1. **Agenda Approval**

Changes or additions to the agenda

2. **Minutes Approval**

**BOARD ACTION**

I move to approve the minutes from the October 10-11, 2016 regular Board meeting, the November 14, 2016 special Board meeting, and the November 28, 2016 special Board meeting, as submitted.

3. **Rolling Calendar**

**BOARD ACTION**

I move to set December 20-21, 2017 as the date and the College of Southern Idaho as the location for the December 2017 regularly scheduled Board meeting.
A regularly scheduled meeting of the State Board of Education was held October 19-20, 2016 at Lewis-Clark State College in Lewiston, Idaho.

Present:
Emma Atchley, President
Linda Clark, Vice President
Debbie Critchfield, Secretary
Andy Scoggin
State Superintendent
Don Soltman
Dave Hill
Richard Westerberg
Sherri Ybarra,
State Superintendent

Wednesday, October 19, 2016

The Board met in the Williams Conference Center at Lewis-Clark State College (LCSC) in Lewiston, Idaho. Board President Emma Atchley welcomed everyone and called the meeting to order at 10:00 am Pacific time. Ms. Atchley extended Board and Staff appreciation to LCSC for its hospitality. Board members Scoggin, Ybarra, and Westerberg convened for the afternoon session.

BOARDWORK

1. Agenda Review/Approval

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Clark/Critchfield): To amend the agenda by removing the Work Session Tab A from the agenda, and to approve the agenda as amended. The motion carried unanimously.

2. Minutes Review / Approval

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Clark/Hill): To approve the minutes from the August 11-12, 2016 regular Board meeting and the September 23, 2016 special Board meeting as submitted. The motion carried unanimously.

3. Rolling Calendar

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Clark/Soltman): 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 June 14-15, 2017, and the August 2017 Regular Board meeting to August 9-10, 2017. The motion carried unanimously.

PLANNING, POLICY & GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS (PPGA)

1. Lewis-Clark State College (LCSC) Annual Progress Report

LCSC President Dr. Tony Fernandez welcomed the Board and guests to Lewiston for the October
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 report submitted as part of the agenda materials.

After the campus visit and oral report from President Fernandez, the meeting recessed for lunch. After the lunch break, Board members Scoggin, Westerberg, and Ybarra joined the meeting for the work session and remainder of the scheduled meeting.

WORK SESSION

   Instruction, Research, & Student Affairs

   A. NWCCU Discussion

Dr. Sandra Elman, President of NWCCU was scheduled to facilitate a discussion and provide an opportunity for more detailed questions and answers. Due to complications from the weather, Dr. Elman cancelled her trip to the meeting. As a result, the NWCCU discussion will take place at a later date.

Planning, Policy & Governmental Affairs (PPGA)

   B. Idaho Indian Education Committee – Tribal Governance Structure Discussion

A presentation was led by Helo Hancock, Legislative Director for the Coeur d’Alene Tribe, and Dr. Chris Meyer of the Coeur d’Alene Tribe and Co-Chair of the Indian Education Committee, and Bob Sobbota, also a Co-Chair of the Indian Education Committee. Mr. Hancock provided some background on himself as well as a summarized overview of the history of Idaho Tribes starting as far back as when settlers came west, illustrating the challenges the Tribes have faced over the years. He provided a handout included in the agenda materials summarizing facts about the Coeur d’Alene Tribe and background on federal policy in Indian Country. Mr. Hancock pointed out several misconceptions about life on an Indian reservation that was unfortunately used in many governmental decisions over the years. Mr. Hancock spoke to the unique role the tribes have with the Board’s Indian Education Committee and on the unique cultural and socioeconomic issues facing the tribes around the state. He also pointed out that Tribes, for the most part, are treated as a sovereign nation and generally speaking, state laws don’t apply to Tribes and Tribal members within a reservation (although there are exceptions). He also pointed out the converse is true, that Tribal laws generally don’t apply to non-Indians on reservations, but there are also exceptions to that. He pointed out this creates a complicated jurisdictional maze when dealing with Indian reservations. Tribes have a unique relationship with the Federal government, making them quite different in terms of a minority population. Mr. Hancock indicated that nearly 40% of their budget is Federal dollars, and the rest of their budget is made up through Tribal economic development initiatives. He discussed how Tribes do a lot for their communities and those endeavors are sometimes overlooked.

Mr. Hancock discussed the Indian Education Committee and how a majority of Native American Indian students attend public schools, stating that those students face unique cultural and socioeconomic challenges. He praised the Board for establishing the Indian Education Committee and felt over time it will produce some extremely productive results. There was discussion about how the Board can work with the Tribes to meet the unique needs of American Indian students enrolled in the state’s public schools and institutions. Dr. Meyer commented how important it was for Tribes to have the Indian Education Committee under the Board and expressed gratitude for that. She welcomed the ability to come before the Board with questions and issues. Dr. Meyer acknowledged Board members Clark and Ybarra for their visit to the Coeur d’Alene Tribe and thanked them for their time and interest and their relationships with the school districts. The Tribe was proud to have such esteemed visitors.

Mr. Scoggins asked how many American Indian students are in public schools and what kinds of problems they are facing. Dr. Meyer responded that 75% of Indian students are attending public school. One of the most significant issues are high dropout rates at the high schools which is alarming. Ms.
Selena Grace, member of the Indian Education Committee, added that Tribal students make up about two percent of the enrollment population, and almost 90% of those students attend public schools. There are two Tribal schools in the state. She commented that from a Committee perspective, the most helpful thing the Board could do would be in looking at those policy issues facing the Tribes which impact curriculum, and engaging Tribal leaders in the discussion of the development of that curriculum, because of the historical dynamics of the Indian minority population. For the Board to reach out directly to Tribal education departments through Tribal leadership is key to developing curriculum and standards.

