

**PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

TAB	DESCRIPTION	ACTION
1	COLLEGE OF WESTERN IDAHO – BIENNIAL PROGRESS REPORT	Information Item
2	ROLLING CALENDAR MEETING LOCATIONS	Motion to Approve
3	PUBLIC SCHOOL FUNDING INTERIM COMMITTEE – SURVEY UPDATE	Information Item
4	DIRECT ADMISSIONS REPORT	Information Item
5	2017 LEGISLATION – ADDITIONAL	Motion to Approve
6	BOARD POLICY - BYLAWS – FIRST READING	Motion to Approve
7	BOARD POLICY I.M. ANNUAL PLANNING AND REPORTING – FIRST READING	Motion to Approve
8	BOARD POLICY I.T. TITLE IX AND III.P. STUDENT APPEALS – FIRST READING	Motion to Approve
9	BOARD POLICY I.V. CAREER TECHNICAL EDUCATION – INDUSTRY PARTNER FUND – SECOND READING	Motion to Approve
10	TEACHER PREPERATION PROGRAMS – EFFECTIVENESS MEASURES	Motion to Approve

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

**PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

COLLEGE OF WESTERN IDAHO

SUBJECT

College of Western Idaho Biennial Progress Report

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

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

BACKGROUND

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

IMPACT

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

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – CWI Progress Report

Page 3

BOARD ACTION

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

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
DECEMBER 15, 2016

SUBJECT

Board Meeting – Location Rotation

REFERENCE

February 2016

Board considered and rejected proposal to rotate meeting locations to each institution campus biennially rather than annually.

BACKGROUND

The regular meetings of the Board are currently rotated between each of the eight public postsecondary institution campuses, such that the four year institutions host a Board meeting each year and the community colleges and Eastern Idaho Technical College host Board meetings every other year. The current rotation schedule allows for Board members to be on campus at least once each year and allows for residents in each of the areas to attend a Board meeting without traveling to Boise.

At the February 2016 regular Board meeting the Board discussed the possibility of changing the rotation schedule to one where the institutions would host each meeting based on the same schedule while the physical location would only be on the institutions campus every other year. During the off-year the hosting institution would host the Board meeting at a location in the Treasure Valley. Travel to north and east Idaho can be time consuming and expensive due to the limited availability of flights and long distances. Board members and institution staff have both expressed an interest in reducing cost and time by conducting more of the meetings in the Boise area where it is easier to travel to, regardless of which part of the state in which they may reside. In February 2016, the Board discussed the idea and concerns were expressed that as the Board of Regents or Board of Trustees for those institutions that are under the Board's direct governance the proposed schedule could result in a disconnect of Board members from the institutions and their communities. As a result of that discussion the Board choose not to change the current rotation and instituted a change in the typical Board meeting schedule that allowed for a tour of the hosting campus at the start of each regular Board meeting. The Board has followed the new schedule for almost one year now and the item is being brought back for reconsideration and feedback on how the new meeting schedule, incorporating the campus tours, have been received.

IMPACT

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.

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMENDATIONS

At the February 2016 regular Board meeting staff proposed the following rotation schedule:

PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
DECEMBER 15, 2016

February 2017 – Boise (BSU)
April 2017 – Boise (UI)
May 2017 – Retreat
June 2017 – Coeur d' Alene (NIC)
August 2017 – Boise (ISU)
October 2017 – Lewiston (LCSC)
December 2017 – Twin Falls (CSI)

February 2018 – Boise (BSU)
April 2018 – Moscow (UI)
May 2018 – Retreat
June 2018 – Idaho Falls (EITC)
August 2018 – Pocatello (ISU)
October 2018 – Lewiston (LCSC)
December 2018 – Nampa (CWI)

The proposal was discussed at the December 6, 2016 Presidents' Council meeting, with mixed feelings by the presidents. Should the Board move to a schedule where institution campuses were visited every other year rather than every year, Boise State University has offered their campus facilities should any of the hosting institutions wish to hold the meeting on Boise State University's campus. The final decision on the actual facilities would be up to the hosting institution, so as long as any such facility could meet the Board meeting requirements.

Should the Board indicate they would like to move to a rotation schedule as described herein, staff would bring back a final location rotation schedule through the Rolling Calendar at the next Board meeting. The start date for the rotations would be subject to suitable facilities being located within the Treasure Valley on the currently approved meeting dates.

