



**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  
May 20-21, 2015  
Board Retreat  
Boise, ID**

A special meeting of the State Board of Education was held May 20-21, 2015. It originated from the Skyline Room of the Stueckle Sky Center at Boise State University, in Boise Idaho. Board President Emma Atchley presided and called the meeting to order at 8:00 a.m. A roll call of members was taken.

**Present:**

Emma Atchley, President	Richard Westerberg
Don Soltman, Secretary	Bill Goesling
Dave Hill	Debbie Critchfield
Sherri Ybarra, Superintendent (joined Wednesday at 8:45)	
Rod Lewis, Vice President (joined Thursday at 8:00 am)	

**AGENDA APPROVAL**

**M/S (Soltman/Goesling): To approve the agenda as posted.** The motion carried unanimously 7-0.

**EXECUTIVE SESSION (Closed to the Public)**

**M/S (Soltman/Goesling): To meet in executive session to evaluate the presidents of Idaho's state higher education institutions and to consider hiring a public officer, employee, staff member or individual agent, pursuant to Idaho Code Section 67-2345(1)(a) and (b).** A roll call vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously 7-0. Board members entered into Executive Session shortly after 8:00 a.m.

**Ms. Atchley requested unanimous consent to go out of executive session at 1:00 p.m.** There were no objections.

## **BOARDWORK (Open Meeting)**

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

#### 1. Foundation for Excellence in Education – Mastery Based Education

**M/S (Westerberg/Goesling): To recommend the Department of Education accept the Foundation for Excellence in Education’s offer to partner with Idaho in implementing mastery-based education across the state and the requirements of HB 110.** The motion carried unanimously 7-0.

**M/S (Hill/Ybarra): To amend the motion to remove the word “strongly” from the original motion.** The motion carried unanimously 7-0.

Board member Westerberg introduced the item and provided background information indicating the Governor’s Task Force for Improving Education recommended a shift to a system where students advance based upon content mastery rather than seat time requirements. House Bill 110 passed in 2015 related to this recommendation, and requires the Department of Education to promote understanding and interest in mastery-based education. Following the passage of HB 110, Idaho was recognized by the Foundation for Excellence in Education (Foundation) as being on the leading edge of implementing mastery-based education on a statewide level and would like to provide assistance to the Board in moving forward with the Task Force recommendation and implementation of HB 110. Mr. Westerberg introduced Ms. Carla Phillips from the Foundation to give an overview of their offer to partner with the Board in developing recommendations for a mastery based education.

Ms. Phillips indicated the Foundation is offering to partner with the Board in conducting an interactive policy summit designed to engage key stakeholders to identify roadblocks and opportunities. She outlined the Foundation’s goals and HB 110 goals and how they align. She remarked the Foundation would assist by working with stakeholders and Board staff to understand how the policy is perceived and to develop a communications toolkit that Idaho could use to help communicate with districts to implement the policies. They would assist in the development of preconditions and recommend criteria in an effort to redesign education for student success by helping the state to better serve and support education.

Mr. Soltman asked how the Foundation’s work is being funded. Ms. Phillips responded they have received a grant from the Stiles-Nicholson Foundation to do the work. Ms. Critchfield asked if they have partnered with other states. Ms. Phillips responded that Idaho is the first. There was discussion about what mastery-based education will look like. Ms. Phillips indicated they are presently exploring communications and policy issues related to mastery based education. She was asked and reported on the expertise of the Foundation and its credentials. Ms. Ybarra expressed concern regarding the direction of the legislature through HB 110 for the Department to take the lead on the recommendations. She pointed out HB 110 expressly identifies the

Department as the point on this initiative. She requested that the Foundation make the same presentation to her staff and also work to identify a clearer definition of Foundation assistance.

