



Trustees of Boise State University
Trustees of Idaho State University
Trustees of Lewis-Clark State College
Board of Regents of the University of Idaho
State Board for Career-Technical Education

**APPROVED MINUTES
STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
December 14-15, 2016
College of Western Idaho
Micron Center for Professional-Technical Education
Nampa, Idaho**

A regularly scheduled meeting of the State Board of Education was held December 14-15, 2016 at the College of Western Idaho in Nampa, Idaho.

Present:

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

Don Soltman
Dave Hill
Richard Westerberg
Sherri Ybarra, State Superintendent

Wednesday, December 14, 2016

The Board met at the College of Western (CWI) Idaho's Micron Center for Professional-Technical Education in Nampa, Idaho. Board President Emma Atchley welcomed everyone and called the meeting to order at 10:00 am Mountain time. Ms. Atchley extended appreciation from the Board and Staff to CWI for its hospitality.

BOARDWORK

1. Agenda Review/Approval

BOARD ACTION

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

2. Minutes Review / Approval

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Clark/Scoggin): To approve the minutes from the October 19-20, 2016 regular Board meeting, the November 14, 2016 special Board meeting, and the November 28, 2016 special Board meeting, as submitted. The motion carried unanimously.

3. Rolling Calendar

BOARD ACTION

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

WORKSESSION

Planning, Policy & Governmental Affairs (PPGA)

A. Coordination of Activities – Office of the Board of Education (Board) –
Department of Education (Department)

Mr. Freeman, Executive Director of the Board office introduced the item and the intent for the Department and Board staff to identify and discuss roles and responsibilities at both of the agencies, and identify activities where work may be being duplicated. The intent is to identify overlap, efficiencies, collaboration, and who is or should be responsible for what. He pointed out both Board and Department staff have identified activities which may require discussion. Mr. Freeman introduced Ms. Terri DiNinno to help facilitate today's meeting.

Ms. DiNinno first reminded the Board of the goal for this work session, and started by outlining ground rules for discussion, clarifying the importance to remember those rules if the conversation becomes strained. She identified the RASCI model, with the "R" standing for responsible, the "A" standing for accountable, the "S" standing for sponsor/stakeholder, the "C" standing for consulted, and the "I" standing for informed. She then clarified that the responsible party is accountable to the Board in all cases.

Mr. Freeman directed the attention to the list of items developed by Board and Department staff, clarifying the list is numbered in alphabetical order for ease of navigation. He gave a brief status on each of the items from the list.

Regarding the Administrative Rules, Superintendent Ybarra wanted to make sure both staffs work together on promulgating rules, and when any changes in content occur it needs to go through the Board to be voted upon. There was concern that when a rule is prepared by the Department, it comes to the Board office for review, it then returns to the Department, but it sometimes has been changed. She added that those changes have at times been more substantive such as to the content and meaning of the rule, and not just typographical changes. Ms. Ybarra commented that no matter which department promulgates the rule, both Board and Department staff should be present in the development of and any changes to the rule. There was discussion about a procedure whereby Matt or the Superintendent would be made aware of any major changes to a rule and its content. Mr. Freeman commented that if Board or Department staff could not reach agreement, it would come to the Executive Director and Superintendent for resolution.

Board member Critchfield asked for clarification if it was for every single rule, or just K-12 rules. Mr. Pete Koehler, the Department's Chief Deputy, responded it would be for K-12 rules, or when a Board rule pertains to K-12, especially when the rules affect both secondary or postsecondary. Board member Scoggin suggested a process where if a rule is drafted by the originating group, it will go before the Board as promulgated but with comment from Board staff if necessary, whether in favor or not. Board member Hill added a condition that the recommendations of Board or Department staff be identified clearly for Board members. Board President Atchley clarified there should be both points of view communicated without either taking a stand on a rule, but the final say would be by the Board. There was an additional clarification that each of the DAGs would review the rules, and Mr. Freeman suggested developing a checklist for Board and Department staff to following for rules going forward.

There was discussion about "the Board" being delineated from Board staff, and making that abundantly clear. Distinctions between the Board and the Department in the eyes of the public are sometimes confused, as are the Board, and Office of the Board. The group agreed to make clearly identifying the responsible party and lead staff part of the checklist. They agreed the Board doesn't need to be involved in identifying lead staff.

Regarding Charter Schools and College & Career Readiness, they agreed to move past those items.

The conversation turned to that of the process. Board member Westerberg asked in general what is wrong with the process, and commented the matters before the Board may be resolved at the office level through the Executive Director and Superintendent. Ms. Ybarra commented she felt it would be good for the Board to revisit who is responsible for what. Ms. Atchley commented that the issues identified seem to be communication issues, and the expectations of the Board are for education. She reminded the group they should all have the same end in mind; that is to get the work done for education. Dr. Clark pointed out that we can ill afford duplication of effort because of the slim resources each agency has as it is. Dr. Hill remarked that only substantive matters should be brought before the Board, because it doesn't have the

time to resolve administrative issues. The majority of Board members agreed anything administrative in nature should be resolved at that level. Mr. Westerberg reiterated that the two staffs should have a central goal, and issues related to the law would come before the Board.

With the comments from the Board in mind, Mr. Freeman he recommended skipping through several of the items unless the Superintendent had concerns, requesting they work through the concerning items together at a separate meeting.

Dr. Clark felt it would be beneficial to have conversation about the Data Dashboard, and useful conversation would be related to how the data is collected and used. She was concerned in developing two systems and expending staff resources in two different directions; thereby duplicating effort in collection and dissemination. Mr. Freeman pointed out a meeting is scheduled next week for Board and Department staff to discuss the data dashboard and data collection. After some discussion, they felt the Data Management Council (DMC) would be the place for the oversight of this issue. Mr. Howell, the Board's Director of Research and current DMC Chair, provided some clarification on the DMC's oversight and that it involves both K-12 and Higher Ed. Dr. Clark recommend the Accountability Oversight Committee (AOC) and the DMC working together on the data issue, and how to get the dashboard done in a singular manner.

Moving down the list of items, Board member Soltman praised the direct admissions item and the collaborative work that went into developing the item and getting it off the ground. He felt the short time frame available to develop it may have been helpful in its success.

Regarding K-12 accountability, Mr. Freeman provided a background of the number of people working on this item. Dr. Clark provided background on the AOC and the amount of overlap that may be present. Mr. Koehler offered some comments on the item stressing there needs to be better clarification of the staff roles between the Department and the Board. He pointed out the Department has duties assigned to it by the Board, by the State, and by the Federal Government in this area. He expressed concern over whether the Federal Government would require a consolidated statewide plan. The Board would need to agree to the consolidated plan as a statewide plan, but the Superintendent must sign off on it, adding it deals with Title One funds, and the Department handles the fiscal execution of those funds. He suggested some of the overlap was done purposefully to include both the Department and Board staff, but that at times the relationship is complicated. They clarified the Board as the State Education Authority (SEA) for the State, but that it does require the Superintendent's signature.

Ms. Ybarra went on to encourage more discussion on the overlap between offices. Board member Scoggin commented that the Board members should have some feedback for the Board and Department staff on the clarity of which agency should be handling what, and the where's and why's of the overlap. There was further discussion about the Board and Department staff needing clarification to settle who is responsible and who has the final decision on certain topics where overlap exists. Ms. Atchley

questioned whether the two entities are on the same page with regard to the legal parts. She clarified the responsibility by statute rests with the Board for all education in the State of Idaho. She added the Board depends on the Superintendent and the Department staff greatly, and that the responsibility rests with the body, and not the individuals. Mr. Westerberg reminded the group the governance structure is different in Idaho which can make it challenging. He agreed the role of the Board is clearly established in statute.

Ms. Ybarra agreed with the comments. She still felt there was discussion necessary for the K-12 accountability oversight piece. Dr. Clark disagreed, pointing out its clarity in policy is to bring forward a recommendation to the Board for what the state accountability system should be. She commented further this is an opportunity to develop that relationship through the accountability system, where multiple entities working toward the same system (i.e, AOC, DMC, Board, Dept.).