Ms. Johanna Jones from the Department of Education echoed those comments. She added that funding for teacher education programs would be very important and commented on some recommendations for the Board to look at such as equity in opportunity for American Indian students and scholarships like the Opportunity Scholarship. Dr. Meyer added that that the teachers should be required to take the Tribal Sovereignty Course. Mr. Freeman asked what the Board could do to increase the go-in rate among the Tribes, and pointed out the Direct Admissions Initiative has been extended to the Tribes. Dr. Meyer reaffirmed that the curriculum presently shows an insensitivity to Native Americans and it should be addressed. She felt Native American Indians are not being recognized or acknowledged as citizens and they feel faceless. Tribes want the Board to look at the curriculum and standards to put a face to the Tribes of Idaho rather than referring to them as savages. Ms. Jones added that the teachers are not invested in the students or the communities. Teacher investment is very important where the teachers learn about the Tribes, and the culturally sensitive pedagogy, and further remarked on the insensitivity toward the Tribes. Superintendent Ybarra commented on some of the positive things that are going on related to the Tribes and encouraged other Board members to personally visit some of the Tribes. She thanked the committee members for their work.

Ms. Critchfield suggested there are some things the Planning and Policy Committee could address including some of the curriculum and standards issues. She thanked the Indian Education Committee for their time, expertise and passion in this work. Ms. Atchley added that Curtis Elke, State Conservationist from the Natural Resources Conservation Service, offered his commitment to working with the Idaho Indian Education Committee and is expected to speak in December at the Indian Education Committee meeting. Ms. Atchley felt Mr. Elke would be able to help the Committee have more help at the national level.

C. Performance Reporting

Mr. Carson Howell and Dr. Cathleen McHugh provided a presentation to the Board on performance reporting. Dr. McHugh began the presentation with data from the IPEDS Data Feedback Reports and performance measures related to LCSC. Dr. McHugh provided an overview of what the data dashboard would look like, how to navigate through it on the various tabs, and what peers are relevant to the institution and their geographic location. Dr. McHugh reviewed academic year tuition and fees for LCSC and their peer institutions showing they are near the bottom in terms of fees charged compared to their peers. She reviewed similar data for grant aid; LCSC is toward the top in terms of institutional aid for students. Dr. McHugh reviewed graduation rates, which can be broken down into ethnic groups and gender.

Ms. Critchfield asked if the Board is still connected to the measures previously agreed upon or if the measures needed to be changed. Mr. Howell responded Board staff is reporting on what they feel is useful for the Board and to illustrate the status of the institutions and how they are doing. She asked the Board if these measures will be the ones to help guide the Board’s decision making. Mr. Howell responded that the dashboard would be constructed in a way using the data the Board would find most useful. Mr. Soltman expressed an interest in being able to see trends statewide and among institutions. There was discussion about remediation, and Mr. Howell pointed out some difficulty reporting on remediation and variables in looking at remediation rates over time. There was additional discussion on development of the dashboard and maneuverability on the menu.

Mr. Howell next reported on the dual credit headcount and credit hours. He noted the slope as a result of the fast forward program, has changed for the better and now more students are taking dual credit than
He noted the percentage growth from 2011-2015, and the growth has been in over 800% for students who are earning over 20 credits. In looking at dual credit earned by subject area, the top two areas are English and Math. Related to AP exams taken, there has been about a 30% increase in the number of AP exams. Go-on rates (both 1-year and 3-year) have declined slightly since 2011 which includes both in-state and out-of-state institutions. There was discussion about the go-on rates, and Mr. Howell pointed out that those students who are taking dual credit courses are more likely to go on. Mr. Westerberg also suggested tracking the amount of debt students are accumulating and whether it has an effect on go-on rates. There was some concern about not seeing an increase in Idaho’s go-on rates. One question was how does dual credit impact persistence and completion, or if it does. If not, what does? Mr. Scoggin recommended including the benchmark on the slides for comparative purposes.

Mr. Howell reported 10th day statewide numbers show an increase from 2015 to 2016 of students going on or graduating. He reported on go-on rates by gender which shows that women are enrolling at significantly higher rates than men which also holds true by region. Go-on rates by race/ethnicity also shows a gap between whites and Hispanic and American Indian student populations. Mr. Howell commented on the importance of reporting on demographic data, pointing out how impactful growth rates for different ethnic populations can be regionally. He reported that postsecondary enrollment system-wide has dropped since 2012, and reviewed full time and part time enrollment at each of the institutions.

Dr. McHugh reviewed board-approved types of remediation which include the accelerated model, the co- requisite model, and the empirium model. In terms of English remediation, all Idaho institutions use the co-requisite model. Roughly 85% of students needed remediation in college-level English. Related to Math remediation, Dr. McHugh pointed out the Math data should not be used to compare institutions because neither the definitions nor the cohorts are uniform across the institutions. Dr. McHugh reported that overall, compared to the two year institutions, there is a smaller share of students at the four year institutions needing Math remediation.

Ms. Atchley felt it would be important to see data on those students who did not successfully complete courses. Dr. McHugh indicated the specific data is included in the agenda material packet attached to this work session. Ms. Atchley specifically wanted to know what happens to students if remediation is unsuccessful.

