



AGENDA

**October 19-20, 2016
Lewis-Clark State College
Williams Conference Center
(4th Street and 9th Avenue)
Lewiston, Idaho**

Wednesday, October 19th, 2016, 10:00 am

BOARDWORK

1. Agenda Review / Approval
2. Minutes Review / Approval
3. Rolling Calendar

PLANNING, POLICY & GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

1. Lewis-Clark State College Annual Progress Report and Tour

WORK SESSION

Instruction, Research, & Student Affairs

- A. NWCCU Discussion

Planning, Policy & Governmental Affairs

- B. Indian Education Committee – Tribal Governance Structure Discussion
- C. Performance Reporting
 - Performance Measure Reports
 - Remediation Report
 - Career Technical Teachers Data
 - Data Dashboard

Thursday, October 20th, 2016, 8:00 am

OPEN FORUM

CONSENT AGENDA

BAHR Finance

1. Idaho State University - Multi-Year Contract – SpeedConnect

2. University of Idaho - License Agreement – Sprint Infrastructure – Operation and Maintenance of Theophilus Tower
3. University of Idaho - License Agreement – Sprint Infrastructure– Operation and Maintenance of UI “I” Water Tank
4. University of Idaho - Donation to Coeur d’Alene Center “Fiber Line”

PPGA

5. Indian Education Committee Appointments
6. State Rehabilitation Council Appointments
7. President Approved Alcohol Permits

SDE

8. 2015-2016 AdvanceED Accreditation Report
9. Cassia County School District - Albion Elementary School – Hardship Status

PLANNING, POLICY & GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

2. Idaho Division of Vocational Rehabilitation Annual Progress Report
3. STEM Action Center Update
4. Idaho Department of Labor – Workforce Projections Report
5. Workforce Development Council – Annual Report
6. Board Policy - I.E., Executive Officers – Second Reading
7. Temporary Rule – IDAPA 08.02.01 – Data Collection
8. Educator Preparation Programs – Definition – Low Performing

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

1. Superintendent’s Update
 - FY2018 Public School Budget Request
 - Idaho Reading Indicator Request for Proposal
2. Temporary Rule – IDAPA 08.02.02.004.07 – Alternate Assessment Achievement Standards

BUSINESS AFFAIRS & HUMAN RESOURCES

Section I – Human Resources

1. Board Policy - Section II.F. – Policies Regarding Non-classified Employees, Vehicle Insurance – Second Reading
2. Board Policy – Section II.F. Policies Regarding Non-classified Employees, Vacation Accrual – First Reading

Section II – Finance

1. FY 2017 Sources and Uses Of Funds
2. Board Policy - Section V.S. – Allocation of Lump Sum Appropriation – First Reading
3. Idaho National Laboratory - Board Sponsorship of Cybercore & Collaborative Computing Projects – Update
4. Boise State University - Capital Project Construction Phase – Fine Arts Building
5. Idaho State University - Purchasing Policy

6. Lewis-Clark State College - Capital Project Financing Plan and Construction Phase – Spalding Hall Renovation

INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH & STUDENT AFFAIRS

1. Board Policy III.L. Continuing Education and Credit for Prior Experiential Learning – First Reading
2. Board Policy III.Z. Planning and Delivery of Postsecondary Programs and Courses – First Reading
3. Board Policy III.O. Course Placement – Second Reading
4. Dual Credit Recommendations

If auxiliary aids or services are needed for individuals with disabilities, or if you wish to speak during the Open Forum, please contact the Board office at 334-2270 no later than two days before the meeting. While the Board attempts to address items in the listed order, some items may be addressed by the Board prior to or after the order listed.

**BOARDWORK
OCTOBER 20, 2016**

1. Agenda Approval

Changes or additions to the agenda

2. Minutes Approval

BOARD ACTION

I move to approve the minutes from the August 10-11, 2016 regular Board meeting and the September 23, 2016 special Board meeting, as submitted.

3. Rolling Calendar

BOARD ACTION

I move to set October 18-19, 2017 as the date and Lewis-Clark State College as the location for the October 2017 regularly scheduled Board meeting and to amend the date for the April 2017 Regular Board meeting to April 19-20, 2017, the June 2017 Regular Board meeting to 14-15, 2017 and the August 2017 Regular Board meeting to August 9-10, 2017.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

BOARDWORK
OCTOBER 20, 2016



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

DRAFT MINUTES
IDAHO STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

August 10-11, 2016
Idaho State University
Pond Student Union Building
Salmon River Suite
1065 South Cesar Chavez Avenue
Pocatello, Idaho

The Board met for its regularly scheduled meeting on August 10-11, 2016 at Idaho State University in Pocatello, Idaho. Board President Emma Atchley called the meeting to order at 10:00 am and introduced new Board member Andrew Scoggin, along with Dr. Richard (Rick) MacLennan as the new president of North Idaho College. Idaho State University President Dr. Art Vailas welcomed the Board to Pocatello and gave a warm welcome to the Board, staff, and other guests.

Present:

Emma Atchley, President
Linda Clark, Vice President
Debbie Critchfield, Secretary
Don Soltman

Richard Westerberg
Dave Hill
Andy Scoggin

Absent:

Sherri Ybarra, State Superintendent (absent Wednesday)

BOARDWORK

1. Agenda Review / Approval

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Clark/Westerberg): To approve the agenda as printed. The motion carried unanimously.

2. Minutes Review / Approval

BOARDWORK
OCTOBER 20, 2016

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Clark/Soltman): To approve the minutes from the June 2, 21016 special Board meeting and the June 15-16, 2016 regular Board meeting, as submitted. The motion carried unanimously.

3. Rolling Calendar

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Clark/Hill): To set August 16-17, 2016 as the date and Idaho State University as the location for the August 2017 regularly scheduled Board meeting. The motion carried unanimously.

PLANNING, POLICY & GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS (PPGA)

1. Idaho State University Annual Report and Tour

Idaho State University (ISU) President Art Vailas welcomed the Board to the Pocatello campus for the August meeting. As part of his report to the Board, he guided Board members and staff on a tour of key areas on campus. Specific details regarding the institutions' progress toward meeting its strategic plan goals may be found in the attached report.

WORK SESSION

PPGA

A. Data Dashboard Discussion

Dr. Cathleen McHugh, Accountability Program Manager from the Board office, provided a report for the Board commenting that there are three parts to her report: ISU IPEDS Data Feedback Report, SAT data, and examples of data dashboards from other states (to illustrate examples of dashboards for the Board). She started by indicating the IPEDS Data Feedback Report compares ISU to ISU defined (and Board approved) peers who are found mainly in the west and midwest. She reported on measures a student may consider when deciding to go to ISU such as academic year tuition and required fees. For tuition and fees, ISU compares very favorably to its median peers. Related to what kinds of aid a student may receive also showed rather favorably for ISU compared to its peers in most areas. The data showed that there is perhaps a different kind of student attending ISU than its peers. Regarding bachelor's degree graduation rates, and in looking at the institutional data, it shows that ISU ranks lowest for the three graduation rates (4, 6, and 8 year). Related to core revenues, ISU receives a greater share of its core revenues from tuition and fees than the median institutions with the exception of four other institutions; the University of Wyoming receiving the most funding for FTE. ISU receives a little more than one third of its revenues from tuition and fees and a little more than one third from state appropriations. It ranks fourth among all the universities in terms of the share it receives from tuition and fees, and third in terms of state appropriations. Related to government grants and gifts, it is in the middle of the peer group. Dr. McHugh reviewed ISU's core expenses per FTE enrollment by function which shows it spends more than the median peer institutions on instructional expenses and quite a bit less on research. Other areas such as public service, academic support, institutional support, and student services were considerably less. In the category of "other" core expenses, ISU ranks above their peers. This area includes

BOARDWORK
OCTOBER 20, 2016

expenses such as scholarships and miscellaneous core expenses. Mr. Freeman clarified that in reviewing the data related to ISU, data will be reviewed for each institution according to the meeting schedule – for instance LCSC will be reviewed in October at the next regular meeting.

Dr. McHugh provided a presentation of the 2016 April SAT test data and patterns found in the data. She discussed the SAT data dashboard, patterns in test scores by gender, region, urbanicity, and the future use of SAT test scores, pointing out how these reports assist in determining the overall “health” of the education system, specific schools, or institutions. Related to the SAT scores by region (there are 6 in Idaho), the data shows Regions 1, 2, and 3 are fairly similar in the median composite score, the median math, and the median English scores. Regions 4, 5, and 6 are slightly lower than regions 1, 2, and 3. Region 4 is where scores are the lowest. Results by gender show a gap between males and females being college ready, with the females being behind; 34% of males are college ready and 32% of females are college ready, showing a disparity between genders in preparation for college. Dr. McHugh reviewed SAT scores by ethnicity which showed a gap between Hispanic and non-Hispanic students. Additionally, students attending in rural districts have slightly lower scores overall.

She next provided examples of data dashboards from other states. Dr. McHugh reported on and walked the Board through the data dashboards used by Kentucky, Florida, Texas and Colorado. She reminded the Board members that how they want to use the data will influence how the data dashboard will look. The data is very driven by specific questions of that state’s interests.

There was some discussion on what data to include on the dashboard. Dr. Clark recommended having a drill down factor taking into consideration the user (i.e, public user, Board user, etc.). There was a request by staff for Board input on what they would like to see in the way of a data dashboard. Mr. Westerberg asked if there should be a single dashboard or separate one for K-12 and higher education. He also asked who would be using it: parents, schools, students, etc. Ms. Atchley expressed that she envisioned it designed for the Board’s use in its work. She asked the Board members for their input. Mr. Soltman felt the dashboard for the Board should be explored first, then whether to expand it to the public. One question was if it should be live and immediately interactive. Dr. Hill felt in the narrow sense the Board should pick what is appropriate for its use and start with what data is available to the public such as IPEDS and SAT. They discussed including graduation rates also. Ms. Critchfield pointed out there are also federal requirements for reporting and suggested some system of metrics - and to start simply. Mr. Westerberg felt there are different data sets for different applications, for instance policy management and K-12. He recommended using the strategic plans and KPIs from those plans. He also felt a public information dashboard would be in order. There was additional discussion about the KPIs forming the basis for the data dashboard. Dr. Clark pointed out that because of Idaho’s higher education governance, there is a unique opportunity to communicate to the public a system-wide vision for improvement. It would help facilitate explaining things that are happening, what we’re measuring, and what the Board is doing toward the 60% goal. She pointed out it would also help inform the legislature.

Ms. Atchley provided further that it would be helpful to have a lineal comparison of the institutions and get a better idea of what strengths and weaknesses are present, and how to share best practices. Mr. Westerberg suggested seeing average of peer comparisons for KPIs, and also to consolidate them or identify the most meaningful ones to review (but not more than five). Dr. Clark suggested a public portion be developed after the Board establishes what it needs for its portion of the dashboard. A public system will be an opportunity for communicating

BOARDWORK OCTOBER 20, 2016

to Idaho citizens. Dr. Hill felt following the strategic plan is a good idea but recommended putting the “critical few” indicators on the dashboard, going along with Richard’s point of not having too many KPIs; that they need to distill the dashboard down to the key areas. Ms. Atchley asked if the Board would like to develop a working group. Mr. Freeman would like to review the feedback with Mr. Howell, the Board’s Director of Research, and discuss what is aspirational, and provide a mock up for the Board. Mr. Soltman asked about one or two dashboards – one for k12 and one for higher education. President Atchley responded they would start first with a higher education dashboard.

B. Higher Education Action Plan

BOARD ACTION

Mr. Matt Freeman, Executive Director from the Board office, provided that earlier this year the Governor asked the Board to develop a five year plan for higher education. Mr. Freeman pointed out the Board’s Strategic Plan is in fact a five year plan for public education, but fulfilling the Governor’s request will require the Board to identify specific activities by which to operationalize the Plan. Board staff have mapped the plans goals and objectives to Board activities and initiatives, and categorized them as *proposed*, *in progress*, and *operational*. Mr. Freeman encouraged the Board discuss the activities and initiatives identified in the Operational Plan and provide feedback to staff for incorporation into the Operational Plan document. He also recommended the Board authorize staff to convene a group of stakeholders to review the plan and provide recommendations to the Board at its October meeting.

Mr. Freeman asked the Board for general feedback. Mr. Soltman recommended consolidating items into broader themes if possible. Mr. Freeman responded that there is certainly duplication with the initiatives because they fall within multiple objectives. He asked what those activities are the Board really wants to emphasize for support by the Governor and Legislature on, and if there are funding needs attached to those activities. Mr. Westerberg felt program prioritization and outcomes based funding is a logical progression for the institutionalization of the Strategic Plan (Plan) – which is in progress. Dr. Hill felt the list should ask what we are *not* doing. He felt it was an opportunity look and extract ten or so items at a slightly higher level to improve the state of higher education in Idaho.

Mr. Freeman walked the group through the list reviewing the items that were in the *proposed* status, calling on staff for additional details of various items. Mr. Scoggins asked who the audience is for the intended report. Mr. Freeman responded that aside from the Governor, it would be used as an efficacy piece for stakeholders, legislators, etc. Mr. Scoggins felt that more description and context should be provided under the *proposed* column. Dr. Hill suggested using the report “*Public Research Universities*” as a guide for additional recommendations and went on to highlight a few such as forming alliances with other public universities, and tying back to recommendations. Dr. Hill pointed out the referenced report also contains recommendations for state governments and felt it would help the Board provide a richer report to the Governor. Ms. Atchley provided additional background for Mr. Scoggins for the purpose of this report.

Ms. Atchley recommended a more formal evaluation of where the Board is in its progress, and to include ways to make the recommendations more effective in the next five years. Dr. Clark recommended interfacing the 60% goal and the Task Force recommendations. Mr. Freeman said it would be helpful at the staff level to calendar status reports back to the Board of these initiatives. Mr. Westerberg suggested continuing to refine what the Board has done in its Plan,

BOARDWORK

OCTOBER 20, 2016

and reminded the Board of the short timeline. Ms. Atchley also recommended stabilizing funding as something to work toward in the Plan and how that can be accomplished by working with businesses and stake holders. Mr. Freeman reminded the Board that the Governor's letter referenced directly working on long term support for higher education. Mr. Freeman asked if the *proposed* items should be pulled out of the report or how to proceed. Dr. Clark suggested not pulling any of the *proposed* items because it shows progress and forward thinking. Board members echoed those remarks. Dr. Hill recommended additional work on completeness.

Ms. Critchfield asked the participants are in working on this lift with the Board. Mr. Freeman responded that on August 29th a group of stakeholders will convene to review and provide feedback on outcomes based funding. He reviewed the list of stakeholders that includes higher education, K-12, business, and industry representation. He extended the invitation to higher education presidents to invite a regional business leader to be included in the discussion. Mr. Chet Herbst, the Board's Chief Financial Officer, is preparing a white paper on outcomes based funding that will be provided to the stakeholders prior to the August 29th meeting. Dr. Clark expressed concern with drawing up a dream list and emphasized staying focused on what it will take to reach the Board's 60% goal, identify the key areas, identify overlap, and proceed accordingly. Mr. Soltman felt Idaho Business for Education (IBE) is a major audience and asked Mr. Scoggins' opinion. Mr. Scoggin responded that the principles involved are informative and helpful. Ms. Atchley recommend further discussions with IBE. Ms. Atchley commented on the engagement with the university and the business community, and provided an example of the University of Alabama where every single program has some sort of support from the industry it deals with; adding the engagement of the business community with that university is remarkable. She recommended more engagement by the higher education system with the business community.

Board President Atchley summarized it will use a matrix of what the Board has accomplished and what is in progress, showing the Operational Plan mapped to the Board's Strategic Plan, how outcomes based funding will help, and how to approach long term tasks. Dr. Hill asked to work directly with staff on Goal 2 which is Innovation and Economic Development. Mr. Freeman indicated staff would report back to the Board at the October meeting.

The meeting recessed at 3:43 p.m. MST.

Thursday, August 11, 2016, 8:00 a.m.

Board President Atchley thanked ISU for its hospitality. ISU President Art Vailas welcomed everyone to today's meeting and introduced ISU student body president Makayla Muir.

Open Forum

Mr. James Chapman addressed the Board and expressed his appreciation for their work. He shared three ideas with the Board. He shared a lesson from a professor of economics at the University of Idaho which is that all real wealth comes from the development of natural resources - educating people being the most important. The first idea he proposed to the Board is to see more emphasis placed on the teaching of history, economics, and citizenship. He also recommended an expansion of participation in youth legislature. The second idea is more focus on the problem of student debt and national debt which he felt needs to be addressed immediately. The third item is to place more emphasis with commerce and business partners. Mr. Chapman offered up his own assistance for consultation should the need arise and provided details of his background.

BOARDWORK
OCTOBER 20, 2016

CONSENT AGENDA

M/S (Clark/Soltman): To approve the consent agenda as presented. The motion carried unanimously.

AUDIT

1. University of Idaho Foundation Agreement

By unanimous consent to approve the agreement between the University of Idaho and the University of Idaho Foundation, as submitted in Attachment 2.

BAHR

2. Boise State University – Multi-Year Contracts – Women’s Head Basketball Coach

By unanimous consent to approve the request by Boise State University to enter into a two-year, nine-month employment agreement with Gordon Presnell, Head Women’s Basketball Coach, commencing on August 14, 2016 and terminating on March 31, 2019, at a base salary of \$220,000 and supplemental compensation provisions, as submitted in Attachment 1.

3. Executive Officers – Employment Agreements

By unanimous consent to approve the amended employment agreement for Dr. Robert Kustra as President of Boise State University.

By unanimous consent to approve the amended employment agreement for Dr. Chuck Staben as President of the University of Idaho.

By unanimous consent to approve the amended employment agreement for Dr. Art Vailas, as President of Idaho State University.

By unanimous consent to approve the amended employment agreement for Dr. Tony Fernandez as President of Lewis-Clark State College.

4. University of Idaho – Multi-Year Contracts – SWIRE Coca-Cola USA

By unanimous consent to approve the request by the University of Idaho to enter into a contract with Swire Coca Cola USA for pouring and vending rights in substantial conformance to the form presented to the Board in Attachment 1.

IRSA

5. Programs and Changes Approved by the Executive Director

Information item for the Board

6. Higher Education Research Council Appointment

**BOARDWORK
OCTOBER 20, 2016**

By unanimous consent to re-appoint Mr. Bill Canon to the Higher Education Research Council for three (3) year terms effective immediately and expiring June 30, 2019.

PPGA

7. Lewis-Clark State College Faculty Constitution

By unanimous consent to approve the proposed changes to the Lewis-Clark State College Faculty Constitution as set forth in the materials submitted to the Board in Attachment 1.

8. President Approved Alcohol Permits

Information item for the Board

SDE

9. Professional Standards Commission Appointments

By unanimous consent to appoint Marjean McConnell as a member of the Professional Standards Commission for the remainder of the three-year term which began July 1, 2014, and will end June 30, 2017, representing School Superintendents in Idaho.

10. Adoption of Computer Applications Curricular Materials

By unanimous consent to approve the adoption of the Computer Applications curricular materials and related instructional materials recommended by the Curricular Materials Selection Committee as submitted in Attachment 1.

11. Bias and Sensitivity Committee Appointments

By unanimous consent to appoint the new members to the Bias and Sensitivity Committee as presented in Attachment 2.

By unanimous consent to appoint the alternate members to the Bias and Sensitivity Committee, to serve during the review process for a given year if the appointed member representing the same group is unavailable to participate in the review during that year, as presented in Attachment 3.

PLANNING, POLICY & GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS (PPGA)

2. PPGA Chairman's Report

Board member Debbie Critchfield pointed out that in the future, she would be providing a report to the Board of the recent meetings of the Planning, Policy and Governmental Affairs Committee and pointing out anything of concern for the Board. She had nothing to report at this time.

3. Northwest Regional Advisory Committee Update

Dr. Linda Clark reported that she has been nominated and chosen by the U.S. Department of Education to serve as a member of the Regional Advisory Committee (RAC) to provide

BOARDWORK
OCTOBER 20, 2016

technical advice. Dr. Clark updated the Board on the RAC's work completed thus far and the survey used to collect feedback. She pointed out the agenda materials contain information on the Committee which is a regional committee serving the area. She encouraged the Board members to take an on-line survey; those results will be used for this region. The survey is open to parents, practitioners, higher education, public education, etc., and she encouraged people to take part in the survey.

4. Idaho Career & Technical Education Annual Report

Mr. Dwight Johnson, State Administrator of the Division of Career & Technical Education (CTE), provided an overview of CTE's progress in carrying out the agency's strategic plan. He thanked the Board for the opportunity to serve in his position. He provided a report on CTE's current initiatives and budget, and introduced their new website CTE.idaho.gov, its logo, and reported on CTE's program alignment efforts. They are particularly focused on aligning industry and faculty experiences with learning outcomes. Mr. Johnson provided a list of the 2015 and 2016 programs horizontally aligned. He reported that their program quality efforts in standards development are used to develop their technical skill assessments, workplace readiness assessments, and training at their annual professional development conference. Mr. Johnson reported on their on-line system called *Skill Stack* and provided a short video explaining and illustrating how it works to translate real life work experience to a credit badge system. The Idaho Digital Learning Academy (IDLA) is working with CTE on development of this initiative.

Mr. Johnson pointed out CTE is working on an initiative on connecting education to employment and have been working with Director Ken Edmunds and the State Department of Labor on it. He reported on expanding CTE to provide on-line learning to rural areas and how CTE has been working with IDLA on that initiative. He also reported on the national issue of teacher shortage and how they are working toward implementing a new teaching certification process aimed specifically toward individuals coming to the teaching profession from the private sector. It is expected to be available in Fall 2016.

Mr. Johnson provided a summary of CTE's budget overview. They had just under \$72 million in state and federal dollars that support secondary and postsecondary education programs across the state. They also support adult based education programs at each one of the state institutions. CTE's total FY17 postsecondary funding was \$47.7 million which includes state and federal dollars. It also includes an additional \$3.8 million for their return on investment (ROI) proposal line item which was funded by the Legislature. Mr. Johnson reviewed the FY18 budget proposal indicating they have requested a second round of that type of funding that will benefit 16 programs. He outlined the details of their FY18 ROI proposal and projected results, and outlined out details of the Industry Partnership Fund which was passed but not funded by the Legislature last year (SB 1332). They have requested \$1 million to start this program.

Related to secondary programs, Mr. Johnson indicated there are four CTE funding streams for high school programs and provided details for each. He also pointed out there are 14 career-technical high schools throughout the state that qualify for additional state funding if they have students attending from multiple school districts and if they meet higher quality program requirements. For their FY18 budget, they are requesting a 5% increase in added costs which will help them keep up with equipment needs of the CTE programs, and are asking for nearly \$500,000 for all CTE program incentive funding which includes 1 FTE.

Mr. Johnson reported on the success of the CTE legislative tours from last fall. They expect another successful tour this fall and are in partnership with the Idaho Chamber Alliance. The

BOARDWORK OCTOBER 20, 2016

dates for the tours are during the weeks of September 19 at CSI and CWI; September 26 at LCSC and NIC; and October 10 at ISU and EITC. He closed by reporting on the recently staffed four full time positions in the CTE office which will help further CTE's mission of preparing Idaho's youth and adults for high-skill, in-demand careers.

Dr. Clark asked for a report on the number of students coming through the traditional route to teach CTE courses, and the numbers of teachers coming through the teacher training program into CTE, and also and recommended discussion on how to expand it. She pointed out it is not necessarily a rural issue, but goes along with the teacher shortage issue. Ms. Critchfield recommended teacher shortage as an agenda item for discussion at the next meeting. Mr. Johnson welcomed that discussion.

5. Board Policy I.E. – Executive Officers – First Reading

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Soltman): to approve the first reading of proposed amendments to Board Policy section I.E. Executive Officers, as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Critchfield provided that the proposed amendments to Board policy would eliminate the option for the chief executive officer to use an institution vehicle, and would set out provisions for reimbursement and insurance requirements when a personal vehicle is used for business purposes.

6. Board Policy I.J. – Use of Institutional Facilities – First Reading

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Soltman/Hill): To approve the first reading of proposed amendments to Board Policy Section I.J. as submitted in attachment 1. A roll call vote was taken and the motion failed due to a tie vote. Mr. Westerberg, Dr. Clark, Mr. Scoggin, and Ms. Critchfield voted nay on the motion.

Ms. Critchfield introduced the item related to alcohol policies and the proposed amendment to expand areas where alcohol may be consumed. Approval of the proposed amendments would allow for the possession and consumption of alcohol during NCAA football games hosted by the institutions in select parking lots or other areas on campus designated as “tailgating areas.”

Dr. Staben, University of Idaho (UI) President, and Mr. Kent Nelson, UI Legal Counsel, and Mr. Kevin Satterlee, Chief Operating Officer, Vice President and Special Counsel for Boise State University (BSU), came forward to participate in the discussion. Dr. Staben provided comments on the development of the proposed policy which was also discussed at President's Council. Mr. Satterlee added at BSU they provide a list of rules called *Tailgating 101* that are provided to tailgating participants on game day. Mr. Nelson provided that the draft language of the amendments proposed by the UI were provided to each of the institution's legal counsel for review. No comments from the other institutions were received at the time of agenda production. In addition to the amendments proposed by the University of Idaho is an increase in the per instance liability limits from \$500,000 to \$1,000,000, and the amendment would bring the policy in compliance with the minimum liability required by Risk Management for permitted events.

BOARDWORK
OCTOBER 20, 2016

There was discussion about the liability issues and Jenifer Marcus, the Board's Legal Counsel, provided an opinion of the changes to the policy. The intent of the institutions is to restrict the alcohol usage areas to controlled access areas. There was additional discussion about the previous policy changes and that this iteration provides clearer detail. Some Board members felt such activities are outside of the institutions' mission for learning and public service.

7. Board Policy Bylaws – Second Reading

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Clark): To approve the second reading of Board policy - Bylaws as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried unanimously.

8. Idaho Indian Education Committee - Bylaws

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Soltman): To approve the Indian Education Committee bylaws as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Critchfield indicated that the Idaho Indian Education Committee serves as an advisory committee to the Board. This change would remove some of the provisions from policy and put them into the bylaws.

9. Idaho Educator Pipeline Report

Ms. Critchfield indicated there has been much discussion lately, including nationally, on the teacher pipeline. She introduced Ms. Tracie Bent, Chief Planning and Policy Officer from the Board office, to provide additional details on the Idaho Educator Pipeline Report which was provided in the agenda materials. Ms. Bent reported that as they were collecting the data they found some inconsistencies and that data elements in some areas were lacking making it difficult to make recommendations. It was determined the biggest gap in the pipeline is at the start – relating to recruiting individuals into teacher prep programs. She pointed out there has been a decrease of individuals entering and graduating from the teacher prep programs; and an increase of individuals entering the field through the alternate teaching routes. This does not, however, make up for the overall decrease in the pipeline. Ms. Bent indicated the Career Ladder subcommittee discussed how to change the way education is perceived, the value of teachers and teaching, and that the discussion will be a long term discussion. She pointed out there are not recommendations at this time, but this is an information item for the Board. Staff encouraged the Board to consider convening a group to work on the issues specific to the teacher shortage. She added the topic was raised during President's Council and presidents were interested in participating in the discussion. Dr. Fox from CSI recapped the discussion from President's Council, adding that they intend to review the item at the President's retreat.

10. Accountability Oversight Committee – Statewide Accountability System
Recommendations

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Clark): To adopt the Accountability Oversight Committee's recommendations regarding the statewide accountability framework model with the

BOARDWORK
OCTOBER 20, 2016

exception of moving the high school testing year to grade 11, as presented in Attachment 1. The motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Critchfield introduced the item and provided some historical context that the Accountability Oversight Committee (AOC) was charged with developing the framework for accountability measure recommendations presented to the Board. In April 2016 the AOC presented those recommendations to the Board regarding removal of the ISAT proficiency and college entrance exam graduation requirements. The Board adopted the recommendation that the ISAT proficiency graduation requirement be removed, and rejected the recommendation that the college entrance exam graduation requirement be removed. She pointed out that having a test year or practice year will be beneficial. She also indicated that the recommendations point to every school having an accountability system that links preschool to college and career ready by addressing what makes the most sense at the different grade levels. Reporting of the data is a large part of the federal compliance and within the accountability system there is a requirement for postsecondary enrollment data that accompanies reporting with the accountability system so that parents of students in secondary schools are able to see opportunities within the state.

Ms. Critchfield indicated they are creating an accountability system that is based on student outcomes, student achievement, and school quality. She pointed out the items in the recommendations which they hope to get out to school districts this year for a “test drive”, and reviewed the items which are not yet fully developed. Ms. Critchfield commented that they hope to give districts options to show other indicators of success by having multiple measures as indicators. Dr. Clark, also a member of the AOC, reminded the group this a work in progress where we don’t know all the federal guidelines and requirements yet. She pointed out what we know which is that we must have academic proficiency scores and school quality scores and components of that. Dr. Clark directed attention to the alternative schools column of the recommendations, which as a result of how the prior system was constructed, caused almost all of the alternative schools to automatically be considered schools at risk and receive low scores; generating much concern. She suggested that alternative high schools are Tier II schools and should be treated differently. Dr. Clark commented that in addition to using multiple measures which are fair and equitable measures of school success, this approach is addressing very serious shortcomings from before. She said that by approving this framework it will enable a test run and help to identify unintended consequences.

Ms. Ybarra thanked the AOC committee for their work. She remarked on two concerns which are tests at the 11th grade level and making the ACT/SAT an optional piece. Ms. Critchfield clarified that the AOC recommendation was for the test to be given one time during high school and that it was recommended for the 11th grade year using the Smarter Balanced test (SBAC). Additionally, the college entrance exam would state the student could take the ACT or SAT; the recommendation would be in altering the administration of which test the student takes. The committee’s intent was to add some flexibility for the junior year students and have a college entrance exam that was paid for by the state, but would be of their choice.

Ms. Ybarra commented making the SAT/ACT optional for students changes the direction for students of Idaho if the grade level for the accountability measure testing changes. Additionally allowing the students their choice of test it doesn’t provide comparative data. She commented the SBAC measures standards and the SAT/ACT measures college and career readiness. She also commented on the cost savings by not testing juniors. The Superintendent expressed great concern about testing in the 10th grade as opposed to 11th, in that the 11th grade year testing may be too late to be beneficial for students who are struggling. She felt it would be

BOARDWORK
OCTOBER 20, 2016

important to have a path for students who are not passing the SBAC before the junior year. She firmly recommended keeping the testing at the 10th grade year. Dr. Clark provided additional remarks on the desire to for students to take the test that meets their needs best. Ms. Ybarra reiterated her desire to move solely to the ACT test and provided reasons for that opinion. She also reminded the Board that next year the contract expires with the provider of the test and to be aware of that. With the contract expiring, the future of SBAC is uncertain for Idaho. Ms. Ybarra reiterated she supports everything about the recommendations with the exception of moving the testing to the 11th grade and would be open to deeper conversations on the matter and possibly moving that direction at a later date.

Ms. Atchley summarized that her understanding is these recommendations will be a test run and will come back to the Board for final approval at a later time. Mr. Scoggin asked what year the change from 10th grade to 11th grade testing would occur. Ms. Critchfield responded the timeline would be the 2017-2018 school year. Dr. Clark recommended that the decision on the grade level for the ISAT test would be made prior to the 2017-2018 school year. Ms. Ybarra was supportive of that recommendation. Ms. Bent clarified that the rulemaking process will require clarification on the 10th or 11th grade testing piece. They discussed a revision to the motion to remove the 10th grade testing piece.

Board President Atchley recommended recessing for a 15 minute break. After the break, the group voted on a modified motion. Mr. Soltman asked when testing at the 10th or 11th grade level would be addressed. Ms. Bent recommended the Board consider the issue by next Spring, and that any action by the Board could be incorporated into the rules and would need to be accomplished before August of next year.

11. Education Opportunity Resource Committee Appointment

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Clark): To appoint Andy Mehl to the Idaho Education Opportunity Resource Committee for a four (4) year term effective immediately and expiring on June 30, 2020. The motion carried unanimously.

12. Temporary/Proposed Rule IDAPA 08.01.02 – Postsecondary Credit Scholarship Program

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Soltman): To approve the temporary and proposed rule IDAPA 08.01.02, Rules Governing the Postsecondary Credit Scholarship as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried unanimously.

Approval of this proposed rule will set out the administrative procedures and clarify requirements for the new Postsecondary Credit Scholarship.

13. Temporary/Proposed Rule IDAPA 08.01.04 – Postsecondary Residency Requirements

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Hill): To approve changes to temporary and proposed rule IDAPA 08.01.04, Rules Governing Residency Classification as submitted in Attachment 1. The

BOARDWORK
OCTOBER 20, 2016

motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Critchfield indicated the rule changes the twelve month residency requirements to six or more years for tuition purposes.

14. Proposed Rule IDAPA 08.01.09 – Rules Governing the Gear-up Idaho Scholarship Program

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Clark): To approve changes to proposed rule IDAPA 08.01.09, repealing IDAPA 08.01.09, as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Critchfield indicated the amendments to the proposed rule are regarding student eligibility and align with federal requirements

15. Temporary/Proposed Rule IDAPA 08.02.01.801, Rules Governing Administration – Continuous Improvement Plans

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Hill): To approve changes to temporary and proposed rule IDAPA 08.02.01.801, as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Bent provided some background on the item and outlined changes to the rule for the benefit of Mr. Scoggins.

16. Temporary/Proposed Rule IDAPA 08.02.01, Rules Governing Administration – Literacy Growth Targets

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Soltman): To approve the temporary and proposed rule IDAPA 08.02.01 Rules Governing Administration, Literacy Growth Targets as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried unanimously.

17. Temporary/Proposed Rule IDAPA 08.02.01, Rules Governing Administration – Statewide Average Class Size

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Clark): To approve the temporary and proposed rule IDAPA 08.02.01 Rules Governing Administration, Statewide Average Class Size as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Critchfield indicated the temporary and proposed rule would set out the method by which the statewide average class size for the use in support unit calculations is determined.

18. Proposed Rule IDAPA 08.02.02, Rules Governing Uniformity – Teacher Certification Requirements

BOARDWORK
OCTOBER 20, 2016

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Soltman): To approve changes to Proposed Rule IDAPA 08.02.02, Rules Governing Uniformity, Teacher Certification Requirements, as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Bent provided details on the changes to the proposed rule which includes amending the certificate to a single certificate. She explained that the combination of the current standard elementary and secondary certificate addresses the issue of a teacher teaching outside of the grade range of their certificates without creating disruption to individuals who currently hold certificates, resulting in overall simplification of Idaho's standard instructional certificates. She outlined additional amendments to the rule, pointing out the creation of middle school grade endorsement grade ranges, which will address the issue of individuals who have already obtained endorsements for grades 6-9 that did not previously exist and is in alignment with the single instructional certificate model. The proposed amendments will result in simplifying Idaho's instructional certificates and resolve the issue of individuals teaching outside of their eligible grade ranges.

19. Proposed Rule IDAPA 08.02.03, Rules Governing Thoroughness – Career Technical Education Content Standards

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Hill): To approve changes to the proposed rule IDAPA 08.02.03.004, as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried unanimously.

Approval of the proposed rule changes will add the CTE content standards, approved by the Board at the June 2016 Board meeting, into administrative rule in a similar fashion as the existing academic content standards. The standards being incorporated are the existing CTE content standards that are currently being used by our secondary CTE programs.

20. Temporary/Proposed Rule IDAPA 08.02.03, Rules Governing Thoroughness – Proficiency Graduation Requirement

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Soltman): To approve changes to Proposed Rule IDAPA 08.02.03.105, Rules Governing Thoroughness, Graduation Requirement Proficiency, as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried 7-1. Ms. Atchley voted nay on the motion.

Approval of the proposed rule will eliminate the ISAT proficiency graduation requirement in its entirety.

21. Temporary/Proposed Rule IDAPA 08.02.03, Rules Governing Thoroughness – Civics and Government Content Standards Proficiency – Graduation Requirement

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Hill): To approve changes to Proposed Rule IDAPA 08.02.03.105, Rules Governing Thoroughness, Graduation Requirement, Civics Proficiency, as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried unanimously.

BOARDWORK
OCTOBER 20, 2016

Approval of the proposed rule would provide clarification on the alternate path a school district may use for measuring student civics proficiency.

22. Proposed Rule IDAPA 08.02.03, .111-114, Rules Governing Thoroughness – Comprehensive Assessment Program and Accountability Requirements

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Hill): To approve changes to proposed rule IDAPA 08.02.03.111, 112, 113, and 114, Rules Governing Thoroughness – Comprehensive Assessment Program and Accountability Requirements, as submitted in Attachment 1 with the exception of making the high school ISAT optional in grade 10 and requiring it in grade 11. The motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Critchfield indicated approval of the rule is the first step in implementing the new accountability requirements for the State of Idaho. She clarified that changes would take into consideration the motion made previously under PPGA item #10 and its discussion.