Dr. Hill suggested that the Board knows its roles and responsibilities, but if it would be helpful for staff, they should be written down to outline the executive authorities for staff. Mr. Westerberg felt the governing board is ill suited to make the decisions related to job responsibilities they are discussing today. He recommended those discussions take place between the Executive Director and Superintendent for the respective offices. Ms. Critchfield echoed those remarks. Only when the supervisors can't agree should it come to the Board for discussion. There was additional discussion on the matter and agreement that a recap of roles and responsibilities be reported back to the Board at the February meeting.

Mr. Westerberg commented on the appreciation from the Board to both the Department and Board staff in the effort to make this system more efficient. Mr. Scoggin stressed part of the Board's role is to provide direction to staff when concerns arise, commenting they couldn't help unless they knew what the conflict is. He recommended the Board be willing to address and provide direction for staff who need or request it. Ms. Atchley pointed out it is incumbent on the Superintendent and the Executive Director to solve a problem when the Department and Board office have conflict, and only after would it come to the full Board, or the situation could be addressed in a special meeting.

At this time, the meeting recessed for lunch until 1:00. After lunch, Ms. Atchley announced the time scheduled for dinner and social hour scheduled this evening has been moved up by one hour because of the wintery weather conditions. After the lunch break, the meeting resumed to the remainder of the agenda.

B. K-20 Education Strategic Plan

- Operational Plan
- Annual Dual Credit Report
- Annual Scholarship Program Report

Ms. Critchfield introduced the item and provided some historical background on strategic planning and the work that was accomplished over the summer. The strategic

plan outlines the Board's vision and mission and helps align the institutions goals with the Board's goals.

Ms. Tracie Bent, Chief Planning and Policy Officer from the Board office, outlined the framework of the plan. The framework for the strategic plan is based on the statutory requirements for strategic planning. It encompasses a vision and mission statement, a goal, an objective, and performance measures related to the goal. The Board's strategic plan is the basis for the other agency and institution strategic plans.

Ms. Critchfield asked if the Board was satisfied with the three goals of the strategic plan and if there need to be other areas identified, or are there other items which need to fall under its goals. Dr. Hill asked what the Board really wants to use the plan for. Ms. Bent clarified that it is not just to meet the requirements of the Division of Financial Management (DFM), but the plan is used as the foundation and basis for the other (institution and agency) plans. Mr. Freeman clarified that state law requires all agencies submit a strategic plan every year and the Board's is a rolling five year plan, pointing out it should be driving the other plans and allow for accessibility and communication. Dr. Hill questioned how we could effect change with a specific benchmark and pointed out that some benchmarks may be more in line with aspirational goals, and that we may not be able to affect change.

Mr. Soltman reminded the Board that it does a five year plan in the strategic plan and that it needs to do a better job communicating that to stake holders and the DFM. Mr. Scoggin pointed out this document was very helpful but did not seem strategic in nature. Mr. Freeman responded the operational plan is intended to have strategies to effect the strategic plan. Mr. Scoggin felt it would be hard to ask the institutions to deliver on this plan until it is holistic. There was agreement by other board members on these comments.

Ms. Atchley asked if the group should look at the operational plan and then align it to goals and objectives. The group opted to look at the strategic plan and the operational plan side-by-side. The Board proceeded in looking at each of the goals, objectives and benchmarks in the strategic plan. Regarding reducing in the number of scholarships, Ms. Bent did not recommend making an adjustment at this time because of the increase in scholarship funding. She recommended looking at it next year after additional data is available. Mr. Freeman asked if "tbd" can be used for the scholarships benchmark rather than one that is unrealistic. Ms. Bent responded in the affirmative, but to use that designation sparingly. Dr. Clark recommended not using "tbd" because it would imply an item has not been looked at, but instead inserting something that shows it is being developed.

Mr. Westerberg suggested reducing the number of performance measures. He felt they needed to be more precise and shorter in length; or whether some measures could be consolidated. Ms. Atchley and other Board members were in agreement with the recommendation. Ms. Critchfield suggested a smaller group working on making the plan more precise with more focused measures.

Ms. Bent recommended digging into the plan and using the work session for deeper discussion. Dr. Hill recommended the operational plan and the strategic plan be merged, and in doing so it would be a better communication tool. Ms. Atchley asked if there were any objections from Board members to combine the plans. There were no objections to the suggestion, but emphasis on simplifying the plan. Ms. Atchley recommended going through all the measures today and having the PPGA committee work on the plan for future review.

Mr. Scoggin pointed out that for the operational plan to be a strategic document, it needs to contain strategies throughout the document. He recommended identifying for the smaller work group what the Board wants brought before them for next time and to provide the material to the Board members far enough (3-4 weeks) ahead of time for review. The other option would be to look at it today and determine the measure and what the Board expects the strategy to be to get to those measures. He added it might make sense to divide the group into two sections, one for Higher Ed, and one for K-12. Ms. Bent pointed out the Department brings forward a K-12 plan. The K-12 portion included in this plan are essentially outcomes, and have been included historically.

At this time the meeting recessed for a ten minute break. After the break, the Board discussed numerous benchmarks under Goal 1, Objective A. Ms. Bent provided some clarification on the benchmarks, indicating there are similarities to performance measures under Objective D. After some discussion, they decided to leave in the benchmark on the percentage of Idaho High School graduates meeting college placement/entrance exam college readiness benchmarks. Regarding Advanced Opportunities, they removed the benchmarks on dual credit, technical competency credit, and advanced placement, and kept the benchmarks for the percent of high school graduates who have participated in one or more of the advanced opportunities. The remaining benchmarks under Goal 1, Objective A remained the same.

Ms. Bent indicated under Goal 1, Objective B, the recommendation would be to remove the number of GEDs awarded per population, as it doesn't indicate the number of students who go-on after obtaining a GED. Rather, they would look at new students on campus who enroll with a GED. They also opted to remove the item showing gaps in re-integration measures between groups with traditionally low educational attainment and the general populace.

Under Goal 1, Objective C, after some discussion, the Board recommended measuring the 60% goal rather than the subsets of that goal. They decided to remove the unduplicated percent of graduates as a percent of degree seeking student FTE, the percent of graduates at teach level relative to Board target numbers and those benchmarks.

Under Goal 1, Objective D, the group decided to revisit the plan in February, adding the PPGA committee will be looking at it next year.

Under Goal 1, Objective E, Ms. Bent pointed out it contains a number of measures regarding the University of Utah and students participating in our medical programs, family medical residency, and psychiatry program. She clarified that the particular measures are in the plan in part because we don't do a separate strategic plan for them. If they were not in the Board's plan, they would require their own strategic plan as per state requirements. Dr. Hill recommended moving Goal 1, Objective E and its performance measures to under Goal 2, and provided reasoning for the suggestion, realizing modifications may be necessary. There were no objections to the change.

Under Goal 2, Objective B, Ms. Bent recommended removing all of the performance measures, and reworking the goal. They decided to keep the measure of *Total amount of research expenditures*.

Under Goal 2, Objective C, there were no objections to removing the measure of *increase in gross state product (GSP)*.

Under Goal 3, Objective A, *Data-informed Decision-Making*, the group discussed developing a new goal. They discussed development and implementation of a single K-20 data dashboard as the objective and as a strategic initiative vitally important to the state. Ms. Bent indicated staff would make those changes and bring it before the Board in February for comment. They discussed having the two remaining objectives under Goal 3 (Objective B, Quality Teaching Workforce, and Objective B, Alignment and Coordination) fall under a new Goal 4. There was agreement with the recommendation. Under Objective B, the benchmark data would be available in October when the performance reports are presented. Under Objective C, they discussed moving the two dual credit benchmarks to under Goal 1 – Access as part of its performance measures.

Under Goal 3, Objective D – Productivity and Efficiency, Mr. Westerberg recommended moving performance measures 1, 3, and 6 to Goal 1 – Access. They agreed to remove the remaining two benchmarks.