Mr. Howell went on to discuss retention rates based on two year and four year institutions. The comparison was for students attending the same institution for the duration (students going from a two year to a four year institution are not included in the count). Retention rates at the four year institutions show retention at a higher rate, and female students were retained at a higher rate. By race/ethnicity, retention rates were all very close in numbers, showing a less than 3% variance between races. Mr. Howell reported on how the institutions’ retention rates were rated related to peer institutions. He reported on graduation rates from 2011 to 2015 at each of the institutions, and graduation rates as compared to the institution peers which included gender and race/ethnicity detail.

Mr. Howell reported on degree production from 2011 to 2015, showing the rates have increased for the number of students receiving degrees and certificates. He added the state could definitely benefit from degree production, but that it also depends on what happens to those graduates after receiving their degrees such as who leaves the state (i.e., STEM graduates who leave the state for higher wages). Mr. Howell compared cost per credit by institution, pointing out that students who needs additional or special services would increase the cost per credit. Mr. Freeman pointed out the benchmark is $400.

Mr. Howell reported on progress toward the 60% goal. He indicated that in 2010 we were at 37% and in 2014 we are at 40%, adding that it is on the cusp of being statistically significant.

Ms. Bent reminded the Board members that they would be reviewing and discussing the Board’s strategic plan in December, including reviewing the benchmarks. She requested any recommendations or changes be sent to Board staff.

Mr. Westerberg requested more summary data at a higher level, and less granular information in order to
understand where the trends are. There was consensus on next year having just state level data. The Board recessed the meeting at 4:30 Pacific Time.

Thursday October 20, 2016, 8:00 a.m., Lewis-Clark State College, Williams Conference Center, Lewiston, Idaho

The Board reconvened at Lewis-Clark State College in the Williams Conference Center for regular business. Board President Atchley called the meeting to order at 8:00 a.m. Pacific Time and thanked LCSC for their hospitality.

OPEN FORUM

There were no requests to speak during open forum.

CONSENT AGENDA

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

After approval of the Consent Agenda, Mr. Westerberg requested to take up item number four from the BAHR Finance agenda in an interest of keeping with Boise State President Dr. Kustra’s schedule to attend the grand opening of Boise State’s Downtown Computer Science Campus this afternoon. There were no objections to the request.

Business Affairs & Human Resources – Section I Finance

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

BOARD ACTION

By unanimous consent to approve the by Idaho State University to enter into a long-term contract with SpeedConnect as submitted in Attachment 1.

Instruction, Research & Student Affairs (IRSA)

2. University of Idaho – License Agreement – Sprint Infrastructure – Operation and Maintenance of Theophilus Tower

BOARD ACTION

By unanimous consent 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.

3. University of Idaho – License Agreement – Sprint Infrastructure – Operation and Maintenance of UI “I” Water Tank

By unanimous consent 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.

4. University of Idaho – Donation to Coeur d’Alene Center “Fiber Line”

By unanimous consent to approve the request of 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.

Planning, Policy & Governmental Affairs (PPGA)

5. Indian Education Committee Appointments

BOARD ACTION

By unanimous consent to appoint Dr. Sharee Anderson, representing Eastern Idaho Technical College, effective immediately and expiring June 30, 2017.

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

By unanimous consent 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.

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

By unanimous consent 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.

6. State Rehabilitation Council Appointments

BOARD ACTION

By unanimous consent 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.

7. President Approved Alcohol Permits - Report

A list of approved permits by institution was provided for informational purposes in the agenda materials to the Board.

State Department of Education (SDE)

8. 2015-2016 AdvanceED Accreditation Report

BOARD ACTION

By unanimous consent to accept the 2015-2016 Accreditation Summary Report of Idaho Schools as submitted in Attachment 1.

9. Cassia County School District – Albion Elementary School – Hardship Status

Information regarding this item was included in the agenda materials for informational purposes.

BUSINESS AFFAIRS AND HUMAN RESOURCES - Section II – Finance
4. Boise State University – Capital Project Construction Phase – Fine Arts Building

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Clark): 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. The motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Stacy Pearson, Vice President for Finance and Administration at BSU, indicated they are requesting approval to proceed with a new building to house the Art Department. The request 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. 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.

Dr. Kustra provided a thorough explanation of how the art museum will look with floor to ceiling screens that portray what it looks like to walk through other museums in the world. Ms. Pearson provided an overview of the budget and pointed out 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.

Ms. Atchley complemented BSU on the vision of the project.

PLANNING, POLICY & GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS (PPGA)

2. Idaho Division of Vocational Rehabilitation (IDVR) Annual Progress Report

Ms. Jane Donnellan, Administrator of the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, provided an overview of IDVR’s progress in carrying out the agency’s strategic plan. Ms. Donnellan outlined the IDVR’s program structure and focused primarily on the vocational rehabilitation program for the presentation. She pointed out their program is not a welfare program but one that provides services to eligible citizens to help them on their path to self-sufficiency and go from unemployment to employment. She reviewed the organizational structure of the program, and that there is a strong educational process involved in the program. Ms. Donnellan outlined the IDVR delivery system to its recipients, indicating that IDVR is also a resource to state employers. She identified the regional offices in the 8 regions of the state; there are three regions contained in the Treasure Valley.

Ms. Donnellan reviewed some of IDVR’s accomplishments, and in 2016 there were over 2,000 individuals eligible for employment. In 2016 there was a 506% increase in customer wages after receiving IDVR services, a 3% increase in successful employment outcomes. She reviewed the average wages of IDVR customers since 2012 and that it has shown an increase over the years. Their goal is to help individuals find good paying jobs. Additionally, IDVR supports postsecondary training – success in training equals success in employment. Ms. Donnellan reviewed some success stories of individuals in the IDVR program.