23. Proposed Rule IDAPA 08.02.05, Rules Governing Pay for Success Contracting

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Hill): To approve the proposed rule IDAPA 08.02.05, Rules Governing Pay for Success Contracting as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried unanimously.

Approval of the proposed rule will set out the application process for vendors wishing to participate in the Pay for Success Contracting with the state. Mr. Nelson from the University of Idaho provided some historical background on the item for the benefit of Mr. Scoggin.

24. Proposed Rule IDAPA 08.05.01, Rules Governing Seed and Plant Certification

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Soltman): To approve changes to proposed rule IDAPA 08.05.01, as presented in Attachment 1. The motion carried 7-0. Ms. Atchley abstained from voting.

The Idaho Crop Improvement Association (ICIA) identified an amendment to the rapeseed/canola/mustard seed certification standards that would help to make these seeds produced in Idaho be more competitive.

25. Proposed Rule IDAPA 47.01.01, Rules of the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Scoggins): To approve the Division of Vocational Rehabilitations Field Services Policy Manual as submitted in Attachment 2. The motion carried unanimously.

AND

M/S (Critchfield/Hill): To approve changes to Proposed Rule IDAPA 47.01.01 as submitted

BOARDWORK
OCTOBER 20, 2016

in Attachment 1. The motion carried unanimously.

The proposed changes incorporate the updated Field Service Manual into rule and bring the rule compliant with federal order of selection guidelines.

26. Proposed Rule IDAPA 47.01.02, Rules and Minimum Standards Governing Extended Employment Services

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Hill): To approve changes to proposed rule IDAPA 47.01.02, Rules and Minimum Standards Governing Extended Employment Services, as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried unanimously.

The proposed rule will provide guidance for community rehabilitation programs in the delivery of Extended Employment Services, information that will assist others in making appropriate referrals, and the authority for IDVR to intervene should providers fail to meet the standards set forth in the rules.

27. Proposed Rule IDAPA 55.01.03, Rules of Professional Technical Schools – Career Technical Schools

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Clark): To approve the changes to proposed rule IDAPA 55.01.03 as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Critchfield indicated these changes will align Administrative Code to existing practices, will help ensure consistency in how funds for career technical schools are calculated, and will update the language regarding advanced opportunities to align with the language in Board Policy Section III.Y.

INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH & STUDENT AFFAIRS (IRSA)

1. Board Policy III.O. Course Placement – First Reading

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Hill/Critchfield): To approve the first reading of the new section of Board policy III.O. Course Placement, as presented in Attachment 1. The motion carried unanimously.

Dr. Mathias from the Board office provided some background on the item which would create a separate section of Board Policy regarding course placement and replace the current statewide placement policy. He indicated at its October 2015 meeting, the Board waived the placement section of Board policy III.Q.4.c. as the recommendation was for placement to have its own section in Board policy. The former section of policy covered placement in entry-level college courses and was waived until the end of the 2016 calendar year to allow for the creation and adoption of new placement mechanisms. The new placement mechanisms and processes currently under development by the institutions will be reviewed by the Chief Academic Officer and the Council on Academic Affairs and Programs (CAAP) prior to implementation.

BOARDWORK
OCTOBER 20, 2016

2. Five-Year Program Plan

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Hill/Critchfield): To approve the Five-Year Plan as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Patty Sanchez, Academic Affairs Program Manager from the Board office, provided an update to the Board on the Five-Year Plan. She pointed out the requirement of Board Policy III.Z. for each institution to submit an institution plan with proposed programs. Ms. Sanchez provided a summary for each institution. She reviewed the planning schedule that includes timing for program inventory, proposed programs, work session of the five-year plan, and concluded with programs for discussion. She clarified that her summary today contains programs added and removed to/from the plan, number of programs approved consistent with the five-year plan, number of programs discontinued, and programs projected for Fall 2017. A complete report was provided in the attachments to the agenda materials.

For illustrative purposes, Ms. Sanchez provided a one-page visual of all institutions showing programs removed, added, approved and discontinued, and collaborations among institutions. Mr. Soltman asked if the on-line programs were included. Ms. Sanchez responded in the affirmative. Ms. Atchley asked how the Board ensures the quality of the programs added to the plans. Dr. Mathias responded that there are two mechanisms in policy that ensure program quality and that the proposal definitions are being met.

At this time, Dr. Hill requested to move to item 4 on the IRSA agenda and return to items 5 and 3 after lunch. There were no objections to the request.

4. Boise State University – Online Graduate Certificate in Educational Gaming and Simulation

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Hill/Westerberg): To approve the request by Boise State University to create a new online, self-support program that will award a Graduate Certificate in Educational Gaming and Simulation in substantial conformance to the program proposal submitted as Attachment 1. The motion carried unanimously.

M/S (Hill/Critchfield): To approve the request by Boise State University to designate a self-support program fee for the Graduate Certificate in Educational Gaming and Simulation in the amount of \$379.33 per credit in conformance with the program budget submitted to the Board in Attachment 1. The motion carried unanimously.

Dr. Marty Schimpf provided some background on the item and that BSU proposes the creation of an online, self-support 15-credit graduate certificate program in Educational Games and Simulations, to be offered by the Department of Educational Technology. The new program will add to the array of self-support programs offered by the department: a Master of Educational Technology degree, an Ed.D. in Educational Technology, an Education Specialist degree (Ed.S.) in Educational Technology, and three graduate certificates. BSU also requests approval to assess a self-support program fee consistent with Board Policy V.R.3.b.v.(a) (2). Based on the information for the self-support program fee provided in the proposal, staff found the criteria has been met for this program.

BOARDWORK
OCTOBER 20, 2016

The meeting recessed for lunch until 1:00.

5. EPSCoR Annual Report

Dr. Laird Noh, Committee Chair, and Dr. Peter Goodwin, Project Director, were accompanied by Rick Schumaker, Assistant Project Director, to provide a report to the Board on the recent work of the Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (EPSCoR). EPSCoR is a federal-state partnership designed to enhance the science and engineering research, education, and technology capabilities of states that traditionally have received smaller amounts of federal research and development funds. Through EPSCoR, participating states are building a high-quality, academic research base that is serving as a backbone of a scientific and technological enterprise.

Dr. Goodwin explained the “ONEIdaho” EPSCoR Philosophy and shared who is on the Idaho EPSCoR Committee. Related to Idaho’s research competitiveness, total National Science Foundation (NSF) funding from FY15 equates to \$26.2M which is up 77% from 2008. Dr. Goodwin pointed out Idaho has three active NSF EPSCoR Research Infrastructure Improvement (RII) awards which are divided into three tracks. Track 1 is related to academic research capacity, track 2 is related to regional collaboration, and track 3 is related to STEM education. Idaho EPSCoR was awarded a new Track I grant NSF-EPSCoR award in 2013 entitled, “Managing Idaho’s Landscapes for Ecosystem Services” known as MILES, for \$20M between the 2013-2018 periods. NSF-EPSCoR grants require a state matching component, and these funds are paid out of a portion of the funds allocated for use by the Board’s Higher Education Research Council (HERC). The state match for the current award is \$800,000 for fiscal year 2017.

Dr. Goodwin highlighted details of the MILES program which program outputs include numerous publications and opportunities for undergraduates, grants totaling \$20.2M to date, participation from over 6,800 stakeholders and community members, and 18 graduate degrees granted to MILES students to-date. He commented on workforce development and diversity and that the MILES program is reaching over 11,200 students.

Dr. Goodwin described a track II program called the Western Consortium for Watershed Analysis, Visualization, and Exploration (WC-WAVE) running 2013-2016, and a track III program which is the Indigenous Program for STEM Research and a Native Network of Graduate Education (a national research and educational model running 2014-2019).

Dr. Hill thanked Drs. Noh and Goodwin for their work on Idaho EPSCoR and commented that from a state perspective it is an excellent investment in the future.

3. Annual Program Prioritization Report – BSU, ISU, UI, and LCSC each provided a report to the Board.

Dr. Chris Mathias from the Board office introduced the item indicating each of the institutions provided a report contained in the agenda materials, and also would be making oral presentations to the Board today.

Dr. Marty Schimpf provided BSI’s report on program prioritization. Dr. Schimpf reviewed the value in each of the process areas and pointed out the entire process involves their budget and planning processes as well. He pointed out four topics as they relate to the program

BOARDWORK
OCTOBER 20, 2016

prioritization efforts and that they address all four from the standpoint of their primary challenge to sustain and grow the value of program prioritization. Those four areas include challenges, integration, programmatic changes, and FY18 requests. He reported on the five different types of value gained through this process that included programmatic changes, process changes, structural changes, creating agenda of change, and changes in culture, and provided a deeper account in each area.

Dr. Schimpf reported that as a result of the changes, changes in the campus culture have also occurred. Those changes include a heightened awareness in accountability, awareness of the importance of productivity, and the move to sustaining value through the changes in processes, policies and structures. Dr. Schimpf closed by pointing out that the actions in this process were planned and completed from 45 academic departments. There were 367 actions originally proposed and two years later they have achieved 514 actions which have been implemented or are in progress.

Dr. Laura Woodworth-Ney provided a report to the Board on ISU's program prioritization process, pointing out they are transitioning to a three year prioritization process across campus to assess whether programs are meeting intended outcomes. They have incorporated program health measures to determine the health of academic and non-academic programs. Dr. Woodworth-Ney went on to explain how the process works for evaluating full degree and certificate programs. She shared outcomes from 2015-2016 and that they have completed all phases of the program prioritization process. Academic health is incorporated into their annual planning, and is transitioning into their budgetary process. They are also focused on the health of non-academic units. Dr. Woodworth-Ney provided additional details of their academic three-year hiring plan, which includes the requirement of Academic Affairs to quantifiably justify filling vacant positions before requesting open faculty and staff lines. She also provided additional detail on aligning the academic process to the budget and strategic plan. She pointed out that program health is based both on qualitative and quantitative measures, and they are working to balance both.

Mr. John Wiencek and Mr. Brian Foisy provided a report from UI on their program prioritization process. He summarized steps the UI's new leadership utilized and steps to develop a path forward. Initial steps included getting Board member feedback, attending data dashboard demonstrations, faculty senate discussions, institutional research discussions, and working on improving the processes being developed and implemented in FY17. One of their priorities has been development of a nine-year strategic plan through broad participation at the university. It aligns with SBOE performance measures, program prioritization, and NWCCU accreditation. Mr. Wiencek provided a summary on programmatic actions since 2015 which includes consolidation of select IT functions, reinvestments/reallocations from FY16 program prioritization efforts, and additional process improvements such as streamlining the hiring and payroll processes, and closing the Caine Research Center among others. Their work plan for FY17 includes a newly formed Institutional Planning and Effectiveness (IPE) Committee charged with overall implementation of integrated planning, programming and budget planning. They are working on strategic plans with unit-level goals and metrics, transitioning to an improved budgeting system, and additional program prioritization improvements. Related to integrating program prioritization is building a progressive and sustainable cycle where institutional planning and effectiveness is central.

Mr. Foisy reported on institutionalizing program prioritization through position control at the university. Through the IPE Committee, he outlined how they will reframe program prioritization with a number of objectives that include comprehensive taxonomy in both academic and non-

BOARDWORK
OCTOBER 20, 2016

academic units, and development/implementation of appropriate dashboards and management tools in support of the process and its transparency. Mr. Foisy reported on program prioritization related to FY18 budget requests. The two items of focus for the FY18 budget request are outcomes based finding and support for their library database.

At this time Ms. Atchley welcomed Representative Mark Nye who was present in the audience. Mr. Freeman also welcomed Mr. Keith Bybee from the Legislative Services Office (LSO) who is the new budget analyst taking over for Mr. Paul Headlee. Mr. Headlee will continue to work with the K-12 budget while Mr. Bybee will be working with higher education.

Dr. Lori Stinson and Andrew Hansen provided a report on LCSC's program prioritization. Dr. Stinson provided background on the process which supports their strategic plan goals and outcomes. She reviewed the strategic planning goals of LCSC and reminded the Board LCSC quintiled all instructional and non-instructional programs; there were 115 in total. She reviewed the expected action for each quintile. On an annual basis the programs are reviewed and the program prioritization process is integrated with their budgeting process. Dr. Stinson reported on the programmatic actions for the instructional programs in each of the quintiles and identified opportunities for instructional programs for FY17 that included strategic enrollment, continued integration of data, and continued refinement of measureable, meaningful criteria.

Mr. Hansen pointed out that their entire campus is involved in the prioritization process and proceeded to review the programmatic actions for non-instructional programs in each of the quintiles. Mr. Hansen pointed out the changes in their two TRIO programs which they have realigned into a single administrative unit. Both programs have been funded again for a five-year cycle. Their Institutional Planning and Research Assessment area has new leadership and anticipates greater outcomes going forward. Mr. Hansen reported on new student recruitment in Quintile 1, and that their new student recruitment program has been very successful toward increasing enrollments, and also has provided additional administrative efficiencies. He touched on the integration of program prioritization into the campus culture and remarked that it has given an additional context to review their entire operation. Mr. Hansen closed with the FY18 budget requests driven by program prioritization which are instructional program requests focused on two top quintile programs. They are seeking faculty positions for program expansion and additional delivery models. Requests include a Veterans services coordinator, career counselors, and work-scholars which expands a program shown to reduce student loan debt.

Dr. Hill complemented each of the institutions on their work on program prioritization.

6. IRSA Chairman's Update

Dr. Hill, current chair of the IRSA Committee, provided an update to the Board on the committee and activities it is currently discussing. He reported on the dual credit workgroup which was instituted a few months ago and was tasked to develop recommendations for dual credit. Those recommendations have been forwarded to the CAAP committee for consideration, and forwarded to IRSA. Secondly, the State Department of Education and Board office have developed a math working group, and recommendations will be coming forward at a future date. They are concerned with a consistent difference between students meeting national norms in English Language Arts (ELA) at the 60% level and mathematics at the 40% level, and hope to discover issues related and try to understand those issues are present.

At this time, the meeting recessed for a 15 minute break. After the break, President Fernandez introduced LCSC's new Vice President of Finance and Administration, Todd Kilburn.

BOARDWORK
OCTOBER 20, 2016

Mr. Westerberg requested unanimous consent to move to item 4, followed by item 8 on the BAHF Finance Agenda. There were no objections to the request.

BUSINESS AFFAIRS & HUMAN RESOURCES (BAHR)

4. Idaho National Laboratory (INL) – Board Sponsorship of Idaho National Laboratory Project

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Soltman): To approve the Capital Budget Request Six-Year Plans for FY2018 through FY2023 for Boise State University, Idaho State University, the University of Idaho, Lewis-Clark State College, and Eastern Idaho Technical College, as provided, for submission to the Permanent Building Fund Advisory Council for consideration in the FY2018 budget cycle. The motion carried 7-0. Dr. Hill recused himself from voting on the motion since he formerly held a senior level position at INL.

Mr. Herbst from the Board office introduced Dr. Kelly Beierschmitt, INL Deputy Laboratory Director of Science & Technology, Mr. Van Briggs from INL, and Wayne Meuleman who is the legal counsel from the Idaho State Building Authority (Building Authority). Mr. Herbst provided an overview of the project and the building authority's role to the relationship of this project. He explained the lease arrangement for the project. Mr. Meuleman provided additional detail on the role of the Building Authority in managing this project, in that the Building Authority is governed by a Board and has the legal authority to enter into agreements with state agencies to provide financing and development services for different projects. The financing side is a taxable bond issuance. He pointed out the interest rates at this time are very low indicating an opportune time for this project. The Building Authority also has the legal authority to enter into design and construction management contracts. They would anticipate a lease arrangement between the Building Authority and the Board, or other public entity who would then sublease to INL. At the completion of the bond maturity, the Building Authority deeds the bonds to the appropriate state entity and they would then become facilities owned by that entity.

For the benefit of Mr. Scoggins the ISU and UI presidents provided some additional historical context related to the INL project and their support for the project.

8. Idaho State University – Idaho College of Osteopathic Medicine

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Hill): To authorize Idaho State University to enter into a Ground Lease Agreement with the Idaho College of Osteopathic Medicine, LLC in substantial conformance to the draft lease agreement provided in Attachment 1, and in coordination with the West Ada School District and the Idaho Division of Public Works. The motion carried unanimously.

Dr. Vailas introduced the Dean of the Idaho College of Osteopathic Medicine (ICOM), Dr. Robert Hasty, and recognized a number of people instrumental in developing the details of the lease agreement. He provided some historical background on the item and that the lease will enable ICOM to construct its medical school facility in close proximity to ISU's Meridian facilities, and will enable collaboration between ISU-Meridian and ICOM operations. Dr. Hasty indicated

**BOARDWORK
OCTOBER 20, 2016**

they are still on track for a 2018 start date for students. He said they are hopeful for pre-accreditation by the end of this year, then provisional accreditation in 2017. Once they enter into the ground lease agreement, they will be able to proceed with their architectural plan and tentatively break ground in early 2017. Mr. Soltman asked about the impact on current parking. Dr. Hasty responded they anticipate little or no impact.

BUSINESS AFFAIRS & HUMAN RESOURCES (BAHR)

Section I – HR

1. Section II.F. – Policies Regarding Non-Classified Employees

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Clark): To approve the first reading of the proposed amendment to Board Policy Section II.F “Policies Regarding Non-classified Employees” as provided in Attachment 1. The motion carried unanimously.

2. ISU - Reclassification of Provost to Executive Vice President and Provost

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Scoggins): To authorize Idaho State University to establish the position of Executive Vice President and Provost, with terms and duties as described in the documentation provided. The motion carried unanimously.

BUSINESS AFFAIRS & HUMAN RESOURCES (BAHR)

Section II – Finance

1. FY 2018 Line Items

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Soltman): To approve the Line Items for the agencies and institutions as listed in Attachments 1 and 2, and to authorize the Executive Director to approve the MCO and Line Item budget requests for agencies and institutions due to the Division of Financial Management and Legislative Services Office on September 1, 2016. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Westerberg reminded the Board of the direction given to the institutions which was they may request up to two line items in priority order, the total value of which not to exceed five percent of an institutions FY17 General Fund appropriation.

2. FY 2018 Capital Budget Requests

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Hill): To approve the capital projects listed in the table in Attachment 1 on Page 5 from Boise State University, Idaho State University, the University of Idaho, and Lewis-Clark State College for submission to the Permanent Building Fund Advisory

BOARDWORK
OCTOBER 20, 2016

Council for consideration for Permanent Building Fund support in the FY2018 budget cycle. The motion carried unanimously.