Under Goal 3, Objective E, Mr. Freeman recommended keeping it and the performance measure, and allowing staff time to work on it to bring it back before the Board in February. There were no objections to this recommendation. Ms. Bent recommended, based on the changes proposed for the Strategic Plan, for staff to work on the Operational Plan and bring it before the Board in February. There were no objections to the recommendation.

C. Higher Education Research Strategic Plan

M/S (Critchfield/Soltman): To approve the 2017-2021 Higher Education Research Strategic Plan as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Carson Howell, the Board's Director of Research, introduced the item and briefly outlined minor changes to the plan which clarify some of the challenges and link them to

the objectives and goals of the strategic plan. Dr. Hill praised the work that has been done on the HERC Strategic Plan.

The meeting recessed at 4:05 p.m. MST until Thursday morning at 8:00 a.m. MST.

Thursday December 15, 2016, 8:00 a.m., College of Western Idaho, Micron Center for Professional-Technical Education

The Board reconvened at the College of Western Idaho at the Micron Center for Professional-Technical Education in Nampa for regular business. Board President Atchley called the meeting to order at 8:00 a.m. Mountain Time and thanked CWI for their hospitality. She introduced Dr. Jeff Davis, CWI Music Program Anchor Faculty Member, to sing the national anthem.

Ms. Atchley pointed out that Ms. Critchfield was not able to attend today's meeting and Dr. Clark would be handling the Planning, Policy and Governmental Affairs portion of the agenda. Mr. Scoggins joined the meeting at 8:11, Superintendent Ybarra joined the meeting at 8:13.

OPEN FORUM

There were no requests to speak during open forum.

CONSENT AGENDA

M/S (Clark/Hill): To approve the consent agenda as presented. The motion carried 5-0. Mr. Scoggin, Ms. Ybarra, and Ms. Critchfield were absent from voting.

Business Affairs & Human Resources – Section II Human Resources

1. Boise State University – Campus Law Enforcement Services Contract with Boise Police Department

BOARD ACTION

By unanimous consent to approve the request by Boise State University to execute a campus law enforcement contract with the Boise Police Department in substantial conformance with the proposed contract in Attachment 1.

2. Idaho State University – Lease of Real Property to McDonald's USA, LLC

BOARD ACTION

By unanimous consent to approve the request by Idaho State University to enter into a long-term ground lease agreement with McDonalds, and to delegate authority to the Interim Vice President for Finance and Administration to execute

all relevant documents in substantial conformance with the terms provided in Attachment 1.

3. University of Idaho – Human Resources Third Party Administration Services Contract

By unanimous consent to approve the request by the University of Idaho to enter into a contract with Morneau Shepell Limited, for services relating to employee benefit enrollment, retiree and COBRA administration for the UI's employee/retiree benefits plan in substantial conformance to the contract materials submitted to the Board in Attachment 1.

Instruction, Research & Student Affairs (IRSA)

4. Programs and Changes Approved by the Executive Director – Quarterly Report

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

5. State General Education Committee Appointments

By unanimous consent to appoint Dr. Joanne Togle, representing Idaho State University; and Dr. John Bieter, representing Boise State University to the General Education Committee, effective immediately.

6. Idaho Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (EPSCoR) Committee Appointments

By unanimous consent to appoint Dr. David Hill to the Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research Idaho Committee as an ex-officio member based on his position as a member of the Idaho State Board of Education.

By unanimous consent to appoint Dr. Janet Nelson to the Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research Idaho Committee as an ex-officio member based on her position as the Vice President of Research at the University of Idaho.

By unanimous consent to appoint Skip Oppenheimer to the Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research Idaho Committee as a representative of the private sector effective immediately and expiring on June 30, 2021.

Planning, Policy & Governmental Affairs (PPGA)

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.

8. University of Idaho – Naming of Indoor Golf Facility

By unanimous consent to approve the request by the University of Idaho to name the Indoor Golf Performance Facility the “Jess and Kathleen Hall Vandal Golf Performance Center.”

9. State Rehabilitation Council – Appointment

By unanimous consent to approve the appointment of Robert Atkins to the State Rehabilitation Council as a representative for the business/industry and labor for a term of three years effective January 1, 2017 and ending December 31, 2019.

State Department of Education (SDE)

10. Professional Standards Commission – Boise State University – Health Endorsement

By unanimous consent to accept the Professional Standards Commission recommendation to conditionally approve the Health Endorsement offered through Boise State University as an approved teacher preparation program.

PLANNING, POLICY & GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS (PPGA)

1. College of Western Idaho (CWI) Biennial Progress Report

Dr. Clark introduced CWI President Dr. Bert Glandon for his biennial report to the Board. Dr. Glandon welcomed the Board and guests to Nampa for the December meeting. He publically thanked Guy Hurlbutt for his service to CWI. Specific details regarding the institution’s progress toward meeting its strategic plan goals may be found in the report submitted as part of the agenda materials.

Dr. Glandon reported their Strategic Plan will be implemented in 2018 and contains six objectives. The college’s enrollment is remaining consistent over the last three years and they are still experiencing growth. Workforce development has added additional programs in response to industry needs. CWI apprenticeship programs have exceeded 1000 student enrollments this year. He reported CWI has realized nearly a 250% increase in degrees and certificates since 2012. Regarding accreditation, they have finished their seventh year with the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU); an evaluation was completed in October and they expect to receive independent accreditation this Spring. He thanked College of Southern Idaho’s President, Dr. Jeff Fox, and his entire team for their help and support in CWI’s success during the accreditation process.

Dr. Glandon reported on the accommodations and recommendations received by CWI. He indicated the CWI trustees are exploring future growth options, and the goal is to have CWI operating from three campuses: Nampa, Boise, and Ada County. Dr. Clark thanked Dr. Glandon and CWI for their hospitality and acknowledged their effort in hosting the Board meeting.

Mr. Soltman introduced a student of CWI, Russell Njilayi, from whom he received a letter regarding High School Outreach. Mr. Soltman shared portions of the letter to the Board, indicating Mr. Njilayi is a first generation college student who moved from Congo, Africa to the United States in 2010. His advice to the Board is to invest more in helping young adults toward higher education. That is, to help them realize the importance of a higher education not only for themselves, but for society. He added that students will be more successful in college if they have a clear idea and understanding of what they are getting themselves into, and what majors make the most sense for them to follow. He emphasized helping inform students to go to college for more than the canned statement of “going to college is the right thing to do”.

2. Rolling Calendar Meeting Locations

This item was presented for informational purposes. At the February 2016 regular Board meeting, staff proposed a rotation meeting schedule. The proposal was discussed at the December President’s Council with mixed feelings by the presidents. Approval of the new rotation schedule would result in future meetings being hosted by an institution on the current schedule, however, approximately half of the regular meetings would be held in the Treasure Valley area.

A few of the presidents came forward for comment. Idaho State University (ISU) President, Dr. Art Vailas, commented that the presence of the Board in their respective regions is a welcome thing not only for the institutions and students, but for the community as well. He clarified ISU would be supportive of the recommendations and recognized it would save time and money to use the rotation. Lewis-Clark State College (LCSC) President, Dr. Tony Fernandez was supportive of the Board visiting the campuses every two years and suggested it would be more convenient.

Board member Scoggin commented on the significant expense to the institutions, agencies, and OSBE and SDE offices, but felt the balance would be well set by having four meetings in a central location and a fall and spring visit to campuses in other regions. Dr. Clark reminded the Board this item is not for action at this time, but if the Board wishes to act on it a motion would be brought forward at a later time. Dr. Hill commented he felt the campus visits should still take place at the institutions. He felt reluctant to be any more centralized than the proposed schedule. Mr. Westerberg was supportive of the rotation proposal.