Ms. Donnellan reviewed the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) of 2014 and reviewed some of the challenges the Act has generated for the division. She outlined the key elements of WIOA and how it effects IDVR.

Ms. Donnellan highlighted some of the projects that have been developed for students with disabilities and details of those projects. Those projects included the BSU Prep Academy, the LCSC College Readiness Educational Workshop (CREW), the BSU Mentoring Transition Project, ISU Bengals’ Pre-employment Transition Services Project, UI’s McCall Outdoor Science School Project, and the BSU On-
Ms. Donnellan reviewed their SFY 2018 budget request which included a $125,000 increase in state general fund appropriations, $214,300 in additional state general fund appropriations for the extended employment services, and $111,100 in state general funds for the purpose of supporting one additional full-time employee for the Council for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing (CDHH) which currently has a staff of two. She reviewed partnerships which included collaborations with a number of other state agencies. She pointed out that without these partnerships IDVRs services to its customers would be adversely impacted.

3. STEM Action Center Update

Ms. Angela Hemingway, Executive Director of the STEM Action Center (Center), provided an update for the Board. The Center is dedicated to providing a STEM competitive workforce by implementing Idaho’s kindergarten through career STEM education programs. She reviewed the individuals who make up the members of the STEM Action Center Board, and identified their mission and vision statements. She reviewed two pieces of legislation specific to STEM Action Center, and how they are working with the State Board of Education, the Department, industry, educators, and universities to create Idaho specific K-12 computer science standards.

Ms. Hemingway indicated they expect to experience significant STEM job growth over the next ten years. Idaho is one of the top five states, and STEM jobs in Idaho pay much higher than jobs in other sectors with the median wage at $32 per hour, or an average of $67,833 annually. The state currently has over 6,000 STEM job openings presently. Ms. Hemingway reported on the number of men and women in STEM fields, but that women are behind in numbers. She provided that Idaho ranks 49th in women earning computer science degrees, and provided an illustration of the percentage of women earning bachelor’s degrees in various STEM areas.

Ms. Hemingway reviewed the goals of the STEM Center’s strategic plan of which the main goal is to coordinate and facilitate implementation of STEM programs throughout Idaho. She reviewed some of the events, scholarships, competitions, grants, and professional development initiatives, and reported on participation in science and engineering fairs.

Related to their second goal, Ms. Hemingway reported on the alignment between education and workforce. Related to their third goal to increase awareness of STEM throughout Idaho, she identified a number of efforts to increase that awareness. She reviewed professional development opportunities, student competitions, and reported on some of the strong partnerships they are forming in the state with industry. Ms. Hemingway reported that they are working to create a virtual, project-based, statewide mentorship program, and outlined the details and vision of this program.

Ms. Hemingway expressed a call of action to the Board to help spread the word about grant and professional development opportunities. Additionally, to help the Board connect with industries that support STEM education, and to partner with the STEM Action Center to create programs to expand STEM K-20 education efforts.

4. Idaho Department of Labor – Workforce Projections Report

Mr. Ken Edmunds, Director of the Idaho Department of Labor (IDOL) provided a presentation to the Board of the Workforce Projections Report. He introduced Mr. Craig Shaul who accompanied him for the presentation. Mr. Edmunds commented on the potential to collaborate together to solve the problems facing Idaho’s workforce.

Mr. Edmunds indicated every two years, they do a ten-year projection on total employment of the state. He reported that Idaho is very healthy presently and has experienced a 1.8% in growth which is greater than the national projection. He provided that projected growth in jobs and workforce between 2014 and 2024 is 138,000 and 89,000 respectively, so labor supply is a challenge. He provided an illustration of
Mr. Edmunds discussed work-based learning and that there is a great need to focus on apprenticeships, and a cooperative education model. He reported on college and career advising, and other areas such as adopting a Hispanic initiative, working with veterans, and two programs called Choose Idaho and Targeted Recruiting. He reported on their program called the Talent Accelerator Initiative, funded through 4% of unemployment tax collections, and used for direct employer training reimbursement, industry sector grants, and rural micro-grants. Mr. Edmunds pointed out they are working through a funding decline from $10 million to $5 million and reviewed the proposal and the funding suggestions.

He reviewed State Board, Career-Technical Education, and IDOL shared objectives and asked for support in areas which include outcomes based funding, current legislative funding, and the Talent Accelerator Initiative. He asked for collaboration among stakeholders to define college and career readiness, apprenticeships and the 60% goal, college and career advising, alignment of programs to jobs, retention and recruiting of graduates, and the Talent Accelerator Initiative.

Mr. Edmunds pointed out 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 they have identified gaps in workforce development training. IDOL presented information in a number of different areas including an overview of job placement, locations, and income levels for Idaho postsecondary graduates, along with a progress report on how VISTA and AmeriCorps volunteers are being deployed to support local district efforts in career advising.

Mr. Edmunds discussed a request for the Board to consider changes to the definition of those recognized as achieving the 60% goal. They also requested assistance in determining how Idaho’s education system is preparing students to fill today’s jobs. Mr. Edmunds presented business and industry needs in context with Idaho’s current education model, and how IDOL is seeking assistance in implementing its initiatives. Additionally, IDOL is seeking input on its Talent Accelerator Initiative and support from the Board for increased workforce training funding as related to that initiative.

5. Workforce Development Council – Annual Report

Ms. B.J. Swanson, Vice Chair of the Workforce Development Council (Council) provided the Council’s report to the Board. She introduced Molly Kauffman, Human Resource Director from Lewiston. Ms. Swanson reviewed the council’s strategic goals as part of its strategic planning process. She provided Council’s vision statement, which includes seeking to improve access to education, economic opportunity and employment for all Idaho job seekers. She reviewed a few of their priorities contained in the state plan. Those priorities included serving rural communities, alignment of career pathways to target sectors, attracting and retaining workforce, and connecting youth to the workforce, to name a few. She reviewed some strategies for addressing the noted priorities.

