr. Albiston reported from EITC that the plan submitted addresses safety, physical security, information security, emergency response and their relationship with the local police department. They have decided to remain status quo and will continue to contract through a company for the college's security. Their security guards are not armed nor will they be. He indicated that throughout conversations with the local police department, they will continue to use them for support.

Dr. Dunlap reported from NIC that their new policy is congruent with LCSC and ISU since they also have a presence at NIC. They have installed locks in classrooms should the

need arise for shelter. They have worked with the police department and have put computer software in place if necessary for a lock down. They have compiled a FAQ list for students and visitors to the campus. They did issue a supplemental funding request for increased costs as a result of the new bill.

Dr. Vailas reported that ISU has updated and enhanced their safety policy, and their safety officers are now armed. They have identified some exceptions and have identified a process to address those exceptions. He pointed out that they have also worked with the police department to decrease their response time to incidents.

Dr. Fernandez reported that LCSC has changed its policies to be in concert with the State Board's policies. They have had and will continue to have meetings on campus to explain that policy. They have established a firearms advisory team to continue to look at the issue to make necessary changes. They have posted details on campus and have purchased equipment to facilitate the new laws; they will not have armed security guards. They have absorbed the costs thus far in implementing the things they have put into place. Dr. Fernandez added they are very confident in the Lewiston Police Department and have included them in their Firearms Committee.

Dr. Jeff Fox from the College of Southern Idaho (CSI) indicated they have taken a slightly different approach and hope that Idaho citizens will continue to abide by the law. They have not asked for any additional funding at this time. CSI does have a full time public safety director. He reported they have done awareness training, have the ability for lockdowns, video surveillance, and have nine full time unarmed security officers and also have a law enforcement program on campus.

Ms. Cheryl Wright Vice President of Finance and Administration from the College of Western Idaho (CWI) spoke on behalf of President Glandon and apologized for his absence. She reported that they have worked diligently the past year and one half on the campus safety plan. They have a revised policy and they contract out for security. Their officers are unarmed, but will carry pepper spray. They have a MOU with the Nampa Police Department to have presence on their Nampa campus during the campus open hours. They have a request for funding for a school resource officer in both Canyon County and Ada County, and are working with the Boise Police Department for an MOU for the Ada County presence.

Dr. Westerberg thanked the presidents for their collaboration and thoughtful consideration of the safety of the institutions' students and visitors.

3. Division of Professional-Technical Education (PTE) Annual Report

Dwight Johnson introduced himself and offered a brief history and background of himself for the Board. Mr. Johnson is the new Administrator for the Division of Professional-Technical Education, and brings unique insight to this position from the Departments of Commerce and Labor. He provided a report to the Board on the Division of Professional-Technical Education's current activities and progress.

He remarked on the Governor's Accelerate Idaho initiative, and the opportunity and need for a skilled workforce and how that relates to professional-technical education and enhancing a skilled workforce in Idaho. He pointed out the need for a skilled workforce as a driver of the Board's 60% goal, as well as the Workforce Development Council's 60% goal. He felt what PTE does in regard to technical training contributes directly to the development of a skilled workforce. He remarked about the Legislature passing House Concurrent Resolution 53 which directs the Departments of Commerce and Labor to work with the Board of Education and report back in January on how to make education more responsive to business talent and workforce needs, and pointed out that the whole picture is an increasing public policy priority.

Mr. Johnson reported that the PTE delivery system spans secondary and postsecondary education levels and their strategic plan ties with the Board's goals and objectives. He commented that professional technical education works and 64% of high school PTE program students go on to college. The strength of PTE is that it is relevant education, it uses applied learning, it recognizes credentials, and contains learn-and-earn models. PTE helps connect education to students' passions and goals. He commented that their keys to accomplishing goals are building partnerships to engineer talent pipelines for industries, and building career pathways for students.

Mr. Johnson identified Idaho industry targets include advanced manufacturing, energy, high technology, and health care. Regarding building career pathways, successful transitions will be important. He remarked that building talent pipelines includes work from K-12 through career and industry centers.

He commented on the tools, incentives, and programs available to help support the Board's 60% goal, and that those elements include grants and reallocated funds, apprenticeships, education programs and credentials, and legislative tax credits. He concluded by commenting on the critical role of PTE in leadership, advocacy, and technical assistance.

Mr. Soltman thanked Mr. Johnson for his comprehensive report to the Board and remarked that a key and critical thing to focus on will be leadership at the Division.

4. Amendment to Board Policy, Bylaws – Second Reading

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Soltman): To approve the second reading of Board policy - Bylaws as submitted. The motion carried unanimously seven to zero.

During the June Board meeting additional edits were requested that would ensure it was clear that the Board hired and/or fired the independent auditors and that the Board President had the authority to set the Board meeting locations.