BOARD ACTION

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

**PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

SUBJECT

Results – Public School Funding Formula Interim Committee Survey

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

HCR 33, 63rd Idaho Legislature, 2nd Regular Session (2016)

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

The Idaho State Board of Education 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. Starting Tuesday, October 4, 2016, through Sunday, October 23, 2016, an online public opinion survey was available for any Idaho citizen to provide comments and opinions regarding how public school districts and public charter schools in the state are funded.

The survey was developed in support of the work of the Interim Committee, which is charged with undertaking a complete study of the public school funding formula and making recommendations for improvement. The Interim Committee will evaluate the existing formula to assess how it meets the needs of different learning modalities, serves Idaho students, and provides fiscal stability to public school districts and public charter schools.

The Interim Committee was established at the passage of HCR 33 during the 2016 legislative session. In addition to members of the House and Senate, the committee membership includes a member of the State Board of Education (Dr. Linda Clark) and the Superintendent of Public Instruction, Sherri Ybarra.

IMPACT

The results of the survey can be used to identify trends in opinions regarding the state's public school funding formula. The survey findings, along with other policy research conducted by the committee provide important background information that can assist in forming recommendations by the Interim Committee.

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Governor's Task Force for Improving Education recommended a change to the public school funding formula from Average Daily Attendance to Average Daily Enrollment/Membership. The Public School Funding Subcommittee tasked with further developing the recommendation concluded that rather than focus solely on funding based on attendance or enrollment, the entire funding formula needed to be addressed. The public schools funding formula significantly changed between 1994 and 1996, in part as a response to "adequacy and equity" lawsuits filed in 1991. Since that time the various sections of Idaho Code that establish public school funding have had amendments to specific sections in an attempt to address isolated issues, however, a systemic look at how public schools are funded in Idaho has not been conducted since that time. The Subcommittee also concluded that a potential change of such magnitude would take significant legislative buy in and support.

**PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

The Interim Committee has been 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.

BOARD ACTION

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

**PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

SUBJECT

Direct Admissions Report

REFERENCE

August 2015	Board approved the Direct Admission benchmark
November 2015	First Direct Admissions letters mailed to students and parents
February 2016	Deadline for applying under the Direct Admissions program

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

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.

Through working with the Provosts and Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs at each public institution, a benchmark score consisting of a student's grade point average and college entrance exam scores was adopted. Students meeting the agreed upon benchmark would be accepted at all eight of the Idaho public institutions. Students not meeting the benchmark would be admitted to six of the Idaho public institutions.

The first letters to students and parents were sent in November 2015. A follow-up survey was sent to those students who applied to an Idaho public institution by the February deadline. This report looks at the enrollment behavior and results from the follow-up survey.

IMPACT

Recognizing the recruitment efforts by each institution, it is impossible to identify how much of the enrollment growth is caused by the Direct Admissions program. 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.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – Draft Direct Admissions Report

Page 3

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Board staff will be prepared to answer questions that the Board may have regarding the Direct Admissions program.

BOARD ACTION

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

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
DECEMBER 15, 2016

SUBJECT

Legislation – 2017 Session

REFERENCE

June 2016	The Board approved 28 legislative ideas to be submitted through the Governor’s Executive Agency Legislation process for the 2017 Session and authorized the Executive Director to identify additional potential legislation for submittal.
August 2016	Board approved FY18 Line Items, including funding for the Adult Completers Scholarship
September 23, 2016	Board approved 2017 Legislative Agenda
October 2016	Board received an update from the STEM Action Center, including benefits on the establishment of a public school STEM designation.

BACKGROUND/ DISCUSSION

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. In addition to this process the Board will also regularly choose to support other education related legislation. Board staff have been working with the Governor’s Office to develop legislation supporting the Board’s FY2018 Line Item request for funding for an Adult Completers Scholarship. The proposed legislation is in alignment with legislation introduced by the Governor’s Office during the 2016 legislative session that was supported by the Board. Additionally, Board staff has done some preliminary work in collaboration with the Governor’s Office and STEM Action Center staff to develop a program that recognizes quality STEM schools or programs. While the Board already has the authority to set STEM school standards for a uniform and thorough system of public education, the program envisioned through the proposed legislation would provide a mechanism to incentivize schools and districts to develop high quality STEM programs and meet quality STEM program standards.

