



**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
February 17-18, 2016
Boise State University
Student Union Building
Boise, Idaho**

A regularly scheduled meeting of the State Board of Education was held February 17-18, 2016 at Boise State University's Simplot Ballroom in Boise, Idaho.

Present:

Don Soltman, President
Emma Atchley, Vice President
Bill Goesling, Secretary
Dave Hill

Richard Westerberg
Linda Clark
Debbie Critchfield
Sherri Ybarra, State Superintendent

Absent:

Wednesday, February 18, 2016

Board President Don Soltman called the meeting to order at 1:00 pm Mountain Time and welcomed the Board members to the meeting.

BOARDWORK

1. Agenda Review/Approval

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Goesling): To amend the agenda to move the setting of the rolling calendar to Thursday's portion of the meeting at the end of the PPGA agenda, and to pull Tab 13 of the Planning Policy & Governmental Affairs agenda. The motion carried unanimously 8-0.

2. Minutes Review / Approval

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Atchley/Clark): To approve the minutes from the November 30, 2015 special Board meeting, the December 9-10, 2015 regular Board meeting, the January 11, 2016 special Board meeting, and the January 21, 2016 special Board meeting as submitted. The motion carried unanimously 8-0.

WORKSESSION

PLANNING, POLICY & GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS (PPGA)

A. Board Member Professional Development

Matt Freeman introduced Dr. Thomas C. Meredith, Senior Fellow, from the Association of Governing Boards (AGB) to facilitate the work session. He reviewed the topics and pointed out the work session will provide the Board with a unique opportunity to interact with an expert consultant.

Dr. Meredith reviewed the discussion points from his prior visit with the Board and reflected on some comments they shared regarding serving on the Board. He pointed out he would be covering four main topics today: The consequential board, presidential assessment, presidential compensation, and board self-evaluation.

Ms. Critchfield requested a copy of the AGB's *Consequential Boards* literature from the Trusteeship Magazine.

Dr. Meredith reviewed the hallmarks of effective boards which included governance (not management), operating with trust and candor, focusing on strategic issues that matter most, not tolerating personal agendas, taking time to listen to opposing views, recognizing the student and quality of education as the highest priority, assuming responsibility for both advocacy and oversight, committing to due process and academic freedom, balancing institutional needs with state's needs and priorities, to impose and insist on the highest ethical standards, to openly debate important issues but speak with one voice once decisions are made, and to make comprehensive board orientation and continuing education a priority.

Dr. Meredith reminded the Board to be in communication with state agency and political leadership and of its importance and benefit. The Board should be engaged as a partner for the benefit the state and to help the state get to where it needs to be. He discussed sequencing things in general and how Boards plot out what needs to take place in order to move from A to B. Such sequencing includes the responsibilities and communication of the parties involved (parents, teachers, administrators, presidents and Boards, etc.) that takes part toward the end goal. He also pointed out the importance of short term goals that help propel the momentum toward the full goal and accountability of those involved.

The discussion moved toward institutions reporting to the Board. Dr. Clark and a number of Board members would prefer the institutions use a template when reporting to the Board. The template idea was supported, but members were reminded that the pre-work needs to be done and presented to the institutions so they are not blinded by reporting expectations. Dr. Meredith recommended using a dash board of items that can be measured at each institution, recognizing there are also some elements that differ at each institution. He emphasized the president being accountable for the institutions' overall performance.

After further discussion, Dr. Meredith asked questions of the Board and encouraged deep thought on things such as: Does this board make a difference, do meetings matter, is the institution/system better, does it use a consequential agenda or transactional agenda, does it allow time for discussion, how is talent utilized to think strategically, and how to consider strategic questions about the future. He recommended the Board thoroughly review the agenda and ask whether the items are things the Board should be spending meeting time on. He recommended putting everything possible in the consent agenda and using valuable meeting time for those items that really require discussion, strategic review, and conversation. He said if things are heavily stacked on the agenda because of because of policy, then change policy. If it is a law, then perhaps work on changing the law. Other questions were related to Board member trustworthiness, high risk areas for the Board, strategic plan goals and successes, and that the budget is tied to the strategic plan.

Dr. Meredith reminded Board members that great trustees are engaged. They keep learning, know their colleagues, keep students first, avoid the shoelace syndrome (otherwise known as conflict avoidance) to avoid difficult discussion or motion. He reminded the Board to think strategically, advocate as well as oversee, to make meetings teaching moments, and to remember the "body corporate" – that the Board operates as a body. Additional reminders included learning the Board culture, being supportive of presidents, the fragility of institutions, read and be prepared, understand it's not about you individually, and he reminded them to enjoy the work at hand.

Next, the meeting moved to the discussion of presidential assessments. Dr. Meredith indicated that he had a conversation with each one of the four-year presidents, and reported on their overall comments. One of the common complaints from the presidents was the lack of follow-up on presidential evaluations; overall they felt the evaluations were not very meaningful.