3. Public School Funding Interim Committee Survey Update

Mr. Blake Youde, Communications Officer for the Board office, introduced the item stating that the Board and the Idaho Legislature's Public School Funding Formula Interim Committee (Interim Committee) partnered to collect public input from Idahoans on how the state's public schools are funded. The Interim Committee was tasked with studying the current public school funding structure and making recommendations to the Legislature on possible amendments. The current funding formula is being evaluated to assess its ability to address the variety of learning modalities available to students as well as increased student mobility. Mr. Youde reviewed how the Task Force Recommendations directed the work on this item and the passage of HCR 33 in 2016 established an interim committee to work on this complicated issue. Superintendent Ybarra and Dr. Clark are on the committee.

Mr. Youde reviewed the regional presentation schedule which served to inform citizens and allow for public comment. There was an on-line public survey made available to Idaho citizens to provide comments and opinions regarding how public school districts and public charter schools in the state are funded. Findings were consistent that the state should inject more money into the public education system in an effort to make it more successful.

4. Direct Admissions Report

Mr. Howell provided a report to the Board on the first year of the direct admissions program. The program was approved by the Board in August 2015 as a way to encourage high schoolers to go from high school directly to college. The Direct Admissions program was designed to remove barriers for students choosing to attend an Idaho public institution. Through data already collected in the Educational Analytics System of Idaho (EASI), high school seniors could be proactively admitted to Idaho public postsecondary institutions. The data suggests that Direct Admissions played a role in the increases seen across the Idaho public institutions where fall 2016 growth by Idaho students who graduated high school within 12 months grew by 6.7% statewide over fall 2015. Students who participated in the survey indicated that 75% of students talked to their parents about going on to college.

Mr. Howell reported on the types of questions asked of the students. One of the goals was also to encourage students to attend an Idaho college or university. Mr. Howell pointed out the collaboration efforts between the institutions that have taken place, and that it speaks to the vision of our institutions to work together for higher education. Mr. Howell indicated they are getting calls from other states to replicate the program. Board members praised the institutions on their work on this item, and Dr. Staben in particular for the idea.

5. 2017 Legislation – Additional
 - a. STEM School Designation
 - b. Adult Completers Scholarship

M/S (Clark/Soltman): To approve the proposed legislation in substantial conformance to the form provided in attachments 1 and 2 and to authorize staff to work with the Governor's Office and the STEM Action Center to move forward the proposed legislation during the 2017 legislative session. The motion carried 7-0. Ms. Critchfield was absent from voting.

Dr. Clark introduced the item indicating that the Board approved legislative ideas for the 2017 legislative session at the June 2016 regular Board meeting and the Board's 2017 Legislative agenda at a special Board meeting on September 23, 2016.

She indicated that the Board is considering two additional pieces of legislation and background and specific details were provided in the agenda for review. The pieces being considered are the Adult Completers Scholarship legislation and the STEM School Designation.

6. Board Policy – Bylaws – Nomination Committee – First Reading

M/S (Clark/Hill): To approve the first reading of Board policy – Bylaws, establishing a Board Nomination Committee, as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion failed 5-2. Ms. Critchfield was absent from voting.

Dr. Clark introduced the item explaining that Board staff have researched a variety of governing boards' officer nominating processes and procedures, including the Association of Governing Boards recommendations on committee structures and Board governance. The majority of board's that have formal nominating committees are governing boards with much larger membership than Idaho's Board of Education membership. Additionally, it is common for nominating committees for these larger boards to not only make recommendations for board officers, but to also provide nominations for open seats on the boards.

Mr. Westerberg was not supportive of the legislation and felt it was a recommendation to fix something that was not broken. He felt our Board is small enough to continue our present process, and that it makes sense. Mr. Freeman clarified that the item would come back for a second reading after additional work. In general, board members seemed to agree with Mr. Westerberg.

7. Board Policy – I.M. Annual Planning and Reporting – First Reading

M/S (Clark/Soltman): To approve the first reading to Board policy section I.M. as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried 7-0.

Dr. Clark indicated approval of changes to Board policy I.M. will further clarify institution and agencies strategic plan requirements.

8. Board Policy – I.T. Title IX and III.P. Students – Student Misconduct Appeals – First Reading

M/S (Clark/Soltman): To approve the first reading of amendments to Board Policy I.T. Title IX and III.P. Students, as submitted in Attachments 1 and 2 as corrected.

The item was returned to the Planning, Policy & Governmental Affairs Committee for additional work with Board and institution legal counsel.

Dr. Clark indicated the proposed amendments to Board Policy I.T. correct the reporting requirement where institutions are required to notify students of time frames relevant to investigations as well as to those applicable to hearings. The proposed amendments to Board Policy III.P. I8. limit student appeals to the Board.

Mr. Kevin Satterlee, Vice President and General Counsel from Boise State University (BSU), expressed concerns on the corrections on this policy, particularly on tab 8, page 6. He pointed out it will make their student judicial processes on campus subject to appeal to the Board. He clarified there is already an appeals process established at the campuses and these changes might actually be more work for the Board, and suggested not moving in this direction. Ms. Jenifer Marcus, Deputy Attorney General for the Board office, indicated that existing Board policy III.P. allows students to appeal essentially any institution's final decision to the Board. She noted that this was an attempt to narrow the range in situations involving student misconduct. There was additional discussion and institution legal counsel questioned whether the Board should consider whether it wants to hear these type of student conduct appeals. Mr. Satterlee pointed out just at BSU, they heard 112 appeals at the basic level. He added that if the Board would like to learn about the institution appeals processes the information would be made available. Ms. Marcus pointed out that the Board only hears appeals if the Executive Director refers it to the Board. There was additional discussion on the interpretation and breadth of the policy.

Board member Hill reminded the Board there are two policies being discussed and asked if there would be opposition to the change in I.T. Legal counsel from Idaho State University (ISU), Joanne Hirse-Stacy reported on the number of conduct and grievance cases at ISU and suggested inserting timeframes in the policy. Mr. Westerberg suggested returning the item to PPGA, requesting legal counsel work together on clarifying the policy. Mr. Westerberg requested unanimous consent to return the item to PPGA for additional work by Board and institution legal counsel. There were no objections to this request.

9. Board Policy – I.V. Career Technical Education – Industry Partner Fund –
Second Reading

M/S (Clark/Soltman): To approve the first reading of Board Policy IV.E. Division of Career Technical Education, Subsection 7, Industry Partner Fund as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried 7-0. Ms. Critchfield was absent from voting.

Dr. Clark introduced the item pointing out the impact of this policy formalizes the relationship between the Technical Deans Leadership Council (TCLC) and the

Administrator of the Division of Career Technical Education in accepting, reviewing, and awarding proposals that are submitted under the Industry Partner Fund. There were no changes between first and second reading.

10. Educator Preparation Performance Measures and Definition – Low Performing

M/S (Clark/Westerberg): To approve the proposed measures for determining Educator Preparation Provider program effectiveness, as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried 7-0. Ms. Critchfield was absent from voting.

Ms. Tracie Bent, Planning Policy & Governmental Affairs Officer from the Board office, provided some background on the item, reminding the Board they reviewed this item at the October Board meeting. The material today contains minor changes that are consistent with the revised Title II requirements under the Higher Education Act recently released by the U.S. Department of Education. She clarified the state is required to report on teacher preparation programs that are low performing, adding that low performing programs could become ineligible for the Teacher Education Assistance for College and Higher Education (TEACH) grants.

AUDIT

1. FY 2016 Financial Statements

M/S (Soltman/Scoggin): To accept from the Audit Committee the Fiscal Year 2016 financial audit reports for Boise State University, Idaho State University, University of Idaho, Lewis-Clark State College, and Eastern Idaho Technical College, as submitted by Moss Adams LLP in Attachment 1. The motion carried 7-0. Ms. Critchfield was absent from voting.

Mr. Soltman introduced the item indicating that Moss Adams LLP, the independent accounting firm that conducts annual financial audits of BSU, ISU, UI, LCSC and EITC, reviewed their findings with the Audit Committee and Board staff in November. He pointed out Lewis-Clark State College had a finding related to student financial assistance. Mr. Chet Herbst, Chief Financial Officer from the Board office, provided background on the item, pointing out that LCSC has corrected the finding. He commented that last year Moss Adams had zero findings for the institutions. The audit results were included in the agenda materials for the Board members' review.

2. FY 2016 Financial Ratios

Mr. Soltman introduced the item which was provided for informational purposes for the Board. Mr. Herbst provided a financial ratio analysis overview, and reviewed the four ratios of particular interest to the Board which helps them in reviewing the financial health and relative efficiency of each institution. By combining those four ratios, it provides a composite financial index ratio used to review the institutions. Mr. Herbst

reported on other considerations in comparing the financial health of the institutions and reported the agenda materials include a report on the ratios for each institution.

3. FY 2016 Net Position Balances

Mr. Herbst reported on the colleges and universities unrestricted net position which is an informational item for the Board. The net position balances as of June 30, 2016 are shown in the attachments to the agenda materials. Mr. Herbst provided a detailed overview of the areas considered in determining the unrestricted net positions of the colleges and universities. He pointed out that the volatility of state funding as well as fluctuations in enrollment and tuition revenue necessitates that institutions maintain fund balances sufficient to stabilize their operating budgets. The Board has set a minimum target reserve of 5% of operating expenditures as a benchmark in its Strategic Plan, Goal 3, Objective D.

BUSINESS AFFAIRS & HUMAN RESOURCES (BAHR)

Section I – Human Resources

1. University of Idaho – Market Rate-Based Compensation System

Mr. Westerberg introduced the informational item and invited the University of Idaho (UI) to provide comments. He pointed out the Board approved implementation of a revised classification system for classified employees in August 2013. The University of Idaho proposes a new compensation system which will be brought before the Board for action at a later date.

Mr. Brian Foisy, Vice President for Finance and Administration at UI, provided some background on the item and reviewed market based compensation for the Board. He introduced Mr. Wesley Matthews, Director of Human Resources at the university, to provide a presentation. Mr. Matthews indicated UI proposes to move forward from its current compensation system to a market-based system which provides a specific market rate for each individual position. With this approach, the university can be as precise as possible in offering competitive salaries when hiring, and achieving and maintaining equitable salaries for current employees. He added this approach would make the institution more competitive in recruitment and retention efforts. Mr. Matthews provided a detailed overview of the proposal. He reviewed the primary sources for obtaining market data which include data from the Bureau of Labor and Statistics for the eight-state region, the CUPA-HR for Carnegie R2 classification in the western US, and pointed out that market data includes average, entry and experience level, and standard deviation.

Mr. Matthews reported that discussions on campus have received very positive feedback, adding the university has been transparent and inclusive of staff, have conducted open forums, and have formed a Compensation Task Force to further develop the concept.

Mr. Foisy pointed out they are personally responding to any questions they have received from employees regarding the proposal. Support for the proposal has been very positive.

Ms. Atchley asked about how employee evaluations fit into this system. Mr. Matthews explained how a solid base pay foundation will make a difference for employees. Mr. Foisy added that if an employee is performing below satisfactory, they do not receive merit increases. Mr. Soltman reminded Board that not long ago the university consolidated pay grades, and now they are exploding the pay grades. He cautioned it on being a flavor of the day. Mr. Foisy described their current system and pointed out that they have been experiencing an 18% turnover, meaning roughly one of five employees leave every year, stressing the system needs a remedy. They are designing a system they believe is fair, logical, and appeals to employees, and should help provide longevity in positions.

Dr. Clark asked about their minimum hourly rate. Mr. Matthews responded it is \$12.02. Mr. Scoggin asked if they feel their turnover is driven exclusively by pay. Mr. Foisy responded not exclusively, but they have found massive disconnects between pay grades and actual salary offered in the market. Mr. Scoggin asked what costs in salary would this drive. Mr. Foisy responded they believe their minimum salary should be at least 80% of market. He indicated a preliminary numbers for an approximate 10-12% increase with a transition period of 5-7 years would cost around \$6-\$7 million.

Section II – Finance

1. Medical Education Committee Update

M/S (Westerberg/Soltman): To accept the findings and recommendations of the Medical Education Study Committee as presented in Attachment 1, and to forward these to the Governor. The motion carried 6-0. Dr. Clark abstained from voting on this item. Ms. Critchfield was absent from voting.

Mr. Herbst provided a report from the Medical Education Study Committee (Committee) for the Board on the findings and recommendations of the Committee. He reviewed the members of the Committee chaired by Mr. Ed Dahlberg, former CEO of St. Luke's, and reported that progress has been made on a number of the recommendations of the 2009 Committee Report.

Mr. Herbst reported the 2016 findings indicated three main areas of concern which included 1) the supply of health care providers, 2) maldistribution of professional providers, and 3) the lack of mental health care providers. He reported on the shortages throughout the state and physician disbursement which is very sparse in rural areas. Mr. Herbst outlined the specific recommendations which included to continue to grow the number of accredited residencies, to designate a coordinator to support statewide graduate medical education (GME) expansion efforts, and to implement the Committee's recommendations. Additionally they recommend to grow the supply of

qualified preceptors to support training of healthcare providers, sustain programmatic and infrastructure support funding for WWAMI and UUSOM, and to improve support to providers in rural areas. Mr. Soltman remarked highly on the work of the Committee and the dedication of the Committee members.

2. Boise State University – Authorization for Issuance of General Revenue and Refunding Bonds

M/S (Westerberg/Clark): To approve the finding that the Fine Arts Building is economically feasible and necessary for the proper operation of Boise State University and to approve a Supplemental Resolution for the Series 2017A Bonds, the title of which is as follows:

A SUPPLEMENTAL RESOLUTION of the Board of Trustees of Boise State University authorizing the issuance of General Revenue Project and Refunding bonds, in one or more series, of Boise State University; delegating authority to approve the terms and provisions of the bonds and the principal amount of the bonds up to \$78,570,000; authorizing the execution and delivery of a Bond Purchase Agreement upon sale of the bonds; and providing for other matters relating to the authorization, issuance, sale and payment of the bonds.

The motion carried unanimously 7-0. Ms. Critchfield was absent from voting.

Ms. Stacy Pearson provided background on the item and that Boise State University (BSU) requests approval by the Idaho State Board of Education (Board) to issue tax-exempt general revenue and refunding bonds related to the construction of their Fine Arts Building. She indicated they will realize a savings of about 8% or nearly \$3.5 million. Ms. Pearson was accompanied by Ms. JoEllen Dinucci, Associate Vice President of Finance and Administration of BSU, and S.C. Danielle Quade of Hawley, Troxell, Ennis & Hawley LLP, Bond Counsel.

3. Boise State University – Relocation of Facilities and Central Receiving Building – Planning and Design

M/S (Westerberg/Scoggin): To approve the request by Boise State University to proceed with planning and design of the Campus Planning and Facilities Building, under a Design-Build project approach, for a total cost not to exceed \$150,000. The motion carried 7-0. Ms. Critchfield was absent from voting.

Mr. Kevin Satterlee of BSU indicated the new Center for Materials Science research will displace the current building and yard housing facilities services. They have identified property owned by the university as a suitable site for the relocated functions which will be designated as the “Campus Planning and Facilities (CPF) Building”. He provided a visual overview of the project, and outlined the planning and design phase, indicating the requested project will be funded with institutional dollars and is included in their

Board-approved six-year capital plan. Upon completion of the planning and design phase, BSU will seek Board approval for the construction phase of the project.

4. Boise State University - Residential Honors College and Additional Student Housing Project – Agreement with EDR Boise LLC

M/S (Westerberg/Soltman): I move to approve the request by Boise State University to enter into the attached letter agreement with EdR Boise LLC, a wholly-owned subsidiary of Education Realty Operating Partnership LP, including purchase of the rights to operate and control the dining facility; and for the University to authorize EdR to complete the buildout of the facility, including furniture, fixtures, and equipment, for an estimated additional cost of \$3,000,000 with a total project cost not to exceed \$6,500,000; and to delegate authority to the Vice President for Finance and Administration to execute all relevant documents in substantial conformance with the terms herein. The motion carried 7-0. Ms. Critchfield was absent from voting.

Mr. Satterlee reminded the Board in August 2015 it approved a ground lease and operating agreement with EdR Boise LLC which provides for the construction and operation of a new residential Honors College and additional student housing project at Boise State. He provided a visual illustration and concept drawings of the space for the Board. Mr. Satterlee reported on details of the dining facility and confirmed anticipated auxiliary operations revenues and reserves are sufficient to cover the additional \$2 million cost of the complete facility buildout within the revised overall project cost of \$6.5 million. The original cost was \$5.5 million and the additional \$1 million was covered by their current food vendor Aramark. There is currently 4.5 years remaining on the contract with Aramark and which does contain cancellation provisions.

5. Boise State University – Online Program Fee – Existing Online Undergraduate Certificate in Design Ethnography

M/S (Westerberg/Hill): To approve the request by Boise State University to designate an online program fee for the Boise State University undergraduate certificate in Design Ethnography in the amount of \$497 per credit in conformance with the program budget submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried 7-0. Ms. Critchfield was absent from voting.

Mr. Westerberg introduced the item that BSU is requesting Board approval of an online fee structure for a new certificate program. He requested to have additional discussion in the BAHF Committee regarding on-line fees. BSU's on-line fee request would be applicable only to students in the Design-Ethnography online course sections, and would not apply to BSU students who are simultaneously enrolled in other BSU programs.

6. Idaho State University Foundation - Release of Easement Rights in Idaho Falls

M/S (Westerberg/Clark): To approve the request by the Idaho State University Foundation for the Board to release its easement on the half acre parcel owned by the Foundation, as more particularly described on the attached documents. The motion carried 6-0. Dr. Hill abstained from voting. Ms. Critchfield was absent from voting.

Mr. Westerberg pointed out the Board would be vacating an easement on a half-acre parcel owned by the ISU Foundation.

7. University of Idaho – Six-Year Capital Plan Update – Salmon Classroom and Idaho Arena

M/S (Westerberg/Hill): To approve the proposed revision to the University of Idaho’s six-year capital plan for FY2018 through FY2023, as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried 7-0. Ms. Critchfield was absent from voting.

Mr. Westerberg introduced the item whereby UI is requesting to add two items to its Six-Year Capital Plan for FY2018 through FY2023. The university is bringing the request forward in order to proceed with additional fundraising. Mr. Dan Ewart, Vice President for Infrastructure, provided that the UI is providing an updated Six-Year Capital Plan to reflect changes on two projects: To upgrade of the university’s extension center in Salmon, Idaho; and construction of a multi-purpose arena adjacent to the Kibbie Activity Center on the Moscow, Idaho campus.

8. University of Idaho – Educational Association Agreement with Navitas

M/S (Westerberg/Soltman): To authorize the University of Idaho to execute the contract with Navitas Moscow, and Navitas Holdings, for a Pathway Program for Recruiting International Students, in substantially the same form as that attached hereto as Attachment 2. The motion carried 7-0. Ms. Critchfield was absent from voting.

Mr. Westerberg indicated the UI requests authorization to execute an educational association agreement with Navitas to develop and implement the University of Idaho International Student Success Program. He pointed out Navitas is a well-known firm and this contract will benefit the campus by increasing the number of overall international students, and increasing the opportunities for all students to expand their international knowledge and experience.

9. Lewis-Clark State College – Living and Learning Complex Project – Planning and Design Phase

M/S (Westerberg/Clark): To approve the request by Lewis-Clark State College to proceed with planning and design of the Living and Learning Complex project at a cost not to exceed \$1.4 million. The motion carried 7-0. Ms. Critchfield was absent from voting.

Mr. Westerberg indicated LCSC is requesting Board approval to proceed with planning and design for the Living and Learning Complex project. Dr. Fernandez introduced Todd Kilburn and Dr. Ron Smith from LCSC to provide details regarding the project.

Dr. Ron Smith, Special Assistant to the President, provided an overview of the Living and Learning Center project and described it in detail. He indicated the total project is currently estimated at \$17 million, including design and construction costs, appropriate and precautionary contingency allowances, and fixtures, furniture and equipment (FF&E) estimates. Mr. Smith clarified funding for this project is to be provided through the use of institutional reserves and donated gifts. He added these funds will supplement money acquired through borrowing (bonding) with the debt service to be paid through student rental fees.

Dr. Fernandez announced that Dr. Smith is retiring from higher education and his official last day is tomorrow. Dr. Fernandez shared the background of Dr. Smith, who has been a tremendous help to LCSC. He thanked him for his work and wished him well in his future adventures. Ms. Atchley thanked Dr. Smith for his service in higher education and to the state.

10. Lewis-Clark State College – Six-Year Capital Plan Update – Career Technical Education Building

M/S (Westerberg/Soltman): To approve the revision to the Lewis-Clark State College six-year capital plan as submitted in Attachment 2. The motion carried 7-0. Ms. Critchfield was absent from voting.

Dr. Fernandez announced this is a recent development at LCSC and in the Lewis Clark valley, and they are requesting approval to add a new Career Technical Education building to their six year capital plan. He indicated LCSC intends to partner with local industry and the local school district to develop and construct the building, and described details of the discussions that led to here. He pointed out this project will provide training in technical vocations to meet the labor force needs and provide collaborative programs with the new Lewiston High School. Dr. Fernandez noted LCSC makes this request at this time in order to put together a funding plan that includes possible donations, Federal grant opportunities, institutional contributions and other State funds. Board members expressed enthusiasm for this item.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (SDE, Department)

1. Superintendent's Update

Superintendent of Public Instruction, Ms. Sherri Ybarra, will provide updates on the State Department of Education, report on the progress of implementing Mastery Education, provide a Legislative update, and discuss teacher shortages and teacher evaluation audits.

Ms. Ybarra introduced a number of her staff who were present to assist with the Superintendent's update and provide additional information.

Mr. Duncan Robb, the Department's Chief Policy Advisor, provided a legislative update and discussed teacher shortages. Mr. Robb discussed the challenge, the proposed solution, and the legislative approach for the three legislative items which were related to education support centers, school social workers, and college and career advisors. He provided a handout detailing the items, the challenges, and proposed solutions. There was discussion on how districts will be impacted and how the distribution for college and career advisors will be increased and the anticipated results. Ms. Lisa Colon, Director of Certification, and Mr. Pete Koehler, Chief Deputy, provided clarifying remarks. Regarding the school social workers item, Mr. Robb reviewed the intent to clarify statutory requirements for school counselors and to potentially revise IDAPA rule to better reflect the intended endorsement requirements for school counselors and/or school social workers.

Mr. Robb next reported on the teacher shortage. He indicated a questionnaire was administered to district superintendents asking two questions: 1) were there any teaching positions that were unfilled, if so, which ones. And 2) did they declared a hiring emergency. Mr. Robb reported on the results of the survey which showed 33 districts reporting unfilled positions with 120 total vacancies. Vacancies were especially evident in special education, technology, and core content subjects. Mr. Robb said they were surprised by the number of superintendents who reported on their use of last minute or alternative authorization hires. Feedback from the superintendents included several recommendations to "grow your own". He reported on the action SDE is taking including to help teachers obtain certification using the alternative authorization route and encouraging districts to use leadership premium dollars to award excellent teacher mentors.

Dr. Clark recommended having additional information or requirements regarding the American Board for the Certification of Teacher Excellence (ABCTE) available. Mr. Freeman also reminded the group of the Troops to Teachers resources as well. Mr. Robb clarified that Troops to Teachers is not an alternative path to certification, but an opportunity to increase the teachers in the classroom by hiring qualified veterans.

The meeting recessed for lunch at 11:58 after which they discussed mastery based education and the teacher evaluation audits.

Regarding the teacher shortage report information released earlier this year, Ms. Colon introduced Tony Davis, Consulting Director, and Tedra Clark, Managing Researcher and Project Director, from McREL International. Mr. Davis provided some background on McREL International, a non-profit education research and consulting firm located in Colorado and have been consulting for over 50 years. They were commissioned to conduct a desk review of generalizations of the Idaho teacher evaluation system. He indicated the media misreported the report as an audit rather than it being a desk review

and clarified how different the two are. He also pointed out the Department intended to use this report to move forward in teacher evaluations.

Dr. Clark asked if they were given copies of Idaho Code or administrative rules to use as reference. Ms. Clark responded they were given materials that outlined indicators in teacher evaluations. Ms. Colon explained the background of the indicators used that they were looking for, and that McREL was not given any IDAPA or Idaho Code references. The materials were provided in July 2015. Mr. Soltman asked if in their opinion Idaho is using the Charlotte Danielson model appropriately. Mr. Davis responded in the affirmative. Mr. Scoggin requested their top takeaway's from the report. Mr. Davis responded that a clear definition of educator effectiveness is very important. Secondly is to be thoughtful in working with the steering committees around the state and put together concise and strategic actions to follow in terms of professional development. Thirdly is to take the results moving forward in teacher practice and strengthening the teacher pipeline. Ms. Clark clarified there were no indicators of administrators doing anything wrong or evidence of administrators reporting inaccurately. Ms. Clark indicated the report served as more of a base line related to teacher evaluations. Mr. Scoggin asked what *they* learned from our current practice. Mr. Davis responded that precision in language around educator effectiveness is important, and summarized the conclusions of the report. He concluded there was consistency in the way the teachers were reviewed.

Mr. Soltman asked if there was a communication plan to discuss how the results were presented. Ms. Clark responded the findings were presented to the department within the timeline required. Mr. Jeff Church, Chief Communications Officer for the Department, responded that while they had received the report, there were still conversations between superintendents taking place which led to continued support for the Danielson model. Mr. Church provided additional details on the timeline. Dr. Clark added they were pleased to have the report presented in a formal manner such as at this meeting which allowed for the oral interpretation of the findings, and discussion of the report.

Ms. Atchley indicated the legislature has tasked the State Board with conducting an audit of the teacher evaluations. She commented on the development of a checklist or rubric that ensures the audit will look at the process, but not the content of the evaluation, and the Board must ensure the process specified in code occurs. She commented there is a great deal of concern on this issue, and the findings will help Idaho do a better job on teacher evaluations. Ms. Colon responded on the checklist and that the language needs to be very precise between observation and evaluation.

Mr. Westerberg asked if there is a list of actionable items as a result of this desk review. Ms. Colon responded they are still receiving additional feedback from districts, and they were also asked to provide support to the field in the way of workgroups. Dr. Clark expressed concern about the process and pointed out we must not require any piece of data be included unless it is available prior to the deadline requirements. The dates must be such to allow for complete and thorough reporting in a timely manner.

Ms. Kelly Brady, Director of Mastery Education, presented a report on mastery based education and related pieces of legislation. She pointed out mastery based education was one of the recommendations of the Education Task Force. Ms. Brady provided the definition of mastery based education and reported on the progress they have been making in the area, also providing a handout of the legislation they are proposing. Ms. Brady reported they are doing statewide awareness campaigns with the help of Strategies 360, to launch a corresponding public awareness and communication effort that will offer tools and resources for educators and administrators, public, and media. They are also doing parent and stakeholder interviews and surveys to determine the perception of mastery based education, and will be collaborating with higher education institutions to incorporate a transition to a mastery based education system.

Superintendent Ybarra introduced Mr. Scott Cook, Director of Academic Services, and Ms. Karlynn Laraway, Director of Assessment.

2. Temporary Rule – IDAPA 08.02.03.004.01, Idaho Content Standards – Science

M/S (Ybarra/Hill): To approve the Revised Idaho Science Content Standards, the incorporated by reference document, as submitted in Attachment 3. The motion carried 7-0. Ms. Critchfield was absent from voting.

AND

M/S (Ybarra/Hill): To approve the Temporary Rule amendment to IDAPA 08.02.03.004, Rules Governing Thoroughness, the Idaho Content Standards, as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried 7-0. Ms. Critchfield was absent from voting.

Mr. Cook, Director of Academic Services, provided background on the item in that the science standards attached to the agenda materials are a revised set of standards different than what the Board adopted in August 2015. Differences between the two revisions include revisions of structure and organization, including eliminating correlations to Idaho Content Standards in Mathematics and English Language Arts and Literacy, as well as other correlations to engineering practices. He pointed out revisions were also made to the standards to answer concerns of stakeholders and legislators.

3. Professional Standards Commission 2015-2016 Annual Report

M/S (Ybarra/Westerberg): To accept the Professional Standards Commission 2015-2016 Annual Report. The motion carried 7-0. Ms. Critchfield was absent from voting.

Ms. Ybarra indicated the Professional Standards Commission (PSC) report includes the number of requests that were received for Alternate Authorization for Interim Certificates as well as the number of individuals completing Board approved non-traditional

preparation programs. There are currently two non-traditional preparation programs approved by the Board, American Board for Certification of Teacher Excellence (ABCTE) and Teach for America (TFA). Mr. Soltman asked if the revocations and if we are up or down. Ms. Lisa Colon responded they do not have the previous years to indicate whether it is up or down.

4. Emergency Provisional Certificates

M/S (Ybarra/Clark): To approve one year emergency provisional certificates for Colby Argyle, Roxana Camacho, Jonathan Sheen, Joshua Spencer, Nathan Bundy, and Paiten Mortan to teach the content area and grade ranges at the specified school districts as provided herein. The motion carried 7-0. Ms. Critchfield was absent from voting.

Ms. Ybarra indicated this is to provide emergency provisional certificates for school districts. She pointed out that Section 33-1203, Idaho Code allows the Board to authorize provisional certificates in declared emergencies. Each of the applicants have at least two years of training from an accredited postsecondary institution. She clarified that if emergency provisional certificates are not approved, the school districts will have no certificated staff to serve in the classrooms. Mr. Westerberg recommended putting this item on the Consent Agenda in the future.

5. Recommendation from the Bias and Sensitivity Committee

M/S (Ybarra/Soltman): To approve the removal of the three (3) ELA items, one (1) grade 11 passage with five (5) associated items, one (1) grade 8 passage with eleven (11) associated items, and one (1) grade 6 math item, as submitted. The motion carried 6-1. Dr. Hill voted nay on the motion. Ms. Critchfield was absent from voting.

Ms. Ybarra provided some background on the item that the Board appointed a Bias and Sensitivity Committee to review any new test items that have been added to any summative computer adaptive test, including the Idaho Standards Achievement Test for English Language Usage and Mathematics. She noted following the review process the committee may make recommendations to the Board for removal of any test questions that the committee determines may be bias or unfair to any group of test takers.

Dr. Hill expressed significant reservations about the cost benefit of this.

At this time Mr. Freeman introduced Dr. Randall Brumfield as the Board's new Chief Academic Officer who comes from the University of Kansas.

INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH & STUDENT AFFAIRS

1. University of Utah – School of Medicine Report

Mr. Chet Herbst provided an overview of the report for the Board. As part of the Board's contract with the University of Utah School of Medicine (UUSOM), the Board receives an annual report which provides program information including curriculum, clerkships, budget, and names and home towns of first year Idaho-sponsored students. The UUSOM contract is up for renewal at the end of the 2018-2019 academic year.

2. Board Policy III.L. Continuing Education and Credit for Prior Experiential Learning (PLA) – First Reading

M/S (Hill/Scoggin): 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 6-0. Ms. Ybarra and Ms. Critchfield were absent from voting.

Dr. Brumfield noted two changes to this policy which establish modernized expectations for how and when PLAs are to be administered and when credit may be awarded. The use of PLAs and granting of credit is ancillary 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 effectively communicated which leads to underutilization. The proposed changes aim to create a set of shared expectations for the usage of PLA and granting of credit.