Adult Completers Scholarship

This legislation would establish the Adult Postsecondary Completion Scholarship to help Idaho residents return to school and complete their academic studies.

The scholarship is intended to support adult students returning to a public college or university after an absence of at least three (3) years or more and who are completing their first undergraduate degree. Applicants may qualify for up to \$3,000 per academic year for up to eight (8) consecutive semesters.

Applicants must meet the following criteria in order to be eligible for consideration:

- Must be a resident of the state of Idaho.
- Must enroll as a student at an Idaho public higher education institution seeking a first undergraduate degree or certificate.

**PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

- Must be an undergraduate reentry student who has experienced a gap (three full academic years or more) in the pursuit of postsecondary education.
- Must have a minimum of 24 credits earned from any institution toward a degree (must be transcriptable credits).
- Must demonstrate financial need as determined by the Estimated Family Contribution (EFC) calculation on a completed FAFSA.
- Must be registered at least part time: a minimum of 6 credits per semester.

Fiscal Impact:

\$3 million ongoing General Fund appropriation to fund scholarship awards as well as implementation costs of the program. In addition, ongoing General Fund of \$92,000, of which \$89,000 is for salary and benefits, \$3,000 for Operating Expenditures, and \$3,000 for one-time Capital Outlay to the State Board of Education to cover salary, benefits and operation costs for this program.

STEM School Designation

This bill provides an opportunity for public schools to earn a STEM school designation or STEM program designation.

This bill defines terms, creates the STEM designation for public schools, requires the State Board of Education and STEM Action Center to collaborate to develop the requirements for a STEM designation and to implement an annual process for review of schools and programs seeking a STEM designation.

STEM schools and programs have gained popularity in recent years. Setting a common minimum standard for earning a STEM designation will help to inform parents and students about the quality and expectations of the schools or programs in which they are enrolling their students. A uniform STEM designation will assure a minimum quality standard.

Fiscal Impact:

The STEM school designation will be funded through existing funds appropriated to the STEM Action Center. Appropriated funds will be provided to help schools attain the standards established to receive the STEM designation and will be granted to schools who have received the STEM designation to sustain high quality STEM programs and educator professional development. Schools would be assessed by a third party reviewer and awards granted based on their progression toward the STEM designation. Estimates are based on the number of schools currently self-identified as STEM schools.

Designation Level	Anticipated # in Year 1	Review Cost (per year)	Total Anticipated Review Cost	Awards	Total Anticipated Awards Annually
Sustaining	5	\$ 1,500	\$7,500	\$10,000	\$50,000
Advancing	5	\$ 200	\$1,000	\$ 7,500	\$37,500
Emerging	10	\$ 200	\$2,000	\$ 5,000	\$50,000
				TOTAL	\$148,000

**PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

Funding for the STEM School Designation program would be requested through the state budget process by the STEM Action Center.

ATTACHMENT

Attachment 1 – Draft Adult Completers Scholarship Legislation (RS24909)Page 3
Attachment 2 – Draft STEM School Designation Language (RS24910) Page 7

IMPACT

Board approval would allow Board staff to continue to work with the Governor's Office and STEM Action Center staff (as applicable) to advocate for the proposed legislation.

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Should either piece of legislation be enacted by the 2017 Legislature, Board staff would develop administrative rules, as applicable, for the implementation of the statutes during the 2017 rulemaking cycle for Board consideration.

Staff recommends approval.

BOARD ACTION

I move 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.

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes _____ No _____

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
DECEMBER 15, 2016

SUBJECT

Board Policy - Bylaws – First Reading

REFERENCE

October 2014	Board approved a first reading of the Board Bylaws, incorporating language outlining the purpose of the Athletic Committee.
February 2015,	Board approved the second reading of proposed changes to the Board Bylaws, incorporating the Athletic Committee.
June 2016,	Board approved the first reading of the Board Bylaws, amending the program approval sunset clause.
August 2016	Board approved the second reading of the Board Bylaws, amending the program approval sunset clause.