Ms. Kauffman summarized the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) Combined State Plan and identified its strategies for career pathways and youth in the workforce, along with their vision statement and other details of coordination. Ms. Swanson provided a link to the public copy of the WIOA Combined State Plan which can be found at www.labor.idaho.gov/WIOAstateplan.

Ms. Atchley asked if they could help define what skills are needed for someone who is career ready. Ms. Kauffman responded it is rather context specific regarding a trade or supervisory skills. She reported that basic skills for communication and writing are a very important factors as well.

BOARD ACTION

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

Board staff received one comment regarding concern over the insurance requirements from Boise State University. Based on this feedback and additional staff review, the proposed policy has been amended to remove the reference to vehicle maintenance and upkeep provided by the institution.

7. Temporary Rule – IDAPA 08.02.01 – Data Collection

BOARD ACTION

M/A (Critchfield/Westerberg): To approve the Temporary Rule, IDAPA 08.02.01.251 Rules Governing Administration, Career Ladder Data Collection. The motion 7-1. Ms. Ybarra voted nay on the motion.

Ms. Critchfield indicated this temporary rule will clarify that the requirement for school districts and charter schools to report the data necessary to calculating movement on the career ladder annual that is specified in Section 33-1004B, Idaho Code, is each of the criteria defined in Section 33-1001, Idaho Code as the performance criteria as well as the information necessary for determining if a teacher is eligible for the professional endorsement. The temporary rule will provide the Department of Education with the clear directive 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. Section 33-1004B, Idaho Code requires the Department of Education to make the calculations based on the data submitted by the school districts.

Ms. Ybarra expressed concern over the additional points proposed for collection. She requested further clarification. Ms. Bent responded that the Board and the Department discussed the level of data needed and the required components specified in Idaho Code. Ms. Ybarra disagreed with many components added to the temporary rule, stating the Department is already collecting what it needs and that there is not a need for this additional data collection. She felt Department staff and Board staff did not come to an agreement on the content of this rule, reiterating the accountability is already built into the rule. Ms. Bent reiterated that the data elements proposed in the rule are the exact data points specified as the performance criteria that must be met in order for an individual to move on the Career Ladder, with the one addition of the individualized professional learning plan. The professional learning plan is required for individuals to obtain the professional endorsement and the professional endorsement is required to move from the residency rung to the professional rung on the Career Ladder. All of the criteria must be collected to determine if an individual is eligible for movement, further the statute specifies the Department of Education will make the calculation for determining movement. Without the necessary data points movement could not be calculated.

Mr. Pete Koehler, Chief Deputy Superintendent, reported on the data that is presently required and for the benefit of the Board members, described the process in detail a district superintendent goes through; requirements are met in 12 separate areas. Mr. Tim Hill, Associated Deputy Superintendent also pointed out they have worked to reduce the number of data elements collected, and their intent to collect those that are most useful.

Mr. Westerberg commented on the obligation between the Board and Department to verify the adequacy of the use of the measures being used at the local level, and to ensure the standard is being applied the way it was meant to be applied. Ms. Ybarra recommended additional work on the measures together before passing this temporary rule. Ms. Atchley asked how many data points are being collected. Mr. Koehler responded nearly 600 were being collected and the work of the Department has done has reduced it by nearly 40%. He reported that they have reduced it to more meaningful collection rather than
a high quantity of data collection. Their goal is to ensure the burden of data collection they require is meaningful and beneficial for reporting.

Dr. Clark commented on having strong accountability and in not defining it, there are a number of misuses that can happen. She pointed out the committee that made the recommendation to the Task Force and the Task Force recommended heightened accountability and how the money was distributed. Mr. Freeman commented on the input the Board has received from legislators. He reiterated a single yes or no answer would not be sufficient in terms of accountability with regards to the Career Ladder. He commented the purpose of the rule was to make clear the data the Department would collect related to the accountability measures on the Career Ladder.

Mr. Scoggin commented that if this temporary rule is enacted the data being collected needs to be looked at as to whether it is being used and if not, the rule would need to be amended.

8. Educator Preparation Programs – Definition – Low Performing

Ms. Critchfield provided some background on the item and directed the Board to their agenda materials for greater detail. Annually, the 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 Board 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.

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.

Ms. Critchfield directed attention to Attachment 1 which 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. 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. The draft definition developed by the Idaho Coalition 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.

STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (SDE)

1. Superintendent’s Update

Superintendent Sherri Ybarra provided an update from the Department. She invited Mr. Duncan Robb, Chief Policy Advisor, to report on the Department’s legislative items. Mr. Robb reported on the legislation supporting rural schools and the work they have been doing to enhance rural education. He discussed the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) which authorized the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). The ESSA requires the Department to go through a process of content coordination with stakeholders across the state. He indicated they expect to have a draft plan by the end of this month and stakeholder input will be gathered. Public feedback forums will be hosted during the first weeks of November. The draft plan will be before the Board at the December meeting.

Ms. Ybarra introduced Tony Pierce, Chief Procurement Officer for the Department, to provide an update on the Idaho Reading Indicator (IRI) Request for Proposal (RFP). Mr. Pierce provided background on the process and the development of the scope of work for the proposal, and best practices. The RFP was
released in September, and an addendum was released in October. An eleven (11) person panel has been assembled to review written technical proposals. After the panel evaluates the proposals, they will be ranked. Once completed, they will work with the contractor on implementation.

Mr. Scoggin asked what is driving the decision to upgrade to a different system. Ms. Ybarra responded it is a Governor’s Task Force recommendation and that the old system is 20 years old.

Mr. Tim Hill next reviewed the Department’s budget and discussed the handouts for the Board. The first handout provided an overview of a zero based look at their budget showing all the revenues and expenditures, the second handout illustrated the same zero based look at the public schools portion, and the third handout provided a detailed explanation of their budget request from the FY17 appropriation to the FY18 request.

2. Temporary Rule – IDAPA 08.02.02.004.07 – Alternate Assessment Achievement Standards

BOARD ACTION

M/A (Ybarra/Clark): To approve the Temporary Rule, IDAPA 08.02.03.004.07 Rules Governing Thoroughness, Idaho Alternate Assessment Achievement Standards, as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Charlie Sylva, Special Education Director, was available by phone for questions. Ms. Ybarra indicated 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.

At this time the meeting recessed for lunch.

BUSINESS AFFAIRS AND HUMAN RESOURCES - Section I – Human Resources

1. Board Policy Section II.F. – Policies Regarding Non-Classified Employees, Vehicle Insurance – Second Reading

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Hill): 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. The motion carried 5-0. Mr. Scoggin, Ms. Critchfield, and Ms. Ybarra were absent from voting.

Mr. Westerberg indicated the proposed amendment fills a gap in previous Board policy with respect to courtesy vehicles. There were no changes to the proposed amendment after the first reading.

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

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Scoggin): 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. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Chet Herbst, Chief Financial Officer for the Board, provided a brief overview of the impacts and changes from the U.S. Department of Labor’s Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA). He reported that a number of non-classified staff that would become overtime eligible under the new rules. Additionally, he discussed there would be questions on how to fund the overtime pay or comp time pay, and possible
morale issues that the FLSA changes will effect. Mr. Herbst provided a slide for illustrative purposes on
the number of impacted employees of newly overtime-eligible non-classified staff. The number at
institutions totals roughly 715 employees and the number at the agencies is roughly 38. He also pointed
out that budget increases to cover these changes are not automatically included. Mr. Herbst provided
some examples of possible scenarios that could affect employee morale such as some employees would
be earning half the leave rate that they were earning before, some may feel that they are demoted to an
hourly position, and so forth. He pointed out for the Board the depth of this complicated issue and other
economic impacts.

Ms. Stacy Pearson from BSU suggested possible establishment of an additional classification called a
professional non-exempt group, where they would accrue leave at a different rate. The group agreed to
consider alternate options going forward.

BUSINESS AFFAIRS AND HUMAN RESOURCES - Section II – Finance

1. FY 2017 Sources and Uses of Funds

Mr. Westerberg introduced the item and Mr. Herbst provided an overview of the sources and uses of
funds. A summary of revenue sources was provided in the Board Agenda materials. Additionally, a trend
analysis was provided to show how the allocation of budgeted revenues and expenditures has changed
since fiscal year 2010 excluding any mid-year adjustments.

2. Board Policy Section V.S. – Allocation of Lump Sum Appropriation – First Reading

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Critchfield): To waive Board Policy Section V.S. – Allocation of Lump Sum
Appropriation, Subsection II.B., Enrollment Workload Adjustment, for the FY 2018 Fiscal Year.
The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Westerberg indicated the intent of the proposed amendment removes the Enrollment Workload
Adjustment (EWA) methodology to facilitate Board efforts to align Board 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.

3. Idaho National Laboratory (INL) – Board Sponsorship of Cybercore &
Collaborative Computing Projects - Update

Mr. Chet Herbst from the Board office provided a brief update on the project’s progress.

He indicated that a preferred site has been identified for the C3 project on property currently owned by
the Board. 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 (Foundation). Both
sites are acceptable to INL. The site on Foundation property may provide advantages in terms of
pedestrian flow, but the parcel is subject to deed restrictions which, unless lifted, will preclude use of the
property for the Cybercore site. The Foundation is working with the property donors to lift the restrictions
and is arranging for the appraisal of the property. A final proposal for the Cybercore and C3 sites will be
presented to the Board for approval at the December Board meeting.

Break in continuity: BAHR Finance Item 4 was addressed immediately following the Consent Agenda.

5. Idaho State University – Purchasing Policy

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Hill): 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. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Westerberg indicated ISU is seeking Board approval to adopt a new purchasing policy which will exempt ISU from the provisions of the State Procurement Act. The university will still follow purchasing policy and procedures that are consistent with those applicable to other state agencies.


BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Soltman): 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. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Westerberg indicated LCSC is requesting Board approval of the budget and financing plan and approval to begin construction for the Spalding Hall renovation project. The renovation will include new plumbing, electrical, and HVAC systems to bring the building up to modern standards, along with a new fire suppression system and removal of asbestos throughout the building.

At this time Mr. Freeman announced that the Board’s Chief Academic Officer, Dr. Chris Mathias, has expressed his intent to pursue other opportunities. He took a moment to recognize his work and thank him for his service. Dr. Hill offered some additional comments complementing the good work and guidance of Dr. Mathias.

INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH & STUDENT AFFAIRS (IRSA)

1. Board Policy – Section III.L. – Continuing Education and Credit for Prior Experiential Learning – First Reading

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Hill/Westerberg): To approve the first reading of amendments to Board Policy III.L, Continuing Education and Credit for Prior Learning as provided in Attachment 1. The motion carried unanimously.

Dr. Mathias provided background on the item and walked the Board through the changes to policy. He pointed out 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.