There was additional discussion on the Foundation and its history and area of expertise. Ms. Marilyn Whitney provided supportive comments on its vetting and background, founded by Governor Jeb Bush, recommended by the Idaho Business for Education (IBE), and confirmed the support of the Governor's office. She added that it makes sense to use the resources the Foundation is offering. Ms. Atchley added that this is an opportunity to make significant advancements and use this support to help develop a template in implementing the work of the Task Force.

There was concern expressed about the word "strongly" in the original motion, and Board member Hill recommended rewording it to say "recommend" rather than "strongly recommend". There were no objections to the amendment.

## 2. Temporary Rule – Seed Certification

**M/S (Westerberg/Hill): To approve the Temporary Rule amendment to IDAPA 08.05.01, as presented in Attachment 1.** The motion carried 6-1. Ms. Atchley abstained from voting.

## 3. Temporary Rule – Alternate Route to Certification

**M/S (Westerberg/Hill): To approve the Temporary Rule amendments to IDAPA 08.02.02.044 as submitted in Attachment 1.** The motion carried unanimously 7-0.

Ms. Bent introduced and clarified the item which is a temporary rule which will be revisited with additional changes adding clarification. They discovered the Department of Education had been authorizing provisional certificates which does not follow what is in statute. Since the discovery, the Department has stopped issuing the provisional certificates. In order to bring the state certification process back into compliance with Idaho Code and meet the needs of school districts who have been unable to fill critical teaching positions with individuals holding a standard certificate, several changes are being proposed to the Alternative Authorization – Content Specialist certification requirements in IDAPA 08.02.02.044.

## 4. Memorandum of Understanding – Higher Education Opportunities Shanxi Province

**M/S (Westerberg/Soltman): To approve the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between Idaho State Board of Education and Shanxi Provincial Education Department, The People's Republic of China, as presented to the Board in Attachment 1 and authorize the Executive Director to sign on behalf of the Board.** The motion carried unanimously 7-0.

Mr. Blake Youde from the Board Office introduced the item and remarked on the importance of global competitiveness and collaboration. He indicated the Shanxi Province of the People's Republic of China is a sister state to Idaho. On June 14-16, 2015, Governor Otter and the Idaho Department of Commerce are hosting a delegation from the Chinese Province of Shanxi to mark the 30<sup>th</sup> anniversary of this relationship. As part of the visit, Governor Otter will sign an Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Shanxi Province pledging continued partnerships, followed by the signing of MOUs between state agency representatives and Shanxi delegates. The Governor's Office and the Department of Commerce have asked the State Board of Education to sign an MOU relating to continued cooperation in higher education. The University of Idaho, Boise State University, and Lewis-Clark State College will also be signing individual MOUs.

By agreeing to the MOU, State of Idaho (through the Board) and the Shanxi Province will encourage education programs among the colleges and universities within their respective jurisdictions. Additionally, the MOU will support the efforts of Governor Otter and the Department of Commerce in promoting Idaho and its goods and services worldwide.

The Board recessed the meeting at 4:43 pm MST.

## **BOARD RETREAT (Open Meeting)**

### **1. Methods of Measuring K-12 Student Achievement**

Board President Atchley introduced the work session item indicating the staff felt assessments are an important part of the state's concern with education and education reform in the state, and felt it would be helpful to have a presenter with in-depth knowledge on the matter. The presentation today is related to k-12 student achievement and measurement thereof.

Dr. Rush pointed out that during the last legislative session, the legislature passed some legislation directing the state to review education standards and assessments. Because of the important decisions ahead and the level of detail required, the concerns surrounding standards and assessments, the Board felt that an informal conversation with an expert would be valuable. Dr. Rush introduced Dan A. Long, consultant from Tennessee with a distinguished record of working with states in the area of assessment and implementation of standards. Dr. Rush provided additional details about Mr. Long's background through the entire educational system and as a consultant to many major educational groups, and welcomed him to the work session.

