



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 Career-Technical Education

**APPROVED MINUTES
IDAHO STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION**

**May 18-19, 2016
Boise State University
Stueckle Sky Center
Boise, Idaho**

A special meeting of the State Board of Education was held May 18-19, 2016. It originated from the Skyline Room of the Stueckle Sky Center at Boise State University, in Boise, Idaho. Board President Don Soltman presided and called the meeting to order at 10:30 a.m. Mountain Time. During the Executive Sessions, presidential evaluations were conducted. A roll call of members was taken.

Present:

Don Soltman, President
Emma Atchley, Vice President
Bill Goesling, Secretary
Linda Clark

Richard Westerberg
Dave Hill
Debbie Critchfield
Sherri Ybarra, State Superintendent

BOARDWORK - AGENDA APPROVAL

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION (Closed to the Public)

M/S (Atchley/Westerberg): To meet in 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. Board members entered into Executive Session shortly after 10:30 a.m. Mountain Time.

The Board recessed from Executive Session at 11:34 Mountain Time for lunch and to go into the open portion of the meeting to conduct regular business.

(Open Meeting)

BUSINESS AFFAIRS AND HUMAN RESOURCES (BAHR)

1. University of Idaho – Athletic Conference

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Hill): To approve the request by the University of Idaho to accept the invitation of the Big Sky Conference for football, joining the rest of UI Athletics teams in the regional Division I FCS conference. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Westerberg introduced the item indicating in November, 2015, the Big Sky Conference (BSC) reaffirmed their invitation for the University of Idaho (UI) to add football to the other sports already participating in BSC with a six month extension of the previous invitation. At this time, the UI seeks to accept this invitation and participate in all sports with the BSC.

Thursday, May 19, 2016

EXECUTIVE SESSION (Closed to the Public)

Board members resumed Executive Session shortly after 8:00 a.m. Mountain Time.

M/S (Atchley/Clark): To go out of executive session. The motion carried unanimously. The group came out of Executive Session at 12:30 p.m. Mountain Time to conduct regular business.

(Open Meeting)

BUSINESS AFFAIRS AND HUMAN RESOURCES (BAHR)

2. Idaho National Laboratory – Lease Expansions

Mr. Westerberg introduced Mr. Van Briggs from the Idaho National Laboratory (INL) who provided an overview of a proposal to expand, through new construction, the Cyber Innovation Center (CIC) and the Collaborative Computing Center (C3). He reported that

related programs are currently carried out in smaller facilities, and additional space is needed to accommodate the growth in these programs.

Mr. Briggs said they will build the two new buildings either through a developer or lease options and wished to discuss how to further develop the partnership between the INL and the State Board of Education (Board) related to that development. They are hoping to determine if sponsorship through the Board is possible in the near-term. If they partner with the state, financing for the facilities' expansion would be through the Idaho State Building Authority (IBA). The property is owned by the Board and Idaho State University Foundation adjacent to INL Research Facilities. A summary of the proposed construction, financing, state sponsorship, and leasing arrangements was contained in the agenda materials provided to Board members. Mr. Briggs indicated the IBA could issue taxable bonds and contracts for the construction of the two facilities which would be leased to INL and that action would require a concurrent resolution of the Legislature.

Mr. Briggs outlined the benefits for state sponsorship for INL lease initiative. He outlined the benefits to the Board and the state, starting with revenue when the bonds mature. The lease will provide a defined and steady income for the state and the location would use underdeveloped state-owned properties which are sitting vacant. He commented how it supports growth for the state and creates world-class opportunities for students. Mr. Briggs discussed the feasibility of the proposal and commented they would like to enter into a long term commitment with the lease. He also remarked on INL's commitment to the state and to learning. They intend to seek external funding sources after fully exploring those with the state. Mr. Briggs reviewed the conceptual nature of the proposed facilities and provided an illustration of the buildings and an overview of the construction timeline. He provided a diagram of who has ownership of the land around the INL campus and parcels zoned for research.

Mr. Briggs discussed the projected cost which is around \$40 million per project and the various bonds and leasing options. Mr. Westerberg asked how soon they need to know a decision from the Board. Mr. Briggs responded they would like to proceed as soon as possible, and there are a series of approvals and answers they need in order to proceed. The Board wasn't sure if it could have those answers in time for the June meeting; and the Board is not entirely the final decider on whether they can partner with the INL on this project. Mr. Herbst indicated they would likely have information from the IBA by the June meeting. Mr. Westerberg pointed out there are many questions which need to be answered, including those related to covenants, and there will be another informational update at the June meeting with perhaps an action item in August. Dr. Hill commented that conceptually this project is much larger and has the potential to create a university lab complex with research park capabilities that would attract companies and spark economic development in Idaho Falls. He requested arranging a tour for the Board members to the property while they are in Idaho Falls during the June meeting. Ms. Atchley requested a full and thorough look at legal ramifications before proceeding with this proposal. She recommended the highest level of caution and review before proceeding.

3. Eastern Idaho Technical College – Presidential Appointment

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Goesling): To appoint Dr. Rick Aman as President of Eastern Idaho Technical College, effective July 1, 2016, at a salary of \$116,000 annually and to authorize an annual housing allowance of \$13,000. The motion carried unanimously.

4. Eastern Idaho Technical College – Real Property

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Atchley): That the Board finds the property in question, located at Eastern Idaho Technical College, is not surplus property at the current time. The Board will monitor the ongoing work of the Community College Citizen Study Panel regarding the potential future of the campus as a new community college site. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Westerberg provided some background on the item that in 2013 there was a request by EITCs former president for approval to dispose of the referenced property. The Board approved that request, but no further action was ever taken on the property. There has recently been a request by a developer to buy that property. Mr. Westerberg pointed out there have been significant changes since 2013 to the area, and for the Board to consider how disposal of the property could positively or negatively impact the community's efforts to establish a community college district. Also that the property lies within a significant area of the cities of Ammon and Idaho Falls' *Connecting Our Community* regional master plan.

PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

1. Master Teacher Premium Framework

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Clark): To approve the Master Teacher Premium Plan as outlined in Attachment 3, including the standards and characteristics specified in Attachment 4. The motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Tracie Bent, Chief Planning and Policy Officer from the Board Office, and Mr. Mark Jones, Chairman of the Master Teacher Premium Committee, presented the recap of the work of the Master Teacher Premium Committee. Mr. Jones remarked the committee looked at three areas in developing the plan template which included evaluation, student achievement, or a portfolio where teachers show their master teacher capabilities. The committee felt the guiding principles they looked at were

thorough and helped the committee arrive at most appropriate approach for the master teacher premium criteria; that it was the most fair and logical system to use which is for teachers to use a portfolio system.

Mr. Jones described the portfolio which teachers must submit, pointing out it is provided in detail on Tab 1, page 9 of the Board agenda materials. The committee agreed on five areas as the main platform to show what a master teacher is which included: leadership, professional collaboration and partnerships, students and learning environment, content/instruction/assessment, and professional growth. Within those areas are eight characteristics that were developed which outline what the characteristics look like. Mr. Jones reviewed the non-negotiable and negotiable types of terms of how master teacher determinations are made. Non-negotiable items are the standards and characteristics; the negotiable items are how the teacher shows how they meet those standards and characteristics. He pointed out the structure provides a considerable amount of latitude for teachers to demonstrate their own expertise and master level abilities.

Dr. Clark commented on the work of the committee and how long and detailed the process was and that they have arrived at a model which will be modeled. She felt the result exceeds what they hoped to accomplish with the committee; they feel it is a very sound proposal which passes muster of teachers, administrators, and others. She also pointed out this is a good starting point or platform and it will be reviewed and adjusted as they move forward.

Ms. Atchley expressed concern about ensuring teachers being evaluated similarly across the state. Mr. Jones responded that when the portfolios are submitted to the peer group for evaluation, the evaluators don't know who they are evaluating. Ms. Bent clarified further that the legislation which passed did include language that would allow school districts to develop their own plans for how teachers show they are in fact master teachers. Those plans do need to come before the Board for approval and must be comparable to what has been developed. She explained the plans at the district level will have a slightly different review process.

Dr. Hill asked where the reviewers will come from. Mr. Jones responded they envision a mostly peer group, which would also include administrators, and volunteers. They envisioned an application process where there would be costs associated whereby a stipend would be paid to the reviewers. A budget would need to be developed and approved by the legislature. Training for those individuals would also be established.

2. Accountability Oversight Committee - Appointments

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Goesling): To approve the appointment of Roger Stewart to the Accountability Oversight Committee for a term of 2 years commencing immediately and ending on June 30, 2018. The motion carried unanimously.

AND

M/S (Critchfield/Clark): To approve the appointment of Julian Duffey to the Accountability Oversight Committee for a term of 2 years commencing immediately and ending on June 30, 2018. The motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Critchfield indicated the committee currently has two vacancies for at-large members. The committee is recommending that Roger Stewart and Julian Duffey be appointed for two-year terms. Julian Duffey would serve as the at-large member with special education experience. Resumes for both individuals were included in the agenda materials.

3. Board Policy I.Q., Accountability Oversight Committee – First Reading

BOARD ACTION

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

Ms. Bent clarified that in order to maintain consistency of leadership on the committee, if the two existing at-large committee members do not want to serve as chair, the proposed changes would provide the flexibility of selecting the chairperson from all of the existing committee members rather than only the at-large positions.

4. Board Self-Evaluation Update

Ms. Bent provided a summary of the Boards self-evaluations she received. She pointed out the evaluation had more focus on policy issues and the feedback indicated too much focus in that direction, so it will be scaled back for the future. Overall the performance was considered *adequate* or *very good*. Areas of improvement that showed consensus indicated Board members would like more discussion on the topics during the meetings and better management of the presentations. Summarizing, Board members felt the information from institutions or agencies was important but needed to lead to discussion, rather than just a presentation.

Comments were mixed on whether there was too much or too little material provided in Board materials for informational purposes. Ms. Bent clarified that the cover page is intended to have enough information for Board members to be able to make an informed decision, and the attachments are intended as backup. She pointed out that part of the material volume is a result of required materials that must be included as part of the official record.

Another recommendation was to have a better understanding of the agencies governed by the Board. Staff responded more detail would be provided so Board members

understand why the agencies are part of the system and why they are governed by the Board. An explanation on how career technical education (CTE) funding works was specifically requested as well. Staff would provide that information to the Board. One area universally mentioned was general governance of the system. Staff indicated they would inquire with NASBE or AGB for additional information or a Board work session on that area.

Also universally noted was progress on strategic priorities, specifically the 60% goal. Staff felt better work could be done to connect the strategic plans so there is a fluid connection on how those plans and the performance measures work together. There was a suggestion to incorporate more research data Board staff is working on. For instance, looking at what impact was achieved by the requirements and how those specific areas had or did not have the impact anticipated. One suggestion was for data to become a standing item. Staff indicated they will look at more data as part of the work session going forward and will have a stronger data piece and specific topics targeted at each meeting.

Ms. Bent pointed out related to institution annual reports, they would be trying a new process at the next Board meeting where the annual reports are incorporated into the campus tours.

Dr. Goesling suggested looking at programs the Board has approved a few years out – to see if they are working or not and if the intended expectations or achievements were being met. Ms. Bent indicated that is part of the strategic planning – to determine what kind of impact something has had and whether it needs adjusted. Ms. Critchfield felt that type of “auditing” might be something to put back on the institutions; to include it in the annual report. Dr. Hill felt the suggestion was important and that IRSA and Dr. Chris Mathias from the Board office are developing some sort of review mechanism. Mr. Westerberg felt that type of follow-up should remain with the germane committees.

5. Presidential Evaluation Process Debrief

Related to this year’s evaluation process and the changes to the process from previous years, Board members felt it was valuable, but results of the informal conversations with presidents was varied. Mr. Soltman recommended asking presidents if they found the conversations valuable and to request their feedback. Dr. Hill recommended informal reviews be six months off cycle from evaluations. Mr. Westerberg felt the evaluation process was better than in the past. Ms. Critchfield restated the six month reviews would give presidents a chance to touch base on goals and so forth. Mr. Freeman asked if the informal evaluations should be a formative evaluation with the whole Board or with the three of the Executive Committee. The response was for the Executive Committee. Dr. Clark remarked that the Board did speak over the last couple of days about other instruments they would like to see and will need to have that conversation regarding framework. Mr. Freeman responded he and staff would be working on it. Mr. Freeman asked about developing a schedule for 360 style evaluations (3-5 years in between). Ms. Bent reminded the Board the 360 review is very intensive. The Board

recommended only one 360 evaluation per year; a consultant would need to be used to facilitate the work. After discussion on process, the consensus was to look at best practices (like from the Association of Governing Boards) and how to proceed with presidents.

Ms. Bent asked related to the materials provided to the Board in addition to the presidents' self-evaluations, if they wanted something more or different. One question was whether to fact check what is in the president self-evaluations. Board response suggested it was not necessary.

OTHER BUSINESS

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

M/S (Westerberg/Goesling): To adjourn the meeting at 2:13 p.m. The motion carried unanimously.