2. Board Policy III.Z. – Planning and Delivery of Postsecondary Programs and Courses – First Reading

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Hill/Critchfield): 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. The motion carried unanimously.

Dr. Mathias indicated 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.
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3. Board Policy III.O. – Course Placement – Second Reading

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Hill/Westerberg): 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. The motion carried unanimously.

Dr. Mathias indicated approval of the proposed amendments would create a separate section of Board Policy regarding course placement and replace the current statewide placement policy. No changes have been made since first reading.

4. Dual Credit Recommendations

Dr. Hill indicated these recommendations would also be brought before the Board in December. Dr. Chris Mathias provided background on the item that at its February 2016 meeting, the State Board’s 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.

Dr. Mathias pointed out the recommendations were presented and discussed by IRSA and CAAP, and additionally with the Executive Director of the National Alliance of Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships (NACEP), Adam Lowe, who commended the Board for its work on these recommendations. They do not conflict with NACEP accreditation standards and are consistent with the direction NACEP and other states are moving.

Dr. Mathias provided an overview of the recommendations which were also included in the Board agenda materials. He clarified that after further discussion on the recommendations, IRSA intends to bring them before the Board for approval at the 2016 December Board meeting.

Ms. Atchley recommended leftover scholarship dollars go into the program to help these recommendations take place, including scholarships for the teachers. Ms. Ybarra requested regarding item 8 on the creation of a standard template for compensation processes, to make that an optional piece because of the potential message it sends.

Dr. Mathias thanked the Board and institution staff for their tireless work for education. He also thanked the Board staff and Department staff for their work as well, and extended a special thank you to Matt Freeman for his support and work at the SBOE office.

OTHER BUSINESS

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

M/S (Westerberg/Hill): To adjourn the meeting at 2:10 p.m. Pacific Time. The motion carried unanimously.
A special meeting of the State Board of Education was held November 14, 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 9:00 am Mountain Time. A roll call of members was taken.

Present:
Emma Atchley, President
Debbie Critchfield, Secretary
Andy Scoggin
Sherri Ybarra, State Superintendent

Absent:
Linda Clark, Vice President

BUSINESS AFFAIRS & HUMAN RESOURCES (BAHR)

Section I – Human Resources

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

M/S (Westerberg/Hill): To approve the second reading of the proposed amendment to Board Policy Section II.F. “Policies Regarding Non-Classified Employees – Annual Leave,” subsections 2 and 3, as provided in Attachment 1. The motion carried unanimously 7-0.

Mr. Westerberg introduced the item indicating that this is the second reading to the proposed amendment to Board Policy II.F. intended to minimize the negative impact 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 under the current policy. He pointed out there have been no changes between the first and second reading.

He clarified that under the proposed amendment, the protection of these employees’ current leave accrual rate would be limited to their time in the specific position. “Grandfather” protection would end if the employee departs or moves to a new position. The proposed amendment would not increase the current costs to the institutions for the leave accrued by the affected individuals—they would 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 immediate leave accrual savings, which would not be available until the “grandfather” protection lapsed for the affected positions.

Dr. Hill asked if this was a complete solution or a temporary solution that would further evolve. Mr. Westerberg responded it is an imperfect solution that will help resolve itself through time. Mr. Scoggin also commented on the need for the Board to remain open to what the impacts are...
to the institutions with the understanding that if there are changes which could improve situations for the institutions, the Board should explore and be open to suggestions.

Ms. Critchfield asked about the timeline if this item were revisited. Mr. Westerberg responded that board policy could be amended at the Board’s discretion to make the situation better.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

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

**M/S (Scoggin/Critchfield): To adjourn the meeting at 9:15 a.m.** The motion carried unanimously.
A special meeting of the State Board of Education was held November 28, 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 2:00 p.m. Mountain Time. A roll call of members was taken.

**Present:**
- Emma Atchley, President
- Linda Clark, Vice President
- Debbie Critchfield, Secretary
- Don Soltman
- Richard Westerberg
- Dave Hill
- Sherri Ybarra, State Superintendent
- Andy Scoggin

**Absent:**
- Andy Scoggin

### DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (SDE)

#### BOARD ACTION

M/S (Ybarra/Critchfield): To approve Pending Rule Docket No. 08-0202-1602, Rules Governing Uniformity, Bullying, Harassment, and Intimidation, through Pending Rule Docket No. 08-0203-1606, Rules Governing Thoroughness, Incorporated by Reference – Achievement Level Descriptors, as submitted in the Department’s Agenda, Tabs 1-9.

The motion carried unanimously 7-0.

Ms. Ybarra introduced the first item pointing out that no changes have been made to the rule from either the version approved by the Board as a temporary rule at the February 2016 Regular Board meeting nor the proposed rule approved by the Board at the June 2016 Regular Board meeting. She pointed out that was the same case for each of the Department’s pending rules being approved at today’s special meeting.

At this time Ms. Atchley recommended making a motion to approve the items from the Department’s Agenda which the Board has seen and discussed before, provided there were no questions, concerns, or anything of significance they should revisit. Ms. Ybarra was in favor of the suggestion and made a motion to reflect the recommendation motion.

1. Pending Rule 08.0202.1602 – Rules Governing Uniformity – Bullying, Harassment and Intimidation


6. Pending Rule 08.0203.1603 – Rules Governing Thoroughness – Advanced Opportunities


8. Pending Rule 08.0203.1605 – Rules Governing Thoroughness – Alternative Secondary Programs


POLICY, PLANNING & GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS (PPGA)

At this time Ms. Critchfield clarified that her intent was to make a similar motion for the Planning Policy and Governmental Affairs portion of the agenda as was exercised by the Superintendent, which would include PPGA Tabs 1-6, 10-12, and 14-15. She pointed out that those items which would be discussed or voted on individually include items 7-9, 13, and 16. Ms. Atchley clarified that she would recuse herself from voting on item 13 regarding seed certification. Ms. Critchfield requested unanimous consent to proceed with that process. There were no objections.

