























































































































































































































**BUSINESS AFFAIRS AND HUMAN RESOURCES**  
**OCTOBER 20, 2016**

---

The institutions' expenditures fall into the following standard functional categories:

**Expenditure Categories:**

Instruction – expenses for all activities that are part of an institution's instruction program (credit and noncredit courses; academic, vocational, and technical instruction; remedial and tutorial instruction; etc.)

Research – all expenses for individual and/or project research as well as that of institutes and research centers

Public Service -- expenses for activities established primarily to provide non-instructional services beneficial to individuals and groups external to the institution (e.g. conferences, institutes, radio and television, consulting, museums, etc.)

Library – expenses for retention, preservation, and display of educational materials and organized activities that directly support the operation of a catalogued or otherwise classified collection

Student Services – expenses incurred for offices of admissions, registrar and financial aid, student activities, cultural events, student newspapers, intramural athletics, student organizations, etc.

Physical Plant – all expenses for the administration, supervision, operation, maintenance, preservation, and protection of the institution's physical plant.

Institutional Support – expenses for central, executive-level activities concerned with management and long-range planning for the entire institution, such as planning and programming operations and legal services; fiscal operations; activities concerned with community and alumni relations, including development and fund raising; etc.

Academic Support – expenses incurred to provide support services for the institution's primary missions: instruction, research, and public service (includes academic administration, galleries, A-V services, etc.)

Athletics – expenses for intercollegiate sports programs are a separately budgeted auxiliary enterprise

Auxiliary Enterprises – an enterprise which exists to furnish goods or services to students, faculty, staff, other institutional departments, or incidentally to the general public, and charges a fee directly related to, although not necessarily equal to, the cost of the goods or services. The distinguishing characteristic of an auxiliary enterprise is that it is managed to operate as a self-supporting activity. Examples include residence halls, food services, student unions, bookstores, copy centers, health centers, etc.

Scholarships/Fellowships – includes expenses for scholarships and fellowships (from restricted or unrestricted funds) in the form of grants to students.

Federal Student Financial Aid – funds passed through to students

Other – institution specific unique budgeted expenditures

**BUSINESS AFFAIRS AND HUMAN RESOURCES**  
**OCTOBER 20, 2016**

---

**IMPACT**

The attached worksheets provide a high level overview of the institutions' sources of funding and expenditures based on the standard categories listed above. The trend analysis shows how the allocation of budgeted revenues and expenditures has changed since fiscal year 2010 excluding any mid-year adjustments (e.g. holdbacks).

**ATTACHMENTS**

Attachment 1 – Aggregate Trend Report	Page 5
Attachment 2 – Aggregate Annual Report	Page 6
Attachment 3 – Boise State University Trend Report	Page 7
Attachment 4 – Boise State Annual Report	Page 8
Attachment 5 – Idaho State University Trend Report	Page 9
Attachment 6 – Idaho State University Annual Report	Page 10
Attachment 7 – University of Idaho Trend Report	Page 11
Attachment 8 – University of Idaho Annual Report	Page 12
Attachment 9 – Lewis-Clark State College Trend Report	Page 13
Attachment 10 – Lewis-Clark State College Annual Report	Page 14

**STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Starting in FY 2013, federal student aid was disaggregated from Federal Grants & Contracts on the revenue side and from Scholarships/Fellowships on the expense side since federal aid only passes through the institution to the eligible students.

Institution staff will be available to answer questions from the Board.

**BOARD ACTION**

This item is for informational purposes only. Any action will be at the Board's discretion.

**THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK**

**BUSINESS AFFAIRS AND HUMAN RESOURCES**  
**OCTOBER 20, 2016**

---

**SUBJECT**

Idaho State Board of Education Policy V.S. – First Reading

**REFERENCE**

February 2006	Board approved the second reading of amendment to Board policy V.S. (establishing .67 as payback ratio for computed rolling-three year average of weighted credit hour delivery costs)
August 2016	Board approved 2017 Line Item initiative to establish an Outcomes-Based Funding model in place of the Enrollment Workload Adjustment method

**APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY**

Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies & Procedures, Section V.S.

**BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION**

The Idaho State Board of Education (Board) is seeking approval from the Governor and Legislature to establish a phased, multi-year plan to replace the Enrollment Workload Adjustment (EWA) process with an Outcomes-Based Funding (OBF) approach. The EWA process, in theory, enabled institutions to recover a portion of the costs for delivery of eligible credit hours and was designed to adjust for changes in enrollment levels. The EWA procedure was not embedded in Idaho statute, and state appropriations in response to annual EWA requests from the Board and institutions were inconstant, especially during economic downturns. The OBF initiative would provide additional funds to higher education institutions based on students' successful completion of their programs of study and award of certificates and degrees. The requested funding for year one (FY2018) of the OBF initiative is for a total of \$11M in ongoing dollars, with \$10M in new appropriated funding and \$1M reallocated from the current base budgets of the institutions.

**IMPACT**

The OBF initiative is the Board's top priority Line Item request for FY2018. As part of this effort, the Board has decided not to seek EWA funding for FY2018 and to discontinue its EWA approach. The proposed amendment will remove the portions of the funding allocation policy which pertained to the EWA process.

**ATTACHMENTS**

Attachment 1: Amendment to Board Policy Section V.S. – First Reading Page 3

**STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

The proposed amendment to Board policy V.S. removing the EWA methodology will facilitate Board efforts to align its policy with the Outcomes Based Funding approach. It is anticipated that Board Policy V.S. will be revised to incorporate the basic procedures pertaining to OBF if/when the funding approach is approved by the Governor and Legislature. Staff recommends approval.

**BUSINESS AFFAIRS AND HUMAN RESOURCES**  
**OCTOBER 20, 2016**

---

**BOARD ACTION**

I move to approve the first reading the proposed amendment to Board Policy Section V. S. "Allocation of Lump Sum Appropriation" as provided in Attachment 1.

Moved by \_\_\_\_\_ Seconded by \_\_\_\_\_ Carried Yes \_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_

**BUSINESS AFFAIRS AND HUMAN RESOURCES**  
**OCTOBER 20, 2016**

---

**IDAHO NATIONAL LABORATORY**

**SUBJECT**

Update on Idaho State Board of Education (Board)-sponsored Idaho National Laboratory (INL) facility expansion project

**REFERENCE**

May 2016	Board received initial overview briefing on proposed project from INL Program Manager.
June 2016	Board members toured potential construction sites for new facilities on properties adjacent to INL operations. Board assigned two of its members to serve on a project feasibility/coordination team.
August 2016	Board approved request to sponsor the Cybercore and Collaborative Computing Center (C3) facilities construction project, subject to subsequent approval of plans for financing and construction of the project through the Idaho State Building Authority.
September 2016	Board approved concurrent resolution for 2017 Legislative session as a prerequisite to obtaining state bonding authority for the project.

**APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY**

Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies & Procedures, Section V.I. Real and Personal Property and Services

**BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION**

The Idaho National Laboratory (INL) proposes to expand, through new construction, its Cybercore and Collaborative Computing Center (C3) operations in Idaho Falls. The Cybercore and C3 programs are currently carried out in smaller facilities at the INL site, and additional space is needed to accommodate the increased demand for the programs carried out in the two facilities. The Cybercore supports a wide range of cyber security research projects. The C3 provides massive, high-speed computational capability to support regional and national research operations. The new facility construction would be financed through bonds issued by the Idaho State Building Authority (ISBA). The ISBA would also oversee construction of the facilities. The potential sites for the new Cybercore and C3 facilities include properties owned by the Board and the Idaho State University Foundation (Foundation), adjacent to existing INL research facilities.