The group discussed the current presidential assessment process and shared a few things they felt are good about it. Dr. Meredith asked about the weaknesses. Board members indicated they are reluctant to talk about the difficult items during evaluations and there hasn't been enough work ahead of time on the evaluations in setting meaningful goals and developing discussion points. The most useful evaluations seemed to be tied to goals that are mutually recognized and strategically important. One suggestion was to have both a formal and an informal evaluation. For instance, having informal evaluations throughout the year so when the formal evaluation comes up there

are no surprises and the progress can be seen (or not) from the beginning of the cycle. Another recommendation was a quarterly report on goals. Dr. Meredith pointed out the evaluation should be a process of developing leadership, and providing assistance. He reviewed purposes of assessments and to also ask questions about the president's purpose. A couple of things to think about for annual presidential evaluations: Why did you hire this person? What did they think they were being hired to do? Work out a timetable and sequence with the president to review presidential self-assessments, agreed upon goals and progress toward those goals. What data trends regarding enrollment, retention, completion, and so forth should be a part of the template. Dr. Meredith pointed out that unfortunately during a presidential search the real questions aren't posed, but a lot of generalities are made. During the meeting with the president – who is present? He pointed out the atmosphere should be positive. There should be an open forum for Board members to ask questions, the president should be able to review progress of each goal, he/she should be able to discuss concerns and issues. If the Board or any of its members have concerns about a particular president or faculty member, be sure to give the Board president a heads up about those concerns so it doesn't come as a surprise during the evaluation. Also make sure next year's goals are discussed and agreed upon and be sure to ask about the president personally, even his/her spouse. Dr. Meredith recommended if the Board goes with a smaller group during evaluations, perhaps three would be a good number.

Related to the setting of president goals, the president should initiate; he/she should make them stretch goals, have five or six big goals and make them measurable, maybe include a personal goal or two. The Board should discuss the goals with the president and both agree on a final list for next year. Boards must also realize there are many factors that can disrupt progress on particular goals in a given year.

Related to presidential assessment and annual follow-up – the Board needs to discuss and grade each goal as “accomplished”, “made substantial progress”, “made insufficient progress”, or “made no progress” or something similar. Stay away from a numerical rating. Mr. Soltman asked for Board member feedback on the grades noted. Dr. Clark recommended using for the high achievers something that indicates “exceeds” for instance “exceeds expectations”. Dr. Meredith pointed out the Board members likely will not all see each grade in the same light and that is where discussion is important. Mr. Westerberg recommended the germane committee, PPGA, work on recommending goals that make sense to the Board and that they agree with to evaluate presidents on. Dr. Meredith reminded Board members that the goals should be developed by the presidents and reflect the needs of the system and the state. Mr. Westerberg clarified that the PPGA committee would approach the president's for recommendations. Dr. Clark added that if the Board is serious about the 60% goal, then certain expectations should be mandated related to goals. Mr. Soltman commented it might be helpful for a smaller group to evaluate presidents. Dr. Hill urged the Board to start now on the process – lay out a formal process – so presidents are ready by May for the evaluations and have time to provide feedback. Dr. Hill also recommended laying the groundwork for a revised annual process for these evaluations well in advance. The group discussed having the presidents' goals made available for Board member review at the

April Executive Session. Dr. Clark recommended expecting a certain number of goals from certain specific over-arching areas. Mr. Westerberg pointed out the goals should be tied to institution strategic plans and areas the Board sees as very important (retention for example), and to make sure the goals are things the Board feels presidents should be working toward; the budget should also be included and reflective of the goals (i.e., increase support services, funding needs, etc). The group concluded they would ask for the input of the presidents first and then give feedback. Dr. Hill suggested President Soltman introduce the ideas to the President's Council at their March meeting. Mr. Soltman confirmed he would introduce the ideas and timing discussed during today's work session to the presidents and request feedback. To summarize, process items from the work session included that the PPGA committee will solicit president goals for the coming year and Board members will review and discuss those goals at the April Executive Session. Mr. Soltman asked Dr. Meredith to review the current presidential evaluation form and provide feedback at a later date.

Dr. Meredith also recommended some things for mid-year evaluations such as a short verbal conversation with presidents (no hard materials being submitted). Discuss the goals that were agreed upon and issues or barriers ahead of those goals – perhaps with the Board President, the Executive Director, and the institution president. Circling back to the follow-up, Dr. Meredith pointed out it is important as quickly as possible after the session, for the Board president and one other person (Executive Director) to meet with the president to go over the Board's assessment, to pay complements, and to discuss concerns that have been expressed. If there are serious concerns, a plan for improvement would be expected from the president in a reasonable period of time. A mid-year verbal update on progress toward achieving the goals is recommended.

Dr. Meredith went on to discuss a different assessment process which is the periodic comprehensive assessment or 360 degree review. The 360 is designed to enhance leadership development and/or determine if the institution is on course with the Board's direction. This review occurs every three to five years. Interviews are held and a more comprehensive data gathering takes place. In addition, the president submits a written self-assessment with draft goals for the next year. Dr. Meredith reported many boards are interested in the perceptions of the president's performance. The referenced interviews are conducted with faculty representatives, students, campus staff, administrators, alumni, foundation, political figures, community leaders, board members, etc. All interviews are conducted on the theme of leadership development with only constructive criticism accepted. Often an outside entity conducts the interviews. A final report is prepared by the interviewer complete with recommendations if desired. A meeting is then held with the president by the interviewer to go over the report and recommendations. Sometimes the board president may choose to sit in. A meeting is then held with the whole board to go over the final report and hear comments and asks questions. The president then joins the meeting for discussion. Action plans for improvement can be developed at this point if necessary.

Dr. Meredith offered a side note on strategic planning, recommending small progress reports on the strategic plan (a matrix of where we are at toward each goal). Too many

places build a strategic plan and then don't know where they are on it. He felt the plans should be reviewed once a year as a regular tab-keeping exercise to make sure things are progressing. He pointed out long strategic plans are too difficult to keep from over complicating; shorter strategic plans are better for keeping on task. He also pointed out the importance of the presidents' aspirations and dreams for the university and campus, and the importance of encouraging them to share that type of information.