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies and Procedures - Bylaws

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

Board Officers are elected by the Board annually. Currently Officers are selected at the regular June Board meeting. The date for the election of officers is not established in the Board bylaws and may be set for any properly noticed Board meeting at the direction of the Board President. The current June cycle is predicated by the fact that Board member terms, in their final year, terminate on June 30th. Previously, the election of Board Officers had been held at the regular April Board meeting or at the annual May Board Retreat. April elections were held at a time when Board terms expired on February 28th. Nominations for positions are taken from the floor at the time of the election. There is currently no formal nomination process. There are no established term limits for officers or length of service restrictions for eligibility to be an officer.

Following the 2016 Board Officers elections it was requested that Board staff explore options for establishing a more formal process for soliciting nominations for Board Officer positions. All standing committees of Board members are established in the Board's bylaws along with the Board's operations procedures. The creation of a Nomination Committee would need to be established through amendments to the Board's bylaws.

IMPACT

The proposed amendments would create a new standing committee of the Board, made of the Board officers and past President. The committee would have the responsibility of soliciting nominations for the annual election of officers.

**PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – Bylaws – First Reading

Page 3

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Board staff have researched a variety of governing board's 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. In most cases these boards meet throughout the year and gather information on the qualifications of each board member, and based on those qualifications the nominating committee will then make nominations for open positions on the board. 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. Nominations from these committees were generally due from 30 to 60 days prior to the election of officers, and were either made to the board president or chairperson or to the board as a whole.

BOARD ACTION

I move to approve the first reading of Board policy – Bylaws, establishing a Board Nomination Committee, as submitted in Attachment 1.

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes _____ No _____

PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
DECEMBER 15, 2016

SUBJECT

Board Policy I.M. Annual Planning and Reporting – Second Reading

REFERENCE

March 2008	Board approved first reading of Board Policy I.M. I.M.4. and III.M.3. Clarify Boards role in accreditation visits and Board self evaluation
April 2008	Board approved second reading of Board Policy I.M. I.M.4. and III.M.3. Clarify Boards role in accreditation visits and Board self evaluation
August 2008	Board approved first reading of Board Policy I.M. clarifying reporting requirements for strategic plans and performance measures
October 2008	Board approved second reading of Board Policy I.M. clarify reporting requirements for strategic plans and performance measures
April 2011	Board approved first reading of Board Policy I.M.
June 2011	Board approved second reading of Board Policy I.M.
June 2016	Board approved agency and institution strategic plans and requested the creation of a formal template for the submittal of future plans.

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies & Procedures, Section I.M. Section 67-1901 through 16-1905, Idaho Code.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

Sections 67-1901 through 16-1905, Idaho Code, establish the state's annual strategic plan reporting requirements. These requirements include the annual review and submit of strategic plans and performance measures. Institutions, agencies and special/health programs under the oversight of the Board submit their strategic plans to the Board for approval, the approved plans are then submitted by the Board office to the Division of Financial Management.

The plans must encompass at a minimum the current year and four years going forward. The Board planning calendar schedules these plans to come forward annually at the April and June Board meetings. This timeline allows the Board to review the plans and ask questions in April, and then have them brought back to the Regular June Board meeting with changes for final approval while still meeting the states timeline. Attached you will find the strategic plans for the institution's, agencies and special/health programs for Board consideration. In addition to those requirements set out in Idaho Code, Board Policy I.M.1. requires each institution and agency develop and maintain five-year strategic plans that are created in accordance with Board guidelines. The policy further states that the plans must contain a comprehensive mission and vision statement, general goals and objectives, and key external factors. Performance measures are required to be

**PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

developed and updated annually for Board approval, and tied to the strategic plan. Board approval of the performance measure is accomplished through the approval of the strategic plans and the performance measures contain there in. All strategic plans are required to be in alignment with the Board's K-20 Education Strategic plan.

Proposed changes to Board policy would establish the required strategic plan components, in alignment with the strategic plan requirements established in Idaho Code, provide additional clarification on the definition of each component and require plans be submitted in the template established by the Policy, Planning, and Governmental Affairs Committee.

IMPACT

Approval of changes to Board policy I.M. will further clarify institution and agencies strategic plan requirements.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – Board Policy I.M. – First Reading

Page 3

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Approval of the proposed amendments will establish a consistent format for the submittal of institution and agency strategic plans. The consistent format will not only assure that all of the statutory strategic planning requirements are met, but also facilitate a more efficient review of the plans by the Board and staff. The proposed definitions are definitions provided to the institutions and agencies each year by Board staff and are consistent with the Division of Financial Managements definitions for each component.