Likely lease arrangements include a ground lease of the construction site property from the Board to the ISBA until such time as the bonds are paid off. In parallel, lease arrangements would be established for the ISBA to lease the new facilities to the Board, which would sub-lease the facilities to the INL. Rent from INL for the facilities will pass through the Board to ISBA until the bonds for the facilities are

**BUSINESS AFFAIRS AND HUMAN RESOURCES**  
**OCTOBER 20, 2016**

---

paid off, at which time all rent proceeds from INL would go to the Board and ISBA's role would be complete. The facility lease to INL would be triple net, with the lessee being responsible for all operational costs, utilities, applicable taxes, insurance, and maintenance. There would be no operational costs for the Board under the anticipated arrangements, and financing and project management responsibilities would be borne by ISBA, to suit Board interests.

The proposed use of the properties would help preserve the contiguity of a growing INL Idaho Research Campus. The proposed lease arrangements would parallel those currently used in the Board's lease of the Center for Advanced Energy Studies (CAES) facilities to the INL. The Board has agreed to be the state Sponsor for the project, a pre-requisite for using ISBA bonding authority. Board sponsorship is contingent upon selection of suitable sites for the two facilities (INL has initiated geophysical surveys of the potential sites), approval of the overall project by the U.S. Department of Energy; and approval by the ISBA of a bond financing plan. Bonding will also require Legislative action in the form of a concurrent resolution in the upcoming 2017 session. A concurrent resolution was approved by the Board in September 2016 as part of the Board's legislative initiatives package.

A Board member-chaired working group has been established to work with INL, ISBA, Idaho State University (ISU) and the ISU Foundation, as needed, to flesh out plans and prepare options for Board action. The Board's working group members and Board staff continue to receive weekly updates on the status of project planning and financing.

**IMPACT**

The proposed INL Cybercore and C3 project will expand the current scope of collaboration in joint research and educational activities between the INL and Idaho's research universities. The project will have a positive economic impact on the region and the state and will provide leadership for Idaho in two areas of critical importance to global competitiveness and national security. Following payment of debt for construction, lease payments from INL would redound to the Board and would be available to support additional strategic goals and objectives. No institution or agency dollars would be needed to carry out the two construction projects (each facility estimated at approximately \$40 to \$50 Million).

**ATTACHMENTS**

Attachment 1 – INL information update on Cybercore and C3 project	Page 5
Attachment 2 – Background info on Idaho State Building Authority	Page 7

**STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

At the time of writing of this agenda item, a preferred site has been identified for the C3 on property currently owned by the State Board of Education. Two potential sites have been identified for the Cybercore facility—one located entirely on Board property and one located on property currently owned by the ISU Foundation. Both

**BUSINESS AFFAIRS AND HUMAN RESOURCES**  
**OCTOBER 20, 2016**

---

potential Cybercore sites are acceptable to INL: the site on Foundation properties may provide advantages in terms of pedestrian flow among facilities. The ISU Foundation parcel is subject to deed restrictions which, unless lifted, will preclude use of the Foundation property for Cybercore site. The Foundation is working with the property donors to lift the restrictions and is arranging for the appraisal of the property for sale as part of the overall property acquisition and construction budget. Geophysical surveys of the proposed sites are underway. A final proposal for the Cybercore and C3 sites will be presented to the Board for approval at the December Board meeting.

INL project managers are working to complete their proposals to the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) for a go-ahead for the project. The INL's goal for obtaining DOE approval of the project is approximately 160 days. Groundbreaking for the project would begin in August 2017. Substantial completion and beneficial occupancy would occur on October 2018.

INL and the Board Staff are also working closely with the Idaho State Building Authority to develop the lease plans and financial package for bonding of the projects. Discussions with Legislators, the Governor's Office, and other stakeholders continue.

Board Staff is optimistic that the project is moving forward on a timely basis, with aggressive efforts being made by all parties on multiple fronts to meet pre-approval requirements.

**BOARD ACTION**

This item is for informational purposes only. Any action will be at the Board's discretion.

**THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK**



**BUSINESS AFFAIRS AND HUMAN RESOURCES**  
**OCTOBER 20, 2016**

---

disciplines: Art Education, Art Foundations, Art History, Art Metals, Arts and Humanities, Ceramics, Drawing and Painting, Graphic Design, Illustration, Photography, Printmaking and Sculpture. In addition to the spaces for the arts disciplines, a large Visual Arts Center and World Museum will be included in the building.

The building will incorporate modern and innovative studio and instructional spaces, critique areas, classrooms, and gallery spaces to support the various disciplines. There will also be offices and formal and informal meeting spaces for faculty and students. The total gross square footage of the building is approximately 97,400 gross square feet (GSF). A program summary is included as Attachment 1.

This project is anticipated to bid in late December 2016. Construction will be completed in early spring 2019, with occupancy in August 2019.

**IMPACT**

Current estimates indicate a construction cost of \$34,806,780. Contingencies, architectural and engineering fees, commissioning, testing and other administrative and soft costs bring the estimated total project cost to \$42 million. This project will be brought back to the Board for financing approval prior to contract award.

Portions of the work, including the build-out of the fourth floor of the building and the second floor office areas adjacent to and above the gallery will be bid as additive alternates in an effort to assure a successful award within the budget. Even with the margin which additive alternates may provide, continuing volatility and inflation create risk for BSU. Accordingly, BSU has incorporated contingency funds into the estimated project cost should they be necessary to award the bid. In the event that bid and alternate results come in below estimates, BSU may proceed with the purchase and installation of furniture, fixtures and equipment for this project within the budget authorized by the Board.

Project funding leverages the strategic facility fee by utilizing several additional funding sources including \$5 million in Permanent Building Fund (PBF) "Set A" funding, cash donations and pledges and university reserves.

The projected funding package is as follows:

Set A, PBFA funds (FY2016 and FY2017):	\$ 5,000,000
Private and institutional funds:	\$ 5,000,000
Strategic Facilities Fees Bonds:	<u>\$ 32,000,000</u>
Total	\$ 42,000,000

**BUSINESS AFFAIRS AND HUMAN RESOURCES  
OCTOBER 20, 2016**

---

This project will be procured through the Construction Manager at Risk (CMR) process through DPW and/or the Idaho Division of Purchasing standard process(es) as appropriate.

**ATTACHMENTS**

Attachment 1 – Program Summary	Page 5
Attachment 2 – Project Budget	Page 6
Attachment 3 – Capital Project Tracking Sheet	Page 7

**STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Board policy V.K. requires that, when an institution will finance all or a portion of a major project through issuance of debt, the institution must obtain Board approval for the financing plan subsequent to the meeting at which construction is approved. BSU intends to issue bonds to finance a portion of this building and will seek Board approval at the December 2016 meeting to issue those bonds prior to starting construction. Staff recommends approval of BSU's request to proceed with construction.

**BOARD ACTION**

I move to approve the request by Boise State University to proceed with construction of a new Fine Arts Building for a total cost not to exceed \$42,000,000, subject to the Board's subsequent approval of a debt financing plan for this project.

Moved by \_\_\_\_\_ Seconded by \_\_\_\_\_ Carried Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

**THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK**

**BUSINESS AFFAIRS AND HUMAN RESOURCES**  
**OCTOBER 20, 2016**

---

**IDAHO STATE UNIVERSITY**

**SUBJECT**

Approval of Idaho State University (ISU) Purchasing Policy

**REFERENCE**

June 2010	Idaho State Board of Education (Board) approved Boise State University (BSU) Purchasing Policy
June 2016	Board approved revision to BSU Purchasing Policy, incorporating updates to reflect 2016 updates to Chapter 92, Title 67, Idaho Code

**APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY**

Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies & Procedures, Section V.I. Section 67-9225, Idaho Code (Effective July 1, 2016)

**BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION**

Section 67-9225, Idaho Code provides that state institutions of higher education, with Board approval, may establish policies and procedures for procuring property that is substantially consistent to those required of other state agencies. ISU requests Board permission to implement a purchasing policy which mirrors the policy already in effect at BSU. BSU's purchasing policy, which served as the model for ISU's proposed policy, was approved by the Board in June 2010 and updated in June 2016.

**IMPACT**

Approval of the proposed policy will exempt ISU from provisions of the Chapter 92, Title 67, Idaho Code — State Procurement Act. While increasing ISU's autonomy, the university would still follow purchasing policy and procedures that are consistent with those applicable to other state agencies. Approval of ISU's proposed purchasing policy will benefit from added in-house decision-making ability on matters of purchasing, which will reduce turn-around time for procuring goods and services.

**ATTACHMENTS**

Attachment 1 – ISU Purchasing Policy

Page 3

**STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Idaho code (67-9225—Procurement by State Institutions of Higher Education), permits the Board to approve separate purchasing policies by institutions, as long as those policies are substantially consistent with procurement policies set forth under Chapter 92, Title 67, Idaho Code. Upon Board approval of ISU's proposed policy, the university would no longer be subject to the provisions of this section of code, with the exception of the requirement that "*when the state enters into an open contract, no state institution of higher education shall fail to use such contract;*

**BUSINESS AFFAIRS AND HUMAN RESOURCES**  
**OCTOBER 20, 2016**

---

*provided however, that if the property to be acquired may be procured at equal or less expense to the institution from a vendor that is not party to the open contract, then the institution may, at the institution's discretion, procure the property from the nonparty vendor.”* ISU’s proposed purchasing policy is functionally identical to BSU’s Board-approved policy, and is substantially consistent with the requirements for procuring property set forth in Chapter 92, Title 67, Idaho Code. It also contains internal safeguards to protect against possible abuse of the open contract exception in the italicized Code excerpt above. Staff recommends approval.

**BOARD ACTION**

I move to approve the request by Idaho State University to adopt the new purchasing policy as detailed in Attachment 1 which exempts Idaho State University from Chapter 92, Title 67, Idaho Code – State Procurement Act.

Moved by \_\_\_\_\_ Seconded by \_\_\_\_\_ Carried Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

**BUSINESS AFFAIRS AND HUMAN RESOURCES**  
**OCTOBER 20, 2016**

---

**LEWIS-CLARK STATE COLLEGE**

**SUBJECT**

Capital Project financing plan and construction authorization for the Spalding Hall renovation project.

**REFERENCE**

June 2016 Board approved initiation of design and planning phase for Spalding Hall upgrade and approved the associated revision of the College's six-year capital plan

**APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY**

Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies & Procedures, Section V.K.1 and V.K.3.b.

**BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION**

Lewis-Clark State College (LCSC) is requesting State Board of Education (Board) approval of the budget and financing plan and approval to begin construction for the Spalding Hall renovation project. Spalding Hall is a three-story above ground masonry building, with basement, constructed in 1924. The building is named after pioneer educator Eliza Hart Spalding, who, with her husband, Henry, established the famous mission school at Lapwai for the Nez Perce tribe. Originally a women's dormitory, it was later converted into faculty offices in 1966. The facility was approved for re-roofing as part of LCSC's FY2014 Permanent Building Fund (BPF) request. The interior rooms of the building are in dilapidated condition. The building is approximately 24,000 sq. feet and has a replacement value of about \$6.6M and is of historical significance to LCSC and the Lewiston community.

The renovation will include new plumbing, electrical, and HVAC systems to bring the building up to modern standards. A new fire suppression system will be installed and asbestos will be removed throughout the building. The new fire suppression system will extend to Clark Hall, the dormitory wing connected to the south side of Spalding Hall. The resulting construction will include a complete removal of outdated and damaged materials and some reconfiguration of existing walls to provide seven additional offices (58 total). New carpet, ceilings and doors will refresh the office interiors. New electrical systems will include LED lighting with dual switches and occupancy sensors. New HVAC systems will include digital controls with individualized climate control for each office. The result will be a safe, modernized building with improved ADA accessibility and energy efficiency.