M/S (Critchfield/Clark): To approve Pending Rule Docket No. 08-0102-1601, Rules Governing the Postsecondary Credit Scholarship Program, through Pending Rule Docket No. 08-0201-1604, Rules Governing Administration, Statewide Average Class Size, and Docket 08-0203-1610, Rules Governing Thoroughness – Career Technical Education, Content Standards, as presented in the Planning Policy and Governmental Affairs Agenda, Tabs 1-6, 10-12, and 14-15. The motion carried unanimously 7-0.

1. Pending Rule – Docket No. 08-0102-1601 – Rules Governing the Postsecondary Credit Scholarship Program

2. Pending Rule – Docket No. 08-0104-1601 – Postsecondary Residency Requirements

3. Pending Rule – Docket No. 08-0109-1601 – Rules Governing the GearUP Idaho Scholarship


Dr. Clark asked about the distinction between class sizes contained in item 6. Ms. Bent clarified it relates to the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and Idaho Code Section 33-104. Ms. Bent explained the difference between group one and group two and that the divisors are where the difference lies.


At this time they moved to item 13 on the PPGA agenda.


M/S (Critchfield/Soltman): To approve the pending rule, docket number 08-0501-1601, Rules Governing Seed and Plant Certification, as presented in Attachment 1. The motion carried 6-0. Ms. Atchley abstained from voting.

At this time they moved to item 16 on the PPGA agenda.


M/S (Critchfield/Soltman): To approve the first reading of Board Policy IV.E. Division of Career Technical Education, Subsection 7, Industry Partner Fund as submitted. The motion carried unanimously 7-0.

Ms. Critchfield introduced the item and that in August the Board approved the Division of Career Technical Education FY18 Line Item request, including $1M for the Industry Partner Fund. The purpose of the fund is to provide Idaho’s six technical colleges the flexibility to work with Idaho employers to provide “timely access to relevant college credit and non-credit training and support projects.” However, no moneys were appropriated to the fund for FY2017. The Division of Career Technical Education (Division) has requested $1,000,000 for FY2018. One-hundred percent (100%) consensus was reached on the draft policy. There will be a second reading of the policy at the December meeting.

At this time they moved to the remaining items 7, 8, and 9 on the PPGA agenda.

Ms. Critchfield indicated that in August, the Board approved proposed rule changes which simplified Idaho’s instructional certificates and resolved the issue of individuals reaching outside of their eligible grade ranges. There were technical changes and corrections made which provided a consistent definition for paraprofessionals. Ms. Critchfield clarified aloud the definition for paraprofessional for the benefit of the group. Mr. Soltman asked if this would be a consistent statewide definition for paraprofessional. Ms. Bent responded that once it is accepted by the legislature then it will be consistent statewide.


M/S (Critchfield/Clark): To approve the pending rule, docket number 08-0203-1608, as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried unanimously 7-0.

Ms. Critchfield introduced the item and pointed out a couple of changes to the pending rule. For the 2017-18 school year there is a pre-algebra enrollment at the 8th grade. In the 2018-19 school year, there are two additional indicators. One is a state satisfaction survey that will go to parents, students, and faculty. The other is a communication that will go to parents on student achievement. Other minor changes were made for clarification. Ms. Bent also pointed out the addition of college and career readiness in the alternative high schools; and for the traditional high schools the 5-year cohort graduation rate was included. Dr. Clark strongly felt this plan will meet muster at the Federal level. Ms. Ybarra echoed those remarks and that she received word recently that we are permitted to use our own methodology for calculating graduation rates. Dr. Clark suggested we would need additional work on a ranking system that would be acceptable to the Federal government.


M/S (Critchfield/Ybarra): To approve the pending rule, docket number 08-0203-1609, Rules Governing Thoroughness – Proficiency Graduation Requirements, as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried unanimously 7-0.

Ms. Critchfield introduced the item and that the proposed amendments to the rule eliminate the ISAT proficiency graduation requirement. The intent is to look at other indicators of success and proficiency for high school students. If approved, students would not need to meet the proficiency requirement to graduate high school after the effective date (end of the 2017 legislative session). No comments were received during the public comment period, and no changes have been made between the proposed and pending rule stages.

Ms. Atchley expressed concern about comparing consistency across the state using other measures. Ms. Critchfield responded that there is a required test in high school (SAT) along with a credit requirement for graduation. She pointed out the Accountability Framework recently approved includes many other proficiency indicators. Ms. Ybarra echoed those remarks. Dr. Clark commented that further development of the definition of college and career readiness is underway and would be very beneficial. Ms. Ybarra commented the definition of college and career readiness has already been defined in the standards. Dr. Clark clarified that the common definition of college and career readiness is being developed which will apply statewide and not just academically. Mr. Freeman offered a point of clarification in that if all of the content
standards are met, a student is considered college and career ready. However, for the purposes of the Departments of Commerce and Labor, Higher Education, Workforce Development Council, Industry, etc., there is a workgroup in the process of developing a definition of college and career readiness for our students to be able to step into a postsecondary or career setting.

OTHER BUSINESS

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

M/S (Critchfield/Ybarra): To adjourn the meeting at 3:15 p.m. The motion carried unanimously 7-0.