5. Data Management Council – Policies and Procedures

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Goesling): To approve the Data Management Council governing policies and procedures as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried unanimously seven to zero.

Mr. Carson Howell from the Board office provided some background on the Data Management Council (DMC). The Statewide Longitudinal Data System (SLDS) is a user initiated matching system what uses data from the K-12 system, the postsecondary system, and the Department of Labor; those databases are separate databases that are not linked to each other. Mr. Howell clarified the levels of restrictions on the data and provided some examples of its use. He pointed out that any data will be stored on a secure sever and that it has limits on who has access to the data. The data will be used to determine how to improve the education system. He explained how the data requests are ether approved or disapproved by the DMC. Passage of this item will ensure that the DMC bylaws and the Board of Education are in compliance with state law.

Mr. Luna asked for comment on the perception that people have of the existence of one large database containing student data. Mr. Howell clarified that there are three separate data bases and how they are limited. In Idaho the decision was made to have separate databases as a form of security and confidentiality. Mr. Howell explained the process for how data is requested and how it is approved by the DMC which includes discussion and a vote. Further, only the data elements required to answer the specific question are provided in response. The requestor must clarify what the data is going to be used for, and is given clear direction on how the data may be used, as well as destroyed. An annual report is required by the Legislature of any data requested. Mr. Hill asked if it has a dedicated server. Mr. Howell responded the K-12 and postsecondary data are on a dedicated server and the data is encrypted. Ms. Critchfield asked if it has been determined on how long the data is stored. Mr. Howell responded it would be brought up to the DMC. Mr. Luna asked for a report to the Board after that discussion with the DMC.

Mr. Howell also pointed out that the SLDS does not collect any data that is not already collected at the school district and that parents have access to this data.

6. School District Model Data Security Policy

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Soltman): To approve the Model Student Data Privacy and Security Policy as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried unanimously six to zero. Ms. Critchfield abstained from voting on the motion.

Mr. Howell reported that the last section of the bill directs the State Board to develop a model policy for school districts and public charter schools that will govern data collection,

access, security, and use of such data. This model policy has been drafted and approved by the DMC. He pointed out that if a district or public charter fails to adopt, implement, and post the policy where any inappropriate release of data occurs, the district or public charter shall be liable for a civil penalty not to exceed \$50K that shall be paid to the General Fund. The DMC received and considered input from various stakeholders including charter schools, school districts, and parents. The policy was approved unanimously by the DMC. Passage of this item will bring the State Board into compliance with state law and provide school districts and public charter schools with the required policy to be in compliance with state law.

Mr. Howell discussed concerns about the data that is being gathered, such as the idea that it is a tracking system. He clarified that this system is a tool intended to be used to review trends and determine how to better to improve the education system; they are specifically looking at patterns of students that go on to college. Employment data is useful because it shows if students are getting jobs and in what areas. For instance, a recent data analysis shows that students are graduating, but are taking jobs in Washington and Oregon where they are making better wages. Using this data, they hope to look at ways to keep graduates in Idaho and how to contribute to its economy.

Mr. Luna asked about the secondary uses of the data. Mr. Howell highlighted the contract requirements for vendors for the secondary uses of the data. In addition, he pointed out that the Board shall obtain express parental consent for those secondary uses prior to deployment of the vendor's services under the contract. He discussed what is and what is not permitted under this policy. Mr. Luna remarked that he thought the understanding was the local *School Board* would be the one obtaining parental consent, and not the *State Board*. Mr. Howell pointed out the language in the bill points to the State Board of Education. Mr. Hill recommended getting clarification from the Legislature on the specific definition of the term "board".

7. Pending Rule – Docket 08-0501-1401 – Seed and Plant Certification

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Critchfield): To approve the Pending Rule Docket 08-05-1401 as submitted. The motion carried unanimously six to zero. Ms. Atchley abstained from voting on the motion.

8. Proposed Rule – Docket 08-0111-1401 – Registration of Postsecondary Institutions and Proprietary Schools

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Hill): To approve the Proposed Rule changes to Docket 08-0111-1401 as submitted. The motion carried unanimously seven to zero.

9. Proposed Rule – Docket 08-0202-1401 – Teacher Certification

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Goesling): To approve the Proposed Rule changes to Docket 08-0202-1401 as submitted. The motion carried unanimously seven to zero.

Dr. Linda Clark, superintendent of the Meridian School District, provided comments on this item otherwise known as tiered licensure. She provided some background on the item, and a presentation on tiered licensure and the tiered certification framework. This system is a two tiered system with the first tier being a residency tier, and the second being a professional certificate. The residency tier is an institutional recommendation from a state approved educator preparation program from where the individual has met certain criteria derived from the Danielson model. That individual would have an individualized learning plan; learning objectives and measureable student achievement are also considered. It is recommended that every teacher in Idaho have an individualized learning plan.

Dr. Clark reported that the residency certificate is a three year non-renewable certificate, and professional development in years 1-3 includes intensive mentoring, mentoring at a lesser level, and independent practice. After three years, they would be qualified to obtain a professional certificate. Dr. Clark reviewed those qualifications. She also pointed out the contingencies if the teacher does not meet the criteria at the end of three years. Those teachers would not be certificated during this time, but have the opportunity to return to a higher education institution for instruction in the area on non-proficiency.

Tier two is a professional certificate renewal. It is a five year renewal where teachers must meet current credit requirements. Dr. Clark identified the other requirements for this tier and certificate renewal. If the teacher does not meet the criteria, the teacher is moved to a contingent professional certificate status. The teacher would be placed on an improvement plan to include peer assistance and if necessary intervention. Contingent status is removed once professional certificate requirements are satisfied. There are additional contingencies such as the teacher not being eligible for a leadership premium.

If the teacher meets the criteria of a professional certificate and are exemplary, they can qualify for the master professional certificate which is a five year renewable certificate. Dr. Clark highlighted the requirements for this certificate which included such areas as meeting current credit requirements, a minimum of eight years of teaching experience, and demonstrated teacher proficiency to name a few.

Dr. Clark indicated there has been a great deal of emphasis placed on the evaluation of teachers in Idaho. Summative evaluations based on Idaho state performance evaluation framework must include observations completed by two observers who have proof of proficiency in evaluating teacher performance as stated in IDAPA 08.02.121.05.c. Dr. Clark also pointed out that there is an appeals process allowed at the time of renewal. Appeals regarding certification will be conducted by the Professional Standards Commission. She also highlighted the recommendations for out-of-state teachers, and

those requirements for an interim master professional certificate. Dr. Clark also addressed options for teachers who may take a leave of absence from teaching or from a district, including military leave.

Ms. Bent outlined the process of approvals for the proposed rule.

10. Proposed Rule – Docket 55-0105-1401 – Agriculture Startup and Incentive Grants

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Goesling): To approve the Proposed Rule Docket 55-0104-1401, Rules Governing Idaho Quality Program Standards Incentive Grants and Agricultural Education Program Start-up Grants as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried unanimously six to zero. Mr. Luna was absent from voting.

AND

M/S (Westerberg/Soltman): To approve the Idaho Agricultural Education Quality Program Standards as submitted in Attachment 2. The motion carried unanimously six to zero. Mr. Luna was absent from voting.

AND

M/S (Westerberg/Goesling): To approve the first reading of amendments to Board Policy IV.E. Division of Professional-Technical Education, incorporating the Idaho Agricultural Education Quality Program Standards by reference as submitted in Attachment 3. The motion carried unanimously six to zero. Mr. Luna was absent from voting.

BUSINESS AFFAIRS & HUMAN RESOURCES – Section I – Human Resources

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

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Goesling/Hill): To approve the second reading of Board Governing Policy and Procedures II.H., Coaches and Athletic Directors, as presented. The motion carried unanimously six to zero. Mr. Luna was absent from voting.

2. University of Idaho – Multi-Year Employment Agreement – Director of Track and Field and Cross Country

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Goesling/Soltman): To approve the University of Idaho's three-year employment contract with Tim Cawley, Director of Track and Field and Cross

Country for a term commencing August 14, 2014 through August 13, 2017, at a base salary of \$63,252.80 and supplemental compensation provisions in substantial conformance to the contract submitted to the Board in Attachment 1. The motion carried unanimously seven to zero.

BUSINESS AFFAIRS & HUMAN RESOURCES – Section II – Finance

At this time Dr. Goesling requested moving the late item related to FY 15 Supplemental Requests forward on the agenda. There were no objections.

Late Item – BAHF Finance

1. FY 2015 Supplemental: Fiscal Impact of Guns on Campus Law

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Goesling/Soltman): To approve the FY 2015 supplemental appropriation requests for Boise State University, Idaho State University, University of Idaho, College of Western Idaho and North Idaho College as submitted, to eliminate the corresponding FY 2016 line items for Boise State University and North Idaho College in the BAHF Finance Tab 1 agenda, and to reduce the College of Western Idaho's FY 2016 line to \$115,300. The motion carried unanimously seven to zero.

Mr. Freeman indicated this is a request for supplemental appropriation to address security costs associated with the passage of Senate Bill 1254 which was the Guns on Campus legislation approved during the last session. He reported that the President's Council unanimously agreed that this request should be an FY 2015 supplemental request rather than a FY 2016 line item budget request.

Mr. Westerberg asked if the institutions consulted other area institutions on their security expenses. Mr. Smith from UI responded that they did contact their colleagues in Utah and Colorado. Those states didn't have any additional expense other than CCTV surveillance costs. Mr. Nelson added that all the schools they talked to in Utah and Colorado already had their own campus security. Mr. Westerberg asked if other institutions were using metal detectors at big events. The response was that they were not. Mr. Smith clarified that in Utah, the carry of fire arms cannot be restricted.

1. FY 2016 Line Items

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Goesling/Soltman): To approve the FY 2015 Supplemental Appropriation Request for Idaho Division of Vocational Rehabilitation in the amount of \$555,000 in federal funds as shown on Tab 1 page 3. The motion carried unanimously seven to zero.

M/S (Goesling/Soltman): To approve the Line Items for the agencies and institutions as listed on Tab 1 pages 7-9, and to authorize the Executive Director to approve the MCO and Line Item budget requests for agencies and institutions due to Division of Financial Management and Legislative Services Office on September 1, 2014. The motion carried six to one. Mr. Westerberg voted nay on the motion.

M/S (Goesling/Soltman): To accept the budget prioritization detail as distributed during the meeting. The motion carried seven to zero. The budget prioritization detail distributed during the meeting is as follows:

Prioritize ongoing budget items:

1. Complete College Idaho
2. HERC funding
3. Salary competitiveness for each institution
4. Institutional requests as follows:
 - a. Boise State University
 - i. Computer Science Workforce Initiative (Priority 4.1)
 - b. Lewis-Clark State University
 - i. Work College Trial (Priority 4.1)
 - c. Idaho State University
 - i. Occupancy Costs (Priority 4.1)
 - ii. Career Path Internships (Priority 4.2)
 - iii. e-ISU Online Access (Priority 4.3)
 - d. University of Idaho
 - i. Employment readiness (Priority 4.1)
 - ii. Idaho Law and Justice Learning Center (Priority 4.2)
 - iii. Occupancy Costs (Priority 4.3)

Prioritize one-time budget items:

1. Deferred Maintenance
2. Philanthropic Scholarship Matching Program

Mr. Freeman indicated that at the June meeting the institutions and agencies presented their Line Item requests to the Board. The Board directed the Business Affairs and Human Resources (BAHR) Committee to review the FY 2016 budget line item requests and to report recommendations back to the Board at the August Board meeting. Mr. Freeman pointed out that in the agenda materials on Tab 1 page 7, a summary sheet reflecting changes by the institutions was provided. Mr. Freeman highlighted those changes.

Mr. Freeman added one comment that on July 16 there was a joint meeting with the provosts and financial vice presidents to discuss several things, including the Complete College Idaho (CCI) line item. He reported that there seemed to be some confusion about the coherency of the CCI item by policy makers. A recommendation by Dr.

Schimpf was to look at the CCI line item in terms of 1) pre-college readiness, 2) go-on, and 3) retention and persistence. There was consensus among the group that the suggestion was a good way to look at and market the CCI initiative and to help it be more understandable among policy makers.

Mr. Westerberg asked why some items were grouped under system wide needs and some were under the individual institution needs. Mr. Freeman responded that in April the CCI item was at a system wide level. In order to advance the 60% goal, it seemed appropriate to make it an institution level priority. Mr. Westerberg remarked that he felt it should be at the institution level. Mr. Freeman responded that CCI has pros and cons to either approach. There was continued discussion on CCI being a system wide issue. The responses varied on whether institutions felt it should be at the system wide or institution level. BSU, UI and CWI felt it should be at the system wide needs level. ISU and LCSC responded it is better defended at the institutional level.

Mr. Smith from UI also indicated that salary competitiveness is another high priority. Mr. Westerberg asked what data was used to evaluate salary competitiveness. Most of the institutions responded they used CUPA data in reviewing salary competitiveness. Mr. Herbst added that they also look at the state classified system and peer review. Keith Ickes from UI responded they used peer review and AAUP salary survey. They also recently completed a reclassification of staff across the university. Mr. Westerberg remarked that the institutions should be using a consistent model to look at salary competitiveness. Mr. Ickes responded they looked at salary competitiveness in different ways and the end result was very similar for each observation.

There was additional discussion on the prioritization of the items. Mr. Freeman was directed to prepare a motion and distribute budget prioritization detail to support the motion.

2. FY 2016 Capital Budget Requests

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Goesling/Soltman): To recommend to the Permanent Building Fund Advisory Council the number one priority major capital project for each institution as listed on page 5 for consideration in the FY 2016 budget process. The motion carried unanimously seven to zero.

AND

M/S (Goesling/Soltman): To approve the six-year capital construction plans for Boise State University, Idaho State University, University of Idaho, Lewis-Clark State College, and Eastern Idaho Technical College. The motion carried unanimously seven to zero.

Mr. Freeman provided some background on the item for the benefit of the new board members. He indicated the capital projects request process is separate from the line item budget request process. The Permanent Building Fund Advisory Council (PBFAC), which is staffed by the Division of Public Works (DPW), has several major areas of focus: new, renovated or remodeled projects; Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) projects; asbestos abatement/removal, and building demolition. Only Board-approved major capital projects can be forwarded to the PBFAC. The PBFAC, Governor and Legislature will then be informed of the Board's recommendation based upon the priorities indicated (if any) at the Board's discretion.

3. Intercollegiate Athletic Reports – NCAA Academic Progress Rate (APR) Scores

Dr. Goesling provided brief comments to summarize this item. Mr. Spear from the University of Idaho commented that they are on track for a 950 single year improvement; they have implemented a few new things, and are on track with their APR scores. He pointed out they have also been reaching out to former student athletes to return to the university and complete their degree; they have had three young men return to complete their degree this year. One student returned from 2007.

4. Amendment to Board Policy Section V.E. – Gifts & Affiliated Foundations

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Goesling/Soltman): To approve the first reading of proposed amendments to Board Policy V.E. Gifts & Affiliated Foundations, as presented in Attachment 1. The motion carried unanimously seven to zero.

Dr. Goesling provided some background stating that several universities are developing proposals for research foundations. He pointed out that “technology transfer organizations” are specifically excluded from Board policy V.E. on governance and formation of affiliated foundations. Board staff, in consultation with institution counsel, has determined that Board policy V.E. can be amended to facilitate the inclusion of research foundations and technology transfer organizations under the existing policy. The requirement for a Board-approved foundation operating agreement under current policy would apply to research and technology transfer foundations, including review and re-approval of the agreements every three years.

5. Amendment to Board Policy Section V.X. – Intercollegiate Athletics – Second Reading

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Goesling/Soltman): To approve the second reading of proposed amendments to Board Policy V.T. Fee Waivers, as presented in Attachment 1. The motion carried unanimously seven to zero.

6. Amendment to Board Policy Section V.X. – Intercollegiate Athletics – Second Reading

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Goesling/Soltman): To approve the second reading of proposed amendments to Board policy V.X. Intercollegiate Athletics, as presented in Attachment 1. The motion carried unanimously seven to zero.

7. Boise State University, Idaho State University, University of Idaho – Intellectual Property Policies

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Goesling/Soltman): To approve the intellectual property policies of the University of Idaho, Boise State University and Idaho State University as submitted. The motion carried unanimously seven to zero.

Mr. Freeman provided some background on the item and pointed out the policies are consistent with the Board's policy on intellectual property (IP). All of the institution IP policies are consistent and compliant. Mr. Westerberg thanked the committees and institutions for their work on this item.

8. Boise State University – Collegiate Licensing Company Contract

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Goesling/Soltman): To approve the request by Boise State University to enter into the proposed contract with the Collegiate Licensing Company for licensing and marketing of logo merchandise for a term commencing retroactively on July 1, 2014 and terminating June 30, 2019, in substantial conformance with the agreement submitted to the Board as Attachment 1. The motion carried unanimously seven to zero.

9. Boise State University – Alumni and Friends Center Development and Occupancy Agreement

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Goesling/Soltman): To authorize Boise State University to enter into the University/Foundation Development, Occupancy, Ownership and Use Agreement in substantial conformance with the document as presented in Attachment 1, and to find the project economically feasible and necessary for the proper operation of the university. The motion carried unanimously seven to zero.

10. Boise State University – Learfield Contract Amendment

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Goesling/Westerberg): To approve the request by Boise State University to enter into the proposed amendment to the multi-media and marketing rights agreement with Bronco Sports Properties, a subsidiary of Learfield Communications as submitted. The motion carried unanimously seven to zero.

Legal counsel for BSU, Kevin Satterlee, reported that the contract has been renegotiated to the benefit of BSU, and Tab 10 of the agenda materials outlines the details of the renegotiation. He added that the Albertson's agreement is in addition to the Learfield contract.

11. Idaho State University – Athletic Program Funding Proposal

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Goesling/Westerberg): To waive Board policy V.X.3.b. and to approve the request by Idaho State University to temporarily increase its institutional funds limit by an amount not to exceed \$250,000 annually for a period of three years (FY 2015 – 2017) in support of its athletics program, and to direct ISU to provide an annual report to the Athletics Committee on the impact of the increased investment and plans for sustainability. The motion carried six to one. Mr. Soltman voted nay on the motion.

12. University of Idaho – Idaho Law and Justice Learning Center Project

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Goesling/Soltman): To approve the request by the University of Idaho to implement the construction phase for the tenant improvements at the Idaho Law and Justice Learning Center in the amount of \$1,600,000 pursuant to the estimated budget set forth in the materials submitted. The motion carried unanimously six to zero. Mr. Westerberg was absent from voting.

Mr. Freeman provided brief background on the item for the benefit of the new Board members.

INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH & STUDENT AFFAIRS

1. Amendment to Board Policy III.P. – Student Complaints/Grievances – Second Reading

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Soltman/Westerberg): To approve the second reading of proposed amendments to Board policy III.P. Students, subsection 18, as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried five to zero. Mr. Luna and Mr. Hill were absent from voting.

2. Boise State University – Master of Political Science

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Soltman/Hill): To approve the request by Boise State University to create a new Master of Arts in Political Science. The motion carried unanimously seven to zero.

Dr. Schimpf indicated they are seeking to create a new Master of Arts in Political Science and provided some supportive comments regarding the need for this program at BSU based on the regional needs identified. They approximate 20 students each year and project 13 or 14 graduates. Dr. Schimpf addressed the sunset clause, commenting that if the program does not meet the target of 12 graduates per year in 4-5 years, the resources invested in the program would be withdrawn.

3. Boise State University – STEM Institute

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Soltman/Westerberg): To approve the request by Boise State University to create a new STEM Institute. The motion carried unanimously seven to zero.

Dr. Schimpf indicated that BSU proposes to create a new STEM Institute, which will support STEM education and research. ISU and UI also offer a number of initiatives that support STEM education and research. In many cases, those initiatives represent substantial collaborative efforts among BSU, UI, and ISU. Board staff, CAAP, and IRSA recommend approval. Ms. Atchley asked if this will undergo program prioritization. Dr. Schimpf responded it would.

4. Lewis-Clark State College – Faculty Constitution

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Soltman/Hill): To approve the proposed changes to the Lewis-Clark State College Faculty constitution as set forth in the materials submitted to the Board as attachment 1. The motion carried unanimously seven to zero.

Provost Lori Stinson summarized the changes from the first reading. Mr. Alex Bezzerides, chair of the Faculty Senate, summarized the changes to the language. He indicated the committee structure was revised to eliminate redundancy and increase efficiency. Mr. Soltman inquired about the level of student representation. Mr.

Bezzarides responded the conclusion was to let students have a voice on the senate but to not allow them to have a vote, emphasizing the importance of listening to the concerns and input of students.

5. Accreditation Process and Status Update

Dr. Chris Mathias from the State Board office provided an update on institution accreditation and a PowerPoint presentation to illustrate the accreditation process and where the institutions are at in the process. ISU is having its seven year accreditation review this October, and Dr. Mathias provided a summary of what to expect during the site visit.

IRSA – Late Item

1. University of Idaho – Board Policy III.Y. – Advanced Opportunities - Waiver

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Soltman): To approve the request by the University of Idaho for a waiver of Board policy III.Y. Advanced Opportunities, subsection 4, as it applies to the University's College of Agricultural and Life Sciences dual credit courses for the Fall 2014 semester, and direct University staff to work with Board staff to bring the courses into compliance prior to the end of the Fall 2014 term. The motion carried unanimously seven to zero.

Dr. Mathias provided background on the item. Provost Kathy Aiken clarified that they are seeking a waiver from Board policy until the courses can be brought into compliance with Board policy. Mr. Luna indicated that student concerns are also whether the credit is a core or an elective credit, and it is important for the sustainability of the program that it is at the college level for the students who then go on and transfer their credits.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

1. Superintendent's Update

Superintendent of Public Instruction, Tom Luna, provided an update from the Department of Education, focusing on Smarter Balanced, and presented a PowerPoint presentation on the subject. Prior to the Smarter Balanced presentation, Ms. Willits aired two short video clips on the Idaho Core.

Mr. Luna indicated 164,600 students participated in the Smarter Balanced field test. The test survey results from 10,428 respondents showed favorable responses from students. The students responded that the testing is in line with what they are learning. Mr. Luna reviewed student comments on likes and dislikes of the testing. The Department also conducted an administrator survey to gain understanding of challenges administrators are facing. They reviewed both positive and negative feedback from administrators and

found the biggest challenge appeared to be scheduling and proctors for the test. One of the challenges noted was that there is a general prejudice against the test, and that test was comparable to the ISAT but took longer. The overall teacher survey indicated that the results went somewhat well. He encouraged Board members visit a school and observe the testing process. Next steps are to set achievement levels (i.e., cut scores). He pointed out that 19 Idaho educators were selected to participate in the setting of achievement levels; there is also an on-line panel to set achievement levels. To date there are 167 Idahoans registered to do this. There was additional discussion regarding the cut scores.

At 3:20 Dr. Goesling left the meeting.

With regard to the name of the test, Mr. Luna indicated the name of the test (the ISAT) is consistent with what it has been called from the beginning. Ms. Willits discussed the digital library and interim assessments from Smarter Balanced. She indicated with the digital library, educators need to be provisioned by their districts to use it. There are instructional and professional resources related to the formative assessment process. The interim assessments will be released in Fall of 2014. Mr. Luna reported that they would demonstrate to the Board how this would be used after the start of school.

Board member Critchfield volunteered to serve on that committee. Mr. Luna showed two additional short videos on the Idaho Core standards.

2. Consolidation of North Gem and Grace School Districts

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Luna/Westerberg): To approve the Consolidation Plan for North Gem and Grace School Districts as submitted and forward the plan to the local electorate for a vote. The motion carried unanimously six to zero. Dr. Goesling was absent from voting.

Mr. Luna pointed out this motion allows the districts to move toward the next step in consolidation. There was no further discussion on the item.

3. Temporary and Proposed - Rule IDAPA 08.02.01.400 – Rules Governing Administration

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Luna/Westerberg): To approve the Temporary and Proposed rule amendment to IDAPA 08.02.03.400, as submitted. The motion carried unanimously six to zero. Dr. Goesling was absent from voting.

4. Proposed Rule - IDAPA 08.02.02.004, Rules Governing Uniformity, Incorporation by Reference

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Luna/Hill): To approve the proposed revisions to the Idaho Foundation and Enhancement Standards for: School Counselor, Special Education Generalist, Special Education Director and School Psychologists as submitted. The motion carried unanimously six to zero. Dr. Goesling was absent from voting.

M/S (Luna/Westerberg): To approve the proposed standards revisions to the Idaho Standards for Operating procedures for the Idaho Public Driver Education Programs, Incorporated by Reference, as submitted. The motion carried unanimously six to zero. Dr. Goesling was absent from voting.

M/S (Luna/Hill): To approve the Proposed Rule amendments to IDAPA 08.02.02.04.01, Rules Governing Uniformity, Incorporation By Reference as submitted. The motion carried unanimously six to zero. Dr. Goesling was absent from voting.

Mr. Luna indicated approval of the Idaho Standards for Initial Certification of Professional School Personnel will bring the standards up to date with current best practices in the listed areas. Approval of the Driver Education Program standards will provide clarity to the reporting requirements.

5. Temporary Rule- IDAPA 08.02.02.004, Rules Governing Uniformity, Incorporation by Reference

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Luna/Soltman): To approve the Temporary Rule amendment to IDAPA 08.02.02.004, Rules Governing Uniformity, Incorporation By Reference, as submitted. The motion carried unanimously six to zero. Dr. Goesling was absent from voting.

6. Proposed Rule - IDAPA 08.02.02.027, .028, .030, .047, .076 Rules Governing Uniformity

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Luna/Hill): To approve the Proposed rule amendments to IDAPA 08.02.02.027, .028, .030, .047, .076 Rules Governing Uniformity, as submitted. The motion carried unanimously six to zero. Dr. Goesling was absent from voting.

Mr. Luna indicated approval of the proposed changes will update language used in describing the endorsements and update requirements with current best practices. Additional changes to the ethics section add greater clarity to Principle II and Principle X.

7. Proposed Rule IDAPA 08.02.02.120, .121 – Rules Governing Uniformity - Educator Evaluations

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Luna/Hill): To approve proposed rule amendments to IDAPA 08.02.02.120, .121 as submitted. The motion carried unanimously six to zero. Dr. Goesling was absent from voting.

Mr. Luna indicated if the State Board of Education does not approve the changes, Idaho school administrators will be required to include two (2) classroom observations regardless of the situation and specific administrator staff will not be identified as responsible for measuring teacher performance.

8. Temporary and Proposed Rule - IDAPA 08.02.03.104 - Physical Education and Professional Technical Education

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Luna/Hill): To approve the Temporary and Proposed Rule amendments to IDAPA 08.02.03.104 – Other Required Instruction, as submitted. The motion carried unanimously six to zero. Dr. Goesling was absent from voting.

Mr. Luna indicated approval of the proposed rule amendments would reinstate the requirement that high schools offer physical education and professional-technical education, and clarify that the learning plans created in middle school/junior high must be reviewed annually throughout the student's high school experience.

9. Temporary Rule - IDAPA 08.02.03.105 – Rules Governing Thoroughness

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Luna/Westerberg): To approve the Temporary amendments to IDAPA 08.02.03.105, High School Graduation Requirements, as submitted. The motion carried unanimously six to zero. Dr. Goesling was absent from voting.

Mr. Luna provided a timeline and background for the item and pointed out the class of 2016 will be the last class to take the old ISAT. Ms. Willits highlighted what they are trying to clarify regarding the Rules Governing Thoroughness by detailing the changes item by item. Those specific details were also included in the agenda materials.

10. Proposed Rule - IDAPA 08.02.03.105 – Rules Governing Thoroughness

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Luna/Hill): To approve Proposed Rule amendments to IDAPA 08.02.03.105, High School Graduation Requirements, as submitted. The motion carried unanimously six to zero. Dr. Goesling was absent from voting.

Ms. Willits walked the Board through the changes to this rule. She clarified that when the Legislature ends, the temporary rule expires and the proposed rule takes effect. This is the full version of the plan for high school graduation requirements. Ms. Willits provided a review of the college and career ready graduation requirements starting with the class of 2017 through the class of 2020. She pointed out that any student who passes the ISAT in high school at the 11th grade college and career ready level will be exempt from future tests.

11. Temporary and Proposed Rule - IDAPA 08.02.03.111 - Rules Governing Thoroughness

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Luna/Hill): To approve the Temporary and Proposed Rule change to IDAPA 08.02.03.111 – Assessment in the Public Schools, as submitted. The motion carried unanimously six to zero. Dr. Goesling was absent from voting.

Mr. Luna indicated if approved, students will continue to have an Educational Learning Plan (EAP) with designated supports and accommodations for use in daily classroom and for the annual ISAT assessment that align with the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium guidelines. There will be no noticeable change for students by removing the previous language. In addition, high school students will take an End of Course assessment in biology or chemistry in lieu of the science Idaho Standards Achievement Tests. This will not increase state testing, but will rather replace the previous science test to a more appropriate measure of student understanding.

12. Temporary and Proposed Rule - IDAPA 08.02.03.112 – Rules Governing Thoroughness

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Luna/Hill): To approve the Temporary and Proposed rule amendment to IDAPA 08.02.03.112. – Accountability, as submitted. The motion carried unanimously six to zero. Dr. Goesling was absent from voting.

Mr. Luna indicated if approved, districts will have a uniform definition for Limited English Proficient (LEP) students. Mr. Luna remarked on the impact to students, as the current language is arbitrary and could limit the number of students who are identified as LEP.

13. Temporary and Proposed Rule IDAPA 08.02.03.115 – New student data elements for inclusion in the state student data system

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Luna/Hill): To approve the Temporary and Proposed rule amendments to IDAPA 08.02.03, as submitted. The motion carried unanimously six to zero. Dr. Goesling was absent from voting.

Mr. Luna indicated the new data elements will provide the information necessary to accurately identify students, staff and educational institutions participating in various programs offered by the Idaho State Department of Education. It will also provide the information necessary to calculate the accurate payments to be sent to the school districts to reimburse students and/or parents for the associated costs with the programs. There are five areas of data elements in the area of advanced opportunities. This report will go to the legislature.

14. Proposed Amendments to Idaho's ESEA Flexibility Amendment

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Luna/Westerberg): To approve Idaho's addendum for the ESEA Flexibility Waiver as submitted. The motion carried unanimously six to zero. Dr. Goesling was absent from voting.

Mr. Luna gave some background on the item and discussed the Star Rating System. The Star Rating System focuses on achievement, proficiency, and growth, and includes the Board's priorities. He pointed out that because the field test was intended for cut-score setting, no scores and proficiency levels were provided for 2013-2014. The impact of the missing scores is annual student growth percentiles (SGP) cannot be calculated. Mr. Luna indicated that because of this, they are asking the Board to approve a Star Rating "reset" so that a baseline can be created with the operational tests next year, and growth the following year. He clarified that there will be accountability next year. They will report on all the other measures, just not growth. Their recommendation is to not do a Star Rating System next year.

LATE ITEMS

BAHR

2. Formation of Idaho State University Intellectual Property Foundation, Inc.

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Soltman/Hill): To approve the request by Idaho State University to participate in the formation of the Idaho State University Intellectual Property Foundation and to enter into the proposed Operating Agreement (which includes as exhibits draft forms of the Loaned Employee Agreement, Services Agreement, Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws) in substantial conformance with the documents

submitted to the Board in Attachment 1. The motion carried unanimously six to zero. Dr. Goesling was absent from voting.

Mr. Soltman introduced the item pointing out that ISU is requesting authority to establish the Idaho State University Intellectual Property Foundation, Inc. (IPF) to facilitate the beneficial use of ISU's intellectual property for Idaho and the nation.

Mr. Freeman indicated this item has been discussed and reviewed extensively with Board staff, general counsel, and others for several months and is recommended for approval.

President Vailas remarked their proposal mirrors the University of Idaho's research proposal for their research foundation with the exception of this proposal focusing mainly on tech transfer. He thanked Board staff for the guidance they have provided on this item. He summarized that this is a request by ISU to approve the creation of an Intellectual Property Foundation, the purpose of which is "to support the education, research, and public service functions of the University through commercializing intellectual property created by the University."

Mr. Fletcher indicated the startup provision would be through a line of credit that would be monitored. The amount of money required will be about \$450K the first year. The understanding is that it will be reviewed and approved by the Board at the time they do the operating budget, but it will be a separate item.

OTHER BUSINESS

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

M/S (Westerberg/Soltman): To adjourn the meeting at 4.50 p.m. There were no objections.