The Permanent Building Fund Advisory Council (PBFAC) recommended an FY2016 alteration and repair project of \$1,000,000 (\$350K PBF, \$650K agency) to the legislature during the 2015 session, and a follow-on FY2017 project was recommended in the 2016 session for an additional \$800,000 (\$500K PBF, \$300K agency). Both projects were approved by the legislature. As the feasibility study

**BUSINESS AFFAIRS AND HUMAN RESOURCES**  
**OCTOBER 20, 2016**

---

was completed, it became evident that, in order to complete the asbestos abatement and bring the building up to electrical and fire code, the cost of the project had escalated into a major capital project with an estimated cost of \$4,000,000 plus \$260,000 to extend the fire suppression system to the attached residence hall (Clark Hall). Upon that discovery, the Division of Public Works (DPW) recommended LCSC either divide the project into a number of phased construction projects over multiple years, or develop a funding plan to complete the building upgrades in one integrated project. Working with DPW, the College has determined that renovation of the entire building as a single project is most cost-effective and least disruptive to campus operations. After detailed design, the total project cost, including Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment (FFE) and extension of the fire suppression system to Clark Hall, is estimated to be \$4.54 million.

Approval of this financing plan and construction will allow the college to complete the project by combining the funds dedicated from the PBFAC and appropriated reserves from LCSC.

**IMPACT**

Total construction costs of \$4.2 million for the expanded project will be covered with \$850,000 from previous PBFAC allocations and \$3,350,000 from institutional reserves. LCSC is anticipating furniture, fixtures and equipment (FFE) and faculty relocation costs during construction to be an additional \$340,000.

Total Project:		Estimated Budget	
Funding:		Construction	\$ 3,145,000
State	\$ 850,000	Const. Cont. (13.5%)	424,575
Federal (Grant)	0	Design/ Consultant Fees	260,425
LCSC	3,690,000	Other	360,000
		FFE & Relocation Costs	340,000
		Project Contingency	10,000
Total	\$ <u>4,540,000</u>		\$ <u>4,540,000</u>

**ATTACHMENTS**

Attachment 1 – Capital Project Tracking Sheet	Page 5
Attachment 2 – Floor Plan Drawings	Page 7
Attachment 3 – Detailed Construction Cost Estimates	Page 11

**STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

The PBFAC considered a cost-comparison analysis of renovating this facility versus demolishing the facility and replacing it with a new structure. It was determined that it was more cost-effective to remodel the facility rather than to replicate its functions in a new building. The design team verified that the upgraded building will have the capability to be reconfigured in future years, if necessary, to meet changing functional needs. Carrying out the project as a unified construction

**BUSINESS AFFAIRS AND HUMAN RESOURCES**  
**OCTOBER 20, 2016**

---

effort is preferable to breaking up the projected into smaller projects with a much larger total cost and greater disruption to campus users and operations. The financing approach and proposed construction plans will restore this historically-significant landmark and functional workhorse on the LCSC campus to a safe and efficient facility. Staff recommends approval.

**BOARD ACTION**

I move to approve the request from Lewis-Clark State College to execute the financing plan and implement the construction phase of the Spalding Hall renovation project as described in the materials provided herein, and to authorize the College to execute all necessary and requisite consulting contracts to bid, award, and complete the construction phase of the project for an amount not to exceed \$4,540,000.

Moved by \_\_\_\_\_ Seconded by \_\_\_\_\_ Carried Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

**THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK**

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH, AND STUDENT AFFAIRS  
OCTOBER 20, 2016**

---

<b>TAB</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>ACTION</b>
1	<b>BOARD POLICY III.L. CONTINUING EDUCATION AND CREDIT FOR PRIOR EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING – FIRST READING</b>	Motion to Approve
2	<b>BOARD POLICY III.Z. PLANNING AND DELIVERY OF POSTSECONDARY PROGRAMS AND COURSES – FIRST READING</b>	Motion to Approve
3	<b>BOARD POLICY III.O. COURSE PLACEMENT– SECOND READING</b>	Motion to Approve
4	<b>DUAL CREDIT RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	Information Item

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH AND STUDENT AFFAIRS**  
**OCTOBER 20, 2016**

---

**SUBJECT**

Board Policy III.L, Continuing Education and Credit for Prior Learning – First Reading

**REFERENCE**

June 2013            The Board received recommendation from the Educational Attainment Task Force including recommendations for a statewide portfolio approval process for credit for prior learning.

December 2013      The Board approved changes to Board Policy III.L.

**APPLICABLE STATUTES, RULE OR POLICY**

Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies & Procedures, Section III.L, Continuing Education and Credit for Prior Learning

**BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION**

The Idaho State Board of Education (Board) has been committed to providing Idahoans the opportunity to earn post-secondary credit(s) through the demonstration of knowledge. This process is generally called the assessment of prior learning, or prior learning assessment (PLA). PLAs provide a bridge for student learning acquired outside the traditional college setting. Prior learning should be evaluated upon the student's request and be eligible for credit through a PLA if it is demonstrated by successfully passing an appropriately rigorous assessment.

Research shows that students who earn credit through PLAs are more likely to persist, take more courses over a longer period of time, and graduate with credentials and degrees. For these reasons, PLAs are essential to achieving the State Board's goal that 60% of 25-34 year olds hold a certificate or degree by 2020.

At the June 2013 Board meeting the Workforce Development Council's Educational Attainment Task Force made three recommendations to the Board for reaching the Board's educational attainment goal. One of these recommendations was that the Board establish a statewide portfolio approval process for awarding credits based on prior learning and experience. The recommendation was forwarded to Board staff for further development.

In early 2014, the Board contracted with the Council for Adult and Experiential Learning (CAEL) to work with its institutions to strengthen the awareness of PLA on the campuses, determine the scope and nature of PLA services best suited to each institution, and identify opportunities for partnerships between and among institutions. As a national leader in the promotion of adult and experiential learning, CAEL was and remains well positioned to assist our institutions. Their final report is available upon request to the Board office.

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH AND STUDENT AFFAIRS  
OCTOBER 20, 2016**

---

In its final report, CAEL acknowledged that over the course of the project:

“several institutions made specific changes that expanded PLA options for students: the provision of reliable challenge exams for high volume departments; intentional partnerships between academic affairs and student services to smooth the PLA path for students; the revision of portfolio development courses tailored to academic departments; proactive communications and marketing tools to inform students about PLA; a focus on implementing PLA for specific populations such as veterans and programs such as health care; and improving the quality and consistent use of course learning outcomes to guide assessment.”

The final report also noted disparateness in PLA efforts across the state noting that among institutions there is:

“a considerable range of approaches to PLA, including different credit limits and multiple ways that students could use PLA to accelerate their path to degree completion.... [Institutions] revealed different interpretations of accreditation guidelines as well as incomplete information about the nature of PLA methods; they expressed interest in pursuing additional information about lesser known methods...to determine the potential for these methods on their campuses.... [I]nstitutions discussed the challenges of transferability of PLA and the advantages of moving toward clearer articulation agreements and curriculum crosswalks.”

The proposed changes to policy aim to provide a solid floor for Board expectations regarding the use of PLAs and granting of credit for prior learning in Idaho.

**IMPACT**

The proposed amendments to Board Policy III.L will establish modernized expectations for how and when PLAs are to be administered and when credit may be awarded.

**ATTACHMENTS**

Attachment 1 – Board Policy III.L – First Reading	Page 5
Attachment 2 – CAEL’s Final Report	Page 11

**STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

The use of PLAs and granting of credit is critical to achieving the Board’s 60% Goal. Current PLA efforts on the campuses are insufficiently employed by students or aspiring students. As a result, these opportunities are not marketed heavily which further leads to less usage. The proposed changes aim to stop this devolution of PLA use and create a new set of modern expectations for the usage of PLA and granting of credit.

Board staff recommends approval.

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH AND STUDENT AFFAIRS  
OCTOBER 20, 2016**

---

**BOARD ACTION**

I move to approve the first reading of amendments to Board Policy III.L, Continuing Education and Credit for Prior Learning as provided in Attachment 1.

Moved by \_\_\_\_\_ Seconded by \_\_\_\_\_ Carried Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH, AND STUDENT AFFAIRS**  
**OCTOBER 20, 2016**

---

**SUBJECT**

Proposed Amendments to Board Policy III.Z, Planning and Delivery of Postsecondary Programs and Courses – First Reading

**REFERENCE**

April 2011	Board approved the first reading of the proposed amendments to Board Policy III.Z, Planning and Delivery of Postsecondary Programs to include the inclusion of statewide program responsibilities into policy.
June 2011	Board approved the second reading of the proposed amendments to Board Policy III.Z. Planning and Delivery of Academic Programs and Courses as amended.
June 19, 2013	The Board was presented with proposed corrections to institutions' statewide program responsibilities.
August 15, 2013	The Board approved the first reading of the proposed amendments to Board Policy III.Z, Planning and Delivery of Postsecondary Programs and Courses to include updating institutions statewide responsibilities.
December 2013	The Board approved the second reading of Board Policy III.Z.
June 18, 2015	The Board approved the first reading of Board Policy III.Z.
August 13, 2015	The Board approved the second reading of Board Policy III.Z.

**APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY**

Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies and Procedures, Section III.Z, Planning and Delivery of Postsecondary Programs and Courses.  
Section 33-113, Idaho Code, Limits of Instruction.

**BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION**

Board Policy III.Z, provides “the purpose of the policy is to ensure Idaho’s public postsecondary institutions meet the educational and workforce needs of the state through academic planning, alignment of programs and courses, and collaboration and coordination.” On February 4, 2016, the Board’s Instruction, Research, and Student Affairs (IRSA) charged the Council on Academic Affairs and Programs (CAAP) to review Board Policy III.Z to determine if any amendments were necessary to the statewide program responsibilities section of policy. CAAP identified that several program names and degree titles needed to be updated within the Statewide Program Responsibility chart in Board Policy III.Z. CAAP also discussed the provision under subsection 2.b.i, which provides that the Board reviews the statewide program list for alignment every two years. CAAP and Board staff determined that the term “alignment” was not clear and









**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH AND STUDENT AFFAIRS**  
**OCTOBER 20, 2016**

---

5. Standardizing more meaningful intake processes and orientations for both post-secondary faculty and the approved high school faculty.
6. Standardizing the site visit process by which high school DC teachers are evaluated. Include a requirement that building administrators be notified of site visits prior to the classroom visit.
7. Identifying each institution's minimum requirements for an instructor to teach DC sorted by institution and discipline, and post this information in a single location.
8. Creating a standard template regarding compensation processes and amounts for DC teachers for use by the districts and institutions.
9. Beyond orientations, providing a state sponsored one or two day statewide institute for DC instructors to learn more about guidelines, policy requirements and changes, and other relevant matters.
10. Identifying who approves applicants to teach DC courses, how applicants are approved, and post this information in a single location.
11. Gathering from the institutions their hiring practices for DC instructors and find a place to centralize this information.
12. The Board Office should lead the administration of the Dual Credit enrollment participant survey.

**IMPACT**

The adoption and implementation of these recommendations offers an opportunity to provide consistency and transparency of processes; generate greater efficiencies, particularly as it relates to the streamlining and centralization of certain administrative functions; has the potential to create greater access for many rural students; and would create more accessible pathways for current (particularly rural) high school teachers to earn the necessary credentials to teach dual credit courses in their high schools.

**ATTACHMENTS**

Attachment 1 – Dual Credit Work Group Recommendations

Page 3

**STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

At this time, these recommendations are being brought forward for informational purposes and discussion. It is the intention of the IRSA to bring the recommendations back for approval at the December 2016 Board meeting.

**BOARD ACTION**

This item is for informational purposes only. Any action will be at the Board's discretion.