Staff recommends approval.

BOARD ACTION

I move to approve the first reading to Board policy section I.M. as submitted in Attachment 1.

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes _____ No _____

PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
DECEMBER 15, 2016

SUBJECT

Board Policy I.T. Title IX and III.P. Students – First Reading

REFERENCE

April 2016	The Board approved the first reading of Board Policy I.T. Title IX
June 2016	The Board approved the second reading of Board Policy I.T. Title IX and discussed the institutions providing additional information regarding their compliance with the new policy requirements and their internal appeal processes at a future Board meeting.

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies & Procedures, Section I.T. and III.P.
Education Amendments of 1972, 10 USC §1681
Title IX, CFR §106.1

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 and its implementing regulations, 34 C.F.R. Sec. 106 (“Title IX”), prohibit discrimination on the basis of sex in federally funded education programs and activities. Title IX protects students, employees, applicants for admission and employment, and campus visitors from all forms of sexual harassment, including sexual violence and gender-based harassment. All public and private elementary and secondary schools, school districts, and colleges and universities receiving any federal financial assistance must comply with Title IX.

Following approval of the second reading of Board Policy, I.T. Title IX, institution staff brought up possible concerns regarding the potential for a student, charged with misconduct, including Title IX violations, to continue to appeal to the Board after they have exhausted the appeals process established at the institution and the potential harm this could cause the victim. Specific concerns raised by the institutions included:

1. The institutions’ own policies already allow students to appeal procedural issues. Another appeal on this issue is not necessary.
2. Students would raise the issue of procedural error as a further delay technique to stretch out the appeal process.
3. In Title IX cases, allowing students an appeal to the Board could result in further trauma to the complainant by forcing the complainant to relive the incident and further delaying recovery.

The proposed amendments to Board Policy I.T. correct the reporting requirement. The institutions are required to notify students of time frames relevant to investigations as well as to those applicable to hearings. The proposed

PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
DECEMBER 15, 2016

amendments to Board Policy III.P. 18. limit student appeals to the Board regarding misconduct to those due to allegations of procedural errors which resulted in an unjust application of the code of student conduct, involved previously unavailable relevant evidence that could significantly impact the outcome of the case, or where a sanction is substantially disproportionate to the findings.

IMPACT

The proposed policy amendments will limit the continued appeals of student misconduct complaints, allowing closure to victims while still assure a student's right to due process.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – Board Policy, I.T. Title IX

Page 3

Attachment 2 – Board Policy, III.P. Students

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The initial request from the institutions was a restriction on all student appeals to the Board regarding student misconduct. After discussion with the legal counsel at the institutions and the Board's legal counsel, the staff recommendation is to limit appeals to the Board regarding cases of student misconduct except those that fall within the provided exceptions. Should the Board choose to hear a student misconduct appeal related to Title IX, the Board would need to have specific training related to hearing these types of appeals.

Institutions will be providing a report to the Board at the February Board meeting detailing their internal appeal processes and implementation of Board Policy I.T. Title IX.

BOARD ACTION

I move 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.

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes _____ No _____

CAREER TECHNICAL EDUCATION

SUBJECT

Board Policy IV.E. Career Technical Education – Industry Partner Fund – Second Reading

REFERENCE

November 28, 2016 Board approved first reading of proposed changes to Board Policy IV.E., adding the Industry Partner Fund.

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

Section 33-2213, Idaho Code

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

Idaho Code 33-2213 was added during the 2016 legislative session and establishes the Industry Partner Fund. The purpose of the fund is to give 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 has requested \$1,000,000 for FY2018.

The policy establishes a comprehensive framework to govern the use of funds, should they be appropriated in the future. The draft policy defines specific terms related to the proposal process, formally establishes the Technical College Leadership Council and their roles and responsibilities throughout the proposal acceptance and review process, outlines the application process for accessing funds, as well as outlines the distribution and use of funds and related reporting requirements.

IMPACT

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.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – Board Policy IV.E. – Second Reading Page 3

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

There have been no changes between the first and second reading.

Staff recommends approval.

PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
DECEMBER 15, 2016

BOARD ACTION

I move 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.

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes _____ No _____

PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
DECEMBER 15, 2016

SUBJECT

Educator Preparation Programs Performance Measures and Definition – Low Performing

REFERENCE

October 2016 Board was updated on progress made toward developing educator preparation program effectiveness/performance measures.