Mr. Long started the conversation reminding the group that the subject is about standards first – how we teach kids; then assessment – what they know. He spoke with the group about instruction, assessments, and how they relate; along with what states do with it all and what it costs in terms of resources, personnel, and time and energy

involved. Mr. Long discussed essential questions behind assessments like why, what, how and when. He discussed the importance of determining how much you want to know along by asking basic questions like is it a must know, nice to know, don't need to know, etc. Mr. Long reported on assessment basics and that they can take many forms and be designed for many reasons. He recommended the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) Assessment quality principles. He discussed different types of assessments and some of the results they produce, and summarized that with high quality standards-based assessments we can improve student learning, classroom instruction, include accountabilities, and assist with evaluation and research. He reviewed assessment quality principles and that they should be internationally benchmarked, be instructionally sensitive and educationally valuable, valid, reliable, and fair. Finally, that assessments need to match up to standards.

There was discussion about how this might look to people, and how to build confidence and assurance in people with other preconceived perceptions. Mr. Long summarized that it's a process involved in what becomes the vision the state has which includes component parts, and as the vision is developed it makes it easier to explain to people. There was also discussion about the issue of building trust whereby folks trust the state education leaders and policy makers to have assessments that are valid, reliable, and fair. The foundation needs to be communicated in a straight-forward, transparent way that is easy for people to understand; and also to realize that the definitions to words like "valid", "reliable", and "fair" have different meanings to individuals, entities, and industries.

Returning to the CCSSO principles, Mr. Long recommended aligning to College and Career Readiness (CCR) standards in English Language Arts assessing student reading and writing in both English Language Arts (ELA) and literacy. And, similarly in Mathematics, by focusing strongly on content most needed for student success in later mathematics. The group discussed criteria for high-quality assessments, recognizing that no single assessment can evaluate all of the kinds of learning we value for students, nor can a single instrument meet all of the goals held by parents, practitioners, and policy makers.

Mr. Long clarified that it is important to envision a coordinated system of assessment where different tools are used for different purposes. He reported that five major features define the elements of assessment systems that can fully measure the Common Core state Standards and support the evaluation of deeper learning. Those include the assessment of higher-order cognitive skills, high-fidelity assessment of critical abilities, standards that are internationally benchmarked, the use of items that are instructionally sensitive and educationally valuable, and assessments that are, valid, reliable, and fair. They discussed assessment methods, types, tasks, and timing, and differences between formative and summative assessments which can have different interpretations among educators. Overall, the standards and expectations must be made very understandable and clear, and how accountability is held boils down to a policy related decision and has little to do with ethics or what you can afford; it is a policy decision on what the Board feels is the right place to be. Additionally, if there is

not state buy-in, the clients don't buy in, and you don't have a system that works. Mr. Long pointed out that no matter what, you will not get 100% buy-in from all regardless of how hard you try.

He highlighted that it becomes very important to share what you're doing, because people want assurances about what valuable and reliable means. Assurances provide proof to people over time that educators are doing the best they can. People want to trust that the policy makers are making good decisions and being able to explain the "why" to them is a very important part of the process. The communication piece will also be very important to discuss and diffuse a perception on over testing. What you are looking for is an amount of testing that is the Goldie Lock's theory of "just right". The amount that is "just right" for determining how your students are doing and how get comparative information to answer specific questions. The Board must think about what its vision is long term. I.e., the system can be whatever you want it to be, but the last part of that is "and whatever you can afford". It can be perfectly aligned, and be anything you want it to be, IF you have the resources to do that. Mr. Long indicated if you don't have the resources, then "good" is a good thing to shoot for, because perfect can cost you a whole lot in resources, manpower and time. It boils down to the question of what do you want to know and what do you want to do with the information?