3. Board Policy III.N. General Education – First Reading

M/S (Hill/Scoggin): To approve the first reading of the proposed amendments to Board Policy III.N, General Education as presented in Attachment 1. The motion carried 6-0. Ms. Ybarra and Ms. Critchfield were absent from voting.

Dr. Brumfield indicated the existing requirement calls for five of the six competencies to be met. Following the General Education Summit held on October 5, 2016, the recommendation from the General Education Committee was to require students to meet all six competencies upon completion of a course. This proposed amendment provides increased uniformity to the general education framework bringing the outcomes into alignment with the national discipline expected outcomes.

4. Board Policy III.W. Higher Education Research – First Reading

M/S (Hill/Westerberg): To approve the first reading of Board Policy III.W., Higher Education Research as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried 6-0. Ms. Ybarra and Ms. Critchfield were absent from voting.

Mr. Howell provided a brief overview of the proposed changes which included outlining the terms the Vice Presidents of Research at each of the institutions serve on the Higher Education Research Council (HERC). Two sections contain more substantive changes which incorporate past action taken by the Board regarding reporting Center for Advanced Energy Studies (CAES) activities, use of funds appropriated for the use of the Board's Higher Education Research Council and designated for Idaho Global

Entrepreneurial Mission purposes, and update minimum program reporting requirements.

5. Board Policy III.Z. Planning and Delivery of Postsecondary Programs and Courses – Second Reading

M/S (Hill/Clark): To approve the second 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 6-0. Ms. Ybarra and Ms. Critchfield were absent from voting.

Dr. Brumfield indicated every two years the institutions are responsible for updating program names and degree titles and ensuring such updates occur on a regular basis. The proposed amendments also clarify the expectations of the universities regarding the delivery of statewide program responsibilities. There was one change between first and second reading that would further clarify the term “when necessary” under subsection 2.b.i. regarding the delivery of statewide program responsibility programs.

6. Boise State University – Bachelor of Science in Urban Studies and Community Development

M/S (Hill/Scoggin): To approve the request by Boise State University to create a Bachelor of Arts in Urban Studies and Community Development in substantial conformance to the program proposal submitted as Attachment 1. The motion carried 6-0. Ms. Ybarra and Ms. Critchfield were absent from voting.

Dr. Hill indicated BSU proposes to create a new Bachelor of Arts (BA) degree in Urban Studies and Community Development. Dr. Schimpf, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs from BSU, provided information on the item pointing out the new program is the first of two programs being proposed by BSU’s new School of Public Service; the second will be a BA in Global Studies, which will be considered at a later Board meeting. Both programs are designed to cross the lines that exist between traditional disciplines such as Political Science, History, Public Policy, and Economics, and will make use of faculty expertise and coursework across the university. BSU projects that the program will accept approximately 20 new students a year, have an overall enrollment of approximately 120 students, and have at least 16 graduates per year once the program is fully up and running.

7. Boise State University – Master of Athletic Training

M/S (Hill/Scoggin): To approve the request by Boise State University to create a new academic program that will award a Master of Athletic Training in substantial conformance to the program proposal submitted as Attachment 1. The motion carried 7-0. Ms. Critchfield was absent from voting.

Dr. Schimpf introduced the item indicating BSU proposes to create a new program that will award a Master of Athletic Training degree. BSU has offered an accredited Bachelor of Science in Athletic Training for 34 years, and transition to a master's level program is being required by the Commission on Accreditation of Athletic Training Education. The proposed program will be offered face-to-face in BSU's regional service area. Two faculty members and one graduate assistant who now teach in the bachelor's level program will be assigned to the master's level program. One additional faculty member will be funded using resources reallocated within the College of Health Sciences.

8. Boise State University – Master of Science in Economics and Master of Economics

M/S (Hill/Scoggin): To approve the request by Boise State University to create a new academic program that will award a Master of Science in Economics degree and a Master of Economics degree in substantial conformance to the program proposal submitted as Attachment 1. The motion carried 7-0. Ms. Critchfield was absent from voting.

Dr. Schimpf introduced the item and indicated BSU proposes to create a new program that will award a Master of Science degree in Economics and a Master of Economics degree. The proposed program will be offered face-to-face in BSU's regional service area. Creation of the proposed program will have minimal fiscal impact. A portion of the coursework will be provided by existing undergraduate economics courses that will be cross-listed as graduate courses.

9. Idaho State University – Master of Arts in Teaching

M/S (Hill/Scoggin): To approve the request by Idaho State University to approve the Master's in Teaching in substantial conformance to the program proposal submitted as Attachment 1. The motion carried 7-0. Ms. Critchfield was absent from voting.

Dr. Laura Woodworth-Ney, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs from ISU introduced the item indicating ISU is requesting the addition of a Master of Arts in Teaching Program (MAT). This degree will target a demonstrated need in Idaho for qualified personnel in the secondary school setting. This program is a blend of the existing Master of Arts in Secondary Education degree and the Certification Only track. Both programs will continue to exist alongside the MAT. MAT programs ensure deep content knowledge grounded in a bachelor's degree, and then provide master-level pedagogy and research skills that prepare teachers for initial licensure while focusing on the analysis of student data and implementation of best practices that support student achievement. ISU projects approximately 12-20 initial enrollments at the start of the program. Upon implementation, cohort enrollment will be capped at 20 candidates.

10. Idaho State University – Master of Social Work

M/S (Hill/Scoggin): To approve the request by Idaho State University to approve the Master's in Social Work in substantial conformance to the program proposal submitted as Attachment 1. The motion carried 7-0. Ms. Critchfield was absent from voting.

M/S (Hill/Scoggin): To approve the request by Idaho State University to designate a professional fee for the Master of Social Work in the amount of \$200 per semester in conformance with the program budget submitted to the Board in Attachment 1. The motion carried 7-0. Ms. Critchfield was absent from voting.

Dr. Laura Woodworth-Ney indicated ISU is requesting Board approval for a Master's in Social work and to designate a professional fee for it in the amount of \$200 per semester. ISU is currently approved to offer a Bachelor of Arts (BA) degree in Social Work.

She reported currently, the BA program prepares graduates for generalist professional practice and a new MSW program would prepare graduates for advanced professional practice within the field of social work through mastery of a core set of competencies as set forth by the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE), the national accrediting body. Two options for the MSW degree would be offered: 1) a one-year, advanced standing MSW program which would be an efficient graduate education option for those students who complete their BA degrees in social work at ISU or another CSWE accredited program; 2) a traditional two-year program for students who have completed non-social work BA degrees.

She pointed out ISU projects 25 initial enrollments at the start of the program with 25 additional enrollments in year two and another in year three, after which enrollment would stabilize at approximately 75 students. ISU requests approval to assess a professional fee consistent with Board Policy V.R.3.b.iv. at \$200 per semester. Dr. Woodworth-Ney indicated they would revisit the professional fee after the program is underway.

11. Dual Credit Workgroup Recommendations

M/S (Hill/Westerberg): To direct Board and Institution staff to develop recommendations and implementation timelines in alignment with the Dual Credit Workgroup recommendations and bring back for Board consideration at a later date. The motion carried 7-0. Ms. Critchfield was absent from voting.

Dr. Hill introduced the item providing some background that at its February 2016 meeting, the State Board's Instruction, Research, and Student Affairs (IRSA) Committee asked Board staff to assemble a workgroup consisting of representative stakeholders from higher education and K-12 education to bring forward a set of recommendations to make improvements to Idaho's dual credit program.

Dr. Brumfield summarized the report and recommendations, indicating the adoption and implementation of these recommendations offers an opportunity to provide consistency and transparency of processes; generate greater efficiencies, and potentially create greater access for many rural students. This would create more accessible pathways for current high school teachers, particularly in rural areas to earn the necessary credentials to teach dual credit courses in their high schools.

OTHER BUSINESS

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

M/S (Westerberg/Soltman): To adjourn the meeting at 2:49 p.m. Mountain Time.

The motion carried unanimously 7-0.