Moving on to discuss compensation, Dr. Meredith indicated that whenever you talk about salaries it needs to include relevant information. He recommended the Chronicle for Higher Education - a weekly publication that covers all the latest news on higher education. Annually they publish a report of all presidential salaries which includes housing, cars, and additional compensation. He also recommended CUPA – College and University Personnel Association for reference materials on salaries. He pointed out the Ed Trust Organization is a reference that provides comparative information between institutions, such as gpa, retention rates, graduation rates, tuition rates, student body and characteristics, etc.

Regarding the Board's self-evaluations, Dr. Meredith felt it was a good exercise using good questions, but questioned what is done with it. Board members confirmed it is an exercise they do at the Board Retreat, but usually no action follows it. Dr. Meredith pointed out a lot of board's survey themselves for a better working board. They ask if they are getting enough materials to make good decisions, are they getting too much material, what improvements could be made, discuss suggestions, and so forth.

At this time Board President Soltman indicated they would move into Executive Session at a time certain of 4:30 PM Mountain Standard Time (MST).

EXECUTIVE SESSION (time certain – 4:30 p.m.) – Closed to the public

1. Office of the State Board of Education
2. Lewis-Clark State College

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Atchley/Goesling): To go into executive session pursuant to section 74-206(1)(e), Idaho Code, "To consider preliminary negotiations involving matters of trade or commerce in which the governing body is in competition with governing bodies in other states or nations."

And

To go into executive session pursuant to Section 74-206(1)(b), Idaho Code, "To consider the evaluation, dismissal or disciplining of...a public officer, employee, staff member or individual agent, or public school student." A roll call vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously 8-0.

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Hill/Clark): To go out of executive session. The motion carried unanimously 8-0.

Board President Soltman recessed the meeting at 6:38 pm MST immediately following Executive Session.

Thursday February 18, 2016, 8:00 a.m., Boise State University, Simplot Ballroom, Student Union Building, Boise, Idaho.

Board President Soltman called the meeting to order at 8:00 a.m. MST for regularly scheduled business.

OPEN FORUM

There were no participants during Open Forum.

CONSENT AGENDA

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Atchley/Hill): To approve the Consent Agenda as presented. The motion carried unanimously 8-0.

BAHR

1. Boise State University – Multi-Year Service Agreement – Aramark

By unanimous consent to authorize Boise State University to enter into a food service contract with Aramark in conformance with the contract in Attachment 1.

PPGA

2. Boise State University – Micron Facility Naming

BOARD ACTION

By unanimous consent to approve Boise State University's request to name the new Center for Material Research facility "Micron Center for Materials Research."

3. Boise State University – Micron School Naming

BOARD ACTION

By unanimous consent to approve Boise State University's request for the naming of the new School of Materials Science and Engineering to be named the "Micron School of Materials Science and Engineering."

4. Alcohol Permits – President Approved – Report

This item was provided in the agenda materials for informational purposes only. Any action will be at the Board's discretion.

PLANNING, POLICY & GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS (PPGA)

1. Boise State University - Annual Report

Boise State University (BSU) President Dr. Bob Kustra provided an annual report to the Board. He introduced to the Board Dr. Gordon Jones who joins BSU from the Harvard Innovation Lab. Dr. Jones is the Dean of the New College of Innovation and Design. Dr. Kustra reported on another great year for Boise State University, pointing out the university has been classified as a doctoral research university. Dr. Kustra indicated construction would begin soon on the new Honors College which will hold over 600 beds and provide opportunities for Honors College and other students to live on campus. He introduced *Bronco Fit* which is a program that strives to create an institute that will focus on population health, research, and creative new ways to foster healthy behavior while students are in college and beyond. One of the proposals is to provide primary care for all students at flat fee of around \$150 per student per semester. He provided updates on the new School of Public Service and on the College of Innovation and Design. Dr. Jones provided an update of his work to date and outlined three areas that the college is focused on which are innovating inside universities today, experimenting with the future university, and imagining new connections for the university to the community. Dr. Jones reported on a number of degrees and certificates under the College of Innovation and design. He shared some of the activities and innovations already underway at the college, along with faculty and industry collaborations in support of those activities, and how they also emphasize bridge to career expansions, and university connections with the community. Their goal is to be a catalyst to innovation.

2. President's Council Report

Chair of the President's Council, Dr. Tony Fernandez, provided a report to the Board of the January 5th President's Council meeting. He reported that the meeting was highlighted by a visit from Governor Otter who recapped his higher education initiatives including tuition lock and the adult learner scholarship. The Governor and presidents discussed support for a community college in eastern Idaho. The group discussed a Learning Management System (LMS) vendor. Idaho Digital Learning academy (IDLA) and five institutions (BSU, UI, LC, ITech, and NIC) have committed to the LMS project with three institutions (CWI, CSI, and ISU) that could opt in later; high schools will be

able to opt in as well. The State Department of Purchasing is managing the RFP with technical aspect assistance from BSU and IDLA. All institutions will review the RFP, and the RFP will be released in March/April. Finalists will be given the opportunity to provide demonstrations and a decision will be made by Fall. Institutions will cover the cost of training for their staff.

At this time Ms. Critchfield requested the Presidents and Board discuss the rolling calendar. Dr. Fernandez indicated there was a proposal from the Board on the possibility of having half the Board meetings at a centralized location and the Board sought presidential input on the idea. Dr. Staben and others commented that they find great value in the Board visiting each campus and expressed some disappointment with the idea of centralizing the meeting locations. The group discussed the various costs involved in hosting the meetings as well as with travel, and institutions would work up estimates for the Board on expenses and/or savings. They also discussed trying to keep the number of staff that travel to the meetings at a minimum. Board presidents also agreed that there is benefit to the campuses, faculty, and staff by having the Board members' present on campus.

3. Idaho Public Charter School Commission – Annual Report

Ms. Tamara Baysinger, Public Charter School Commission (Commission) Director, provided a report to the Board. She reviewed the members of the Commission and pointed out a new commission member – Evan Frasure, who replaced commissioner Esther VanWart. Ms. Baysinger provided an overview of the PCSC. She indicated they have enjoyed an increase in staff from FY 15 from 2.5 to 4 FTE, and their budget has increased 41%, which was mostly due to the increase in staff. Enrollment in authorized schools is up in the brick and mortar schools and down slightly in virtual schools. She reviewed the 2015 annual performance reports and the data she reported on was largely related to proficiency. Growth data will be available at a later time. Ms. Baysinger provided an overview of demographics illustrating the kinds of students charters are serving, and relative to most charter schools, they are serving a more diverse population. She reported that messaging to the community is important for charters so the community knows all students are welcome to attend public charter schools and are entitled to receive the same services as a traditional school (i.e., special education, or free and reduced lunch). SAT results showed charter school students scoring higher overall, as well as higher in college readiness.

Ms. Baysinger reported that the majority of charter schools are doing very well operationally, and reported on school performances, operational accountabilities, and financial accountability designations. Related to operational outcomes, the majority of schools fell in the *honor* designation, and no schools fell in the *critical* designation. She reported on financial outcomes. Idaho's public charter schools received \$94,231,644 in state funding during FY15. She reported that the majority of PCSC portfolio schools score well on near-term measures. Financial sustainability is of greater concern, with nearly one-third of schools earning fewer than 60% of points possible in the financial sustainability category. There were seven schools falling into the accountability

designation of *remediation* and *critical* and face both near-term and sustainability concerns.

Ms. Baysinger reported that in 2014 there was a fairly comprehensive on-site evaluation conducted by the National Association of Charter School Authorizers (NACSA). She indicated they are in agreement with the vast majority of the recommendations, and in looking ahead the PCSC continues implementation of those recommendations, as well as continuing to broaden the scope of resources provided to charter schools and the commissioners. She pointed out a large portion of this year's work will be focused on the renewal process which will require a heavy workload at the beginning of the process. The process focuses on the weakest schools in the beginning and then they move to the strongest schools.

4. Idaho Digital Learning Academy (IDLA) Annual Report

Ms. Cheryl Charlton, CEO, provided a report to the Board and was assisted by Dr. Sherawn Reberry, Director of Education Programs, and Mr. Ryan Gravette, Director of Technology. She welcomed as a guest to the meeting Ms. Amy Hirotaka, State Policy and Advocacy Manager from Code.Org out of Seattle, WA. Ms. Charlton commented on the partnership with Code.Org, Idaho Technology Council, and IDLA, pointing out it is the first in the nation of its kind. Dr. Reberry reported on the progress over the past 18 months with the aforementioned partnership. One highlight has been the training of over 300 teachers K-12 throughout Idaho in computer science. She provided an overview of IDLA courses, course and teacher quality, and their partnership with the Division of Professional Technical Education – PTE Digital. She remarked on the many different courses that support the pathway to college and career, along with an increase in enrollments in advanced opportunities. Dr. Reberry also reported on the collaborative counselor training initiative (CCTI).

Moving on, Mr. Gravette provided a report on enrollments and that IDLA has served 22,856 enrollments from 2014-2015. He reported on the district portal, how it looks and how IDLA is working to improve the log-in and navigation process – improving access to students and users. He introduced the Education Resource Library (ERL) which enables teachers to access digital resources available across the state.

Superintendent Ybarra spoke of her appreciation of IDLA and what it's doing for Idaho. Dr. Clark remarked on the tools of the IDLA and that the management piece will be critical. Ms. Atchley asked about the make-up of students and Ms. Charlton responded that the student population is diverse.

5. Idaho Educational Services for the Deaf and Blind Annual Report

Administrator for the Idaho Educational Services for the Deaf and Blind (IESDB), Brian Darcy, provided a report to the Board, pointing out this is his sixth year with the IESDB. He reviewed their Board members and remarked on their strong leadership team. He reported on their continuum of services for the deaf and blind that starts from birth. Mr.

Darcy reported on their two big programs: Outreach and Campus. Outreach has served over 1,812 students and over 30 teachers across the state provide a variety of services to students. The teachers and the IESDB serves as a constant in the lives of the people they serve. Teachers have very significant caseloads and serve seven different regions. The IESDB offers short term programs regionally both for students and for staff. One program in particular is in a partnership with Vocational Rehabilitation and is a work study program targeting 14-18 year olds. Also related to Outreach, Mr. Darcy reported on their media and library services.

Mr. Darcy indicated the actual campus was established in 1908 in Gooding, ID. He reported that the school runs Monday through Thursday where students arrive Sunday night and then return home Thursday afternoon. He reported on an increase in enrollments and they currently have 95 students on campus; they have not had that number of students on campus in nearly 15 years. He reported on the number of collaborations that make their services possible and shared several examples of the experiences that their students have been able to participate in.

Mr. Darcy reported on future requests such as with their irrigation system, updated windows at one of the buildings, and an upgrade of their Round Building. He reported on the Governor's budget recommendations that total a one-time request of \$517,600. Moving on to strategic planning, Mr. Darcy reviewed their goals and foreseeable barriers – the largest barrier being the lack of qualified teachers. He reviewed their partnerships and spoke of how important those partnerships are.

At this time, Dr. Kustra took a moment to introduce and recognize Michael Carter of the Strive Program who was in Boise today presenting to the Senate Education Committee. The Strive Program is one where college students mentor high school juniors and seniors. In Fall of 2013, the program started with 19 students and now has over 300. Over 80 high schools have reached out for the assistance if the Strive Program.

6. Idaho State Historical Society – Museum Update

Ms. Janet Galimore, Executive Director, provided an update to the Board that included an overview of the Idaho State Historical Museum, the expansion renovation, and the new educational exhibition experiences. She introduced Ms. Chris Brady from her team to assist with the presentation. Ms. Gallimore provided agency highlights and pointed out that their services are mandated by federal law. Their major project over the past three years has been the planning, development, and funding of their new Historical Museum located in Julia Davis Park. She reviewed the timeline of the Historical Museum and how the project will serve as an educational resource, and contribute to the economic vitality of the city, along with being a great benefit to its citizens. She reported on the influence from Idaho's five federally recognized Indian tribes, and how the museum will engage visitors with Idaho's past, present, and future.

Ms. Gallimore walked the Board through a time line from the beginning of the Historical Society to where it is today, and provided a visual "fly through" animated presentation of

how the new museum will look in both the upper and lower level galleries. The museum will also have areas available for lecture. It is anticipated to open in December 2017.

7. Every Student Succeeds Act - Overview

Ms. Alison Henken, K-12 Accountability and Projects Manager from the Board office provided an overview to the Board on the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). She indicated the ESSA was signed into law on December 10, 2015 and pointed out that in reviewing third-party summaries, it is clear the law is already being interpreted differently in a number of areas. She pointed out the US Department of Education has started implementing the federal rulemaking process to provide additional guidance to states for areas that are less clear. This and future ESSA reviews will provide the Board with the opportunity to evaluate existing programs and provide guidance to Board and Department staff on areas that might warrant changes or to identify new programs the state might like to explore.

She reviewed overall changes which provide states with increased authority and flexibility. Some of those changes include funding for many special programs being rolled into the state's allocation and new language requiring teachers to meet state certification and licensure standards. Waivers and state accountability systems are effective until August 2016, and new accountability systems and revised formula grants are effective in 2017-18. Ms. Henken indicated changes in requirements will necessitate submission of new plans for Title I, II, and III. The State Education Agency (SEA) is responsible for creating and submitting these plans and the Governor must be given opportunity to review and sign the Title I and II plans. Ms. Henken reviewed changes and highlights to the requirements of Title I through Title IX.

8. Accountability Oversight Committee – Statewide Accountability System Framework Timeline

Ms. Critchfield introduced the item and provided some historical information related to the framework that had been developed and presented at the October Board meeting. Coincidentally, that same day the new law was signed (ESSA) which precipitated a pause in the development of that framework. Ms. Critchfield indicated that since now more is known on the expectations and requirements of the new law, they are presently working on developing an accountability system for Idaho and plan to present that to the Board at the June meeting. Dr. Clark reported that the Committee sees a viable opportunity to create a single accountability system that meets both Federal requirements and the states' needs and it is seeking input on the system.

9. 2016 Legislative Update

Mr. Blake Youde Chief Communications Officer from the Board provided an update on legislation effecting the state educational system. Mr. Youde highlighted some of the larger pieces of legislation and where we are at in the process. A summary was also provided in the Board agenda materials. He pointed out HB 450, the Literacy

Intervention Bill, and the charter school replication legislation (RS), is scheduled to be heard by the House Education Committee this week. The Career Ladder legislation will be heard in committee very soon, and Chairman DeMordaunt has personally taken the lead on this legislation. Two pieces will not be heard this year as it is felt they need to mature more; one was related to how school districts are funded, and the second was requested by the Professional Standards Commission related to investigations of a certificate holder.

Mr. Youde pointed out HB 459, which is the support for the start-up of a community college in eastern Idaho, was heard this morning in Committee, and Senate Bill 1291 which is the Governor's Adult Degree Completion Scholarship will be heard in Senate Ed. Senate Bill 1290 is headed to the full senate and is in regard to college and career counseling. SCR 134 is sailing through both chambers and should be done by early next week. Mr. Freeman reported that HB 459 did pass committee this morning.

10. Idaho State University Mission and Core Themes

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Hill): To approve Idaho State University's mission statement and core themes as presented in Attachment 1. The motion carried unanimously 8-0.

11. Board Policy I.E. – Executive Officers – Second Reading

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Atchley): To approve the second reading of proposed amendments to Board Policy section I.E. Executive Officers, incorporating the reporting requirement, as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried unanimously 8-0.

There were no changes between first and second reading.

12. Board Policy I.Q. – Accountability Oversight Committee – Second Reading

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Goesling): To approve the second reading of amendments to Board Policy I.Q. Accountability Oversight Committee as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried unanimously 8-0.

There were no changes between first and second reading. Ms. Critchfield recommended a special meeting related to this item be held prior to the April meeting.

At this time Ms. Critchfield returned to Item 3 from the Boardwork section of the agenda.

3. Rolling Calendar

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Clark): I move to set February 15-16, 2017 and Boise State University as the location for the February 2017 regularly scheduled Board. The motion carried unanimously 8-0.

Related to discussion on the rolling calendar and whether to have a centralized location for many of the Board meetings, Dr. Hill expressed that he is opposed to the idea of having Board meetings centrally located and that the issue is not related to cost but related to doing to his job as a Board member. He was concerned of the importance of Board members visiting campuses in person. Dr. Goesling echoed those remarks. Superintendent Ybarra also expressed that she was originally in favor of the idea, but has since changed her mind to be supportive of visiting the campuses in person, as well as an opportunity to be present regionally for stakeholder and public visitation. Mr. Westerberg felt that the time at institutions should be spent more usefully and not just as a place to conduct meetings.

INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH & STUDENT AFFAIRS

1. Higher Education Research Council (HERC) - Annual Report

Dr. Mark Rudin, the current chair of HERC provided the Council's annual update to the Board, which included an update on the Center for Advanced Energy Studies (CAES) activities. Dr. Rudin reported on the membership of HERC including their industry representatives and what they bring to the table. Dr. Rudin reported on the HERC initiatives which also align with the HERC budget. The HERC Research Infrastructure Initiative provides funding to support science, engineering, and other research infrastructure. The HERC Incubation Fund gets ideas from research enterprise out to the community; currently 38 projects are being funded plus five new ones just this year. Dr. Rudin reviewed HERC IGEM projects which included projects with BSU and ISU. He also commented on CAES, its vision and mission, and provided an overview on how CAES was created. He reported on its governance and that it is a consortium agreement which delineates roles and responsibilities. The steering committee is comprised of VPRs of member universities and the Idaho National Lab (INL) Deputy Director. Dr. Rudin pointed out that the University of Wyoming was recently added to the consortium which has greatly expanded the consortium's reach, and remarked on the wind energy research that the University of Wyoming brings to the mix. He also provided a research example which was the FORGE – Frontier Observatory for Research in Geothermal Energy who is studying in the Snake River Basin. Dr. Rudin reported on how CAES research is reaching into communities, and on CAES by the numbers which in FY15 includes \$3M in state support, \$347,000 University of Wyoming investment, and \$6.84M in INL support and investments. Dr. Rudin commented that outreach plays a huge role in the CAES return on investment. In FY 15, CAES had collaborated with over 84 different companies, and the investments the state and lab

has made have resulted in nearly \$17M in competitive money coming back to the state. Dr. Hill also pointed out that in 2014, the three universities spent in \$143 million of external money (primarily federal dollars) on research, adding the research enterprise in Idaho is remarkable.

At this time the meeting recessed for lunch.

2. Amendment to Board Policy – Section III.P. – Students – First Reading

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Hill/Atchley): To approve the amendment to Board policy III.P.16, as presented in attachment 1. The motion carried unanimously 8-0.

Mr. Chet Herbst, Chief Fiscal Officer from the Board office, outlined the proposed amendments to the policy stating they eliminate the Board-level mandate that full-time students must obtain health insurance. The amended policy will give the presidents of Boise State University, Idaho State University, Lewis-Clark State College, the University of Idaho, and Eastern Idaho Technical College the authority to establish health-insurance requirements for all or particular groups of students (e.g., international students, intercollegiate athletes, students in designated health profession or student teachers, etc.). The amendment provides appropriate flexibility to the institutions and their students. It is anticipated that the amended policy will have a positive impact on access, enrollment, and affordability at the affected institutions.

3. Boise State University – Ph.D. in Ecology, Evolution and Behavior

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Hill/Westerberg): To approve the request by Boise State University to create a new academic program that will award a Ph.D. in Ecology, Evolution, and Behavior. The motion carried unanimously 8-0.

4. University of Idaho – Master of Public Administration – One-line Program Fee Request

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Hill/Goesling): To approve the request by University of Idaho to offer the Master of Public Administration through distance delivery and to assess an online program fee in the amount of \$7,500 per year; for 9 credits per semester. The motion carried unanimously 8-0.

Mr. Soltman asked if it was a one or two year program. Dr. Kirsten, Dean of the College of Letters, Arts, and Social Sciences, responded it is a two year program.

5. University of Idaho – Master of Laws

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Hill/Atchley): To approve the request by the University of Idaho to offer a Master of Laws (LL.M.) degree starting in Summer 2016. The motion carried unanimously 8-0.

Dean Mark Adams from the College of Law, indicated this degree is focused on educating international students that hold a degree in law from their home country who are learning about law in the United States. The degree is only available at the Moscow campus where the resources are available to support international students.

6. University of Idaho – Bachelor of Science, Sociology, Criminology Emphasis – On-line

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Hill/Atchley): To approve the request by the University of Idaho to offer the Bachelor of Science with a major of Sociology, Criminology emphasis through distance delivery. The motion carried unanimously 8-0.

Dr. Hill asked who the targeted audience would be. Dean Kirsten responded it is for those who are currently working in that field and are in the degree completion process.

BUSINESS AFFAIRS & HUMAN RESOURCES (BAHR)

Section I – Human Resources

Mr. Westerberg requested unanimous consent to hold item two on the BAHR agenda to a future date as additional information would be available. There were no objections to the request.

1. Retirement Plan Committee Appointments

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Atchley): To appoint Sarah Jones, Brandi Terwilliger, Jeff Phelps, Eric Nielson, Richelle Sugiyama, Kent Kinyon, Jane Buser, and Bryan Raymond as members of the Board’s Optional Retirement Plan Committee. The motion carried unanimously 8-0.

2. Chief Executive Officer Compensation – Item Held until Future Date
3. Boise State University – Multi-Year Employment Agreement – Women’s Head Volleyball Coach

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Goesling/Clark): To approve the request by Boise State University to enter into a new multiyear agreement with Coach Garus commencing on February 28, 2016 and terminating on January 31, 2018, with the option for a one-year extension in substantial conformance with the terms of the agreement set forth in Attachment 1. The motion carried unanimously 8-0.

Dr. Hill asked about the annual percentage rate (apr) and grade point average (gpa) scores being used toward an incentive. Dr. Goesling, Athletics Committee Chair, explained why they included both in this contract. Mr. Westerberg recommended not straying too far from apr as it is so frequently used in the National College Athletic Association (NCAA). He also suggested keeping close to the model contract and not setting a precedent with this contract.

4. University of Idaho – Multi-Year Employment Agreement – Athletic Director

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Goesling/Clark): To approve the University of Idaho’s multi-year employment contract for Athletic Director, Robert Spear, for a term commencing upon execution of the contract after approval, and terminating on August 12, 2019 with provision for a one year extension to August 12, 2020, in substantial conformance to the form presented to the Board in attachment 1. The motion carried unanimously 8-0.

Mr. Soltman asked what a one year extension does. Dr. Goesling responded it was at the institution’s request so the coach would be present during some upcoming changes with their athletics program.

Section II – Finance

1. Intercollegiate Athletics – Financial Reports

The Athletics Reports present the financial status of the intercollegiate athletic programs and the participation of students in the various sport programs. The report on page seven shows all the institutions have positive fund balances and is included in the agenda materials.

2. Intercollegiate Athletics – Employee Compensation Reports

In FY 1997 the Board adopted an annual report on the compensation of the employees of the intercollegiate athletic departments. The reports were included in the agenda materials and include FY 2015 actual compensation and FY 2016 estimated compensation for each institution.

At this time the chair moved to item four of the BAHF Finance agenda.

4. Board Policy – Section V.R. – Establishment of Fees – First Reading

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Goesling): To approve the first reading of proposed amendments to Board policy Section V.R., Establishment of Fees, as presented in Attachment 1. The motion carried 6-2. Ms. Atchley and Dr. Hill voted nay on the motion.

Mr. Westerberg provided an update on the item and that the proposed amendment would enable institutions to respond to the BAHF Committee's invitation to forward any particularly worthy new candidates for differential/cost-based fees to the Board for consideration at the April tuition and fee setting meeting. This approach preserves the Board's current prerogative to approve special fee requests on a case-by-case basis. The change inserts the word "may" instead of "shall" in the policy.

Ms. Atchley was concerned this policy was too broad. Mr. Westerberg responded that he shares her concerns but the policy states the Board can respond and act differentially. Mr. Westerberg asked for any recommendations to come to BAHF between now and second reading.

At this time the chair returned to item three of the BAHF Finance agenda.

3. Outcomes-Based Funding (OBF)

Mr. Chet Herbst provided an update to the Board on the progress of the OBF planning team and the work to date. OBF will eventually replace enrollment workload adjustment (EWA) process with an OBF approach. A team consisting of financial and academic officers from the colleges and universities has been formed and work is underway. Mr. Herbst summarized that transitioning to an OBF system may provide a vehicle which may be better supported and understood by policy makers and participants. It is linked closely to the state's 60% goal and is more effective as an incentive to encourage degree completion, and more acceptable to policy makers as a means of linking funding to performance. Mr. Herbst provided an illustration of what other states participate in OBF. Mr. Herbst reviewed key objectives and assumptions, and reported on efforts to date in the work process and under discussion.

At this time, the Chair requested moving to item 6 and item 8.

6. Boise State University – Release of Reservation in Grant Deed on Real Property – College of Western Idaho

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Atchley): To approve the request by Boise State University to execute the Release of Reservation in Grant Deed (Attachment 2). The motion carried unanimously 8-0.

8. Idaho State University – Issuance of General Revenue Bonds

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Goesling): To approve a Supplemental Resolution for the Series 2016 Bonds, the title of which is as follows:

A SUPPLEMENTAL RESOLUTION of the Board of Trustees of Idaho State University authorizing the issuance of General Revenue Refunding Bonds, Series 2016, delegating authority to approve the terms and provisions of the Bonds, in the principal amount of up to \$14,500,000; authorizing the execution and delivery of a Bond Purchase Agreement upon sale of the Bonds, and providing for other matters relating to the authorization, issuance, sale and payment of the Series 2016 Bonds. Roll call vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously 8-0.

Mr. Jim Fletcher, Financial VP from ISU, introduced the item stating that Idaho State University (ISU) is seeking approval to refinance certain outstanding bonds; the bonds are stock series bonds. The bonds from 2004 were put into place to finance the acquisition of land and improvements at University Place in Idaho Falls, and the 2007 bonds are general revenue bonds which financed the construction and addition to the Reed Gym Complex. The 2016 bonds would be issued solely for refinancing purposes; there are no new capital projects or other new funding related to the 2016 bonds. Mr. Fletcher indicated the refunding of the Series 2004B and Series 2007 in the aggregate principal amount of approximately \$13,695,000 would result in a debt service net present value savings in the amount of approximately \$2,000,000. He said they intend to do the pricing on March 1st and close on April 2nd.

At this time, they returned to item 5 of the BAHF Finance agenda.

5. Boise State University – Facility Lease and Purchase Agreement – Gardner Company

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Hill): To approve the request by Boise State University to execute its purchase option for condominiums (currently identified as Suites 140, 150, 200 and 300 at 777 W. Main Street, Condo Units: 1D, 1E, 2A, 3A and 3B) within the Clearwater Building and Centre Building, as described in the Lease Agreement between City Center Plaza Education, LLC and the State of Idaho By and Through Idaho State Board of Education and hereby delegate to the Vice President for Finance and Administration the authority to execute the needed

documents and payments for an amount not to exceed \$6,422,667. The motion carried unanimously 8-0.

Ms. Stacy Pearson from Boise State University provided an update on the item stating they feel this is the best purchase price for the facility. They have performed a financial analysis, and will use designated reserves for this purchase; no new debt will be issued.

7. Idaho State University – Capital Project – Remodel of the Turner Dining Hall, Design-Build Phase

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Atchley): To approve the request by Idaho State University to proceed with a design-build projection project to remodel Turner Dining Hall. The project would be accomplished with Non-State Funds in the amount of \$1,175,000. The motion carried unanimously 8-0.

Mr. Jem Fletcher introduced the item to the Board indicating ISU is requesting approval to proceed with a design-build construction project to allow Chartwells, the current dining contract holder with ISU, to remodel the Turner/Garrison Dining Hall Facility.

9. Lewis-Clark State College – Proposed Summer Session Fee Discount

Mr. Westerberg introduced the item reporting that for the 2016 Summer Session, LCSC plans to propose a discount for Summer Session fees of up to 25% of the per credit rate which was approved by the Board in April, 2015. The proposed discount will reduce the approved per credit cost from \$307 to approximately \$230 per credit. Through the LCSC program prioritization process, Summer Session was identified as a program in need of significant restructuring. It is the intent of LCSC to offer an expanded and focused Summer Session that allows students the opportunity to meet graduation requirements and promote on time or accelerated degree completion.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

1. Superintendent of Public Instruction Update

Superintendent of Public Instruction, Ms. Sherri Ybarra, provided a report from the State Department of Education which was focused on their budget. She introduced Chief Deputy of Finance Tim Hill and Assistant Chief Financial Officer Louie Konkol to provide the presentation and overview. Mr. Hill pointed out the agenda materials contained two handouts: one on a zero-based overview, and the other a base-plus overview. Mr. Hill reported on how the Department breaks down their statutory and non-statutory expenditures and explained the Public Education Stabilization Fund (PESF) which is a vehicle to absorb any variances in actuals relative to the Department's appropriation. He explained how federal expenditures tie into the equation, and how support units are divided into the net state funding. He pointed out that support units are what essentially

drives distribution. Mr. Hill next reviewed the general fund appropriation and what it includes in various categories.

2. Temporary Rule – IDAPA 08.02.02.111 – Bullying, Harassment, and Intimidation

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Ybarra/Goesling): To approve the Temporary Rule amendment to IDAPA 08.02.02, creating a new section 111, Rules Governing Uniformity - Bullying, Harassment and Intimidation Prevention. The motion carried unanimously 8-0.

Mr. Matt McCarter, Director of Student Engagement, provided an overview to the Board of the temporary rule. He indicated in August 2015 the Board approved a proposed rule regarding bullying, intimidation, and harassment. The proposed rule was not submitted for publication by the Department and the rulemaking was vacated. At this time, the temporary rule is before the Board for consideration. Mr. Goesling asked about the feedback they received. Mr. McCarter responded the feedback was based on further defining bullying and it was vetted with a number of stakeholder groups. This temporary rule serves as a baseline and will be followed-up with a proposed rule after the legislative session. The proposed rule will go through the negotiated rulemaking process and will be brought before the Board at a later date.

3. Professional Standards Commission Annual Report

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Ybarra/Clark): To accept the Professional Standards Commission 2014-2015 Annual Report. The motion carried unanimously 8-0.

Director of Certification Lisa Colon was available for questions. This report advises the State Board of Education regarding the accomplishments of the Professional Standards Commission (PSC) at the conclusion of each fiscal year. Ms. Critchfield asked if the Commission is fully staffed and how long the term is. Ms. Colon responded in the affirmative and that the term is three years; members can serve two consecutive three-year terms.

4. Idaho Standards Achievement Test – Parent Reports

Dr. Cheryl Findley, Director of Assessments, and Nancy Thomas Price, Comprehensive Assessment System Coordinator, provided a report to the Board on the Smarter Balanced reports from the ISAT and how teachers can utilize them to understand where their students are in their learning.

Ms. Nancy Thomas Price reported on that the system is a balanced assessment system and not simply an end of year assessment. It includes a digital library, interim, and summative assessments. She shared examples of a district report and how it might

look, along with how classroom reports and trend reports might look and that they can drill down to certain targets. She also illustrated how the different reports may be used and how specific areas can be addressed rather than the broad categories of a summative assessment. These reports are also beneficial in illustrating to parents where their children may need assistance or to apply additional work; it clearly shows where the student needs help.

Dr. Clark asked how quickly the teachers and parents are able to use the information from the testing and scoring and what a reasonable amount of time would be. Dr. Findley responded that three to four weeks would be reasonable and it occurs in June. She added that interim results are immediate. Dr. Clark pointed out the timeframe is after school is out and to hold the vendor to a shorter timeline and be able to have the results when the student is still in school would be most beneficial. It would also allow the results to be sent home with students which would decrease the cost of mailing the results out after school is out. Ms. Ybarra acknowledged that would be something to think about in the future.

OTHER BUSINESS

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

M/S (Westerberg/Critchfield): To adjourn the meeting at 2:57 p.m. The motion carried unanimously.