The group discussed testing, both formative and summative; along with test timing, and that it needs to be done with results back in an amount of time that is useful for instruction. They discussed the importance of the relationship between curriculum, assessment and instruction and where the segment of overlap occurs, and what an assessment should accomplish. And also that the assessments need to stand up to scrutiny and potential legal action. There was discussion about balancing data needs whereby educators need different types of information about student learning for different purposes, that different assessment types are suited for different data needs. Assessment purposes of the data may include accountability, student information, educator information, school or district information, state information, and federal information, or any combination thereof.

At the conclusion of Wednesday's discussion, Mr. Long summarized that the state needs to put their plan into a voice that makes sense to those who are reading it at several different levels depending on the audience. And, pointing out that Idaho somewhat already has a vision with there being policy in place and legislative pieces in place. Idaho needs to continue the follow through to drive the whole piece, and the plan needs to take in all the variables to makes sure the people understand what you are doing.

**Thursday, May 21, 2015**

## **BOARD RETREAT (Open Meeting)**

### **1. Methods of Measuring K-12 student Achievement (Continued)**

The Board continued discussion with Mr. Long regarding assessments. The morning started with questions and expectations for what assessments should include and what they should yield. They discussed the need to consider the comparative notions of achievement and what kinds of assessments to consider. For instance should the assessment yield growth or accountability? The instrument needs to be built to get the result you are looking for. And taking that one step further is exploring the range you are measuring; i.e., are you measuring a class, school, district, region, or statewide.

The Board discussed using assessments to measure achievement, accountability, and achievement and how it relates to accountability. Mr. Long urged the Board to set a vision as a Board on what they want to achieve. The vision includes what you want it to do and what you want it to say, and it needs to match up to the principles of the vision along the way.

The Board has agreed that the assessments it should be using are summative. They should also inform instruction down to the individual teacher. Board members discussed a possible disconnect between formative and summative assessments and arriving at a proper balance through the test. There was a suggestion for more formative work on the standards. In a broader sense, there is still a need to teach against the standards. There was additional discussion about the accountability of a summative test and the emphasis on local control. Mr. Long recommended looking at best practices of other states, but reminded the Board they need to do what is best for their own state. They also discussed failing districts and how to turn their direction, concluding that it relies on the duty of the local school board.

The group discussed different tests such as the Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) test, the SAT, ACT, and SBAC. SBAC is aligned and built to the common core. They discussed Idaho assessments and local control, and the need for testing on the state's standards. Mr. Long pointed out that local control states know some good practices and one of those is how they look at data and how it helps them with what they need to do. The Board discussed that part of the shift in perspective needs to be from the state burdening school districts, students, and teachers, to the fact that the state is providing a service for local districts, students, and teachers that coordinates with the system that is in place to help students do better in class. Overall that the information that comes from testing is going to help the student in the short and long term. Building on that, Dr. Goesling added that the argument should be expanded to include the taxpayer as the entire discussion it is important to our economy as a state going beyond the student, teacher, and district level – which gets back to the communications plan and different audiences. Mr. Long reaffirmed the systemic layers of the work.

The group concluded the conversation by discussing cost implications of assessments including cost per student; states testing more students have a lower cost per student. Some cost categories include base data, number of items tested, scoring, types and distribution of tests, reports, development, meeting and service costs, reporting costs, etc. Mr. Long pointed out that related to cost, the first step is determining the budget limitations and then decide how to balance out the other elements of the assessments;

i.e., where does the Board want to put the money to be most effective. He thanked the Board for the opportunity to discuss assessments with them today.

### **EXECUTIVE SESSION (Closed to the Public)**

**M/S (Soltman/Goesling): To meet in executive session to evaluate the presidents of Idaho's state higher education institutions and to consider hiring a public officer, employee, staff member or individual agent, pursuant to Idaho Code Section 67-2345(1)(a) and (b).** A roll call vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously. Board members entered into Executive Session at 10:20 a.m.

**Unanimous consent was requested to go out of executive session at 2:25 p.m.** There were no objections to the motion.

### **BUSINESS AFFAIRS AND HUMAN RESOURCES (BAHR)**

#### **1. Chief Executive Officer Salaries**

#### **BOARD ACTION**

**M/S (Lewis/Westerberg): To approve an hourly rate of \$52.63 (annual salary of \$109,470.40) for Dwight Johnson as Administrator of the Division of Professional-Technical Education, effective April 26, 2015.** The motion carried unanimously.

**AND**

**M/S (Lewis/Westerberg): To approve an hourly rate of \$48.12 (annual salary of \$100,089.60) for Jane Donnellan as Administrator of the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, effective April 26, 2015.** The motion carried unanimously.

**AND**

**M/S (Lewis/Soltman): To authorize the Executive Director to set the salary for Ron Pisaneschi General Manager of Idaho Public Television consistent with its approved compensation plan.** The motion carried unanimously.

**AND**

**M/S (Lewis/Soltman): To approve an annual salary for Dr. Robert Kustra, President of Boise State University in the amount of \$385,948.16, effective June 7, 2015.** The motion carried unanimously.

**AND**



**M/S (Lewis/Goesling): To approve an annual salary for Dr. Art Vailas, as President of Idaho State University, in the amount of \$371,310.16, effective June 7, 2015.**

The motion carried unanimously.

**AND**

**M/S (Lewis/Westerberg): To approve an annual salary for Dr. Chuck Staben, as President of the University of Idaho, in the amount of \$364,000.00, effective June 7, 2015. The motion carried unanimously.**

**AND**

**M/S (Lewis/Critchfield): To approve an annual salary for Dr. Tony Fernandez as President of Lewis-Clark State College in the amount of \$183,051.44, effective June 7, 2015. The motion carried unanimously.**

2. Eastern Idaho Technical College – Interim President

**BOARD ACTION**

**M/S (Lewis/Goesling): To appoint Dr. Rick Aman as Interim President of Eastern Idaho Technical College, effective July 1, 2015, at a salary of \$109,250 annually and to authorize a \$13,000 housing allowance to address the temporary housing requirements during the appointment. The motion carried unanimously.**

President Albiston is retiring effective June 30, 2015. The Board President and Executive Director interviewed the interim president candidate on April 22, 2015 on the EITC campus, and they bring this appointment forward for the Board's consideration.

The interim candidate lives in Canyon County, so he would incur relocation and temporary housing expenses in Idaho Falls if he were to accept this appointment. These expenses are estimated at \$13,000. While it is not customary for the president at Eastern Idaho Technical College to receive a housing allowance, Board staff is recommending a \$13,000 housing allowance to cover these costs due to the unique nature of the interim appointment. An alternate solution would be to increase the salary to cover these costs, however, this approach would require a waiver of Board policy.

3. Boise State University – In-Service Training Fee

**BOARD ACTION**

**M/S (Lewis/Westerberg): To approve the request by Boise State University to participate in the Mickelson ExxonMobil Teachers Academy in order to offer professional development credits to Idaho and non-Idaho teachers not exceed one-third of the average part-time undergraduate credit hour fee or one-third of the average graduate credit hour fee. The motion carried unanimously.**

BSU would like to partner with the Mickelson ExxonMobil Teachers Academy. Board policy V.R.3.a.viii.a) provides for a fee for in-service teachers, but limits the ability to charge the discounted rate for professional development to only Idaho educators. Charging the regular graduate rate of \$358 per credit is not an option since teachers participating in the academy simply won't be willing to pay that much to have professional development credits recorded.

BSU would like to request Board Policy V.R.3.a.viii.a) be amended to allow the institutions to develop professional development opportunities for teachers nationally and apply the in-service teacher fee rather than the applicable tuition rate for these teachers. If BSU is going to participate in the program they must enter into an agreement with the Mickelson ExxonMobil Teachers Academy by the end of May 2015, for the program starting mid-June 2015.

**M/S (Westerberg/Goesling): To adjourn the meeting at 3:00 p.m.** The motion carried unanimously.