AND

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Soltman): To approve the Capital Budget Request Six-Year Plans for FY2018 through FY2023 for Boise State University, Idaho State University, the University of Idaho, Lewis-Clark State College, and Eastern Idaho Technical College, as provided, for submission to the Permanent Building Fund Advisory Council for consideration in the FY2018 budget cycle. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Herbst provided background and timeline for developing the budget requests, and briefly described the process for the FY18 major capital requests. He pointed out detailed summaries of the capital requests for institutions and agencies are included in the agenda materials. Mr. Herbst described the six year planning tool for capital improvements and its importance to the institutions. Mr. Freeman pointed out that the Permanent Building Fund Advisory Council (PBFAC) will make its recommendation in November to the Governor's Office and Legislature; it is a non-binding recommendation. However, historically, the Governor and Legislature have given consideration to its recommendations.

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

Mr. Westerberg reported that the scores for all institutions are good or getting better. All three institutions report that they are meeting the 930 APR benchmark and/or are making progress toward that goal.

5. Boise State University – Oracle HCM Cloud Application Licensing Agreement

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Soltman): To approve the request by Boise State University to execute an ordering document under the Public Sector Agreement for Oracle Cloud Services to license the products as presented to the Board in Attachment 1. The motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Stacy Pearson provided comments on the item. She reported that this project, which is adoption of a state-of-the-art Human Capital Management (HCM) system, is part of an ongoing sequence of initiatives at BSU to migrate central data systems to the cloud and to enhance usability and security of operations. Ms. Pearson reported the total cost of the product suite of \$2,147,963 is offset by PeopleSoft maintenance cost savings of \$867,090 for a net cash flow over five years of \$1,295,273 million. The source of funding is institutional funds set aside for system investments and current operating budget. This investment will provide state-of-the-art technology and allow for improved business processes. Employees will benefit from improved efficiencies, more self-service options and greater access to transactional data to support analysis. Mr. Scoggins cautioned on being ready for the migration before it is initiated.

6. Idaho State University – Land Use Swap between ISU and USI Federal Credit Union

BOARD ACTION

BOARDWORK
OCTOBER 20, 2016

M/S (Westerberg/Hill): To approve the request by Idaho State University to execute an amended lease agreement with the Idaho State University Federal Credit Union in accordance with the terms provided in Attachment 1. The motion carried unanimously.

7. Idaho State University – Disposal of Real Property – O’Neill Property in McCammon, ID

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Hill): To approve the request by Idaho State University to proceed with the sale of the subject real property in McCammon, Idaho for \$7,000, and to authorize Idaho State University finance staff to sign all necessary documents to complete the sale on behalf of the Board of Trustees, as described in the documents provided. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Westerberg indicated approval of the request allows ISU to dispose of unneeded property.

9. Idaho State University – Online Program Fee – Community Paramedic Academic Certificate Program

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Clark): To approve the request by Idaho State University to establish a \$3,300.00 online program fee for the Community Paramedic certificate program. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Westerberg indicated the item is a request by ISU for the establishment of an on-line program fee for the Community Paramedic Academic Certificate Program. The proposed online program fee for this program is \$3,300.

10. Eastern Idaho Technical College – Right of Way Agreement – City of Idaho Falls

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Hill): To approve the request by Eastern Idaho Technical College to grant the City of Idaho Falls 0.226 acres of permanent easement and 0.186 acres of right of way corresponding with the documents submitted to the Board as Attachments 1 through 4, and to authorize the College’s President to execute all necessary related documents. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Westerberg indicated this is a request by Eastern Idaho Technical College to provide a right of way easement to the City of Idaho Falls at the intersection of Hitt Road and 17th Street.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (Department)

1. Superintendents Update

Superintendent Ybarra provided a report to the Board from the Department of Education. She reported that they are focused on development of the budget which is due September 1st and she will provide an overview of it at the October Board meeting. Ms. Ybarra reported on the status of the IRI and that they are looking at vendors and RFPs. She reminded the Board there

BOARDWORK
OCTOBER 20, 2016

is no money in the budget for it, but expected to provide an update in October on the status and RFP process. Ms. Ybarra introduced the Department's new Chief of Policy, Duncan Robb.

2. Proposed Rule IDAPA 08.02.03.004.01, Rules Governing Thoroughness, Incorporation by Reference – Idaho Content Standards

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Ybarra/Clark): To approve the revisions to the Health, Arts and Humanities, English Language Arts/Literacy, Mathematics, Physical Education, and Social Studies Content Standards and the adoption of Computer Science Content Standards as submitted in attachments 2 through 14. The motion carried unanimously.

AND

M/S (Ybarra/Critchfield): To approve the Proposed Rule amendment to IDAPA 08.02.03.004.01, Rules Governing Thoroughness, The Idaho Content Standards, as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Ybarra provided some historical background on the item and pointed out the science standards are not included in this item. They will come before the Board at a later time.

3. Temporary and Proposed Rule IDAPA 08.02.03.106, .117 – Rules Governing Thoroughness – Advanced Opportunities

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Ybarra/Clark): To approve the Temporary and Proposed Rule amendment to IDAPA 08.02.03.106 and 08.02.03.117, Rules Governing Thoroughness, for Advanced Opportunities, as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Ybarra provided background on the item and that the new provisions merge some of the opportunities from these programs with the program known as the Fast Forward Program. The temporary and proposed rule changes repeals the section of rule specific to the Mastery Advancement Pilot Program and adds provisions and clarity to the Advanced Opportunities section on the administration of the new Early Graduation Scholarship. Mr. Matt McCarter provided additional comments on the item and the support it has received. Dr. Clark asked about training for college and career counseling and remarked on the importance of funding for it and that it should be a major legislative item.

OTHER BUSINESS

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

M/S (Critchfield/Hill): To adjourn the meeting at 4:15 p.m. The motion carried unanimously.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

**BOARDWORK
OCTOBER 20, 2016**



**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**

**DRAFT MINUTES
STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
September 23, 2016
Office of the State Board of Education
Len B. Jordan Building, 3rd Floor
Boise, Idaho**

A special meeting of the State Board of Education was held September 23, 2016 in the large conference room of the Office of the State Board of Education, Len B. Jordan Building, in Boise, Idaho. Board President Emma Atchley presided and called the meeting to order at 8:30 am Mountain Time. Ms. Atchley offered a statement clarifying the purpose of this special meeting, indicating that in an abundance of caution regarding concerns raised at the September 19, 2016 Special Board meeting pertaining to the Open Meeting Law, the Board has decided to declare the actions taken at that meeting void. She clarified the numerous efforts, not required by law, the Board extends as a courtesy to the public to be informative about its business. She pointed out that requirements of the Open Meeting Law were followed in accordance for both Special Meetings.

A roll call of members was taken.

Present:

Emma Atchley, President
Linda Clark, Vice President
Debbie Critchfield, Secretary

Richard Westerberg
Don Soltman
Dave Hill

Absent:

Sherri Ybarra, State Superintendent
Andy Scoggin

PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

1. Legislative Agenda

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Hill): To approve the proposed legislation with the exception of Advanced Opportunities Focus No. 501-25 in substantial conformance to the form provided and to authorize the Executive Director to make additional changes as necessary as the legislation moves forward through the legislative process. The motion carried unanimously 6-0.

BOARDWORK OCTOBER 20, 2016

Board member Critchfield reiterated the information contained in the agenda materials that in June 2016 the Board approved 28 legislative ideas to be submitted through the Governor's Executive Agency Legislation process for the 2017 Session and authorized the Executive Director to identify additional potential legislation for submittal. Six additional legislative ideas were identified by Board staff and authorized by the Executive Director for consideration. Of the thirty-four total legislative ideas, five were withdrawn; four based on legislator feedback and one was determined no longer necessary. Of the twenty-nine remaining legislative ideas, twenty-five have been approved to move forward to the next step in the process, reconsideration by the Board. A summarized list of the legislation was included for review in the Board agenda materials.

Mr. Westerberg expressed concern regarding the advanced opportunities (dual credit) proposed legislation. He pointed out the importance of this program but felt legislative changes might send the wrong message to other state policy makers that the state funded program was not successful. He recommended returning the item to Board staff for additional development and bringing it before the Board at a future date.

Board members and State Department of Education (Department) staff were in agreement with Mr. Westerberg. Mr. Koehler, Chief Deputy Superintendent, commented that the Department staff has put together some information and data regarding the item and would make it available for Board members. He pointed out that regarding General Education Matriculation (GEM), 68% of the dual credits that are paid for through advanced opportunity align with the GEM framework. Additionally, that non-GEM courses paid for through advanced opportunity are primarily CTE courses, foreign languages, or foundations into content areas. The Department is concerned that as the language is written presently, it increases the barrier for those CTE interested students and it may actually disrupt equity available in rural districts. One other concern is that some of the GEM classes do not align with the institutions' courses, which was the original intent. The Department believes the institutions of higher learning need to work together to bring their course titles and expectations into alignment to better help the counselors and administrators of the K12 system. Mr. Koehler also offered to provide a breakdown of classes, funding, and offerings by university and community college of the number and types of classes offered. Ms. Atchley responded that the information would be very helpful to the Board. It was pointed out that the proposed legislation included certificates and would not create a barrier to career technical students.

Ms. Atchley requested discussion on any of the other legislative ideas. Mr. Freeman reiterated that Board staff, the Department, stakeholder groups, and school districts would be working to refine any and all of the proposed legislation as needed.

OTHER BUSINESS

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

M/S (Critchfield/Hill): To adjourn the meeting at 8:45 a.m. The motion carried unanimously.

**WORK SESSION
OCTOBER 19, 2016**

TAB	DESCRIPTION	ACTION
A	IRSA – NWCCU DISCUSSION	Information Item
B	PPGA – TRIBAL GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE DISCUSSION	Information Item
C	PPGA – PERFORMANCE MEASURE REPORTING	Information Item

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

**WORKSESSION
OCTOBER 19, 2016**

SUBJECT

Accreditation Process Discussion with NWCCU President, Dr. Elman

REFERENCE

August 2013	The Board was provided with an update of the accreditation process and the status of where each institution is in the process.
August 2014	The Board was provided with an overview of the accreditation process and the status of where each institution is in the process.

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies & Procedures, Section III.M.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

Idaho's public and private colleges and universities are accredited by the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU). In 2010, NWCCU implemented changes to the accreditation review process from a five and ten-year review cycle to a seven-year cycle. The seven-year cycle includes five standards and three separate reporting requirements. Accreditation requires institutions to conduct a thorough self-evaluations at year one, mid-cycle (year three), and year seven to address NWCCU Standards for Accreditation.

Standard 2.A, Governance, requires "that institutions demonstrate the potential to fulfill its mission, accomplish its core theme objectives, and achieve the intended outcomes of its programs and services wherever offered and however delivered. Through its governance and decision-making structures, the institution establishes, reviews regularly, and revises as necessary, policies and procedures that promote effective management and operation of the institution."

Central to institutional accreditation is Standard 5, Mission Fulfillment, Adaptation, and Sustainability. Based on an institution's definition of Mission Fulfillment, the institution develops and publishes evidence-based evaluations regarding the extent to which it is fulfilling its mission. Institutions are required to regularly monitor internal and external environments to determine how, and to what degree, changing circumstances may impact its mission and its ability to fulfill that mission. Further, Standard 5 requires that institutions demonstrate they are capable of adapting, its mission, core themes, programs, and services to accommodate changing and emerging needs, trends, and influences to ensure enduring institutional relevancy, productivity, viability, and sustainability as necessary.

Given the depth and breadth of the NWCCU standards, there are opportunities for the Board to take advantage of the reporting requirements affiliated with accreditation, in a way that also supports the Board's goals' and objectives for the institutions. Affiliated with Standard 5, one of these ways requires that

**WORKSESSION
OCTOBER 19, 2016**

institutions engage in regular, systematic, participatory, self-reflective, and evidence-based assessment of its accomplishments. Based on its definition of mission fulfillment, the institution uses assessment results to make determinations of quality, effectiveness, and mission fulfillment to communicate its conclusions to appropriate constituencies and the public.

IMPACT

This information will provide an update to the Board on changes to the accreditation process and where the institutions currently are in that process.

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In order to provide an opportunity for new Board members to have a greater understanding of the role regional accreditation plays in institutional operations, Dr. Sandra Elman, President of NWCCU will facilitate a discussion and provide an opportunity for more detailed questions and answers.

BOARD ACTION

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

**WORKSESSION
OCTOBER 19, 2016**

SUBJECT

Tribal Governance and Relations

REFERENCE

December 6-7, 2007	The Board was provided an update on the Native American Higher Education Committee's progress.
June 20, 2008	The Board approved the Committee moving forward with scheduling future meetings with each of the Tribes and charged the Committee with reviewing how Board policy can meet the underserved need in the communities through advanced opportunities.
February 21, 2013	The Board approved the first reading of Board Policy I.P.
April 18, 2013	The Board approved the second reading of Board Policy I.P.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

The State Board of Education (Board) formally established the Idaho Indian Education Committee (Committee) to serve as an advisory committee to the Board and the State Department of Education (Department). The committee also serves as a vital communication connection between Idaho's tribes, the Board, and the Department regarding the education of American Indian Students.

In order to effectively support the work of the Committee and the tribes in their unique role in conjunction with the Board and the Department, it is necessary to understand the historical and legal foundation for tribal sovereign governments.

There are over five hundred (500) agreements and treaties that remain valid and "form the baseline parameters of the political relationship between tribes and the United States" (Wilkins, 2002, pp. 42-44). These treaties and agreements guaranteed tribes "all the rights and resources (e.g., rights to water and lands; to hunt, fish and gather; to exercise criminal and civil jurisdiction; to tax) they had not ceded to the federal government when they sold or exchanged the majority of their land – most of North America – were contractual rights that were also protected by the trust doctrine" (Wilkins, 2002, p. 44). Through the trust doctrine, the federal government does not have the same relationship with states as they do with tribal governments. Much of this difference is primarily as a result of the recognition that tribes were sovereign nations continuing to reside within the new boundaries of the United States that required some level of obligation to American Indians and protection from states. Sovereignty is an important element of the relationship between tribal governments, states, and the federal government.

The principles of sovereignty shape not only the relationship between states and the federal government, but the rights of tribal governments in these relationships. Sovereign immunity has been linked to the constitutional doctrine of separation of powers concluding that sovereign immunity is meant to protect the official actions

**WORKSESSION
OCTOBER 19, 2016**

of the government from undue judicial interference. While the federal and state governments retain some level of sovereignty, tribal governments were recognized by the federal government as having unique, independent responsibility for the political, cultural, and health and well-being of their members.

The 1975 Indian Self-Determination and Education Act provided tribes more direct control in the management and implementation of social programs and services (e.g. healthcare, education, and housing) within their communities (Deloria & Wilkins, 1999; Conner, 2014; Calloway, 2016). This allowed tribal governments the ability to determine whether or not to allow the federal government to continue managing these services through the Bureau of Indian Affairs, or whether to contract these services more at the local level. This gave tribal government's explicit authority to work with local school boards and state education agencies (Conner, 2014; Wilkins & Lomawaima 2001).

With the federal and tribal resources supporting the education of American Indian students, states and tribal governments have been slow to develop clear policies or partnerships. Idaho has seen some activity as it relates to American Indian education from a policy perspective.

The Board has identified a gap in the educational attainment of American Indian students in Idaho public schools and the need to advocate for and provide access to educational services for Idaho's American Indian students. To that end, they established the Committee in 2013 as a formal committee of the Board. In June 2015 the Board approved the first ever Idaho Indian Education Strategic Plan. The two goals of the Indian Education Strategic Plan are 1) American Indian Academic Excellence, and 2) Culturally Relevant Pedagogy. Associated with those goals the Committee identified performance measures to increase Idaho's educational standards to include tribal culture, history, and government.

The mission of the Committee is to create conditions for and support the efforts of raising the bar and eliminating the gap of academic achievement. Four of the seven key responsibilities of the Committee, identified in Board Governing Policies & Procedures, relate to making recommendations on American Indian achievement and overall pedagogy. Specifically the relevant responsibilities are as follows: 1) making recommendations for educational policy for American Indian student access, retention, graduation and achievement; 2) making recommendations on instructional materials to ensure inclusion of cultural knowledge and tribal context at the elementary, middle/junior high, and high school, and postsecondary level; 3) making recommendations to ensure integration and use of cultural knowledge and tribal context as a component of instructional practice in schools that serve predominantly American Indian students; and 4) reviewing American Indian student achievement data for purposes of making formal recommendations to the Board to raise the bar and eliminate achievement gaps.

**WORKSESSION
OCTOBER 19, 2016**

IMPACT

To support the necessary educational policy work, staff and the Committee believe it is important to provide historical policy and regarding the sovereign nature and unique role of tribal communities to and with the Board.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – Example - Coeur d'Alene Tribe Information

Page 5

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A presentation will be led by committee members and Helo Hancock, Legislative Director for the Coeur d'Alene Tribe that will cover federal, state and tribal roles, sovereign status, federal trust responsibility, and the history of Indian Education in Idaho. Committee members will also speak to the unique role the tribes have with the Board's Indian Education Committee.

The presentation is intended to engender conversation about what role the Board can play with the Tribes to help meet the unique needs of American Indian students enrolled in the state's public schools and institutions.

BOARD ACTION

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

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

**WORKSESSION
OCTOBER 19, 2016**

SUBJECT

Performance Reporting

REFERENCE

June 2014	Board approved the institutions updated strategic plans, including performance measures for the next four years.
October 2014	Board reviewed performance measures for the period from FY 2015 – FY 2019.
December 2014	Board discussed amendments to its statewide K-20 Education Strategic Plan
February 2015	Board approved amendments to its statewide K-20 Education Strategic Plan
June 2015	Board approved the institutions updated strategic plans, including performance measures for the next four years.
October 2015	Board reviewed performance measures for the period from FY 2016 – FY 2020
June 2016	Board approved the institutions updated strategic plans, including performance measures for the next four years.
August 2016	Board members requested information on Career Technical teacher preparation program completers.

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies & Procedures, Section I.M, and III.S.
Section 67-1901 through 1905, Idaho Code.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

The performance measure data are presented annually to provide a general overview of the progress the state public education system is making toward the Board's strategic plan goals as well as the agencies' and institutions' strategic plan goals. This presentation is meant generate a discussion regarding the overall cumulative progress being made toward the Board's goals and objectives as well as the institutions specific goals and objectives and any changes the Board may want to make in December to it is K-20 system wide strategic plan, including performance measures. In addition to the annual performance measure report Board staff will provide the Board with an update on the implementation the Board approved remedial education models and remedial education success rates pursuant to Board Policy III.S, and career technical teacher preparation program completers.

During the October 2011 Board meeting the Board requested that the institutions' strategic plans contain six performance measures that are consistent across the

**WORKSESSION
OCTOBER 19, 2016**

public postsecondary educational system. The six system-wide performance measures look at:

- Remediation
- Retention
- Dual Credit Participation
- Certificates and Degrees Conferred
- Cost Per Credit Hour
- Certificates and Degree Completions

IMPACT

The data included in this presentation will be used by the Board, institutions, and agencies to direct their future strategic planning efforts.

ATTACHMENTS

Performance Measure Reports

Agencies

Attachment 1 – State Board of Education	Page 5
Attachment 2 – State Department of Education/Public Schools	Page 15
Attachment 3 – Idaho Division of Career Technical Education	Page 19
Attachment 4 – Idaho Division of Vocational Rehabilitation	Page 23
Attachment 5 – Idaho Public Television	Page 27

Institutions

Attachment 6 – Eastern Idaho Technical College	Page 31
Attachment 7 – University of Idaho	Page 35
Attachment 8 – Boise State University	Page 41
Attachment 9 – Idaho State University	Page 51
Attachment 10 – Lewis-Clark State College	Page 59

Community Colleges

Attachment 11 – College of Southern Idaho	Page 65
Attachment 12 – College of Western Idaho	Page 71
Attachment 13 – North Idaho College	Page 75

Special and Health Programs

Attachment 14 – Agricultural Research and Extension Service	Page 81
Attachment 15 – Family Medical Residency (ISU)	Page 85
Attachment 16 – Boise Family Medical Residency	Page 89
Attachment 17 – Forest Utilization Research	Page 91
Attachment 18 – Idaho Dental Education Program	Page 101
Attachment 19 – Idaho Geological Survey	Page 105
Attachment 20 – Idaho Museum of Natural History	Page 109
Attachment 21 – Small Business Development Center	Page 113
Attachment 22 – TechHelp	Page 117
Attachment 23 – WIMU (WI) Veterinary Medicine	Page 121
Attachment 24 – WWAMI Medical Education	Page 125

Research Specific Reports

Attachment 25 – Research Activity Report – FY15	Page 129
---	----------

**WORKSESSION
OCTOBER 19, 2016**

Attachment 26 – Research Strategic Plan Page 133

Other Board Strategic Plan Performance Reports

Attachment 27 – STEM Education Page 135

Attachment 28 – American Indian Education Page 137

Math Remediation Reports

Institutions

Attachment 29 – Eastern Idaho Technical College Page 139

Attachment 30 – Boise State University Page 143

Attachment 31 – Idaho State University Page 149

Attachment 32 – Lewis-Clark State College Page 155

Community Colleges

Attachment 33 – College of Southern Idaho Page 161

Attachment 34 – College of Western Idaho Page 165

Attachment 35 – North Idaho College Page 169

Career Technical Teachers Data

Attachment 36 – CTE Teacher Prep Completer Data Page 173

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Board approved the institutions' and agencies' strategic plans at the June 2016 Board meeting. The strategic plans include performance measures and benchmarks, by approving the strategic plans the Board is also approving the included performance measures and benchmarks. In September of each year the institutions and agencies are required to select performance measures from their strategic plans and submit them to the Division of Financial Management (DFM). DFM then provides the report to the Governor and the legislature as well as posting them on its website. The performance measures provided in the attached Performance Measure Reports are performance measures approved by the Board through the agencies and institutions strategic plans, the institutions reports include the six (6) system-wide measures in addition to self-selected performance measures out of their approved strategic plans.

This year's presentation will focus on the six (6) system-wide performance measures as well as selected performance measures from the educational pipeline out of the Board's strategic plan; remedial education reform implementation; and career technical teacher preparation. The measures selected out of the Board's strategic plan were selected as viewpoints into the education pipeline that have been identified as critical points where students leave the pipeline. The presentation is formatted to allow for discussion specific to the individual institutions as well as the system as a whole throughout the presentation. The data on all of the performance measures included in the Board's strategic plan are included as part of Attachment 1. Following the presentation, time has been allotted for Board members to discuss and give direction regarding any changes the Board would like to see in either the institution and agencies performance

**WORKSESSION
OCTOBER 19, 2016**

measures and strategic plans or the Board's strategic plan and performance measures. The Board's strategic plan will be updated and brought back to the Board for consideration at the December 2016 Board meeting. Additional time has also been allocated to continue the discussion of the proposed data dashboard.

BOARD ACTION

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

**CONSENT AGENDA
OCTOBER 20, 2016**

TAB	DESCRIPTION	ACTION
1	BAHR – SECTION II – IDAHO STATE UNIVERSITY MULTI-YEAR CONTRACT – SPEEDCONNECT	Motion to Approve
2	BAHR – SECTION II – UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO LICENSE AGREEMENT – SPRINT INFRASTRUCTURE – OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF THEOPHILUS TOWER	Motion to Approve
3	BAHR – SECTION II – UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO LICENSE AGREEMENT – SPRINT INFRASTRUCTURE– OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF UI “I” WATER TANK	Motion to Approve
4	BAHR – SECTION II – UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO DONATION TO COEUR D’ALENE CENTER “FIBER LINE”	Motion to Approve
5	PPGA – INDIAN EDUCATION COMMTTEE APPOINTMENTS	Motion to Approve
6	PPGA – STATE REHABILITATION COUNCIL APPOINTMENTS	Motion to Approve
7	PPGA – PRESIDENT APPROVED ALCOHOL PERMITS	Information Item
8	SDE – 2015-2016 ADVANCEED ACCREDITATION REPORT	Motion to Approve
9	SDE – CASSIA COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT – ALBION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL – HARDSHIP STATUS	Information Item

**CONSENT AGENDA
OCTOBER 20, 2016**

BOARD ACTION

I move to approve the Consent Agenda as presented.

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes _____ No _____

**CONSENT AGENDA
OCTOBER 20, 2016**

IDAHO STATE UNIVERSITY

SUBJECT

Approval of a thirty (30) year contract with SpeedConnect.

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

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

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

In 2006, the FCC granted Idaho State University (ISU) the right to lease its excess broadband capacity, and ISU entered into two (2) ten (10) year contracts with Teton Wireless Television, Inc. to lease these wireless frequencies for educational use in Idaho Falls and in Twin Falls. SpeedConnect purchased Teton Wireless Television, Inc. in 2012. The contracts expired on April 30, 2016; however, the contracts were extended through December 31, 2016.

On June 28, 2016, ISU released a Request for Bid (RFB) seeking a partner to utilize the 2.5 GHz wireless frequencies to provide developed solutions that ISU could use to meet its educational use requirement with the FCC and to create a revenue stream to further ISU's educational objectives. The RFB was released for open competition for a period of thirty (30) days. Respondents were required to provide, in detail, their intentions for the use of the available wireless frequencies, how they would meet ISU's educational use requirements, and how they would provide the best financial return for ISU.

The RFB was released to four (4) potential leasing partners, and two responded: 1) White Cloud Communications Inc., an Idaho company that specializes in two-way radio communications; and 2) SpeedConnect, a broadband wireless Internet service provider with an office in Idaho Falls, Idaho.

ISU evaluated the lease terms, annual payment increases, and any additional recompense described therein, and determined that the SpeedConnect proposal provided a clear financial advantage to ISU. The revenue generation offered by SpeedConnect, \$1.5 million, over the thirty (30) year life of the agreement, is \$497,300 over that of the White Cloud proposal. ISU plans to use the revenue generated through this agreement to further the ISU educational mission.

IMPACT

Approval of the agreement brings revenue to ISU in the amount of \$1,504,103.72 over a thirty (30) year period (see Schedule 2(a) Monthly Fee Schedule).

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – SpeedConnect Contract	Page 3
Attachment 2 – FCC Lease Approval WNC731-4.11.12-1	Page 25
Attachment 3 – FCC Lease Approval WND516-4.11.12-1	Page 27

**CONSENT AGENDA
OCTOBER 20, 2016**

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends approval.

BOARD ACTION

I move to approve the request by Idaho State University to enter into a long-term contract with SpeedConnect as presented in Attachment 1.

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes _____ No _____

**CONSENT AGENDA
OCTOBER 20, 2016**

UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO

SUBJECT

License Agreement with Sprint to permit continued operation and maintenance of Sprint infrastructure on the University of Idaho's (UI) Theophilus Tower.

REFERENCE

March 2004	The Idaho State Board of Education (Board) approved License Agreement with Verizon Wireless Services
February 2007	The Board approved extension of License Agreement with Verizon Wireless Services
August 2014	The Board approved License Agreement with AT&T Wireless Services
October 2014	The Board approved License Agreement with Verizon Wireless Services

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies & Procedures, Section V.I.5.b.i.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

Since 2001 Sprint has been permitted, through a prior license agreement, to install and maintain transmission equipment on the rooftop of UI's Theophilus Tower. This equipment is used by Sprint to provide its customers with wireless personal communication service in the surrounding area. The original agreement provided for an annual payment of \$16,800 to UI, and the agreement could be terminated by either party with at least one year's prior notice. As permitted by the current agreement, the site has been periodically updated to install newer technology for personal phone and data. Because the existing license did not provide for escalations in the use fee, UI administration has proposed—and Sprint has tentatively agreed—to revise the terms of this agreement to increase the annual fee paid to \$24,000/yr. The proposed agreement also provides Sprint with permission to use the building rooftop for five years with the ability for Sprint to extend for two additional five year periods. These renewal periods provide fee increases of 15% to UI for each of the two extensions.

IMPACT

UI will receive a substantial increase in payment to extend the license agreement. The installations do not interfere with UI operations in this student residential building.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – Proposed License

Page 3

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends approval.

**CONSENT AGENDA
OCTOBER 20, 2016**

BOARD ACTION

I move to approve the request by the University of Idaho for authority to grant a five year license to Sprint in substantial conformance to the form submitted to the Board in Attachment 1 and to authorize UI's Vice President for Infrastructure to execute the license and any related documents.

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes _____ No _____

**CONSENT AGENDA
OCTOBER 20, 2016**

UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO

SUBJECT

License Agreement with Sprint to permit continued operation and maintenance of Sprint infrastructure on the University of Idaho's (UI) "I" Water Tank.

REFERENCE

March 2004	The Idaho State Board of Education (Board) approved License Agreement with Verizon Wireless Services
February 2007	The Board approved extension of License Agreement with Verizon Wireless Services
August 2014	The Board approved License Agreement with AT&T Wireless Services
October 2014	The Board approved License Agreement with Verizon Wireless Services

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies & Procedures, Section V.I.5.b.i.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

Since 2005 Sprint has been permitted, through a prior license agreement, to install and maintain transmission equipment on the leg of UI's "I" Water Tank. This equipment is used by Sprint to provide its customers with wireless personal communication service in the surrounding area. The original agreement provided for an annual payment of \$9,600 to UI. The agreement provided for escalations to a current annual fee of \$11,616 and could be terminated by either party with at least one year's prior notice. As permitted by the current agreement, the site has been periodically updated to install newer technology for personal phone and data. UI administration has proposed—and Sprint has tentatively agreed—to revise the terms of this agreement to increase the annual fee paid to \$24,000/yr. The proposed agreement also provides Sprint with permission to use the site for five years, with the ability for Sprint to extend for two additional five year periods. These renewal periods provide fee increases of 15% to UI for each of the two extensions.

IMPACT

UI will receive a substantial increase in payment to extend the license agreement. The installations do not interfere with UI operations at this water storage facility.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – Proposed License

Page 3

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends approval.

**CONSENT AGENDA
OCTOBER 20, 2016**

BOARD ACTION

I move to approve the request by the University of Idaho for authority to grant a five year license to Sprint in substantial conformance to the form submitted to the Board in Attachment 1 and to authorize the University's Vice President for Infrastructure to execute the license and any related documents.

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes _____ No _____

**CONSENT AGENDA
OCTOBER 20, 2016**

UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO

SUBJECT

Donation of two high-speed lit fiber lines for a period of fifty years, and ten years of 1Gb of high speed Internet service to the Post Falls Research Park

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies & Procedures, Section V.E.5

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

The University of Idaho (UI) is seeking approval from the Idaho State Board of Education (Board) to approve an agreement with Fatbeam LLC for the donation of two (2) high speed lit fiber lines for a period of fifty (50) years. The lines stretch from Liberty Lake, WA across the greater Coeur d' Alene, ID area. The agreement also includes ten (10) years of 1GB of high-speed Internet service for the Post Falls Research Park facility.

The donation has been valued by Fatbeam at \$3,275,510.00. The components of the gift include \$122,500 in Internet Service and \$3,153,000.00 for the lit fiber lines.

IMPACT

There is no cost to the UI for this gift. The gift will enhance and complement UI's existing cyber-infrastructure at the Research Park to the benefit of the Cybersecurity Training and Operations Center at the Coeur d' Alene campus.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – Fatbeam IRU Agreement – 50 years

Page 3

Attachment 2 – Fatbeam Terms of Service – 10 years

Page 31

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Board Policy V.E.5 states that Board approval is required for donations worth more than \$500,000. Staff recommends approval.

BOARD ACTION

I move to approve the request by the University of Idaho to enter into agreements with Fatbeam for the donation of two lit fiber lines for a period of fifty years and 1Gb of high-speed Internet service for a period of ten years, in substantial conformance to the materials submitted to the Board.

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes _____ No _____

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

**CONSENT AGENDA
OCTOBER 20, 2016**

SUBJECT

Idaho Indian Education Committee Appointments

REFERENCE

June 18, 2014	The Board approved the appointment of Dani Hansing to the Committee.
August 14, 2014	The Board approved the appointment of Kathy Albin and Bill Picard.
October 16, 2014	The Board approved the appointment of Mitzi Sabori to the Committee.
February 19, 2015	The Board approved the appointment of Pete Putra and Will Fanning.
June 18, 2015	The Board approved the appointment of Nolan Goubeaux.
October 22, 2015	The Board approved the appointment of Donovan Chase and Shawna Daniels.
April 14, 2016	The Board approved the appointment of Tomas Puga and reappointments of Selena Grace, Bob Sobotta, and Chris Meyer.

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies & Procedures, Section I.P.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

The Idaho Indian Education Committee serves as an advisory committee to the State Board of Education (Board) and the State Department of Education (Department) on educational issues and how they affect Idaho's American Indian student population. The committee also serves as a link between Idaho's American Indian tribes.

Pursuant to Board Policy I.P. the Idaho Indian Education Committee consists of 19 members appointed by the Board. Each member serves a term of five years. Appointments to vacant positions during a previous incumbent's term are filled for the remainder of the open term. The membership consists of:

- One representative from each of the eight public postsecondary institutions
- One representative from each of the five tribal chairs or designee
- One representative from each of the five tribal education affiliations (K-12)
- One representative from each of the two Bureau of Indian Education schools
- One representative from the State Board of Education, as an ex-officio member

Eastern Idaho Technical College (EITC) has forwarded Dr. Sharee Anderson's name for consideration as their representative. Dr. Anderson is the Vice President of Instruction and Student Service at EITC.

**CONSENT AGENDA
OCTOBER 20, 2016**

The Shoshone-Bannock Tribes have forwarded the following names for consideration: Ms. Donna Bollinger as the tribal chair designee, Ms. Jessica James-Grant as the K-12 tribal education representative, and Mr. Hank McArthur as the Bureau of Indian Education (BIE) representative.

Additionally, the Committee requests the terms for Selena Grace of Idaho State University, Bob Sobotta of Lewis-Clark State College, and Dr. Chris Meyer of the Coeur d'Alene Tribe be extended to June 2021 to be consistent with Board Policy I.P. The terms for these members, reappointed by the Board at the April 2016 Board meeting were calculated incorrectly and were set for three (3) years rather than the five (5) years established in Board Policy I.P.

IMPACT

The proposed appointment replaces the EITC representative on the Committee, replaces the Shoshone-Bannock representatives on the Committee and extends terms for three existing members that were approved in April 2016.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – Current Committee Membership	Page 5
Attachment 2 – Nomination Letters	Page 7

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Mr. Justin Gardner took another position within Eastern Idaho Technical College (EITC) and is unable to serve on the committee. Dr. Sharee Anderson has been identified to replace Mr. Gardner and serve as EITC's representative. Dr. Anderson has been with EITC for over 10 years as an instructor, Division manager of Healthcare and now in the current role of Vice President. If approved, Dr. Anderson's would complete Mr. Gardner's term which, as an original committee member, ran from July 1, 2013 – June 30, 2017.

Ms. Mitzi Sabori is no longer on the Fort Hall Business Council. Ms. Donna Bollinger has been identified to replace Ms. Sabori and serve as the tribal chair designee. Ms. Jessica James-Grant fills a vacancy for the K-12 tribal education representative and Mr. Hank McArthur replaces Mr. Eric Lords as the BIE representative. If approved, Ms. Bollinger and Ms. James-Grant would serve a new five-year term and Mr. Hank McArthur would complete Mr. Lords' term which runs from July 1, 2013 – June 30, 2018.

BOARD ACTION

I move to appoint Dr. Sharee Anderson, representing Eastern Idaho Technical College, effective immediately and expiring June 30, 2017.

I move to appoint Ms. Donna Bollinger, as the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes tribal designee, effective immediately and expiring June 30, 2017.

**CONSENT AGENDA
OCTOBER 20, 2016**

I move to appoint S. Jessica James-Grant representing the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes as the K-12 tribal education representative, effective immediately and expiring June 30, 2021.

Mr. Hank McArthur, representing the Shoshone-Bannock Bureau of Indian Education representative, effective immediately and expiring June 30, 2018.

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes _____ No _____

BOARD ACTION

I move to approve amendment to the terms of appointment for Selena Grace, representing Idaho State University, Mr. Bob Sobotta, representing Lewis-Clark State College, and Dr. Chris Meyer representing the Coeur d'Alene Tribe to the Idaho Indian Education Committee to expire June 30, 2021.

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes _____ No _____

**CONSENT AGENDA
OCTOBER 20, 2016**

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

**CONSENT AGENDA
OCTOBER 20, 2016**

IDAHO DIVISION OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

SUBJECT

Idaho State Rehabilitation Council Membership

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

Federal Regulations 34 CFR §361

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

Federal Regulations (34 CFR §361.17), set out the requirements for the State Rehabilitation Council (Council), including the appointment and composition of the Council.

The members of the Council must be appointed by the Governor; in the case of a State which vests authority for the administration to an entity other than the Governor, the chief officer of that entity pursuant to § 33-2303, Idaho Code, designates the State Board for Career-Technical Education as that entity.

Further Federal Regulations establish that the Council must be composed of at least fifteen (15) members, including:

- i. At least one representative of the Statewide Independent Living Council, who must be the chairperson or other designee of the Statewide Independent Living Council;
- ii. At least one representative of a parent training and information center established pursuant to § 682(a) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act;
- iii. At least one representative of the Client Assistance Program established under 34 CFR § 370, who must be the director of or other individual recommended by the Client Assistance Program;
- iv. At least one qualified vocational rehabilitation counselor with knowledge of and experience with vocational rehabilitation programs who serves as an ex officio, non-voting member of the Council if employed by the designated State agency;
- v. At least one representative from the community rehabilitation program service providers;
- vi. Four representatives of business, industry, and labor;
- vii. Representatives of disability groups that include a cross section of (A) Individuals with physical, cognitive, sensory, and mental disabilities; and (B) Representatives of individuals with disabilities who have difficulty representing themselves or are unable due to their disabilities to represent themselves;
- viii. Current or former applicants for, or recipients of, vocational rehabilitation services;

**CONSENT AGENDA
OCTOBER 20, 2016**

- ix. In a State in which one or more projects are carried out under § 121 of the American Indian Vocational Rehabilitation Services Act, at least one representative of the directors of the projects;
- x. At least one representative of the State educational agency responsible for the public education of students with disabilities who are eligible to receive services under this part and part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act;
- xi. At least one representative of the State workforce investment board; and
- xii. The director of the designated State unit as an ex officio, non-voting member of the Council.

Additionally, Federal Regulations specify that a majority of the council members must be individuals with disabilities who meet the requirements of 34 CFR §361.5(b)(29) and are not employed by the designated State unit. Members are appointed for a term of no more than three (3) years, and each member of the Council, may serve for not more than two consecutive full terms. A member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the end of the term must be appointed for the remainder of the predecessor's term. A vacancy in membership of the Council must be filled in the same manner as the original appointment, except the appointing authority may delegate the authority to fill that vacancy to the remaining members of the Council after making the original appointment.

The Council currently has one (1) nomination for Board approval; Kendrick Lester was chosen to fulfill the Federal Regulations as a representative of the State Department of Education. The Council has two resignations: Lonnie Pitt, who filled the position of a representative of a Former Applicant or Recipient, and Jayne Womack, who filled a position as a representative for Disability Advocacy Groups.

IMPACT

The above appointment and two resignations will bring the Council membership to a total of fifteen (15) with two vacancies on the Council; one for a representative of business, industry and labor and the other for a representative of a Former Applicant or Recipient. Minimum composition for the Council is 15 members.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 - Current Council Membership	Page 5
Attachment 2 – Kendrick Lester Nomination Letter & Resume	Page 7

**CONSENT AGENDA
OCTOBER 20, 2016**

BOARD ACTION

I move to approve the appointment of Kendrick Lester to the State Rehabilitation Council as a representative for the State Department of Education to complete the term vacated by Alison Lowenthal, effective immediately and ending June 30, 2017.

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes _____ No _____

**CONSENT AGENDA
OCTOBER 20, 2016**

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

**CONSENT AGENDA
OCTOBER 20, 2016**

SUBJECT

President Approved Alcohol Permits Report

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies and Procedures, I.J.2.b.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

The chief executive officer of each institution may waive the prohibition against possession or consumption of alcoholic beverages only as permitted by, and in compliance with, Board policy. Immediately upon issuance of an Alcohol Beverage Permit, a complete copy of the application and the permit shall be delivered to the Office of the State Board of Education, and Board staff shall disclose the issuance of the permit to the Board no later than the next Board meeting.

The last update presented to the Board was at the August 2016 Board meeting. Since that meeting, Board staff has received forty-nine (49) permits from Boise State University, nineteen (19) permits from Idaho State University, seventeen (17) permits from the University of Idaho, and four (4) permits from Lewis-Clark State College.

Board staff has prepared a brief listing of the permits issued for use. The list is attached for the Board's review.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 - List of Approved Permits by Institution

Page 3

BOARD ACTION

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

**CONSENT AGENDA
OCTOBER 20, 2016**

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

**CONSENT AGENDA
OCTOBER 20, 2016**

SUBJECT

2015-2016 Accreditation Summary Report of Idaho Schools

REFERENCE

August 2011	Board accepted the 2010-2011 Accreditation Report.
August 2012	Board accepted the 2011-2012 Accreditation Report.
August 2015	Board accepted the 2014-2015 Accreditation Report.

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

Section 33-119, Idaho Code
Idaho Administrative Code, IDAPA 08.02.02.140 – Accreditation

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

Pursuant to IDAPA 08.02.02.140, “All public secondary schools, serving any grade(s) 9-12, will be accredited. Accreditation is voluntary for elementary schools, grades K-8, private and parochial schools, and alternative schools...” Section 33-119, Idaho Code, authorizes the Board to establish the accreditation standards. Through administrative rule, the Idaho State Board of Education (Board) requires schools to meet the accreditation standards of the Northwest Accreditation Commission (NWAC), a division of AdvancED.

In accordance with IDAPA 08.02.02.140, an annual accreditation report will be submitted to the Board. This report outlines the accreditation status of Idaho’s schools that serve any grade(s) 9-12 as well as those elementary schools, schools serving grades K-8, private, and parochial schools that voluntarily seek accreditation.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – 2015-2016 Accreditation Summary Report of Idaho Schools	Page 3
Attachment 2 – AdvancED Accreditation Policies and Procedures	Page 13

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

AdvancED accredits both individual schools as well as school systems (school district) Once a school becomes accredited, they may have one of two accreditation statuses. The accreditation status is based on the performance of a school in areas related to the accreditation standards, policies, assurances, student performance results and stakeholder feedback. The two statuses are “accredited” or “accredited under review.” The term “accredited under review” has replaced the term “accredited probation.”

All institutions that are accredited conduct a five year External Review during their final year of the accreditation cycle facilitated by AdvancED. In addition, all schools have a mid-term accreditation progress report that is done through AdvancED’s online accreditation application. This report is done at the end of the second (2nd) year in the cycle for all schools with the “accredited” status.

**CONSENT AGENDA
OCTOBER 20, 2016**

Those schools with “accredited under review” status have a more frequent reporting cycle. The “accredited under review” cycle can be every year, or more often dependent on the situation. All “accredited under review” institutions conduct an onsite accreditation progress report review facilitated by AdvancED.

The Accreditation Progress report specifically addresses the required actions given by the External Review Team at the five year onsite review. There are two circumstances under which a school may be placed in “accredited under review” status. The first is based on the institution scoring in the bottom fifth percentile of AdvancED’s Index of Education Quality. The second circumstance is based on the school not meeting AdvancED Standards, a complaint has been filed against the school, the school is in violation of AdvancED’s Accreditation Policies and Procedures, or based on and on-site team review.

BOARD ACTION

I move to accept the 2015-2016 Accreditation Summary Report of Idaho Schools as submitted in Attachment 1.

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes _____ No _____

**CONSENT AGENDA
OCTOBER 20, 2016**

SUBJECT

Cassia County School District #151, Albion Elementary School - Hardship Elementary School Annual Report

REFERENCE

October 1999	Board approved the request by Cassia County School District #151 for Albion Elementary School to be designated as a hardship elementary school with the addition that the designation exists for one year.
October 2000 – 2011	Board received Albion Elementary School annual hardship report. No action was taken.
June 2015	Board received Albion Elementary School annual hardship report. No action was taken.

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

Section 33-1003(2)(b), Idaho Code

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

At the October 1999 meeting, the Board approved the request by Cassia County School District #151 for Albion Elementary School to be designated as a hardship elementary school and required an annual report. The 2000 Legislature amended Section 33-1003(2)(b), Idaho Code, by adding, "An elementary school operating as a previously approved hardship elementary school shall continue to be considered as a separate attendance unit, unless the hardship status of the elementary school is rescinded by the state board of education." Therefore, no action is required unless the Board chooses to rescind the hardship status. Conditions supporting the October 1999 decision to approve the Albion Elementary School as a hardship elementary school have not changed.

IMPACT

Cassia County School District #151 would have received \$107,000 less in FY2016 if Albion Elementary School was not considered a separate school.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – Letter from Gaylen Smyer to Sherri Ybarra (4/4/2016) Page 3
Attachment 2 – Letter from Jerry Doggett to Marilyn Howard (9/29/1999) Page 5

BOARD ACTION

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

**CONSENT AGENDA
OCTOBER 20, 2016**

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

**PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
OCTOBER 20, 2016**

TAB	DESCRIPTION	ACTION
1	LEWIS-CLARK STATE COLLEGE ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORT AND TOUR	Information Item
2	IDAHO DIVISION OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORT	Information Item
3	STEM ACTION CENTER UPDATE	Information Item
4	IDAHO DEPARTMENT OF LABOR – WORKFORCE PROJECTIONS REPORT	Information Item
5	WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL – ANNUAL REPORT	Information Item
6	BOARD POLICY – I.E., EXECUTIVE OFFICERS – SECOND READING	Motion to Approve
7	TEMPORARY RULE – IDAPA 08.02.01 – DATA COLLECTION	Motion to Approve
8	QUALITY EDUCATOR PROGRAM INDICATORS	Information Item

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

**PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
OCTOBER 20, 2016**

LEWIS-CLARK STATE COLLEGE

SUBJECT

Lewis-Clark State College Annual Report and Tour

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies & Procedures, Section I.M.3 and 4.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

This agenda item fulfills the Board's requirement for Lewis-Clark State College to provide a progress report on the institution's strategic plan, details of implementation, status of goals and objectives and information on other points of interest in accordance with a schedule and format established by the Board's Executive Director.

IMPACT

Lewis-Clark State College's strategic plan drives the College's planning, programming, budgeting, and assessment cycles and is the basis for the institution's annual budget requests and performance measure reports to the State Board of Education, the Division of Financial Management and the Legislative Services Office.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – Annual Report

Page 3

BOARD ACTION

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

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
OCTOBER 20, 2016

SUBJECT

Idaho Division of Vocational Rehabilitation (IDVR) Annual Report

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies & Procedures, Section I.M.3.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

This agenda item fulfills the Board's requirement for IDVR to provide an annual progress report on the agency's strategic plan, details of implementation, status of goals and objectives and information on other points of interest in accordance with a schedule and format established by the Board's Executive Director.

Jane Donnellan, Administrator of the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, will provide an overview of IDVR's progress in carrying out the agency's strategic plan.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – Idaho Division of Vocational Rehabilitation Presentation Page 3

BOARD ACTION

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

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

STEM ACTION CENTER

SUBJECT

STEM Action Center Annual Report

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

Section 67-823, Idaho Code.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

The STEM Action Center (Center) was created in 2015, as an office of the Governor to coordinate and oversee the implementation of STEM programs, promote STEM through best practices in education to ensure the connection with industry and Idaho's long-term economic prosperity, to produce an Idaho STEM-competitive workforce to offer better access to competitive employment opportunities; and to drive student experience, engagement and industry alignment by identifying and implementing public and higher education STEM best practices to transform workforce development. The duties of the STEM Action Center range from the coordination of state STEM related activities, industry needs assessments and gap analysis, to the alignment and coordination of education related STEM activities with industry and education and the identification of STEM education related best practices.

The Center's Board is made up of nine (9) members representing the Department of Commerce, Department of Labor, State Superintendent, State Board of Education and five (5) members representing manufacturing or STEM related industries. Board of Education member Dr. Hill is the State Board of Education's representative on the STEM Action Center Board and the current chair of that Board.

The Center's enabling legislation requires the Center to report on progress to the State Board of Education annually. The Center has been operating for approximately one year and is now starting to see results. The Center has been working to provide STEM resources and STEM professional development to Idaho educators and communities. Grants focused on innovative project-based STEM and community STEM events are being evaluated for outcomes and impact. Professional development opportunities have included:

- FABSlam – a 3D design and fabrication professional development and student competition,
- BotBall robotics professional development and materials, and
- Oracle's Alice 3.1.1 and Java Fundamentals trainings.

Additional professional development opportunities are currently being evaluated and will be deployed in January 2017. Last year the Center interacted with over 1,200 educators impacting over 10,000 students. Additionally, 36 STEM Family events were held throughout the state impacting not only students and educators,

PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
OCTOBER 20, 2016

but communities as well. This year the Center is hosting three regional (inaugural) science and engineering fairs. Idaho is now, no longer the only state in the nation without student access to national science and engineering competitions.

Additional projects focus on creating a virtual mentorship platform which will connect educators and industry to support student-led projects such as science and engineering fair projects, FIRST robotics, and other projects related to student competitions.

Computer science has also become a major focus of the Center as it works with postsecondary education and industry to create opportunities to enhance Idaho's workforce including the university co-op program and scholarship expansion for STEM educators and students entering STEM and computer science fields. The Center is partnering with the Discovery Center of Idaho, Camp Invention, STEMbusUSA, the University of Idaho, and Boise State University to support scholarships allowing students from traditionally underrepresented population to attend STEM and computer science camps. The Center is also creating strong partnerships with industry receiving significant monetary and in-kind support totaling nearly \$200,000 (so far) in FY17

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – STEM Action Center Overview	Page 3
Attachment 2 – STEM Action Center 2016-2017 Opportunities	Page 5
Attachment 3 – STEM Action Center Strategic Plan	Page 7
Attachment 4 - STEM Action Center Performance Measure Report	Page 17

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Centers duties closely overlap and are in alignment with STEM education goals of the State Board of Educations and the Board's STEM education strategic plan. The Centers staff have developed a good working relation with Board staff allowing for continued collaboration and alignment of the Board's goals as outlined in the Board's STEM education strategic plan (approved October 2014).

BOARD ACTION

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

**PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
OCTOBER 20, 2016**

IDAHO DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

SUBJECT

Workforce Projections Report

REFERENCE

October 15, 2014

The Idaho Department of Labor provided the Board with Idaho Industry and Occupational Employment Projections for 2012 – 2022.

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies & Procedures, Section VI A.4.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

The Idaho Department of Labor (IDOL) is the primary agency charged with workforce development for the State of Idaho. IDOL operates under the guidance of the Workforce Development Council and views its role as the “connection” among education and industry stakeholders. IDOL also administers the Workforce Development Training Fund.

Under a grant provided through the Idaho State Board of Education, IDOL developed key components of the workforce data portion of the State Longitudinal Data System (SLDS) and is mining the workforce data for information beneficial to development of workforce training programs. In addition, IDOL conducts regular studies of labor market information to assist industry and State government in decision making.

IDOL has actively promoted greater collaboration among industry, government and education, particularly in the areas of career awareness for students and job seekers, technical education training and other areas where IDOL has identified gaps in workforce development training. IDOL will present information in the following areas:

End Points Analysis (SLDS) – The analysis will give an overview of job placement, locations and income levels for Idaho postsecondary graduates.

Postsecondary Graduates In-State Retention Study – This study provides a summary of retention rates by institution for a four-year period.

High School Cohort Study – This study tracks the 2004 high school graduates, where they are and what they are doing.

These analyses and studies are being presented in order to emphasize areas where IDOL will be seeking participation from

PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
OCTOBER 20, 2016

education in developing programs and policies to retain and increase Idaho's workforce.

Career Awareness – The plan to improve the Career Information System (CIS) will be presented along with a review of how VISTA and AmeriCorps volunteers are being deployed to support local district efforts in career advising.

IDOL provide a progress report on how the volunteer program is progressing and the need for support from the Board in these efforts.

Work-Based Learning – CTE and IDOL are developing programs to increase work-based learning, particularly apprenticeships. An overview of these efforts, goals and objectives will be presented.

IDOL will be discussing a request for the Board to consider changes to the definition of those recognized as achieving the 60% goal.

10-Year Job Projections – IDOL bi-annual projections of jobs will be presented, including the “hot jobs” list. The presentation will highlight the rapidly changing marketplace and the impact on education.

IDOL will be requesting assistance in determining how our education system is preparing students to fill today's jobs.

Career Skills – Industry expectations for career skills, commonly called soft skills, will be discussed.

IDOL will present business and industry needs in context of our current education model and the need for incorporation of project-based learning, critical thinking and other attributes necessary for student success upon entering the workforce.

Other Workforce Initiatives – IDOL in other areas, including its Hispanic Initiative and Choose Idaho, will be presented.

IDOL will be seeking cooperation and assistance in implementing its initiatives.

Talent Accelerator Initiative – IDOL is evaluating opportunities for increasing workforce development training funds. The Talent Accelerator Initiative and its impact on funding for education will be presented.

PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
OCTOBER 20, 2016

IDOL is seeking input on its proposal and the Board's ideas for increased workforce training funding.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 - Public Postsecondary Graduate Retention Analysis	Page 5
Attachment 2 - Labor Market Projections for Idaho – 2014-2024	Page 13
Attachment 3 - Talent Accelerator Initiative Whitepaper	Page 19

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff comments have been broken out based on the area listed above that they pertain to:

Work-Based Learning – The Board's educational attainment/college completion goal (60% Goal) was based on Board discussion and staff work conducted between May and October 2010. In October 2010 the Goal was incorporated into the Board's strategic plan. Any changes to the Board's definition of "certificate" would be accomplished through an amendment to the Board's strategic plan. The current performance measure is "Percent of Idahoans (ages 25-34) who have a college degree or certificate requiring one academic year or more of study". An academic year runs from the fall to spring semester and is approximately nine (9) months. This goal, including the educational levels included in it, were based on the Georgetown University Center on Education and the Workforce research release in June 2010, showing that by 2018, 61% of the jobs in Idaho would require a postsecondary education.

In 2013, Idaho Business for Education (IBE) conducted a survey of Idaho business and their projected needs. IBE's survey results reaffirmed the Board's current Educational Attainment Goal and was in alignment with the updated Georgetown University Center on Education and the Workforce research showing that by 2020, 67% of the jobs in Idaho would require some form of postsecondary degree or credential. While both the survey and the Georgetown Study showed a need for increased postsecondary attainment at all levels, the survey found the highest percentage of degrees needed was at the baccalaureate level and the updated Georgetown Study identified the highest areas of growth at the baccalaureate or higher levels.

Any discussions regarding the expansion of the definition of certificate should take into consideration the different levels of attainment necessary to meet Idaho's workforce needs, the availability to collect population data on certificates, and the fact that individuals with a certificate of less than one academic year are currently included in the remaining 40% of the population. In addition to the Educational Attainment Goal, the Board has also set out targets for percentages of graduates at each degree level (Goal 1, Objective C) from our public institutions in the Board's strategic plan as well as students participating in internships (Goal 2, Objective A).

PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
OCTOBER 20, 2016

Career Skills – The Board currently sets educational expectations at the elementary and secondary levels (K-12 education) through the adoption of standards, these standards consist of subject area “content standards” as well as minimum standards for educator preparation programs, while the specific methods of teaching and curriculum are selected at the local level. At the postsecondary level program expectations are approved by the Board through the approval of each academic or career technical program. Project-based learning has been identified as a best practice, particularly at the K-12 education levels and various professional development has been provided to school districts over the years in this area. One area that has been identified that would help with the adoption of more project based learning at the K-12 level would be more specific language in the standards (requirements) for our educator preparation programs at the teacher as well as administrator levels. The educator preparation standards are incorporated by reference into Administrative Code and would be amended through the rulemaking process. These standards apply to all educator preparation programs in Idaho at both public and private postsecondary institutions. In addition to the process of amending the standards that Board may wish to look at developing a Board policy specific to the educator preparation programs at the public postsecondary institutions.

BOARD ACTION

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

PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
OCTOBER 20, 2016

SUBJECT

Workforce Development Council – Annual Report

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

Section 72-1336, Idaho Code

Executive Order 2015-02 – Establishing the Workforce Development Council for planning and oversight of the state's workforce development system

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

The Workforce Development Council (Council) was created by Governor Phil Batt in 1996 by consolidating four advisory groups that dealt with workforce development issues. The Council has served as the state workforce board under the Job Training Partnership Act, the Workforce Investment Act and currently under the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act. The Council's 26 members are constituted from the following:

- a. Representatives of business and industry shall comprise at least 40% of the members;
- b. At least 15% of the members shall be representatives of local public education, postsecondary institutions, and secondary or postsecondary vocational educational institutions;
- c. At least 15% of the members shall be representatives of organized labor based on nominations from recognized state labor federations;
- d. Representatives from the Department of Commerce, Department of Labor, the State Board of Education, Division of Career Technical Education and the Superintendent of Public Instruction; and
- e. A representative of a community-based organization.

The Council is responsible for advising the Governor and the State Board of Education (Board) as appropriate and at regular intervals on items that include but are not limited to:

- a. Development of the statewide strategy for workforce development programs;
- b. Development of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act State (WIOA) Plan
- c. Preparation of the annual report to the U.S. Secretary of Labor as required under Section 103 of WIOA;
- d. Development and continuous improvement of comprehensive state workforce services and performance measures;
- e. Development of a statewide employment statistic program and a plan for comprehensive labor market information;
- f. Development of technological improvements to facilitate access to and improve the quality of workforce system services and activities; and
- g. Development of comments at least once annually on the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act.

**PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
OCTOBER 20, 2016**

To fulfill the responsibility of the Council as outlined in statute and executive order, B.J. Swanson, Vice Chair of the Council, will be making the Council's report to the Board.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – Workforce Development Council Annual Report

Page 3

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Council was established to provide strategic direction and oversight of Idaho's workforce development system. The Council members represent business, workers, education, state and local government and community based organizations. The primary role of the Council is to advise Governor C.L. "Butch" Otter and the Board on strategies designed to yield high quality workforce investment services for Idaho's businesses, job seekers, and students.

BOARD ACTION

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

PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
OCTOBER 20, 2016

SUBJECT

Board Policy I.E. Executive Officers – Second Reading

REFERENCE

October 2010	Board approved first reading of Board Policy I.E.2. Presidents/Agency Heads allowing CEO's to receive stipends or other forms of compensation for unrelated duties or activities
December 2010	Board approved second reading of Board Policy I.E.2
December 2015	Board approved first reading of Board Policy I.E. Executive Officers, regarding the timely reporting of events.
February 2016	Board approved second reading of Board Policy I.E. Executive Officers
August 2016	Board approved first reading of Board Policy I.E. Executive Officers – vehicle allowance

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies & Procedures, Sections I.E. Executive Officers.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

State Board of Education Policy, Section I.E., grants each institutional president the use of an institution automobile, maintained by the institution, or a vehicle allowance, at their discretion. When using an institution owned vehicle it is customary for the institution to assign the vehicle to the institution president for their sole use. Currently state owned or controlled vehicles (with few exceptions for law enforcement) are required to be conspicuously marked as state vehicles (Idaho Code §49-2426) and are only allowed to be used for official business.

The proposed amendments to Board Policy I.E. Executive Officers would eliminate the option for the chief executive officer to use an institution vehicle, and would set out provisions for a vehicle allowance. The proposed amendments bring the policy into alignment with state requirements.

IMPACT

Approval of the proposed amendments would eliminate the conflict between Board policy and the state prohibition against state vehicles being used for personal use.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – Board Policy I.E. Executive Officers – Second Reading Page 3

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Board staff received one comment regarding concern over the insurance requirements from Boise State University. Based on this feedback and additional

PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
OCTOBER 20, 2016

staff review the proposed policy has been amended to remove the reference to vehicle maintenance and upkeep provided by the institution.

The vehicle maintenance provision was original language that had been moved when the vehicles were institution vehicles and it has been determined that it is unnecessary to retain it. State mileage reimbursement rates for personal vehicles used for business purposes is set at a level intended to cover fuel as well as normal vehicle maintenance. State mileage reimbursement rates are set by the Board of Examiners.

Currently, Risk Management does not require and specific liability coverage for state employees who occasionally use their personal vehicles for business purposes, the insurance language regarding insurance coverage was added based on the assumption the institution presidents would use the vehicles for more than "occasional use." According to feedback from Risk Management staff, most state agencies have policies in place requiring, when practicable, for staff to use agency/state vehicles or rental vehicles for business purposes. In the case where an employee is using a personal vehicle for extensive business purposes Risk Management has recommended the Board retain the requirement for the liability insurance coverages as proposed in the first reading of the policy amendments.

BOARD ACTION

I move to approve the second reading of proposed amendments to Board Policy section I.E. Executive Officers, as submitted in Attachment 1.

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes _____ No _____

PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
OCTOBER 20, 2016

SUBJECT

Temporary Rule – IDAPA 08.02.01., Rules Governing Administration, Career Ladder Data Collection

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

Article IX, Section 2 of the Idaho Constitution
Sections 33-101, 33-105, 33-107, 33-116, 33-1004B and 33-1004D, Idaho Code

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

The Career Ladder sets out specific components that are required for determining movement on the Career Ladder. The intent of the legislation was that each required component would be collected and used for determining movement on the Career Ladder. The Department of Education has indicated that it is unclear whether they have the authority to collect each component required for determining movement on the Career Ladder and has suggested the Board provide that clarification through an administrative rule. Calculating movement on the Career Ladder is contingent on data collected starting in the 2015-2016 school year.

This temporary rule will specify that each component needed for calculating movement on the Career Ladder are to be collected annually as well as one additional measure used for determining eligibility for the professional endorsement and master teacher premium. The professional endorsement is necessary for moving from the residency rung on the Career Ladder to the professional rung. Currently only one component is being collected -- the overall rating on the state framework for teaching evaluation. The rule will add four additional data elements to the instructional/pupil service staff records that are currently required to be submitted. The components include: Overall rating on the evaluation (already reported); number of components of the evaluation rated as unsatisfactory; if a majority of the teachers students met their student achievement targets or student success indicator targets (yes/no); what tool or tools were used for measuring student achievement or student success (multiple choice); and if an individual has an individualized professional learning plan (Y/N).

IMPACT

Approving the temporary rule will provide the Department of Education with the legal directive needed to collect the necessary data points for calculating instructional staff and pupil service staff movement on the Career Ladder. This calculation is necessary for determining a school district's salary based apportionment.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – Temporary Rule IDAPA 08.02.01.251

Page 3

**PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
OCTOBER 20, 2016**

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Temporary rules go into effect at the time of Board approval unless an alternative effective date is specified by Board action. To qualify as a temporary rule, the rule must meet one of three criteria: provides protection of the public health, safety, or welfare; or is to come into compliance with deadlines in amendments to governing law or federal programs; or is conferring a benefit. Temporary rules also must be approved by the Governor. This rule qualifies as a temporary rule by conferring a benefit. Unlike proposed administrative rules, temporary rules do not have a public comment period, they are not reviewed by the Legislature, and they expire at the end of the succeeding legislative session, except under specific conditions. To assure consistency in the collection of these data the rule will be brought back to the Board at the end of the legislative session for re-approval as a new temporary and proposed rule. This will assure the requirements stay in place throughout FY2017 and will start the process for promulgating a permanent rule effective at the end of the 2018 legislative session.

BOARD ACTION

I move to approve the Temporary Rule, IDAPA 08.02.01.251 Rules Governing Administration, Career Ladder Data Collection.

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes _____ No _____

PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
OCTOBER 20, 2016

SUBJECT

Educator Preparation Programs Definition – Low Performing

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

Higher Education Act of 1965, §§207 (2008).

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

Annually, the Office of the State Board of Education (Board) certifies and submits Idaho's Title II report to the U.S. Department of Education. The report includes data from public and private teacher preparation programs authorized by the State Board of Education to prepare individuals for certification in Idaho.

Several years ago, the U.S. Department of Education added a requirement that states must report preparation programs that had been identified as "Low Performing" or "At-Risk of Being Low Performing" as part of their Title II report. Initially, the federal government intended to set definitions for identifying programs into these categories; however, after substantial feedback from states and postsecondary institutions, the U.S. Department of Education decided to give that responsibility to the individual states. In 2015, states were notified that the U.S. Department of Education was going to require all states to include a definition in the 2016 Title II report identifying teacher preparation programs as "Low Performing" or "At-Risk of Being Low Performing". Based on these two categories, defined by the state, each state would use their definition to evaluate and identify programs needing assistance and provide that support. Based on a recommendation from the Professional Standards Commission (PSC), for the 2016 report, Idaho used the existing State Program Review process for identifying programs as "Low Performing" or "At-Risk of Being Low Performing" with the understanding that the PSC would work with the Idaho Coalition for Educator Preparation and the Idaho Association of Colleges of Teacher Education to recommend a more robust definition in 2016 and would put the new definition in place prior to submitting the 2017 report.

The framework provided in Attachment 1 reflects the indicators the PSC recommends for use in developing the definition and criteria for identifying "Low Performing", "At-Risk of Being Low Performing", and "Appropriately Performing" educator preparation programs. The Idaho Coalition for Education Preparation developed the framework; it was then supported by the Idaho Association of Colleges of Teacher Education and adopted and recommended by the PSC to the Board.

IMPACT

If the Board supports the recommendation of the PSC to use the indicators outlined in Attachment 1, the Idaho Coalition for Educator Preparation will use the indicators to develop the full definition and criteria to be used for identifying educator preparation programs as "Low Performing", "At-Risk of Being Low Performing", or "Appropriately Performing". The draft definition developed by the Idaho Coalition

PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
OCTOBER 20, 2016

for Educator Preparation will be vetted by the Idaho Association of Colleges of Teacher Education and will then be given to the PSC for review and formal recommendation to the Board. The full definition and criteria will be provided to the Board for consideration at the December 2016 regular Board meeting.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – Draft Framework for Identifying Low Performing
Educator Preparation Programs

Page 3

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In 2013 and 2014 the State Board of Education and Department of Education participated in the Network for Transforming Educator Preparation grant, as part of that work, Board and Department of Education staff in collaboration with the Idaho's educator preparation programs identified the following metrics for identifying effective educator preparation programs, most of which were already being collected and reported as part of Idaho's Title II report:

- GPA – Enrollment/Completer (Title II)
- Average GPA (proposed)
- Praxis Scores and Passing Rates (Title II)
- State Teacher Evaluation Summative Rating (in place by May 2015)
- Experience – Field Hours, and Student/Interns (Title II)
- Min # of courses (Title II) – content and pedagogy
- SAT/ACT/Compass (Title II)
- # of Completers by program (Title II)
- # enrolled by program (Title II)
- # FTE versus adjunct by program (Title II)
- Completer Entry and Persistence in teaching
- Completer Placement/persistence in High Need subjects and schools

The grant finished prior to finalizing the work started on developing measures by which Idaho could identify highly effective teacher preparation programs. The Idaho Coalition for Educator Preparation participated in the initial work and based on concerns regarding data limitation developed the proposed framework.

BOARD ACTION

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

**STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OCTOBER 20, 2016**

TAB	DESCRIPTION	ACTION
1	SUPERINTENDENT'S UPDATE	Information Item
2	TEMPORARY RULE – IDAPA 08.02.03.004.07 – ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS	Motion to Approve

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

**STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OCTOBER 20, 2016**

SUBJECT

Superintendent of Public Instruction update to the State Board of Education

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

Superintendent of Public Instruction, Sherri Ybarra, will provide an update on the State Department of Education. In addition, the Superintendent will present the Public School Budget and discuss the Request for Proposal (RFP) released by the Department on the Idaho Reading Indicator (IRI).

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – FY 2018 Public School Budget Request Page 3
Attachment 2 – FY 2018 Public School Budget Request (excludes IESDB)Page 5
Attachment 3 – FY 2018 Public School Budget Request (General Fund) Page 7

BOARD ACTION

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

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

**STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OCTOBER 20, 2016**

SUBJECT

Temporary Rule – IDAPA 08.02.03.004.07, Rules Governing Thoroughness, Idaho Alternate Assessment Achievement Standards

REFERENCE

May 2011	Board approved the Idaho Alternate Assessment Achievement Standards.
----------	--

September 2015	Board approved a temporary rule amending the Alternate Assessment Achievement Standards and the performance level descriptions for the Idaho Alternate Assessment Achievement Assessment.
----------------	---

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

Section 33-105, 33-1612, and 33-2002, Idaho Code
IDAPA 08.02.03.004.07 – Rules Governing Thoroughness, Idaho Alternate Assessment Achievement Standards

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

In 2011, Idaho joined the National Center and State Collaborative (NCSC) to build an alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards for students with the most cognitive disabilities. The goal of the NCSC is to ensure that students with the most cognitive disabilities achieve increasingly higher academic outcomes and develop college, career, and community ready skills.

Idaho administered the operational field test in the spring of 2015 and the NCSC completed standard setting/achievement level process in August 2015, based on the results of the operational field test for participating states.

Idaho proposed the adoption of the NCSC recommended standards and achievement levels to the Board in September 2015 and they were unanimously approved as a temporary rule. Idaho proposes to adopt the same NSCS standards and achievement levels to maintain consistency in assessment results for the 2016 and 2017 test administrations. These standards have not changed and remain the same as they were when adopted by the board in September 2015.

IMPACT

Updating the Idaho Alternate Assessment Achievement Standards will bring Idaho into compliance with requirements under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and current federal requirements in place under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. This rule has no financial impact.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – Temporary Rule IDAPA 08.02.03.004.07	Page 3
Attachment 2 – Cut Scores and Approval Process	Page 5

**STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OCTOBER 20, 2016**

Attachment 3 – Performance Level Descriptors

Page 9

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Temporary rules go into effect at the time of Board approval unless an alternative effective date is specified by Board action. To qualify as a temporary rule, the rule must meet one of three criteria: provides protection of the public health, safety, or welfare; or is to come into compliance with deadlines in amendments to governing law or federal programs; or is conferring a benefit. This rule qualifies as temporary rules as it can be argued that it confers a benefit. Unlike proposed administrative rules, temporary rules do not have a public comment period, they are not reviewed by the legislature, and they expire at the end of the succeeding legislative session, except under specific conditions.

The temporary rule approved by the Board in September 2015 expired at the end of the 2016 legislative session, converting the Idaho Alternate Assessment Achievement Standards to those approved by the Board May 18, 2011. These standards are no longer in alignment with Idaho's alternate standards achievement test, commonly referred to as the ISAT-Alt and referenced as the Idaho Alternate Assessment in IDAPA 08.02.03.111. The Board is being asked to only approve a new temporary rule incorporating the Alternate Assessment Achievement Standards also approved by the Board at the September 2015 Board meeting.

The alternative assessment is available to Idaho students who, based on the students individualized education plan are determined to be unable to take the Idaho Standards Achievement Test with or without accommodations or adaptations. These students are the ones with the most significant, cognitive disability for whom the standard assessment is not appropriate.

BOARD ACTION

I move to approve the Temporary Rule, IDAPA 08.02.03.004.07 Rules Governing Thoroughness, Idaho Alternate Assessment Achievement Standards, as submitted in Attachment 1.

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes _____ No _____

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

TAB	DESCRIPTION	ACTION
<hr/>		
	AMENDMENT TO BOARD POLICY	
1	Section II.F.2. – Policies Regarding Non-classified Employees (Courtesy Vehicles) – Second Reading	Motion to approve
<hr/>		
	AMENDMENT TO BOARD POLICY	
2	Section II.F.3. – Policies Regarding Non-classified Employees (Annual Leave) – First Reading	Motion to approve
<hr/>		

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

BUSINESS AFFAIRS AND HUMAN RESOURCES
OCTOBER 20, 2016

SUBJECT

Idaho State Board of Education Policy II.F. – Second Reading

REFERENCE

June 2016	Board approved the second reading of amendment to Board policy II.F (related to coach and athletic director employment agreements)
August 2016	Board approved first reading of amendment to Board policy II.F (courtesy vehicle policy)

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies & Procedures, Section II.F.
Section 49-2426, Idaho Code

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

The proposed amendment is the result of extended discussions among the State Board of Education (Board) Athletics Committee, the Board's Deputy Attorney General and institutional legal counsel, and the State Risk Management office. Language has been added to the policy to emphasize state regulations with respect to state-owned or leased vehicles and the insurance requirements applicable when local dealerships provide courtesy vehicles to institution personnel who choose to make personal use of those vehicles.

IMPACT

The proposed amendment fills a gap in previous Board policy with respect to courtesy vehicles. The revised wording reiterates existing State policy that personal use by employees of agency-owned/leased vehicles—as well as institution-controlled courtesy vehicles which are insured through the State's Risk management program—is not permitted. The amendment also provides the minimum coverage limits, special endorsements, and "additional insured" requirements when employees obtain personal insurance for courtesy vehicles.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1: Amendment to Board Policy Section II.F. – 2nd Reading Page 3

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The proposed amendments to Board Policy II.F.2.b.vi will help ensure compliance and consistency with respect to use of institution-owned vehicles, including dealer-provided courtesy vehicles for college/university employees. There were no changes to the proposed amendment after the first reading. Staff recommends approval.

BUSINESS AFFAIRS AND HUMAN RESOURCES
OCTOBER 20, 2016

BOARD ACTION

I move to approve the second reading of the proposed amendment to Board Policy Section II.F.2.b.vi "Policies Regarding Non-classified Employees – Automobile Exclusion and Courtesy Vehicles" as provided in Attachment 1.

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes _____ No _____

BUSINESS AFFAIRS AND HUMAN RESOURCES
OCTOBER 20, 2016

SUBJECT

Idaho State Board of Education Policy II.F.2 and 3. – First Reading

REFERENCE

June 2016	The Idaho State Board of Education (Board) approved the second reading of amendment to Board policy II.F (pertaining to coach and athletic director employment agreements)
August 2016	Board approved first reading of amendment to Board policy II.F (cousery vehicle policy)

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

Idaho State Board of Education (Board) Governing Policies & Procedures, Sections II.A. and II.F., subsections 2 and 3.
Sections 59-1607, 67-5303(j), 67-5329 and 67-5334, Idaho Code

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

In March 2014, President Obama directed the US Department of Labor (DOL) to review and update overtime eligibility standards under the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) through the federal rulemaking process. The DOL published its final rule on May 23, 2016, with an implementation date of December 1, 2016 (Final Rule). The Final Rule updates the salary level required for the executive, administrative, and professional overtime exemptions from \$455 per week (\$23,660 per year) to \$913 per week (\$47,476 per year). As a result of implementation of the Final Rule, a number of non-classified professional staff at the institutions and agencies under the Board's governance who have been "overtime exempt" (i.e., not eligible for overtime) will now become overtime-eligible.

The Board is authorized, pursuant to Section 67-5303(j), Idaho Code, to designate certain positions as non-classified positions. Under Board Policy II.A., the Board has delegated primary responsibility for personnel management at the institutions to the chief executive officers within the extent allowed by Board policy and state law.

Section 59-1606, Idaho Code, authorizes the Board to set the vacation leave policies for its non-classified employees. Board Policy II.F. Policies Regarding Non-classified Employees sets out the requirements for individuals employed as non-classified employees at the agencies and institutions under the Board's governance, with the exception of policies for those employees who are in classifications that are called out specifically in other Board policies, such as Board Policy II.G. (Faculty) and II.H. (Coaching Personnel).

Board Policy II.F. specifies that non-classified employees who are not overtime eligible accrue annual leave (vacation time) at a rate of two (2) days per month. Board Policy II.F. also specifies that non-classified employees who are overtime eligible earn annual leave in accordance with the provisions of Section 67-5334,

BUSINESS AFFAIRS AND HUMAN RESOURCES
OCTOBER 20, 2016

Idaho Code. Section 67-5334, Idaho Code sets the rate of vacation accrual for classified and non-classified state employees. The rate of vacation accrual varies depending on whether an employee is classified or non-classified and the employee's length of service with the state, from approximately one (1) day to one point seventy five (1.75) days per month. Vacation accrual rates also impact the maximum amount of vacation that may be accumulated. State employees earning vacation time at the rate of two (2) days per month may not accumulate more than 240 hours of leave, while employees earning leave at the lower rates of accrual may accumulate between 192 hours to 336 hours depending on the length of time employed with the state.

Institutions and agencies under the Board are grappling with how to deal with the increased overtime-exempt threshold. Current employees affected by the change have been identified by the institutions and agencies. Institutions and agencies have the option of limiting payment of overtime by restricting employees' working hours to 40 hours per week, where possible. Raising salaries above the \$47,476 annual threshold is also an option, for those positions that also meet the "duties" test.

As detailed above, the new overtime eligibility impact extends beyond the actual impact of the payment of overtime to issues involving vacation accrual. Once implemented, the Final Rule will result in existing non-classified staff becoming overtime-eligible. Once overtime eligible, under existing Board Policy II.F., vacation time accruals would be reduced from two (2) days per month to a lesser amount.

In addition to the issue of vacation time accrual, it was discovered that the current Board policy regarding overtime compensation (Board Policy II.F.2.b.iii.) is not consistent with state law. Sections 59-1607 and 67-5329, Idaho Code, prohibit classified and non-classified officers and employees who are included in the definition of section 67-5303(j) from earning either overtime compensation or compensatory time. Until such time as state law can be amended it is necessary to remove the conflicting language from Board Policy II.F.2 (Compensation).

The proposed amendments to Board Policy II.F. amend subsection 2.b. bringing it into alignment with existing state law and updating subsection 3.a. to allow those individuals who are non-classified and currently earning leave at a rate of two (2) days per month to continue to earn leave at that rate as long as they remain in their current position.

IMPACT

At this time there has not been an analysis completed on the estimated fiscal impact to the total compensation package received by impacted employees. The institutions and agencies under the Board's governance are subject to the federal overtime eligibility requirements. The fiscal impact of having more staff who are overtime eligible may be controlled by limiting employees from working hours in

BUSINESS AFFAIRS AND HUMAN RESOURCES
OCTOBER 20, 2016

excess of 40 hours per week when such limitations do not impact the overall ability of the institution or agency to function, or by increasing annual salary levels.

The impact of grandfathering in the vacation leave accrual rates for newly overtime eligible staff is also difficult to quantify. The choice of leaving the policy “as is” would result in a financial savings to the institutions and agencies by reducing their costs for vacation leave accrual if employees who had been earning 2 days a month saw their vacation accrual rate decrease. Amending the policy to allow individuals impacted by the overtime eligibility requirement changes to continue to earn leave at a rate of two (2) days per month could have an impact on agency and institution staff morale. In one instance you would have individuals who previously were not eligible to earn overtime now eligible to earn overtime and accruing leave at a rate of two (2) days per month. These individuals would may feel adversely impacted if their vacation accrual rate is reduced. Allowing them to continue to accrue leave at the rate of two (2) days per month avoids any adverse impact to these employees. On the other hand, if the policy amendment is made, there will be other non-classified employees who are not eligible to earn overtime or individuals new to the same or similar positions who are only allowed to earn leave at the lesser classified employee rates.

Board staff will have numbers for the institution and agency employees under the Board’s governance that are currently in non-classified position and not overtime eligible that will become overtime eligible effective December 1, 2016 available at the October Board meeting. Current estimates are in the hundreds.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 - Amendment to Board Policy Section II.F.3 – 1st Reading	Page 5
Attachment 2 – Estimated Number of Employees	Page

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The proposed amendments to Board Policy II.F.3. will minimize the negative impact of the Final Rule on non-classified employees who will become overtime-eligible (but may or may not be permitted to work overtime) and who would be required to accrue leave at a lesser rate. If the policy was not amended, actual reduction in accrual rates for these employees would be dependent on the individual’s length of employment with the State of Idaho. The reduction in accrual would be between one (1) day per month to one-half (1/2) day per month.

The ability to accrue leave at the impacted employee’s current higher rate would be limited to their time in the specific position. If the employee were to move to a new position that was non-classified and not overtime eligible they would accrue leave based on the specific position at the rate of two (2) days per month. If the employee were to move to another position that was classified or non-classified and overtime eligible their leave accrual rate would be reduced to the rate of the specific position. The proposed amendment would not increase the current costs by the institutions for the leave accrued by the affected individuals—they would

BUSINESS AFFAIRS AND HUMAN RESOURCES
OCTOBER 20, 2016

continue to accrue leave at a rate based on two (2) days per month for full time employees. The proposed amendment would result in the institutions and agencies forgoing any leave accrual savings which might have been seen by application of the lower leave accrual rate to newly overtime eligible non-classified employees.

This proposed amendment deals with a complicated issue. Staff will provide a brief overview of the impact of the Final Rule and some examples of how newly overtime-eligible professional staff members would be differentially impacted under different workplace scenarios.

If the first reading of the proposed amendment is approved, it is anticipated that a second reading would take place during a special Board meeting in late November, in order for the policy to be in place by December 1, 2016. Financial and/or Human Resources staff of the institutions and agencies may be available to answer questions regarding the impact of the proposed changes to their specific institutions.

BOARD ACTION

I move to approve the first reading of the proposed amendment to Board Policy Section II.F.3 Policies Regarding Non-classified Employees – Annual Leave, subsections 2 and 3, as provided in Attachment 1.

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes ____ No ____

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

TAB	DESCRIPTION	ACTION
1	FY 2017 SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS	Information item
2	AMENDMENT TO BOARD POLICY Section V.S. – Allocation of Lump Sum Appropriation – First Reading	Motion to approve
3	IDAHO NATIONAL LABORATORY Board Sponsorship of Idaho National Laboratory Project - Update	Information item
4	BOISE STATE UNIVERSITY Capital Project Construction Phase – Fine Arts Building	Motion to approve
5	IDAHO STATE UNIVERSITY Purchasing Policy	Motion to approve
6	LEWIS-CLARK STATE COLLEGE Capital Project Financing Plan and Construction Phase – Spalding Hall Renovation	Motion to approve

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

BUSINESS AFFAIRS AND HUMAN RESOURCES
OCTOBER 20, 2016

SUBJECT

FY 2017 College and Universities "Summary of Sources and Uses of Funds"

APPLICABLE STATUTES, RULE OR POLICY

Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies & Procedures, Sections V.B.4.b., V.B.5.c. and V.B.6.b.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

The College and Universities receive funding from a variety of sources. A summary of the revenue sources is as follows:

Revenue types include:

Approp: General Funds – State appropriation of state funds

Approp: Endowment Funds – Idaho State University (ISU), University of Idaho (UI) and Lewis-Clark State College (LCSC) are the beneficiaries of income from state endowment lands

Approp: Student Fees – Tuition and Fees approved by the Board; Legislature appropriates spending authority

Institutional Student Fees – Fees approved by the institution presidents

Federal Grants & Contracts – Extramural grants and contracts awarded by the Federal government

Federal Student Financial Aid – Funds passed through to students

State Grants & Contracts – Grants and contracts awarded by the State: may include state scholarships and work study funds

Private Gifts, Grants & Contracts – Other non-governmental gifts, grants and contracts

Sales & Services of Educational Activities – Includes: (i) revenues that are related incidentally to the conduct of instruction, research, and public service and (ii) revenues of activities that exist to provide instructional and laboratory experience for students and that incidentally create goods and services that may be sold to students, faculty, staff, and the general public. Examples would include sales of scientific and literary publications, testing services, etc.

Sales & Services of Auxiliary Enterprises – An institutional entity that exists predominantly to furnish goods or services to students, faculty, or staff, and that charges a fee directly related to the cost of the goods or services. Examples include residence halls, food services, student unions, bookstores, copy centers, health centers, etc.

Indirect Costs/Other – Also known as Facilities and Administrative (F&A) Cost recovery, on many grants an institution may charge a grantor for indirect costs. The expense to the grant is not a specifically identifiable cash outlay but a "recovery" of general overhead costs. Other revenue may also include Millennium funds.

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

BOISE STATE UNIVERSITY

SUBJECT

Construction of Fine Arts Building

REFERENCE

June 2012

Six-year Capital Improvement Plan Amendment

April 2013

The Idaho State Board of Education (Board) approved planning and design for new Fine Arts Building at a cost not to exceed \$2,885,000

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies & Procedures, Section V.K.1., V.F.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

In November 2009, the Boise State University (BSU) Art department underwent its second accreditation evaluation with the National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD.) The accreditation review paid specific note to the need for newer, updated facilities. Currently, Art department facilities are located in several different buildings scattered across campus. A new building to house the Art department was noted as one of the highest priority major capital projects for BSU. Fundraising and planning efforts to relocate the department began in early 2013, and in April 2013 the Board approved a request for the planning and design of a new Fine Arts Building. The Division of Public Works (DPW) was authorized to secure design services and the team of LCA/HGA architects was selected.

The result of the design process is an iconic art building that will provide a completely modern forum for art study and production at BSU. One of the building's showcase features is the World Museum which will be dedicated to the display of art and museum pieces from around the world to an audience of all ages. The Museum will incorporate state of the art technology including high definition video screening and 3D interactive technology to bring treasures from around the globe to Boise.

The Fine Arts Building will be located north of the existing Micron Business and Economics Building and has been designed to have a significant, iconic presence along Capitol Boulevard. The location and the design, both interior and exterior, of the building are intended to forward BSU's role as a leader in the Boise art community.

The new Fine Arts Building has been designed to effectively address current and future growth and safety requirements for the Art Department. The building will provide approx. 64,000 assignable square feet (ASF), co-locating the following arts

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 _____

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

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:

Funding:

State	\$	850,000
Federal (Grant)		0
LCSC		3,690,000

Total	\$	<u>4,540,000</u>
-------	----	------------------

Estimated Budget

Construction	\$	3,145,000
Const. Cont. (13.5%)		424,575
Design/ Consultant Fees		260,425
Other		360,000
FFE & Relocation Costs		340,000
Project Contingency		<u>10,000</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**

TAB	DESCRIPTION	ACTION
1	BOARD POLICY III.L. CONTINUING EDUCATION AND CREDIT FOR PRIOR EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING – FIRST READING	Motion to Approve
2	BOARD POLICY III.Z. PLANNING AND DELIVERY OF POSTSECONDARY PROGRAMS AND COURSES – FIRST READING	Motion to Approve
3	BOARD POLICY III.O. COURSE PLACEMENT– SECOND READING	Motion to Approve
4	DUAL CREDIT RECOMMENDATIONS	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
Attachment 2 – CAEL’s Final Report

Page 5
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

recommended an amendment to clarify that the statewide program responsibilities list will be “updated” by the Board every two years.

IMPACT

Proposed amendments to Board Policy III.Z will bring program names and degree titles up-to-date and ensure such updates occur on a regular basis. The proposed amendments will also clarify the expectations of the Universities regarding the delivery of statewide program responsibilities.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – Proposed Amendments to Board Policy III.Z
Planning and Delivery of Postsecondary Programs and Courses

Page 3

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Current Board Policy requires the “statewide program list shall be reviewed for alignment by the Board every two years.” After close consultation between Board Staff, the institutions and IRSA members, it became clear that such alignment was a vague and infeasible activity, which explains why it has never occurred. The proposed language provides clarity and actionable guidance. Proposed amendments add the term “when necessary” regarding the delivery of statewide program responsibility programs. This term is vague and will need to be further defined prior to second reading.

Board staff and CAAP recommend approval as presented.

BOARD ACTION

I move to approve the first reading of proposed amendments to Board Policy III.Z, Planning and Delivery of Postsecondary Programs and Courses as submitted in Attachment 1.

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes _____ No _____

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

SUBJECT

Board Policy III.O.—Course Placement—Second Reading

REFERENCE

February 2014	Board Approved second reading of Board Policy III.Q. Admissions Standards.
June 2015	Board approved Repeal of Board Policy III.O. Equivalency Schedules.
October 2015	Board approved extending the waiver of Board Policy III.Q.4.c, Admissions Placement Scores until the end of the Fall 2016 semester.

APPLICABLE STATUTES, RULE OR POLICY

Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies & Procedures, Section III.Q.4.c

BACKGROUND / DISCUSSION

At its October 2015 meeting, the State Board of Education (Board) extended the waiver of the placement section of Board policy III.Q.4.c. for a third time. This section of policy covers placement in entry-level college courses and was waived until the end of the Fall 2016 semester to allow for the creation and adoption of new placement mechanisms, especially in the wake of the news that ACT would be discontinuing the widely used COMPASS test at the end of CY2016.

The waiver required all new placement mechanisms and processes currently under development by the institutions to be reviewed by the Chief Academic Officer and the Council on Academic Affairs and Programs (CAAP) prior to implementation.

The adoption of this policy will serve two primary purposes. First, it will allow the institutions to design and implement placement processes and mechanisms that allow them to properly place their students based on their individual needs. Second, it will serve the Board's desire to ensure each institution's placement processes and expectations are found in a single location.

No changes have been made since first reading.

IMPACT

Approval of the proposed amendments would create a separate section of Board Policy regarding course placement and replace the current statewide placement policy.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – Board Policy Section III.O. Course Placement –
Second Reading.

Page 3

Attachment 2 – Board Policy Section III.Q.4.c.

Page 4

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

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

Given that course placement and college admissions are sufficiently separate areas of operation, CAAP recommends giving placement its own section of Board Policy. The proposed policy would create a new section of policy. CAAP recommends extracting Board Policy III.Q.4.c (currently under waiver) from III.Q and placing it in III.O. Board Policy III.Q is also in the early stage of being revised.

Currently, Board Policy III.Q.4.c sets a single placement policy for Idaho's public institutions under the Board's direct governance and the community colleges if the college's Board of Trustees does not set their own policy. A system-wide placement policy sets the postsecondary placement requirements in a single location, making it easier for potential students or parents of potential student and secondary school counselors/advisors to find and understand the requirements. While CAAP recommended eliminating a single system-wide placement policy it recognized the importance for critical placement related information to be located in a central location that is easy for students, parents, and school counselors to access.

This proposed policy was recommended for approval by CAAP at its May 26 meeting and recommended for approval by the Instruction, Research and Student Affairs (IRSA) at its July 21, 2016 meeting.

Staff recommends approval.

BOARD ACTION

I move to approve the second reading of the new section of Board policy III.O. Course Placement, as presented in Attachment 1 and to extend the waiver of Board Policy III.Q.4.c. placement in entry-level college courses, until such time as amendments to the policy are brought forward removing the subsection from Board Policy III.Q.

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes _____ No _____

INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH AND STUDENT AFFAIRS
OCTOBER 20, 2016

SUBJECT

Dual Credit Work Group Recommendations

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

Idaho State Board of Education Policy III.Y. Advanced Opportunities.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

At its February 2016 meeting, the State Board's Instruction, Research, and Student Affairs (IRSA) Committee asked Board staff to assemble a temporary workgroup, consisting of representative stakeholders from both the higher education and K-12 education, to bring forward a set of recommendations to make improvements to Idaho's already successful dual credit programs.

In close consultation with State Department of Education staff, the substantive focus of the work was divided into three categories: Teachers, Courses and Administrative Procedures. Each of the three groups met approximately weekly over five weeks to develop their recommendations. The recommendations were discussed among Board and Department staff, distilled down to one set of recommendations, and then returned to the workgroup members for their approval. The recommendations are an amalgam of the three subcommittees' recommendations.

The recommendations were presented to and discussed by IRSA at its July 21 and September 29 meetings. Similarly, these recommendations were presented to and discussed by CAAP at its August 25 and September 15 meetings.

Additionally, during a September 1 phone call, Board staff discussed each recommendation with the Executive Director of the National Alliance of Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships (NACEP), Adam Lowe. Mr. Lowe commended the Board for undertaking this work and considering these recommendations, which he noted do not conflict with NACEP accreditation standards and are consistent with the direction NACEP and many states are moving.

The recommendations include:

1. Providing scholarships/incentives for current high school teachers who want to take the necessary courses to be certified to teach dual credit courses.
2. For those students who take academic dual credit courses, make the General Education Matriculation (GEM) framework the focus. Defined in Board Policy III.N. General Education.
3. Requiring institutions and high schools to work jointly to identify alternatives to commercial text books, especially for GEM courses.
4. Encouraging the institutions to offer more evening, summer, and online courses/programs specific to DC credentialing.

**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.