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

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

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

Annually, the Office of the State Board of Education (Board) certifies and submits Idaho's Title II report to the U.S. Department of Education (USDOE). The report includes data from public and private teacher preparation programs authorized by the State Board of Education to prepare individuals for certification in Idaho. On October 16, 2016 the USDOE released the revised Title II requirements. The rule imposes new reporting measures—beyond the basics required for annual reports under the Higher Education Act—which identify levels of program effectiveness to drive continuous improvement.

The final federal regulations incorporate extensive stakeholder and public feedback obtained throughout four years of federal negotiated rulemaking, public hearings, and public comment processes. The intent of the new rule is to promote transparency about the effectiveness of all educator preparation providers (traditional, alternative routes, and distance) by requiring states to report annually—at the program level—on the following measures:

- Feedback from graduates and their employers on the effectiveness of program preparation; and
- Student learning outcomes measured by novice teachers' student growth, teacher evaluation results, and/or another state-determined measure that is relevant to students' outcomes, including academic performance, and meaningfully differentiates amongst teachers; and
- Placement and retention rates of graduates in their first three years of teaching, including placement and retention in high-need schools; and
- Other program characteristics, including assurances that the program has specialized accreditation or graduates candidates with content and pedagogical knowledge, and quality clinical preparation, who have met rigorous exit requirements.

States are allowed flexibility in determining how to weigh all outcome measures, but are required to categorize program effectiveness using at least three levels of performance (effective, at-risk, and low-performing). These new federal

PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
DECEMBER 15, 2016

requirements are designed to facilitate ongoing feedback amongst programs, prospective teachers, schools and districts, states and the public.

In early 2013, while the proposed Title II (Higher Education Act) rule was moving through the process of negotiated rulemaking at the federal level, Idaho's educator preparation providers were already meeting regularly to develop common assessments and create consistency in measuring program outcomes. The Idaho measures were shaped in alignment with the proposed federal rule and, as a result, the rubric developed through the Idaho Coalition for Educator Preparation (ICEP) and the Idaho Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (IACTE) for measuring program performance is in full compliance with the newly initiated Title II requirements.

The attached document illustrates these proposed performance measures, aligned with federal guidance and recommended by ICEP, IACTE, and the Professional Standards Commission (PSC), for the purpose of establishing a system for reporting varying ranges of program performance. New Title II State Reporting requirements will become effective no later than October 2019.

IMPACT

If the Board approves the measures recommended, as outlined in Attachment 1, Board staff will take next steps to convene the requisite stakeholders for the purpose of consultation as prescribed by Title II guidance. This "consultation group" will be charged with making final recommendations on implementation of the EPP performance assessment system and data collection processes, as well as suggest state-level rewards or consequences associated with the designated performance levels. Feedback and recommendations from this group shall be vetted by the PSC for formal recommendation, and will be presented to the Board at a future meeting.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – Draft Idaho Educator Preparation providers Evaluation Plan –
Title II Aligned

Page 5

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

At minimum, states must use the 2016-17 academic year to design their reporting system in consultation with stakeholders. They may choose to use 2017-18 as a pilot year and are required to fully implement the system in 2018-19. For programs not performing at an "effective" level, federal consequences outline that such programs will become ineligible for the Teacher Education Assistance for College and Higher Education (TEACH) grants. The first year for which any program might lose TEACH grant eligibility will be 2021-22. The TEACH grant program is a federal program that provides grants of up to \$4,000 per year to students who agree to teach for four years in an elementary or secondary school, or educational service agency that serves students from low-income families.

**PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

Additional federal guidance requires states to provide technical assistance to any program rated as low-performing to help it improve. With the Board's support of these recommended measures, progress can be made toward a full pilot in 2017-18, which will allow for close review of this system prior to mandatory implementation. To ensure accuracy and consistency in evaluating educator preparation programs, adjustments to current data reporting and data collection will likely be necessary. Additionally, a pilot year will also allow for discussion and strategic planning as the state education agency considers how to meet the technical assistance requirement in a way that will most effectively support low-performing programs.

BOARD ACTION

I move to approve the proposed measures for determining Educator Preparation Provider program effectiveness, as submitted in Attachment 1.

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes _____ No _____

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK