

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION MEETING
December 14-15, 2016
College of Western Idaho
Micron Center for Professional Technical Education
5725 E. Franklin Road
Nampa, Idaho

Room 1701a/b Audio Only (no video streaming available):

Dial-in Number: (877) 820-7829

Public Passcode: 9096313

Diesel Equipment Lab:

Starting at 1:00 pm, Wednesday December 14, 2016

Live Stream Link

<https://livestream.com/accounts/19362489/SBOENampa>

Wednesday, December 14, 2016, 10:00 am, Rm 1701a/b and Diesel Equipment Lab

BOARDWORK (Rm 1701a/b)

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

WORK SESSION

PLANNING, POLICY & GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS (Rm 1701a/b)

- A. Coordination of Activities – Office of the Board of Education – Department of Education

(break for lunch)

PLANNING, POLICY & GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS (Diesel Equipment Lab)

- B. K-20 Education Strategic Plan
- Operational Plan
 - Annual Dual Credit Report
 - Annual Scholarship Program Report
- C. Higher Education Research Strategic Plan

Thursday December 15, 2016, 8:00 a.m., Diesel Equipment Lab

OPEN FORUM

CONSENT AGENDA

BAHR – SECTION II

1. Boise State University - Campus Law Enforcement Services Contract with Boise Police Department
2. Idaho State University – Lease of Real Property to McDonald's USA, LLC
3. University of Idaho – Human Resources Third Party Administration Services Contract

IRSA

4. Programs and Changes Approved by Executive Director – Quarterly Report
5. General Education Committee Appointments
6. EPSCoR Committee appointments

PPGA

7. Alcohol Permits Approved by University Presidents
8. University of Idaho – Naming of Indoor Golf Facility
9. State Rehabilitation Council – Appointment

SDE

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

PLANNING, POLICY & GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

1. College of Western Idaho Report
2. Rolling Calendar Meeting Locations
3. Public School Funding Interim Committee Survey Update
4. Direct Admissions Report
5. 2017 Legislation - Additional
 - STEM School Designation
 - Adult Completers Scholarship
6. Board Policy – Bylaws – Nomination Committee - First Reading
7. Board Policy – I.M. Annual Planning and Reporting - First Reading
8. Board Policy – I.T. Title IX and III.P. Students – Student Misconduct Appeals – First Reading
9. Board Policy – IV. Career Technical Education – Industry Partner Fund – Second Reading
10. Teacher Preparation Programs – Effectiveness Measures

AUDIT

1. FY 2016 Financial Statement Audits
2. FY 2016 Financial Ratios
3. FY 2016 Net Position Balances

BUSINESS AFFAIRS & HUMAN RESOURCES

Section I – Human Resources

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

Section II – Finance

1. Medical Education Committee Update
2. Boise State University – Authorization for Issuance of General Revenue and Refunding Bonds
3. Boise State University – Relocation of Facilities and Central Receiving Building – Planning and Design
4. Boise State University - Residential Honors College and Additional Student Housing Project – Agreement with EDR Boise LLC
5. Boise State University – Online Program Fee – Existing Online Undergraduate Certificate in Design Ethnography
6. Idaho State University Foundation - Release of Easement Rights
7. University of Idaho – Six-Year Capital Plan Update – Salmon Classroom and Idaho Arena
8. University of Idaho – Educational Association Agreement with Navitas
9. Lewis-Clark State College – Living and Learning Complex Project – Planning and Design Phase
10. Lewis-Clark State College – Six-Year Capital Plan Update – Career Technical Education Building

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

1. Superintendent's Update
2. Temporary Rule – IDAPA 08.02.03.004.01, Idaho Content Standards - Science
3. Professional Standards Commission 2015-2016 Annual Report
4. Emergency Provisional Certificates
5. Recommendation from the Bias and Sensitivity Committee

INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH & STUDENT AFFAIRS

1. University of Utah – School of Medicine Report
2. Board Policy III.L. Continuing Education and Credit for Prior Experiential Learning – First Reading
3. Board Policy III.N. General Education – First Reading
4. Board Policy III.W. Higher Education Research – First Reading
5. Board Policy III.Z. Planning and Delivery of Postsecondary Programs and Courses – Second Reading
6. Boise State University – Bachelor of Science in Urban Studies and Community Development
7. Boise State University – Master of Athletic Training
8. Boise State University – Master of Science in Economics and Master of Economics
9. Idaho State University – Master of Arts in Teaching
10. Idaho State University – Master of Social Work
11. Dual Credit Workgroup Recommendations

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

**BOARDWORK
DECEMBER 14, 2016**

1. Agenda Approval

Changes or additions to the agenda

2. Minutes Approval

BOARD ACTION

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

3. Rolling Calendar

BOARD ACTION

I move to set December 20-21, 2017 as the date and the College of Southern Idaho as the location for the December 2017 regularly scheduled Board meeting.

BOARDWORK
DECEMBER 14, 2016

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

**BOARDWORK
DECEMBER 14, 2016**

**DRAFT MINUTES
STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
October 19-20, 2016
Lewis-Clark State College
Williams Conference Center
Lewiston, Idaho**

A regularly scheduled meeting of the State Board of Education was held October 19-20, 2016 at Lewis-Clark State College in Lewiston, Idaho.

Present:

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

Don Soltman
Dave Hill
Richard Westerberg
Sherri Ybarra,

Wednesday, October 19, 2016

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

BOARDWORK

1. Agenda Review/Approval

BOARD ACTION

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

2. Minutes Review / Approval

BOARD ACTION

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

3. Rolling Calendar

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Clark/Soltman): To set October 18-19, 2017 as the date and Lewis-Clark State College as the location for the October 2017 regularly scheduled Board meeting, and to amend the date for the April 2017 Regular Board meeting to April 19-20, 2017, the June 2017 Regular Board meeting to June 14-15, 2017, and the August 2017 Regular Board meeting to August 9-10, 2017. The motion carried unanimously.

PLANNING, POLICY & GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS (PPGA)

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

LCSC President Dr. Tony Fernandez welcomed the Board and guests to Lewiston for the October

BOARDWORK

DECEMBER 14, 2016

meeting. As part of his report to the Board, he guided Board members and staff on a tour of key areas on campus. Specific details regarding the institutions' progress toward meeting its strategic plan goals may be found in the report submitted as part of the agenda materials.

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

WORKSESSION

Instruction, Research, & Student Affairs

A. NWCCU Discussion

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

Planning, Policy & Governmental Affairs (PPGA)

B. Idaho Indian Education Committee – Tribal Governance Structure Discussion

A presentation was led by Helo Hancock, Legislative Director for the Coeur d'Alene Tribe, and Dr. Chris Meyer of the Coeur d'Alene Tribe and Co-Chair of the Indian Education Committee, and Bob Sobotta, also a Co-Chair of the Indian Education Committee. Mr. Hancock provided some background on himself as well as a summarized overview of the history of Idaho Tribes starting as far back as when settlers came west, illustrating the challenges the Tribes have faced over the years. He provided a handout included in the agenda materials summarizing facts about the Coeur d'Alene Tribe and background on federal policy in Indian Country. Mr. Hancock pointed out several misconceptions about life on an Indian reservation that was unfortunately used in many governmental decisions over the years.

Mr. Hancock spoke to the unique role the tribes have with the Board's Indian Education Committee and on the unique cultural and socioeconomic issues facing the tribes around the state. He also pointed out that Tribes, for the most part, are treated as a sovereign nation and generally speaking, state laws don't apply to Tribes and Tribal members within a reservation (although there are exceptions). He also pointed out the converse is true, that Tribal laws generally don't apply to non-Indians on reservations, but there are also exceptions to that. He pointed out this creates a complicated jurisdictional maze when dealing with Indian reservations. Tribes have a unique relationship with the Federal government, making them quite different in terms of a minority population. Mr. Hancock indicated that nearly 40% of their budget is Federal dollars, and the rest of their budget is made up through Tribal economic development initiatives. He discussed how Tribes do a lot for their communities and those endeavors are sometimes overlooked.

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

Mr. Scoggins asked how many American Indian students are in public schools and what kinds of problems they are facing. Dr. Meyer responded that 75% of Indian students are attending public school. One of the most significant issues are high dropout rates at the high schools which is alarming. Ms.

BOARDWORK

DECEMBER 14, 2016

Selena Grace, member of the Indian Education Committee, added that Tribal students make up about two percent of the enrollment population, and almost 90% of those students attend public schools. There are two Tribal schools in the state. She commented that from a Committee perspective, the most helpful thing the Board could do would be in looking at those policy issues facing the Tribes which impact curriculum, and engaging Tribal leaders in the discussion of the development of that curriculum, because of the historical dynamics of the Indian minority population. For the Board to reach out directly to Tribal education departments through Tribal leadership is key to developing curriculum and standards.

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

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

C. Performance Reporting

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

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

Mr. Howell next reported on the dual credit headcount and credit hours. He noted the slope as a result of the fast forward program, has changed for the better and now more students are taking dual credit than

BOARDWORK

DECEMBER 14, 2016

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. Westerberg requested more summary data at a higher level, and less granular information in order to

BOARDWORK
DECEMBER 14, 2016

understand where the trends are. There was consensus on next year having just state level data. The Board recessed the meeting at 4:30 Pacific Time.

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

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

OPEN FORUM

There were no requests to speak during open forum.

CONSENT AGENDA

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

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

Business Affairs & Human Resources – Section I Finance

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

BOARD ACTION

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

Instruction, Research & Student Affairs (IRSA)

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

BOARD ACTION

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

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

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

4. University of Idaho – Donation to Coeur d'Alene Center "Fiber Line"

By unanimous consent to approve the request of the University of Idaho to enter into agreements

BOARDWORK
DECEMBER 14, 2016

with Fatbeam for the donation of two lit fiber lines for a period of fifty years and 1Gb of high-speed internet service for a period of ten years, in substantial conformance to the materials submitted to the Board.

Planning, Policy & Governmental Affairs (PPGA)

5. Indian Education Committee Appointments

BOARD ACTION

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

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

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

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

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

6. State Rehabilitation Council Appointments

BOARD ACTION

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

7. President Approved Alcohol Permits - Report

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

State Department of Education (SDE)

8. 2015-2016 AdvanceED Accreditation Report

BOARD ACTION

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

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

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

BUSINESS AFFAIRS AND HUMAN RESOURCES - Section II – Finance

BOARDWORK
DECEMBER 14, 2016

4. Boise State University – Capital Project Construction Phase – Fine Arts Building

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Clark): To approve the request by Boise State University to proceed with construction of a new Fine Arts Building for a total cost not to exceed \$42,000,000, subject to the Board's subsequent approval of a debt financing plan for this project. The motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Stacy Pearson, Vice President for Finance and Administration at BSU, indicated they are requesting approval to proceed with a new building to house the Art Department. The request was noted as one of the highest priority major capital projects for BSU.

Fundraising and planning efforts to relocate the department began in early 2013, and in April 2013 the Board approved a request for the planning and design of a new Fine Arts Building. This project will be procured through the Construction Manager at Risk (CMR) process through DPW and/or the Idaho Division of Purchasing standard process(es) as appropriate.

Dr. Kustra provided a thorough explanation of how the art museum will look with floor to ceiling screens that portray what it looks like to walk through other museums in the world. Ms. Pearson provided an overview of the budget and pointed out BSU intends to issue bonds to finance a portion of this building and will seek Board approval at the December 2016 meeting to issue those bonds prior to starting construction.

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

PLANNING, POLICY & GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS (PPGA)

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

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

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

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

Ms. Donnellan highlighted some of the projects that have been developed for students with disabilities and details of those projects. Those projects included the BSU Prep Academy, the LCSC College Readiness Educational Workshop (CREW), the BSU Mentoring Transition Project, ISU Bengals' Pre-employment Transition Services Project, UI's McCall Outdoor Science School Project, and the BSU On-

BOARDWORK DECEMBER 14, 2016

line Digital Literacy Skills Project.

Ms. Donnellan reviewed their SFY 2018 budget request which include a \$125,000 increase in state general fund appropriations, \$214,300 in additional state general fund appropriations for the extended employment services, and \$111,100 in state general funds for the purpose of supporting one additional full time employee for the Council for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing (CDHH) which currently has a staff of two. She reviewed partnerships which included collaborations with a number of other state agencies. She pointed out that without these partnerships IDVRs services to its customers would be adversely impacted.

3. STEM Action Center Update

Ms. Angela Hemingway, Executive Director of the STEM Action Center (Center), provided an update for the Board. The Center is dedicated to providing a STEM competitive workforce by implementing Idaho's kindergarten through career STEM education programs.

She reviewed the individuals who make up the members of the STEM Action Center Board, and identified their mission and vision statements. She reviewed two pieces of legislation specific to STEM Action Center, and how they are working with the State Board of Education, the Department, industry, educators, and universities to create Idaho specific K-12 computer science standards.

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

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

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

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

4. Idaho Department of Labor – Workforce Projections Report

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

Mr. Edmunds indicated every two years, they do a ten-year projection on total employment of the state. He reported that Idaho is very healthy presently and has experienced a 1.8% in growth which is greater than the national projection. He provided that projected growth in jobs and workforce between 2014 and 2024 is 138,000 and 89,000 respectively, so labor supply is a challenge. He provided an illustration of

BOARDWORK

DECEMBER 14, 2016

projected educational attainment by degree in 2024 and their projections are at 61% which is in line with the Board's 60% goal projection. Mr. Edmunds reported on Idaho's Hot Jobs and occupational projections from 2014 to 2024. Formerly healthcare dominated this list, but it has changed to the computer industry with software developers being at the top. He reported on education and training pay which shows how education increases income levels. He reviewed STEM jobs and reported that Idaho's growth in that area is at 26%.

Mr. Edmunds discussed work-based learning and that there is a great need to focus on apprenticeships, and a cooperative education model. He reported on college and career advising, and other areas such as adopting a Hispanic initiative, working with veterans, and two programs called Choose Idaho and Targeted Recruiting. He reported on their program called the Talent Accelerator Initiative, funded through 4% of unemployment tax collections, and used for direct employer training reimbursement, industry sector grants, and rural micro-grants. Mr. Edmunds pointed out they are working through a funding decline from \$10 million to \$5 million and reviewed the proposal and the funding suggestions.

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

Mr. Edmunds pointed out IDOL has actively promoted greater collaboration among industry, government and education, particularly in the areas of career awareness for students and job seekers, technical education training and other areas where they have identified gaps in workforce development training. IDOL presented information in a number of different areas including an overview of job placement, locations, and income levels for Idaho postsecondary graduates, along with a progress report on how VISTA and AmeriCorps volunteers are being deployed to support local district efforts in career advising.

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

5. Workforce Development Council – Annual Report

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

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

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

6. Board Policy I.E. – Executive Officers – Second Reading

BOARDWORK

DECEMBER 14, 2016

BOARD ACTION

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

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

7. Temporary Rule – IDAPA 08.02.01 – Data Collection

BOARD ACTION

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

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

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

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

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

BOARDWORK

DECEMBER 14, 2016

a high quantity of data collection. Their goal is to ensure the burden of data collection they require is meaningful and beneficial for reporting.

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

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

8. Educator Preparation Programs – Definition – Low Performing

Ms. Critchfield provided some background on the item and directed the Board to their agenda materials for greater detail. Annually, the Board certifies and submits Idaho's Title II report to the U.S. Department of Education. The report includes data from public and private teacher preparation programs authorized by the Board to prepare individuals for certification in Idaho. Several years ago, the U.S. Department of Education added a requirement that states must report preparation programs that had been identified as "Low Performing" or "At-Risk of Being Low Performing" as part of their Title II report.

Based on a recommendation from the Professional Standards Commission (PSC), for the 2016 report, Idaho used the existing State Program Review process for identifying programs as "Low Performing" or "At-Risk of Being Low Performing" with the understanding that the PSC would work with the Idaho Coalition for Educator Preparation and the Idaho Association of Colleges of Teacher Education to recommend a more robust definition in 2016 and would put the new definition in place prior to submitting the 2017 report.

Ms. Critchfield directed attention to Attachment 1 which reflects the indicators the PSC recommends for use in developing the definition and criteria for identifying "Low Performing", "At-Risk of Being Low Performing", and "Appropriately Performing" educator preparation programs. If the Board supports the recommendation of the PSC to use the indicators outlined in Attachment 1, the Idaho Coalition for Educator Preparation will use the indicators to develop the full definition and criteria to be used for identifying educator preparation programs. The draft definition developed by the Idaho Coalition for Educator Preparation will be vetted by the Idaho Association of Colleges of Teacher Education and will then be given to the PSC for review and formal recommendation to the Board. The full definition and criteria will be provided to the Board for consideration at the December 2016 regular Board meeting.

STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (SDE)

1. Superintendent's Update

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

Ms. Ybarra introduced Tony Pierce, Chief Procurement Officer for the Department, to provide an update on the Idaho Reading Indicator (IRI) Request for Proposal (RFP). Mr. Pierce provided background on the process and the development of the scope of work for the proposal, and best practices. The RFP was

BOARDWORK DECEMBER 14, 2016

released in September, and an addendum was released in October. An eleven (11) person panel has been assembled to review written technical proposals. After the panel evaluates the proposals, they will be ranked. Once completed, they will work with the contractor on implementation.

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

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

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

BOARD ACTION

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

Ms. Charlie Sylva, Special Education Director, was available by phone for questions. Ms. Ybarra indicated updating the Idaho Alternate Assessment Achievement Standards will bring Idaho into compliance with requirements under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and current federal requirements in place under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

At this time the meeting recessed for lunch.

BUSINESS AFFAIRS AND HUMAN RESOURCES - Section I – Human Resources

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

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Hill): To approve the second reading of the proposed amendment to Board Policy Section II.F.2.b.vi "Policies Regarding Non-classified Employees – Automobile Exclusion and Courtesy Vehicles" as provided in Attachment 1. The motion carried 5-0. Mr. Scoggin, Ms. Critchfield, and Ms. Ybarra were absent from voting.

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

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

BOARD ACTION

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

Mr. Chet Herbst, Chief Financial Officer for the Board, provided a brief overview of the impacts and changes from the U.S. Department of Labor's Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA). He reported that a number of non-classified staff that would become overtime eligible under the new rules. Additionally, he discussed there would be questions on how to fund the overtime pay or comp time pay, and possible

BOARDWORK DECEMBER 14, 2016

morale issues that the FLSA changes will effect. Mr. Herbst provided a slide for illustrative purposes on the number of impacted employees of newly overtime-eligible non-classified staff. The number at institutions totals roughly 715 employees and the number at the agencies is roughly 38. He also pointed out that budget increases to cover these changes are not automatically included. Mr. Herbst provided some examples of possible scenarios that could affect employee morale such as some employees would be earning half the leave rate that they were earning before, some may feel that they are demoted to an hourly position, and so forth. He pointed out for the Board the depth of this complicated issue and other economic impacts.

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

BUSINESS AFFAIRS AND HUMAN RESOURCES - Section II – Finance

1. FY 2017 Sources and Uses of Funds

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

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

BOARD ACTION

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

Mr. Westerberg indicated the intent of the proposed amendment removes the Enrollment Workload Adjustment (EWA) methodology to facilitate Board efforts to align Board policy with the Outcomes Based Funding approach. It is anticipated that Board Policy V.S. will be revised to incorporate the basic procedures pertaining to OBF if/when the funding approach is approved by the Governor and Legislature.

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

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

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

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

5. Idaho State University – Purchasing Policy

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Hill): To approve the request by Idaho State University to adopt the new

BOARDWORK DECEMBER 14, 2016

purchasing policy as detailed in Attachment 1 which exempts Idaho State University from Chapter 92, Title 67, Idaho Code – State Procurement Act. The motion carried unanimously.

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

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

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Soltman): To approve the request from Lewis-Clark State College to execute the financing plan and implement the construction phase of the Spalding Hall renovation project as described in the materials provided herein, and to authorize the College to execute all necessary and requisite consulting contracts to bid, award, and complete the construction phase of the project for an amount not to exceed \$4,540,000. The motion carried unanimously.

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

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

INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH & STUDENT AFFAIRS (IRSA)

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

BOARD ACTION

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

Dr. Mathias provided background on the item and walked the Board through the changes to policy. He pointed out the proposed amendments to Board Policy III.L will establish modernized expectations for how and when PLAs are to be administered and when credit may be awarded.

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

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Hill/Critchfield): To approve the first reading of proposed amendments to Board Policy III.Z, Planning and Delivery of Postsecondary Programs and Courses as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried unanimously.

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

BOARDWORK
DECEMBER 14, 2016

3. Board Policy III.O. – Course Placement – Second Reading

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Hill/Westerberg): To approve the second reading of the new section of Board policy III.O. Course Placement, as presented in Attachment 1 and to extend the waiver of Board Policy III.Q.4.c., Placement in Entry-Level College Courses, until such time as amendments to the policy are brought forward removing the subsection from Board Policy III.Q. The motion carried unanimously.

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

4. Dual Credit Recommendations

Dr. Hill indicated these recommendations would also be brought before the Board in December. Dr. Chris Mathias provided background on the item that at its February 2016 meeting, the State Board's IRSA Committee asked Board staff to assemble a temporary workgroup, consisting of representative stakeholders from both the higher education and K-12 education, to bring forward a set of recommendations to make improvements to Idaho's already successful dual credit programs. In close consultation with State Department of Education staff, the substantive focus of the work was divided into three categories: Teachers, Courses and Administrative Procedures.

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

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

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

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

OTHER BUSINESS

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

M/S (Westerberg/Hill): To adjourn the meeting at 2:10 p.m. Pacific Time. The motion carried unanimously.

BOARDWORK
DECEMBER 14, 2016

DRAFT MINUTES
IDAHO STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

November 14, 2016
Office of the State Board of Education
Len B. Jordan Building, 3rd Floor
Boise, Idaho

A special meeting of the State Board of Education was held November 14, 2016 in the large conference room of the Office of the State Board of education, Len B. Jordan Building, in Boise, Idaho. Board President Emma Atchley presided and called the meeting to order at 9:00 am Mountain Time. A roll call of members was taken.

Present:

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

Richard Westerberg
Dave Hill
Don Soltman

Absent:

Linda Clark, Vice President

BUSINESS AFFAIRS & HUMAN RESOURCES (BAHR)

Section I – Human Resources

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

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

Mr. Westerberg introduced the item indicating that this is the second reading to the proposed amendment to Board Policy II.F. intended to minimize the negative impact on non-classified employees who will become overtime-eligible (but may or may not be permitted to work overtime) and who would be required to accrue leave at a lesser rate under the current policy. He pointed out there have been no changes between the first and second reading.

He clarified that under the proposed amendment, the protection of these employees’ current leave accrual rate would be limited to their time in the specific position. “Grandfather” protection would end if the employee departs or moves to a new position. The proposed amendment would not increase the current costs to the institutions for the leave accrued by the affected individuals—they would continue to accrue leave at a rate based on two (2) days per month for full-time employees. The proposed amendment would result in the institutions and agencies forgoing any immediate leave accrual savings, which would not be available until the “grandfather” protection lapsed for the affected positions.

Dr. Hill asked if this was a complete solution or a temporary solution that would further evolve. Mr. Westerberg responded it is an imperfect solution that will help resolve itself through time. Mr. Scoggin also commented on the need for the Board to remain open to what the impacts are

BOARDWORK
DECEMBER 14, 2016

to the institutions with the understanding that if there are changes which could improve situations for the institutions, the Board should explore and be open to suggestions.

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

OTHER BUSINESS

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

M/S (Scoggin/Critchfield): To adjourn the meeting at 9:15 a.m. The motion carried unanimously.

**BOARDWORK
DECEMBER 14, 2016**

**DRAFT MINUTES
IDAHO STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION**

**November 28, 2016
Office of the State Board of Education
Len B. Jordan Building, 3rd Floor
Boise, Idaho**

A special meeting of the State Board of Education was held November 28, 2016 in the large conference room of the Office of the State Board of education, Len B. Jordan Building, in Boise, Idaho. Board President Emma Atchley presided and called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. Mountain Time. A roll call of members was taken.

Present:

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

Richard Westerberg
Dave Hill
Sherri Ybarra, State Superintendent

Absent:

Andy Scoggin

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (SDE)

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Ybarra/Critchfield): To approve Pending Rule Docket No. 08-0202-1602, Rules Governing Uniformity, Bullying, Harassment, and Intimidation, through Pending Rule Docket No. 08-0203-1606, Rules Governing Thoroughness, Incorporated by Reference – Achievement Level Descriptors, as submitted in the Department’s Agenda, Tabs 1-9.
The motion carried unanimously 7-0.

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

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

1. Pending Rule 08.0202.1602 – Rules Governing Uniformity – Bullying, Harassment and Intimidation
2. Pending Rule 08.0202.1603 – Rules Governing Uniformity – Incorporated by Reference – Idaho Standards for the Initial Certification of Professional School Personnel
3. Pending Rule 08.0202.1604 – Rules Governing Uniformity – Incorporated by Reference – Operating Procedures for Idaho Public Driver Education Programs

BOARDWORK
DECEMBER 14, 2016

4. Pending Rule 08.0202.1605 – Rules Governing Uniformity – Incorporated by Reference – Standards for Idaho School buses and Operations
5. Pending Rule 08.0203.1601 – Rules Governing Thoroughness – Incorporated by Reference – Idaho Content Standards
6. Pending Rule 08.0203.1603 – Rules Governing Thoroughness – Advanced Opportunities
7. Pending Rule 08.0203.1604 – Rules Governing Thoroughness – Incorporated by Reference – Idaho Special Education Manual
8. Pending Rule 08.0203.1605 – Rules Governing Thoroughness – Alternative Secondary Programs
9. Pending Rule 08.0203.1606 – Rules Governing Thoroughness – Incorporated by Reference – Achievement Level Descriptors

POLICY, PLANNING & GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS (PPGA)

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

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

1. Pending Rule – Docket No. 08-0102-1601 – Rules Governing the Postsecondary Credit Scholarship Program
2. Pending Rule – Docket No. 08-0104-1601 – Postsecondary Residency Requirements
3. Pending Rule – Docket No. 08-0109-1601 – Rules Governing the GearUP Idaho Scholarship
4. Pending Rule – Docket No. 08-0201-1602 – Rules Governing Administration – Continuous Improvement Plans, Literacy Intervention Plans, College and Career Advising Plans
5. Pending Rule – Docket No. 08-0201-1603 – Rules Governing Administration – State Literacy Growth Targets

BOARDWORK
DECEMBER 14, 2016

6. Pending Rule – Docket No. 08-0201-1604 – Rules Governing Administration – Statewide Average Class Size

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

- 10. Pending Rule – Docket No. 08-0203-1610 – Rules Governing Thoroughness – Career Technical Education, Content Standards
- 11. Pending Rule – Docket No. 08-0203-1611 – Rules Governing Thoroughness – Civics and Government Content Standards Proficiency – Graduation Requirements
- 12. Pending Rule – Docket No. 08-0205-1601 – Rules Governing Pay for Success Contracting
- 14. Pending Rule – Docket No. 47-0101-1601 – Rules of the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation – Field Service Manual
- 15. Pending Rule – Docket No. 47-0102-1601 – Rules and Minimum Standards Governing Extended Employment Services

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

- 13. Pending Rule – Docket No. 08-0501-1601 – Rules Governing Seed and Plant Certification

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

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

- 16. Board Policy – IV.E. Division of Career Technical Education – Industry Partner Fund – New Subsection - First Reading

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

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

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

- 7. Pending Rule – Docket No. 08-0202-1607 – Rules Governing Uniformity – Educator Credential Requirements

BOARDWORK
DECEMBER 14, 2016

M/S (Critchfield/Soltman): To approve the pending rule, docket number 08-0202-1607, as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried unanimously 7-0.

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

8. Pending Rule – Docket No. 08-0203-1608 – Rules Governing Thoroughness – Comprehensive Assessment Program and Accountability Requirements

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

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

9. Pending Rule – Docket No. 08-0203-1609 – Rules Governing Thoroughness – Graduation Requirements - Proficiency

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

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

Ms. Atchley expressed concern about comparing consistency across the state using other measures. Ms. Critchfield responded that there is a required test in high school (SAT) along with a credit requirement for graduation. She pointed out the Accountability Framework recently approved includes many other proficiency indicators. Ms. Ybarra echoed those remarks. Dr. Clark commented that further development of the definition of college and career readiness is underway and would be very beneficial. Ms. Ybarra commented the definition of college and career ready has already been defined in the standards. Dr. Clark clarified that the common definition of college and career readiness is being developed which will apply statewide and not just academically. Mr. Freeman offered a point of clarification in that if all of the content

BOARDWORK
DECEMBER 14, 2016

standards are met, a student is considered college and career ready. However, for the purposes of the Departments of Commerce and Labor, Higher Education, Workforce Development Council, Industry, etc., there is a workgroup in the process of developing a definition of college and career readiness for our students to be able to step into a postsecondary or career setting.

OTHER BUSINESS

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

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

**WORK SESSION
DECEMBER 14, 2016**

TAB	DESCRIPTION	ACTION
A	COORDINATION OF ACTIVITIES	Information Item
B	K-20 EDUCATION STRATEGIC PLAN	Motion to Approve
C	HIGHER EDUCATION RESEARCH STRATEGIC PLAN	Motion to Approve

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

WORK SESSION
DECEMBER 14, 2016

SUBJECT

Identify operational efficiencies between the Office of the State Board of Education (OSBE) and the State Department of Education (SDE)

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

Idaho Constitution, Article IX, Section 2

Idaho Code §§ 33-101, 105, 114, 115, 116, 118, 120, 125 and 126

Idaho Code § 67-1504

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

At the request of the State Superintendent, the State Board of Education (Board) will undertake a review of major activities and initiatives in which OSBE and the State Department of Education (SDE) both have some involvement or interaction in the form of time and resources; and discuss which agency is best suited to take the lead on each respective activity.

IMPACT

Intended outcomes include the following:

- eliminate duplication of effort and overlap in projects and coordination in those areas where each agency have complementary roles;
- increase communication and role clarity between agencies; and
- increase efficiency of project completion.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – List of activities

Page 3

STAFF COMMENTS

The Board of Education and Department of Education are often referred to interchangeably by educators and policymakers alike. Yet, by law the two entities have distinct roles and responsibilities. The purpose of the work session is to delineate which entity will take lead on identified activities set forth in Attachment 1 which are currently performed to some extent by staff from both entities.

BOARD ACTION

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

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

**WORK SESSION
DECEMBER 14, 2016**

SUBJECT

Idaho State Board of Education 2018-2022 K-20 Strategic Plan

REFERENCE

December 2012	Board reviewed and requested amendments to the 2013-2017 State Board of Education Strategic Plan
February 2012	Board approved 2013-2017 State Board of Education K-20 Statewide Strategic Plan
December 2013	Board reviewed and discussed changes to the State Board of Education K-20 Statewide Strategic Plan
February 2014	Board reviewed and approved the updated 2014-2018 State Board of Education K-20 Statewide Strategic Plan
February 2015	Board reviewed and approved amended 2015-2019 (FY16-FY20) State Board of Education K-20 Statewide Strategic Plan
December 2015	Board approved 2016-2020 (FY17-FY21) Idaho State Board of Education Strategic Plan
August 2016	Board discussed higher education operational plan.

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies & Procedures, Section I.M.1.
Section 67-1903, Idaho Code.

BACKGROUND/ DISCUSSION

The Board's strategic plan is used to define the vision and mission of Idaho's K-20 educational system; to guide future growth and development, and establish priorities for resource distribution. Strategic planning provides a mechanism for continual review to ensure excellence in education throughout the state. The strategic plan not only defines the Board's purpose, but establishes realistic goals and objectives that are consistent with its governing ideals, and communicates those goals and objectives to the agencies and institutions under the Board, the public, and other stakeholder groups.

Pursuant to the Board's master planning calendar, the Board is scheduled to review and approve its strategic plan annually in December, with the option of a final approval at the February Board meeting if significant changes are requested during the December Board meeting. Once approved the institutions and agencies then use the Board's strategic plan to inform their annual updates to their own strategic plans. The agencies and institutions bring their strategic plans forward for approval in April of each year with an option for final approval in June.

The update of the strategic plan during the February 2015 Board meeting included a comprehensive update to the plan on the recommendations of a committee appointed by the institution presidents and lead by Board staff. At the October 2016 Regular Board meeting, the Board reviewed performance measures. This performance measure review is a backward look at progress made during the

WORK SESSION
DECEMBER 14, 2016

previous year in alignment with the strategic plan approved by the Board at the February 2015 Board meeting.

In addition to the Board's K-20 Education strategic plan, the Board has developed a number of area specific strategic plans as well as the Complete College Idaho plan, the Complete College Idaho plan includes statewide strategies that have been developed to move the Board's strategic plan forward with a focus on moving the needle on the 60% benchmark for the college completion performance measure (Percent of Idahoans (ages 25-34) who have a college degree or certificate requiring one academic year or more of study). The Indian Education strategic plan, STEM Education strategic plan, and Higher Education Research strategic plan, approved by the Board, are all required to be in alignment with the Board's overall K-20 Strategic Plan.

Earlier this summer the Governor asked the Board to develop a five year plan for higher education. The Board's Strategic Plan (Plan) is in fact a five year plan for public education (inclusive of secondary and postsecondary); but fulfilling the Governor's request will require the Board to identify specific activities by which to operationalize the Plan. To that end, Board staff have mapped the Plan's goals and objectives to Board activities and initiatives, and categorized them as: "Proposed", "In Progress", and "Operational." For example, outcomes-based funding is "Proposed," while Direct Admissions is "Operational." During the August 2016 Board meeting the Board provided feedback requesting a brief summary of each activity be included in the document. The attached Operation Plan incorporates those descriptions.

IMPACT

Once approved, the institutions and agencies will align their strategic plans to the Board's strategic plan and bring them forward to the Board for consideration in April.

The Board and staff use the strategic plan to prioritize statewide education initiatives in Idaho as well as the work of the Board staff. By focusing on critical priorities, Board staff, institutions, and agencies can direct limited resources to maximum effect.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – 2018–2022 State Board Education Strategic Plan	Page 5
Attachment 2 – Operational Plan	Page 14
Attachment 3 – Annual Dual Credit Report	Page 22
Attachment 4 – Annual Scholarship Data Review	Page 25

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The amendments proposed during this review cycle focus on updates to the performance measures benchmarks that were reached during the previous year or we are close to meeting. Board staff will walk the Board through the various

WORK SESSION
DECEMBER 14, 2016

performance measures and discuss the proposed benchmarks. Discussion during the Work Session will focus on progress made toward meeting the Board's goals and whether or not there should be additional amendments made to the plan during this cycle.

The performance measure data has been incorporated into the strategic plan to make it easier to identify the progress that has been made and to help facilitate the discussion. In addition to the strategic plan with performance measure data, the annual reports on the Opportunity Scholarship and Dual Credit participation are included, should any Board member want more detailed information on efforts in these areas. This is the third year the Board office has produced the dual credit report, which focuses on the impact of students taking dual credit courses. The Opportunity Scholarship Review is our second look at the impact of the Opportunity Scholarship since the consolidation of the state managed scholarships in 2014. The 2015-2016 school year is the first year of full. The Board is required to report on the scholarships effectiveness each year to the legislature. The more detailed information is provided to the Board to help inform the progress of these specific focus areas of the Board and provide a more complete picture of the landscape that impacts the progress towards meeting the Board's goals.

In addition to the overall strategic plan discussion the Board will also have the opportunity to discuss the discrete activities and initiatives identified in the Operation Plan and prioritize activities. The Operational Plan document will serve as the basis for discussions with a stakeholder group. The stakeholder group will formulate recommendation on the Operational Plan for the Board's consideration at a future date.

Amendments to plan may be made during the work session, should the Board have no additional amendments following the work session, the Strategic Plan may be approved at this meeting.

BOARD ACTION

I move to approve the 2018-2022 (FY19-FY23) Idaho State Board of Education K-20 Education Strategic Plan as submitted in Attachment 1.

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes _____ No _____

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

**WORK SESSION
DECEMBER 14, 2016**

SUBJECT

Higher Education Research 2017-2021 Strategic Plan

REFERENCE

April 2010	The Board was provided with a summary of the Statewide Strategic Plan for Higher Education Research
October 2010	The Board was provided with an update of the progress made toward the development of the Statewide Strategic Plan for Higher Education Research
December 2011	Board approved the Statewide Strategic Plan for Higher Education Research
December 2012	The Board was updated on the progress made in the Higher Education Research Strategic Plan
December 2013	The Board was updated on the progress made in the Higher Education Research Strategic Plan and received the annual report of the Higher Education Research Council
February 2015	Board approved the Statewide Strategic Plan for Higher Education Research
October 2016	The Board was provided the Performance Measure Report for the Higher Education Strategic Plan

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies and Procedures, Section III.W., Higher Education Research

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

Board Policy III.W, Higher Education Research, recognizes the significant role science, technology, and other research play in statewide economic development as well as the need for collaboration and accountability in publicly funded research, to this end, the Higher Education Research Council (HERC) is assigned the responsibility of directing and overseeing the development, implementation, and monitoring of a statewide strategic plan for research. The Statewide Strategic Plan for research will assist in the identification of general research areas that will enhance the economy of Idaho through the collaboration of academia, industry, and/or government. The Research Strategic Plan was completed and approved by the Board in December 2011. The Board then approved an updated plan in 2015. The Board has received annual performance measure reports each year.

The plan represents the role Idaho's research universities play in driving innovation, economic development, and enhancing the quality of life in Idaho through national and internationally research programs in strategic areas. The plan identifies areas of strength among Idaho's research universities; research challenges and barriers facing universities; research opportunities Idaho should capitalize upon to further build its research base, and steps for achieving the research vision for Idaho's universities.

**WORK SESSION
DECEMBER 14, 2016**

The Higher Education Research Council, comprised of the Vice Presidents of Research from the three universities, the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs at Lewis-Clark State College, and industry partners; met in July 2016 and revised the strategic plan. In September the Council met and approved the proposed amendments to the attached Higher Education Research Strategic Plan.

IMPACT

Taking a strategic approach to invest in the state's unique research expertise and strengths will lead to new advances and opportunities for economic growth and enhance Idaho's reputation as a national and international leader in excellence and innovation.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – Statewide Strategic Plan for Higher Education Research Page 3

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The strategic plan is monitored annually and updated as needed based on the work of HERC and direction from the Board. This latest revision provides additional focus on the five high impact areas of focus and rationale behind the chosen performance measures. Staff recommends approval of the revised strategic plan.

BOARD ACTION

I move to approve the 2017-2021 Higher Education Research Strategic Plan as submitted in Attachment 1.

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes _____ No _____

**CONSENT AGENDA
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

TAB	DESCRIPTION	ACTION
1	BAHR-SECTION II - BOISE STATE UNIVERSITY Campus Law Enforcement Services Contract with Boise Police Department	Motion to Approve
2	BAHR-SECTION II - IDAHO STATE UNIVERSITY Lease of Real Property to McDonald's USA, LLC	Motion to Approve
3	BAHR-SECTION II - UNIVERSITY of IDAHO Human Resources Third Party Administration Services Contract	Motion to Approve
4	IRSA – PROGRAMS AND CHANGES APPROVED BY THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR	Motion to Approve
5	IRSA – STATE GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS	Motion to Approve
6	IRSA – EPSCoR COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS	Motion to Approve
7	PPGA – ALCOHOL PERMITS – PRESIDENT APPROVED REPORT	Information Item
8	PPGA - UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO – NAMING OF INDOOR GOLF FACILITY	Motion to Approve
9	PPGA – STATE REHABILITATION COUNCIL – APPOINTMENT	Motion to Approve
10	SDE – PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS COMMISSION - BOISE STATE UNIVERSITY HEALTH ENDORSEMENT	Motion to Approve

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

**CONSENT AGENDA
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

BOISE STATE UNIVERSITY

SUBJECT

Campus law enforcement services contract with the Boise Police Department

REFERENCE

October 2004	Idaho State Board of Education (Board) approved contract with Boise City Police Department to provide campus law enforcement services.
June 2008	Board approved renewal of contract with Boise City Police Department to continue to provide campus law enforcement services through September 2012.
June 2012	Board approved renewal of contract with Boise City Police Department to continue to provide campus law enforcement services through September 2016.
June 2014	Board approved a revision of contract with Boise City Police Department to increase the cost of the contract through September 2016.

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies & Procedures, Section V.I.3.a
Section 67-9225, Idaho Code

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

Since October 2004, Boise State University (BSU) has contracted with the Boise City Police Department ("BPD") to provide law enforcement services on campus. In June 2014, the Board approved a revised contract that expired in September 2016. A three-month extension to the contract was signed in September 2016 that will expire at the end of December 2016.

BSU wishes to enter into an agreement with BPD for continued services for three and three-quarters additional years with an additional two one-year renewal options, through 2021. The City of Boise has given preliminary approval for the proposed agreement, subject to final City Council action.

The proposed contract term is for three years beginning January 1, 2017, through September 30, 2019.

Due to the unique nature of campus law enforcement services, it is important for BSU to continue the mutually beneficial relationship with its service provider. Therefore, provided that the contract costs remain competitive and the service exceptional, BSU would like to continue its arrangement with BPD in lieu of seeking a new service provider through the competitive bid process.

IMPACT

**CONSENT AGENDA
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

In addition to the three year contract cost, BSU will pay \$8,762 to the City of Boise to represent the increase in cost not captured in the three month extension of the previous contract pertaining to October 1, 2016 to December 31, 2016. Annual costs are as follows:

Jan. 2017-Sept. 2017	\$ 902,530
Extension Cost for Oct. 1 – Dec. 31	\$ 8,762
Oct. 2017 - Sept. 2018	\$1,239,474
Oct. 2018 - Sept. 2019	\$1,276,658
Total	\$3,427,424

Possible extensions, at Boise State's election:

Oct. 2019 – Sept. 2020	\$1,314,958
Oct. 2020 – Sept. 2021	\$1,354,407

This cost represents an average annual increase of three percent. The increase is intended to support the cost increases of maintaining a law enforcement unit on campus with specialized training and personnel.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – Proposed Contract

Page 3

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends approval.

BOARD ACTION

I move 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.

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes _____ No _____

**CONSENT AGENDA
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

IDAHO STATE UNIVERSITY

SUBJECT

Leasing of Idaho State University (ISU) real property in Pocatello, ID to McDonald's USA, LLC (McDonald's).

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

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

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

ISU requests Board authorization to negotiate and execute a lease with McDonald's. McDonald's is reinvesting in their restaurant located near ISU's campus in Pocatello, ID. As part of this rebuild, McDonald's would like to expand their drive-thru lanes onto ISU property located adjacent to their parcel of land. The adjacent parcel owned by ISU is currently a vacant lot with no current economic use. The proposed lease agreement has been reviewed by the Division of Public Works (DPW) and agreed to by McDonald's and is attached for reference.

ISU and McDonald's have conducted separate appraisals of ISU's parcel to determine the lease amount presented in the proposed lease agreement.

IMPACT

The proposed lease terms allow McDonald's to use this vacant lot for at least ten years with the option to extend their use for another ten or more years. ISU has no immediate use for this lot and would recognize income in the amount of roughly \$33,000 per year.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – Pending Lease Agreement

Page 3

Attachment 2 – Map of Property

Page 27

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends approval.

BOARD ACTION

I move to approve the request by Idaho State University to enter into a long-term 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.

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes _____ No _____

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

**CONSENT AGENDA
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO

SUBJECT

Request approval for Human Resources (HR) Third Party Administration Services contract.

REFERENCE

June 2011

Idaho State Board of Education (Board) approved Benefit Enrollment Management Services contract between the University of Idaho and Morneau Shepell Limited.

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

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

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

Request for Proposals No. 16-78M was issued by the University of Idaho (UI) for services relating to employee benefit enrollment, retiree and Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act (COBRA) administration for UI's employee/retiree benefits plan. Three vendors responded. Based on proposals received, Morneau Shepell Limited (MSL) was deemed by UI to be the successful vendor, pending Board approval under Board Policy V.I.3..

IMPACT

The initial contract term is five years. The total number of enrollees is 3,456 which includes employees, retirees and COBRA participants. The cost per enrollee is \$11.50 per employee per month for a total of \$39,744 per month. The total per year is \$476,928. The total for the initial, five-year term is \$2,384,640.00. This amount will fluctuate somewhat based on the number of employee, retiree and COBRA participants from year to year.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – Proposed Contract No. UI-794	Page 3
Attachment 2 – Morneau Shepell Limited's Proposal	Page 7
Attachment 3 – Request for Proposals No. 16-78M	Page 205

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The vendor selected by UI from among three RFP respondents has provided support services for the UI since 2010. The support services include a robust account management and user-interface software system. Staff recommends approval.

**CONSENT AGENDA
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

BOARD ACTION

I move 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.

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes _____ No _____

**CONSENT AGENDA
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

SUBJECT

Programs and Changes Approved by Executive Director - Quarterly Report

REFERENCE

August 2016

Board received quarterly report.

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies and Procedures, Section III.G.8.a., Postsecondary Program Approval and Discontinuance

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

In accordance with Board Policy III.G.3.c.i. and 4.b, prior to implementation the Executive Director may approve any new, modification, and/or discontinuation of academic or career technical education programs, with a financial impact of less than \$250,000 per fiscal year. Each institution has indicated that their respective program changes, provided in Attachment 1, fall within the threshold for approval by the Executive Director.

Consistent with Board Policy III.G.8.a., the Board office is providing a quarterly report of program changes from Idaho's public institutions that were approved between August 2016 and November 2016 by the Executive Director.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – List of Programs and Changes Approved by the
Executive Director

Page 3

BOARD ACTION

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

**CONSENT AGENDA
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

**CONSENT AGENDA
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

SUBJECT

State General Education Committee Appointments

REFERENCE

October 2014	The Board approved membership of the General Education Committee.
February 2014	The Board received a CCI Plan update that focused exclusively on General Education Reform and approved the first reading of proposed new policy III.N, General Education.
April 2014	The Board approved the second reading of proposed new Policy III.N, General Education.
June 2016	The Board approved membership of new members to the General Education Committee

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

Governing Policies and Procedures section III.N. General Education.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

Board Policy III.N, provides that the General Education Committee will review the competencies and rubrics of the General Education framework for each institution to ensure its alignment with AAC&U Essential Learning Outcomes and that faculty discipline groups will have ongoing responsibilities for ensuring consistency and relevance of general education competencies related to their discipline. The General Education Committee consists of a representative from each of the institutions appointed by the Board; a representative from the Division of Career Technical Education; and, as an ex officio member, a representative from the Idaho Registrars Council.

Idaho State University (ISU) and Boise State University (BSU) have forwarded names for consideration to formally replace committee members due to administrative/structural changes on campuses.

IMPACT

The proposed appointment replaces ISU and BSU representatives on the Committee.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – Current Committee membership

Page 3

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Idaho State University has changed roles of their faculty members. Dr. Joanne Tokle will resume responsibilities as the Interim Associate Vice President for Undergraduate Affairs on campus currently filled by Dr. Margaret Johnson for the 2016-17 academic year. Boise State University has identified Dr. John Bieter to replace Dr. Vicki Stieha due to restructure of responsibilities at BSU.

**CONSENT AGENDA
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

Board staff recommends approval.

BOARD ACTION

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

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes _____ No _____

**CONSENT AGENDA
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

SUBJECT

Idaho Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (EPSCoR)
Committee Appointment

REFERENCE

October 2014	Board appointed Dr. Todd Allen as the INL Representative to the Idaho EPSCoR Committee (Replacing Dr. Hill)
February 2015	Board appointed Senator Tibbits to the Idaho EPSCoR Committee (Replacing Senator Goedde)
April 2015	Board appointed Dr. Cornelis J. Van der Schyf to the Idaho Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (replacing Dr. Howard Grimes)
October 2015	Board reappointed Representative Maxine Bell and Doyle Jacklin and appointed Gynii Gilliam and Senator Roy Lacey (replacing Doug Chadderdon and Senator Tippits, respectively)
June 2016	Board appointed Dr. Kelly Beierschmitt to the Idaho Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (replacing Todd Allen)

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

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

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

The Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (EPSCoR) represents a federal-state partnership to enhance the science and engineering research, education, and technology capabilities of states that traditionally have received smaller amounts of federal research and development funds. As a participating state, Idaho EPSCoR is subject to federal program requirements and policy established by the Idaho State Board of Education (Board). The purpose of EPSCoR is to build a high-quality, academic research base to advance science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) to stimulate sustainable improvements in research and development capacity and competitiveness.

Idaho EPSCoR is guided by a committee of sixteen (16) members appointed by the Board for five (5) year terms. The membership of this committee is constituted to provide for geographic, academic, business and state governmental representation as specified in Board policy including the Vice Presidents of Research from the University of Idaho, Boise State University, and Idaho State University. Members are allowed to serve up to three (3) consecutive terms.

The Idaho EPSCoR Committee is requesting the appointments of Dr. David Hill, Laird Noh, Skip Oppenheimer, and Dr. Janet Nelson. Dr. Hill would be replacing Dr. Bill Goesling, whose term on the Idaho State Board of Education expired. Mr.

**CONSENT AGENDA
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

Oppenheimer would be replacing Mr. Francisco Roberto who stepped down and whose term expired on June 30, 2016. Mr. Oppenheimer would be serving as a representative of the private sector. Dr. Nelson would be replacing Dr. Jack McIver who retired as the Vice President of Research at the University of Idaho. Dr. Nelson is the new Vice President of Research at the University of Idaho. Laird Noh has served on the Committee since 2006, he has been a valuable supporter of the institution and the state's research efforts. Laird Noh would be reappointed for a third term and represents the private sector.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – Current Committee Membership	Page 5
Attachment 2 – Skip Oppenheimer – Letter of Interest	Page 6

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

If appointed, Dr. Hill and Dr. Nelson would serve as ex-officio members, without term limits. Mr. Oppenheimer would serve the remainder of Mr. Francisco Roberto's term, if he had been reappointed in July 1, 2016, which expires on June 30, 2021. Laird Noh would serve a new term effective July 1, 2016 and expiring June 30, 2021.

Board staff recommends approval.

BOARD ACTION

I move to reappoint Laird Noh 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.

Moved by_____ Seconded by_____ Carried Yes_____ No_____

I move 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.

Moved by_____ Seconded by_____ Carried Yes_____ No_____

I move 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.

Moved by_____ Seconded by_____ Carried Yes_____ No_____

**CONSENT AGENDA
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

I move 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.

Moved by_____ Seconded by_____ Carried Yes_____ No_____

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

**CONSENT AGENDA
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

SUBJECT

President Approved Alcohol Permits Report

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

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

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

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

The last update presented to the Board was at the October 2016 Board meeting. Since that meeting, Board staff has received thirty (30) permits from Boise State University, sixteen (16) permits from Idaho State University, fourteen (14) permits from the University of Idaho, and one (1) permit from Lewis-Clark State College.

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

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 - List of Approved Permits by Institution

Page 3

BOARD ACTION

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

**CONSENT AGENDA
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

**CONSENT AGENDA
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO

SUBJECT

Request to name the indoor golf performance facility the "Jess and Kathleen Hall Vandal Golf Performance Center."

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies & Procedures, Section I.K.1.b.

BACKGROUND/ DISCUSSION

The University of Idaho's Athletics Department received a donation valued at \$125,000 from Jess and Kathleen Hall to construct an indoor golf performance facility. This represents a great majority of the expected total cost of \$150K for the project. The facility will support the training of athletes in the university men's and women's golf teams. The project supports the university golf program by providing student athletes with the opportunity to train year round, and making optimum use of computer simulation technology and photo metrics to improve individual skills in golf.

IMPACT

There is no fiscal impact in the naming of this facility.

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Board Policy I.K.1.b(ii) outlines the requirements by which a building, facility, or administrative unit may be named for other than a former employee of the system of higher education. These include consideration of the nature of the gift and its significance to the institution; the eminence of the individual whose name is proposed; and the individuals relationship to the institution. Based on the information provided the request is in compliance with Board policy. Board staff recommends approval.

BOARD ACTION

I move 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."

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes _____ No _____

**CONSENT AGENDA
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

**CONSENT AGENDA
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

IDAHO DIVISION OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

SUBJECT

Idaho State Rehabilitation Council Membership

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

Federal Regulations 34 CFR§361.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

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

The members of the Council must be appointed by the Governor or, in the case of a State that, under State law, vests authority for the administration to an entity other than the Governor, the chief officer of that entity. Section 33-2303, Idaho code designates the State Board for Professional-Technical Education as that entity.

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

- i. At least one representative of the Statewide Independent Living Council, who must be the chairperson or other designee of the Statewide Independent Living Council;
- ii. At least one representative of a parent training and information center established pursuant to section 682(a) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act;
- iii. At least one representative of the Client Assistance Program established under 34 CFR part 370, who must be the director of or other individual recommended by the Client Assistance Program;
- iv. At least one qualified vocational rehabilitation counselor with knowledge of and experience with vocational rehabilitation programs who serves as an ex officio, nonvoting member of the Council if employed by the designated State agency;
- v. At least one representative of community rehabilitation program service providers;
- vi. Four representatives of business, industry, and labor;
- vii. Representatives of disability groups that include a cross section of (A) Individuals with physical, cognitive, sensory, and mental disabilities; and (B) Representatives of individuals with disabilities who have difficulty representing themselves or are unable due to their disabilities to represent themselves;
- viii. Current or former applicants for, or recipients of, vocational rehabilitation services;
- ix. In a State in which one or more projects are carried out under section 121 of the Act (American Indian Vocational Rehabilitation Services), at least one representative of the directors of the projects;

**CONSENT AGENDA
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

- x. At least one representative of the State educational agency responsible for the public education of students with disabilities who are eligible to receive services under this part and part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act;
- xi. At least one representative of the State workforce investment board; and
- xii. The director of the designated State unit as an ex officio, nonvoting member of the Council.

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

The Council currently has one (1) nomination for Board approval: Robert Atkins to fulfill the federal regulation as a representative of business/industry and labor.

IMPACT

The above appointment will bring the Council membership to a total of sixteen (16) with one vacancy on the council for a representative of a Former Applicant or Recipient of VR. Minimum composition for the council is 15 members.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 - Current Council Membership	Page 3
Attachment 2 – Robert Atkins Resume	Page 4

BOARD ACTION

I move 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.

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes _____ No _____

**CONSENT AGENDA
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS COMMISSION

SUBJECT

Professional Standards Commission Recommendation - Boise State University,
Proposed Health Endorsement

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

Section 33-114 and 33-1258, Idaho Code
Idaho Administrative Code, IDAPA 08.02.02 Section 100 – Official Vehicle for the
Approval of Teacher Education Programs

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

Health Endorsement

The Standards Committee of the Professional Standards Commission (PSC) conducted a New Program Approval Desk Review for the Health Endorsement proposed by Boise State University (BSU). Through the comprehensive review, the Standards Committee verified that all of the Idaho Standards for Health Teachers would be met through the proposed endorsement program.

During its September 2016 meeting, the PSC voted to recommend conditional approval of the proposed Health Endorsement offered by BSU. With the “Conditionally Approved” status, BSU may admit candidates for the Health endorsement and submit institutional recommendations for certification. The program will undergo a review at the next scheduled Full Unit Review or Focused Visit.

IMPACT

In order to maintain status as an Idaho approved program and produce graduates eligible for Idaho teacher certification, BSU must have all programs, including new program, reviewed for State approval.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – BSU Health Endorsement Packet

Page 3

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Pursuant to Section 33-114, Idaho Code, the review and approval of all teacher preparation programs in the state is vested in the State Board of Education. The program reviews are conducted for the Board through the Professional Standards Commission, recommendations are then brought forward to the Board for consideration. The review process is designed to assure the programs are meeting the Board approved school personnel standards for the applicable programs, that the teacher are prepared to teach the state content standards for their applicable subject areas, as well as the quality of candidates exiting the programs.

**CONSENT AGENDA
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

The current Board approved accrediting body for teacher preparation programs is the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). On-site preparation program reviews are conducted in partnership with NCATE based on a partnership agreement. During a concurrent visit, the NCATE team and the state team collaborate to conduct the review, however each team generates their own reports. New program are reviewed at the time of application for consideration as an approved teacher preparation program. This review does not accompany an NCATE accreditation visit.

BOARD ACTION

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

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes _____ No _____

**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

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. I8. 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

**AUDIT COMMITTEE
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

TAB	DESCRIPTION	ACTION
1	FY 2016 FINANCIAL STATEMENT AUDITS	Motion to approve
2	FY 2016 FINANCIAL RATIOS	Information item
3	FY 2016 NET POSITION BALANCES	Information item

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

**AUDIT COMMITTEE
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

SUBJECT

Acceptance of college/university FY2016 audit findings reported by the Idaho State Board of Education (Board)'s external auditor

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE OR POLICY

Idaho State Board of Education Bylaws, Section V.H.4.f.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

The Board contracted with Moss Adams LLP, an independent certified public accounting firm, to conduct the annual financial audits of Boise State University, Idaho State University, University of Idaho, Lewis-Clark State College, and Eastern Idaho Technical College.

The audits were conducted in accordance with Generally Accepted Government Auditing Standards and include an auditor's opinion on the basic financial statements.

There was one significant finding for Lewis-Clark State College related to Student Financial Assistance. Moss Adams' audit results presentation, which was provided to the Audit Committee, is attached for the Board's reference.

IMPACT

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 - Moss Adams Audit Results Report

Page 3

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

On November 9, 2016, Moss Adams reviewed their audit findings with members of the Audit Committee and Board staff. This was followed by presentations by senior managers from the audited colleges and universities on their financial statements. Board members were subsequently provided the audit reports and financial statements. Staff recommends acceptance of the financial audit reports submitted by Moss Adams LLP.

BOARD ACTION

I move 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.

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes _____ No _____

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

**AUDIT COMMITTEE
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

SUBJECT

FY 2016 College and Universities' Financial Ratios

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

The ratios presented measure the financial health of the institution and include a "Composite Financial Index" comprised of four ratios. The ratios are designed as a management tool to measure financial activity and trends within an institution. They do not lend themselves to comparative analysis between institutions because of the varying missions and current initiatives taking place at a given institution.

Institution foundations are reported as component units in the college and universities' financial statements. The nationally developed ratio benchmarks model is built around this combined picture.¹ An institution foundation holds assets for the purpose of supporting the institution. Foundation assets are nearly all restricted for institution purposes and are an important part of an institution's financial strategy and financial health.

Ratio	Measure	Benchmark
Primary reserve	Sufficiency of resources and their flexibility; good measure for net assets	.40
Viability	Capacity to repay total debt through reserves	1.25
Return on net assets	Whether the institution is better off financially this year than last	6.00%
Net operating revenues	Whether institution is living within available resources	2.00%
Composite Financial Index	Combines four ratios using weighting	3.0

IMPACT

The ratios and analyses are provided in order for the Board to review the financial health and relative efficiency of each institution.

ATTACHMENTS

Boise State University	Page 3
Idaho State University	Page 4
University of Idaho	Page 5
Lewis-Clark State College	Page 6

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The institutions will present a brief analysis of their financial ratios and will be available for questions by the Board.

¹ See *Strategic Financial Analysis for Higher Education: Identifying, Measuring & Reporting Financial Risks* (7th ed.). New York, NY: Prager, Sealy & Co., LLC; KPMG, LLP; Attain, LLC. The model's well vetted analysis developed by industry experts has been around and evolving since 1980. It is widely used and accepted in the higher education finance community.

**AUDIT COMMITTEE
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

BOARD ACTION

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

**AUDIT COMMITTEE
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

SUBJECT

FY 2016 College and Universities' Unrestricted Net Position

REFERENCE

December 2012-2016

Annual Audit report submitted to the Board

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

The net position balances are shown in the Attachments as of June 30, 2016. The net position is broken down as follows:

Invested in capital assets, net of related debt: This represents an institution's total investment in capital assets, net of accumulated depreciation and outstanding debt obligations related to those capital assets. To the extent debt has been incurred but not yet expended for capital assets, such amounts are not included.

Restricted, expendable: This represents resources which an institution is legally or contractually obligated to spend in accordance with restrictions imposed by external third parties.

Restricted, nonexpendable: This represents endowment and similar type funds in which donors or other outside sources have stipulated, as a condition of the gift instrument, that the principal is to be maintained inviolate and in perpetuity, and invested for the purpose of producing present and future income, which may either be expended or added to principal.

Unrestricted: This represents resources derived from student tuition and fees, and sales and services of educational departments and auxiliary enterprises. These resources also include auxiliary enterprises, which are substantially self-supporting activities that provide services for students, faculty and staff. Not all sources of revenue noted above are necessarily present in the unrestricted position.

Within the category of **Unrestricted Position**, the institutions reserve funds for the following:

Obligated: Contractual obligations represent a variety of agreements which support initiatives or operations that have moved beyond management planning into execution. Obligations include contracts for goods and services, including construction projects. Obligations contain debt service commitments for outstanding debt and staffing commitments for personnel. These amounts also consist of inventories and other balances for which contractual commitments exist.

Designated: Designated net position represents balances not yet legally contracted but have been dedicated to initiatives that have been deemed to be strategic or mission critical. Balances include capital or maintenance projects that are in active planning phases. Facility and administrative cost recovery returns

**AUDIT COMMITTEE
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

from sponsored projects (grants and contracts) are reinvested in infrastructure or on efforts to obtain additional grant funding. Documented central commitments to initiatives that have been approved at an executive level are designated.

Note: Designated reserves are not yet legally contracted, so technically they are still subject to management decision or reprioritization. However, it's critical to understand that these net position balances are a snapshot in time as of June 30, 2016, so reserves shown as "designated" on this report could be "obligated" at any point in the current fiscal year.

Unrestricted Funds Available: Balance represents reserves available to bridge uneven cash flows as well as future potential funding shortfalls such as:

- Budget reductions or holdbacks
- Enrollment fluctuations
- Unfunded enrollment workload adjustment (EWA)
- Unfunded occupancy costs
- Critical infrastructure failures

IMPACT

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. As such, the Board has set a minimum target reserve of 5% of operating expenditures as a benchmark in its [Strategic Plan](#) (Goal 3, Objective D). The institutions' unrestricted funds available as a percent of operating expenses are as follows:

	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016
BSU:	3.5%	5.0%	6.1%	5.1%	5.3%
ISU:	7.3%	12.6%	16.2%	15.6%	11.8%
UI:	2.6%	2.7%	4.2%	5.1%	5.4%
LCSC:	3.8%	5.1%	6.5%	6.3%	6.0%

ATTACHMENTS

BSU Net Position Balances	Page 3
ISU Net Position Balances	Page 5
UI Net Position Balances	Page 7
LCSC Net Position Balances	Page 9

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The institutions will present a brief analysis of their respective unrestricted net position.

BOARD ACTION

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

**BUSINESS AFFAIRS AND HUMAN RESOURCES
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

TAB	DESCRIPTION	ACTION
1	UNIVERSITY of IDAHO Market Rate-Based Compensation System	Information item

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

BUSINESS AFFAIRS AND HUMAN RESOURCES
DECEMBER 15, 2016

UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO

SUBJECT

Market Rate-Based Compensation System

REFERENCE

August 2013 Approval by the Board of Regents to implement a revised classification system for classified employees

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies & Procedures, Sections II.D.1. and II.E.2

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

Board of Regents policy defining classified employees at the University of Idaho (UI) provides “Classified employees at the University of Idaho are subject to the policies and procedures of the UI for its classified employees. Such policies and procedures require approval by the Board, and should be, in so much as practical, parallel to the provisions provided for state of Idaho classified employees in Chapter 53, Title 67, Idaho Code” (Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies and Procedures, Section II.D.1(b)).

Regarding compensation of classified employees at UI, Regents policy states further that “compensation for UI classified employees shall be in accordance with the policies of the UI and these policies” (Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies and Procedures, Section II.E.2).

Pursuant to Board Policy II.D., UI classified employee compensation should parallel, to the extent practicable, the relevant sections of Idaho state code, and that moreover, Regents’ approval is necessary when substantial changes to our policies and procedures are proposed.

Consistent with this policy, in late 2012, the UI embarked on a study to update job descriptions and develop an updated personnel system for both its classified and non-classified staff, and gather market analysis data to compare UI to the labor market and examine compensation rates. The UI engaged Sibson Consulting to help develop an employee categorization system that would meet the needs of the UI and work well with the breadth of positions within these two employee groups (classified and non-classified). The drafted process and outcomes differed slightly from the Hay Point Factor classification system used by the state’s Division of Human Resources for classified positions, but still closely paralleled Idaho State Code.

The UI, with the help of Sibson Consulting, identified benchmarked jobs. Sibson matched these benchmarked jobs to comparable positions in the labor market.

BUSINESS AFFAIRS AND HUMAN RESOURCES
DECEMBER 15, 2016

This matching, along with median salary data, guided Sibson to assign benchmarked jobs to specific pay grades. It was also this median salary data that informed their recommendation to the UI for the number of pay grades, the median salary in those grades, and the spread between the median salaries in each grade.

The final step was to review approximately 1500 position description questionnaires that had been submitted by classified staff employees and their supervisors. UI Human Resources staff compared jobs using several common job value factors. HR staff then applied the job value factors to the non-benchmarked jobs and matched those jobs to the benchmarked positions.

However, in the years since this new system was implemented, staff turnover rates have risen to over 18%, causing the university to question the accuracy of both the benchmarking process and the median salary data points. Accordingly, and building on the work completed in 2012, the UI now proposes to take the next evolutionary step in its compensation systems and policies. The proposal would expand the current 11 pay grades, and identify a market-average salary point for every unique job (not position) at the university. The proposed approach would include classified staff, non-classified staff, and faculty members. All employees performing the same work (for example, all custodians) would share the same market rate. So, while UI has approximately 1500 staff employees, the plan is to establish approximately 700-800 market rates. By matching individual jobs more precisely with the associated market-average salary points, UI hopes to position the university to be more competitive at recruiting and retaining highly qualified faculty and staff. This goal is one of the primary themes of the new university strategic plan.

UI believes that a credible compensation system should rely on market rate data in providing a basis for determining salaries. Market rates represent the average salary rates paid for the various jobs that exist in the labor market. Other market data also provides information regarding pay ranges around the average. Market data is gathered annually by the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) and Integrated Post-Secondary Education Data System (IPEDS), as well as private entities such as the College and University Professional Association for Human Resources (CUPA-HR).

The UI proposes to move forward from its current compensation system (eleven broad classifications) to a market-based system which provides a specific market rate for each individual position. As mentioned, some positions will use the same market rate. But 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. The broad classifications will be dropped as the university moves forward.

Using BLS data, market rates will be collected from the following states: Idaho, Washington, Oregon, Nevada, Utah, Wyoming, Montana, and Colorado. Data

BUSINESS AFFAIRS AND HUMAN RESOURCES
DECEMBER 15, 2016

from CUPA-HR will also be used, as it provides information directly related to higher education positions. The primary use of the CUPA-HR data will be from institutions designated as “high research” (R2) by the Carnegie classification system in the western United States.

Furthermore, the UI will be developing a systematic approach, working within the ranges provided by market data, to address pay equity. This system will include such individual characteristics as previous work experience, total time in service (at UI), time in current position (at UI), and education. Such an approach will serve to address pay compression and avoid any gender pay inequities that might exist or develop otherwise. Minimum pay rates would be set at 80% of the average market salary.

UI believes such a system directly responds to the Regent policy expectation that the compensation policies of the UI will, in so much as practical, parallel the provisions provided for State of Idaho classified employees. The state’s Division of Human Resources uses market data compiled from the same 8-state region as the UI proposes to use - Idaho, Washington, Oregon, Nevada, Utah, Wyoming, Montana, and Colorado. The state funds new positions at 80% of market average salaries, while the UI’s newly-proposed compensation system would set minimum salaries at 80% of market average salaries. Finally, this approach abandons the concept of pay bands, which aligns more closely with the methodologies of the state payroll system.

UI administrators have been working with faculty and staff compensation task forces to explore compensation concepts, ideas, principles, philosophies, and proposals. UI recently completed a series of 14 open forum meetings with employees and supervisors. Employees located at remote sites were able to participate in the meetings using an electronic interface. In total, the UI has communicated directly with almost 800 of the university’s 1500 staff employees and supervisory. This new compensation proposal has broad support from staff, faculty, and administrators. If approved, the changes would be implemented during the upcoming Change in Employee Compensation (CEC) cycle (Spring 2017).

IMPACT

A market-rate based compensation system does not, in and of itself, impose any additional cost on the institution. Rather, such a system is designed to direct the allocation of existing and new compensation resources to the areas of greatest need (as determined by the gap between target market salaries and actual employee salaries). The market-rate based compensation system will highlight the disparity between actual salaries and market salaries, which will increase pressure to direct - and redirect - resources to staff compensation. However, no new resources are required to implement this new system.

**BUSINESS AFFAIRS AND HUMAN RESOURCES
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

ATTACHMENT

Attachment 1 –Market Rate-Based Compensation PowerPoint

Page 5

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

UI representatives are ready to provide an overview of the proposed new compensation system, using the attached slideshow. They will also be ready to address the steps that were taken to communicate the new approach to affected employees and to confirm that there is broad support for these changes. The presentation—and any feedback from the Board—will be helpful as UI finalizes its proposed system. The UI plans to present its fleshed-out personnel system proposal to the Board for review and approval at the February 2017 Board meeting.

BOARD ACTION

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

**BUSINESS AFFAIRS AND HUMAN RESOURCES
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

TAB	DESCRIPTION	ACTION
1	MEDICAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE REPORT	Motion to approve
2	BOISE STATE UNIVERSITY Authorization for Issuance of General Revenue and Refunding Bonds	Motion to approve
3	BOISE STATE UNIVERSITY Relocation of Facilities and Central Receiving Building – Planning and Design	Motion to approve
4	BOISE STATE UNIVERSITY Residential Honors College and Additional Student Housing Project – Agreement With EDR Boise LLC	Motion to approve
5	BOISE STATE UNIVERSITY Online Program Fee - Existing Online Undergraduate Certificate in Design Ethnography	Motion to approve
6	IDAHO STATE UNIVERSITY FOUNDATION Release of Easement Rights	Motion to approve
7	UNIVERSITY of IDAHO Six-Year Capital Plan Update – Salmon Classroom and Idaho Arena	Motion to approve
8	UNIVERSITY of IDAHO Educational Association Agreement with Navitas	Motion to approve
9	LEWIS-CLARK STATE COLLEGE Living and Learning Complex Project – Planning and Design Phase	Motion to approve
10	LEWIS-CLARK STATE COLLEGE Six-Year Capital Plan Update – Career Technical Education Building	Motion to approve

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

MEDICAL EDUCATION STUDY COMMITTEE

SUBJECT

Presentation of Medical Education Study Committee findings and recommendations for approval

REFERENCE

January 2009	Idaho State Board of Education (Board) approved 10 recommendations from the report of findings and recommendations of the State Board of Education Medical Education Study Committee, and subsequently forwarded the amended report to the Governor and Legislature
April 2009	Board approved implementation of the Medical Education Committee's 10 recommendations
August 2012	Board discussed recommendation and status of 2009 Medical Education Study Committee recommendations.

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

Idaho State Board of Education (Board) Governing Policies & Procedures, Section I.E.h. and I.F.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

Progress has been made on a number of the findings and recommendations of the Medical Education Study Committee's 2009 report. For example, in the 2016 Legislative session, a multiyear effort to increase the number of Idaho-sponsored medical school seats in the Washington, Wyoming, Alaska, Montana, and Idaho (WWAMI) collaborative effort with the University of Washington (UW) and the University of Utah School of Medicine (UUSOM) resulted in five additional seats in WWAMI (for a total of 40 slots per year and 160 for the 4-year pipeline) and two additional seats for UUSOM (for a total of 10 seats per year and 40 total). Programs have been realigned to enable undergraduate medical students to accomplish a greater portion of their training in Idaho. Funding support for Graduate Medical Education (GME) residency programs has been provided. A private medical school—the Idaho College of Osteopathic Medicine (ICOM)—is being established in the Treasure Valley, and an affiliation agreement between ICOM and Idaho State University (ISU) has been approved. A number of incentives are in place to encourage medical students and physicians to establish their practices in under-served rural areas in Idaho.

Notwithstanding the progress that has been made, much work remains to be done to address current and future medical/health needs of Idaho citizens. In the Governor's State of the State address in January 2016, Governor Otter asked the Board of Education *"to work with our medical community and higher education*

institutions to develop a new plan for addressing future demand for healthcare providers.” Subsequently, in April 2016, the Board re-convened its Medical Education Study Committee to begin the planning task requested by the Governor. Committee members have been drawn from the Board, each of the four-year higher education institutions, and subject matter experts from the private sector, public health agencies, and other key stakeholders, including the Idaho Medical Association (IMA) and the Idaho Hospital Association (IHA). The Committee has received inputs from rural health care providers, physicians, physician assistants, practical nurses, current students and graduates from medical programs, and external agencies and consultants. Teams within the Committee have worked with the Governor’s Budget Office and Department of Health and Welfare to explore near-term opportunities to enhance access to health care in Idaho.

Primary Findings/Areas of Concern: The Committee has identified three primary areas which need prompt and sustained action to improve access to medical and health services for Idahoans.

1. Improving/expanding the pipeline for physicians and other healthcare providers.
2. Addressing the maldistribution of healthcare providers and services throughout Idaho (i.e., the lack of access to services in rural areas)
3. Increasing access to behavioral health services in rural areas (an issue which compounds the problem of attracting and retaining other healthcare providers in rural areas).

In addressing the above-listed trio of concerns, the Committee has developed findings and recommendations which impact the health education pipeline at four levels: pre-medical education (K-12 and postsecondary education); Undergraduate Medical Education (medical school, training programs for physician assistants, practical nurses, medical technicians, etc.); Graduate Medical Education (GME) residency programs; and post-training/actual practice support.

In all, twenty-eight action recommendations have been identified which cover all three of the main areas of concern and all four segments of the medical/health education pipeline. A brief outline of the action items is provided in Attachment 1. As a prelude to fleshing out these recommendations and developing detailed action plans, the Committee is asking the Board to review and approve the items for submission to the Governor’s Office, and to set the stage for further detailed planning and implementation.

IMPACT

Upon Board, Governor, and Legislative approval, action on the Committee’s various recommendations will have a positive impact on the training, support, and retention of health care professionals and on the provision of needed medical and health services to Idahoans in rural and urban areas. Actions that improve the training, support and retention of health care professionals will, in turn, improve

**BUSINESS AFFAIRS AND HUMAN RESOURCES
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

Idaho's ability to attract, support, and retain healthy, productive citizens and economic growth for the State.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – Outline of Committee recommendation

Page 5

Attachment 2 – Workgroup Grid

Page 11

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Medical Education Study Committee has developed a set of prioritized actions and focus areas which will be helpful as the State focuses resources on solving pressing needs. Submission of the recommendations to the Governor will help coordinate state-wide priorities and action plans and will support the Board's efforts to sustain the momentum of recent progress made in the area of medical/health care education. Members of the Committee will be present to discuss findings and answer any Board member questions. Staff recommends approval.

BOARD ACTION

I move to accept the findings and recommendations of the Medical Education Study Committee as presented in Attachment 1, and to forward these to the Governor.

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes _____ No _____

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

**BUSINESS AFFAIRS AND HUMAN RESOURCES
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

BOISE STATE UNIVERSITY

SUBJECT

Authorization for issuance of general revenue and refunding bonds

REFERENCE

June 2012	Board approved amended six-year Capital Improvement Plan, including Fine Arts Building project
April 2013	Board approved planning and design of Fine Arts Building
October 2016	Board approved construction of Fine Arts Building

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies & Procedures, Section V.B.8., V.F., and V.K.
Section 33-3802, Idaho Code

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

Boise State University (BSU) requests approval by the Idaho State Board of Education (Board) to issue tax-exempt general revenue and refunding bonds ("Series 2017A Bonds") pursuant to a Supplemental Bond Resolution in an amount not to exceed \$78,570,000.

Construction funds	\$32,000,000
Outstanding 2007 bonds	45,870,000
Estimated issuance costs	<u>700,000</u>
Maximum Bond Issue	<u>\$78,570,000</u>

In October 2016 the Board authorized BSU to proceed with construction of a new Fine Arts Building for a total cost not to exceed \$42 million. Approximately \$32 million of the proceeds of the Series 2017A Bonds will be used to partially finance the construction of the Fine Arts Building. The remaining \$10 million will be funded by Permanent Building Fund Set A funds, donations and BSU reserves.

An aggregate principal amount not to exceed approximately \$45,870,000 will be used to refund that portion of the outstanding Series 2007A and Series 2007B bonds supported by market conditions at the time of the bond sale. With the assistance of its bond underwriter, BSU periodically reviews outstanding bond issues to assess whether market conditions warrant refinancing to take advantage of lower interest rates.

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

**BUSINESS AFFAIRS AND HUMAN RESOURCES
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

Principal Amount

Total not to exceed \$78,570,000; approximately \$32,000,000 in Fine Arts construction funding and \$45,870,000 to refinance 2007A and B issuances.

Maturities and Amortization Plan

To be determined the day of pricing, scheduled for January 12. The maturity structure for the refunding component will be 2018-36 to mimic the Series 2007A Bonds. The Fine Arts construction portion will be amortized on a level debt service basis 2018-47.

Source of Security

General Revenue pledge of BSU, excluding appropriated funds, direct grant and contract revenues and restricted gifts.

Ratings

BSU's current ratings are A1/A+ by Moody's Investors Service and Standard & Poor's, respectively (see 2016A reports at Attachments 3 and 4).

Rating agency updates were conducted the week of December 5, 2016, in anticipation of the 2017A issuance.

IMPACT

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

The projected funding package is as follows:

Set A, PBF funds (FY2016 and FY2017):	\$ 5,000,000
Private and institutional funds	5,000,000
2017A general revenue proceeds:	<u>32,000,000</u>
Total	<u>\$42,000,000</u>

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

Series 2007A and Series 2007B bonds will be refunded to the extent that the net present value savings exceed three (3) percent. In the event that market conditions are no longer favorable at the time of the sale, no refunding bonds will be issued.

**BUSINESS AFFAIRS AND HUMAN RESOURCES
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

BSU's current debt service ratio is 4.81 percent. The projected maximum ratio, after the 2017A issuance, is 5.86 percent.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 - Draft Supplemental Bond Resolution	Page 5
Attachment 2 - Draft Bond Purchase Agreement	Page 31
Attachment 3 - Moody's 2016A Rating Report	Page 55
Attachment 4 - Standard & Poor's 2016A Rating Report	Page 63
Attachment 5 - Debt Service Projection	Page 73
Attachment 6 - Ten Year Debt Projection	Page 75
Attachment 7 - Draft Preliminary Official Statement	Page 77

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The proposed action will provide the bulk of financing for BSU's Fine Arts Building project, while simultaneously achieving long-term savings on other outstanding debt through refunding of existing bonds. The refunding action is contingent upon a favorable interest rate at the time of sale. The additional debt to be assumed for financing the Fine Arts Building can be absorbed by BSU without exceeding the Board's prescribed maximum debt service ratio (8%, defined as Actual Debt Service divided by Annual Adjusted Expenses in Board Policy V.F.4.c.). Staff recommends approval. A roll call vote is required.

BOARD ACTION

I move 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.

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes _____ No _____

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

**BUSINESS AFFAIRS AND HUMAN RESOURCES
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

BOISE STATE UNIVERSITY

SUBJECT

Planning and design approval for relocation of displaced facilities operations and central receiving into a new Campus Planning and Facilities building

REFERENCE

October 2015	Idaho State Board of Education (Board) approved Planning and Design of Center for Materials Science Research
August 2016	Board approved Six-Year Capital Improvement Plan

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

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

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

The new Boise State University (BSU) Center for Materials Science Research will displace the current building and yard housing Facilities Operations and Maintenance (FOAM), Central Receiving, a hazardous waste facility, and a vehicular wash-down area. BSU has identified property (owned by the University), located on the northern portion of the block between Belmont and Beacon Streets and between Euclid and Manitou Avenues, as a suitable site for the relocated functions, which will be designated collectively as the “Campus Planning and Facilities (CPF)” Building.

The CPF Building will contain high-bay storage/receiving space, two floors of administrative offices, a loading bay, and an outdoor loading dock. The building is expected to house the FOAM/Central Receiving functions, while accommodating expansion and the future inclusion of additional campus planning and facilities groups and functions including a yard for parking, equipment storage and wash down area, and a hazardous waste structure.

BSU will use a design-build delivery approach for this project and will work with the Division of Public Works (DPW) to make a qualifications-based selection for the design-build team. A portion of the Materials Science Budget has been identified to fund relocation and consolidation of these functions.

IMPACT

Total project costs for the CPF building have been estimated at \$1.5 million, with design costs estimated between \$120,000 and \$150,000. BSU will return to the Board for approval to proceed with construction.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – Project Budget	Page 3
Attachment 2 – Capital Project Tracking Sheet	Page 4

**BUSINESS AFFAIRS AND HUMAN RESOURCES
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The planning and design phase of the requested project, which is one element in BSU's Board-approved six-year capital plan, will be funded with institutional dollars, and BSU will coordinate their actions with DPW. Under the Design-Build approach, the architectural and engineering contractor and construction contractor team will be selected at the outset of the project (without a separate bid process prior to the construction phase). The project will enable the institution to collocate the displaced inter-related physical plant operations at a suitable new site. Upon completion of planning and design work, BSU will return to the Board to seek approval for the construction phase.

Staff recommends approval.

BOARD ACTION

I move 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.

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes _____ No _____

**BUSINESS AFFAIRS AND HUMAN RESOURCES
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

BOISE STATE UNIVERSITY

SUBJECT

New Residential Honors College and Additional Student Housing Project – Dining Spaces and Faculty in Residence

REFERENCE

April 2013	Idaho State Board of Education (Board) approved purchase of 1801 University Drive
February 2015	Board informational item on Proposed Student Housing
June 2015	Update to Board on Proposed Student Housing
August 2015	Board approved ground lease and operating 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 spaces for a cost not to exceed \$3,490,458

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

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

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

In August 2015, the Board approved a ground lease (“Ground Lease”) and operating agreement (“Operating Agreement”) with EdR Boise LLC (“EdR”), which provides for the construction and operation of a new residential Honors College and additional student housing project on Boise State University’s (BSU) campus (the “Honors College”). The Honors College will include dining spaces, to be owned and operated by BSU, in accordance with the terms of the Ground Lease as approved by the Board in August 2015.

Dining Spaces

The Ground Lease provides for EdR to construct the dining spaces for \$3,490,458, of which \$883,200 will be used for improvements to the space beyond shell and core; such improvements will be specific to BSU’s design and intended food concept. The Ground Lease further provides that BSU may elect for EdR to complete the full buildout of the space, according to the specifications of BSU. BSU has revised the original specifications for the dining spaces, and elected for EdR to complete the full buildout, to include all furniture, fixtures and equipment. The additional cost of the full food service build-out is approximately \$2 million in addition to the existing \$3,490,458 already committed. The total estimated budget is approximately \$5.5 million. The attached Letter Agreement memorializes BSU’s election to have EdR complete the buildout. In accordance with the terms of the Ground Lease, BSU intends to purchase the dining spaces “turn-key” upon substantial completion of the construction for an amount not to exceed \$5.5 million.

The approximately 14,720 square foot dining space will focus on fresh food concepts, enhancing the quality of food provided to students on campus, and is currently anticipated to include: 1) Soup/Salad/Sandwich, 2) Oriental Grille Area, 3) Home Style Food. The concepts may change as a result of equipment bids and based on a market study of students. The space also will include a seating and dining area with bathrooms, the food services area and a closed kitchen. The seating/dining area has been designed to be open 24/7, if so desired, for studying or programming of events for the building.

BSU funds this project utilizing a \$2 million contribution from BSU's food service provider, and the remainder of the funds will come from BSU and auxiliary housing and dining reserves.

Letter Agreement

The Ground Lease and Operating Agreement provide for changes in the construction and design of the Honors College upon request and approval by BSU and at its expense. BSU has requested a change in the plans and specifications to replace twelve student beds with three 800 square foot units, each of which will include two-bedrooms, two bathrooms, a kitchen and living room, to provide apartments for faculty in residence or similar residence life staff for BSU's Residential College. There will be one faculty apartment on the fifth floor in the residential space for the Honors College students, and two faculty apartments in the freshman living community, one on the fourth floor and one on the fifth floor.

The attached Letter Agreement confirms that EdR is converting the space into faculty apartments, as requested, and that BSU will pay up to \$60,000 for such conversions, reflecting the actual cost to convert the student beds to faculty apartments. In addition, the proposed Letter Agreement confirms that BSU will pay the rental amount, representing the amount EdR would have collected for the twelve student beds, commencing at \$82,000 for academic year 2017-2018, and subject to increase on the same terms as other rental increases provided for in the Operating Agreement.

Finally, EdR has also requested several additional clarifications to provisions already in the Ground Lease, specifically including timing of payments owed by BSU under the Ground Lease. First, the proposed Letter Agreement confirms that BSU will pay up to \$500,000 for a system that provides for reclamation and retention of graywater, in accordance with Section 3.02(b) of the Ground Lease, which amount will be paid on the Rent Commencement Date. BSU expects the amount to be less than \$500,000, and it is currently expected to be around \$350,000, which provides some savings to BSU.

In addition, the Ground Lease requires BSU to be responsible for remediation of certain hazardous materials discovered during the development and construction of the project. BSU has previously agreed to repay EdR for certain remediation

BUSINESS AFFAIRS AND HUMAN RESOURCES
DECEMBER 15, 2016

conducted by EdR during construction in the amount of \$252,287.63 due to the remediation of an underground storage tank. The Letter Agreement confirms that BSU hereby agrees to pay this amount on the Rent Commencement Date.

Finally, the attached Letter Agreement clarifies that EdR will provide wireless service throughout the Honors College, including dining spaces, and BSU will pay for wireless service in the dining spaces only in the same manner as it will pay for other utilities in the dining space. BSU has requested EdR provide this in order to provide a seamless experience for users of the space and residents in particular.

IMPACT

The primary terms and conditions of the attached Letter Agreement are as described above:

- EdR will fund the development of the food service space, including a full build out and all furniture, fixtures and equipment, and, upon completion, BSU will purchase the space as contemplated by the Ground Lease. The existing commitment for core and shell is approximately \$3,500,000 with an additional payment of \$2,000,000 for the full building project, including furniture, fixtures, and equipment, for a total amount not to exceed \$5.5 million.
- EdR will convert 12 student beds into 3 faculty apartments, for a payment of up to \$60,000 from BSU for one-time development and construction costs, plus annual rent from BSU in the amount of \$82,000, subject to escalation as provided in the Operating Agreement.
- BSU will pay up to \$500,000 to EdR for the actual cost of a graywater system, payable on the Rent Commencement Date.
- BSU will pay \$252,287.63 to EdR for the actual cost of certain hazardous waste remediation, as required by the Ground Lease, payable on the Rent Commencement Date.
- EdR will provide wireless internet service to the entire Honors College Project, including the food service spaces. BSU will pay for the wireless service to the dining spaces only, in the same manner as utilities in accordance with the Ground Lease.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1- Letter Agreement

Page 5

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In discussions with Board Staff, BSU confirmed that anticipated auxiliary operations revenues and auxiliary reserves are sufficient to cover the additional \$2 million cost of the complete facility buildout (including furniture, fixtures, and equipment) within the revised overall project cost of \$5.5 million.

Staff recommends approval.

**BUSINESS AFFAIRS AND HUMAN RESOURCES
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

BOARD ACTION

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 \$2,000,000 with a total project cost not to exceed \$5,500,000; and to delegate authority to the Vice President for Finance and Administration to execute all relevant documents in substantial conformance with the terms herein.

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes _____ No _____

BOISE STATE UNIVERSITY

SUBJECT

Approval of online program fee for an existing online undergraduate certificate in Design Ethnography

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies & Procedures, Section III.G. and Section V.R.3.a.x.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

Boise State University (BSU) is requesting approval of an online program fee for its recently-created undergraduate certificate in Design Ethnography. Approval of this the online fee will enable BSU to serve two different audiences with its new certificate: 1) Students enrolled at BSU who wish to add this certificate to enhance their qualifications/credentials for their chosen programs of study, who will be able to include the certificate courses as part of their overall 120 credits towards degree, and will pay the traditional tuition and fees paid by BSU students; 2) Individuals who are not enrolled in any other BSU program who will be able to will register for separate sections of the certificate courses that will be offered under the online program fee model.

Design ethnography is an adaptation of one sub-discipline of anthropology for purposes of applied research, mainly in the areas of user experience research, design research, and qualitative research. Design ethnography employs the systematic observation and description of attitudes, behaviors and social relations for informing decision making in private, for-profit industry, public-sphere planning and service, and non-profit organizations.

The certificate will provide marketable skills to graduates from a variety of majors, including anthropology, because it is both applicable and accessible to all fields that involve human relations, including business, engineering, psychology, sociology, design, and anthropology. A recent survey of LinkedIn job openings found over 5,000 jobs requiring “qualitative research skills and over 20,000 jobs requiring “research design skills.”

Currently, no other institution in Idaho offers an online or in-person undergraduate certificate in Design Ethnography.

IMPACT

The online mode of the certificate program will operate under the guidelines of Board Policy V.R as they pertain to wholly online programs. This policy enables the institution to set a price-point appropriate for the program; students will pay an online program fee in lieu of tuition. The price-point for the proposed online

**BUSINESS AFFAIRS AND HUMAN RESOURCES
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

program fee will be \$497 per credit. The total cost of the 12 credits would be \$5,964.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – Undergraduate certificate in Design Ethnography
online program fee proposal

Page 5

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This request is for Board approval of an online fee structure for a new certificate program. The undergraduate certificate was processed through a notification letter to the Board office, in accordance with Board Policy III.G. This policy does not require submission and approval of a program proposal for academic certificates consisting of 30 credits or less.

BSU's online fee request would be applicable only to students in Design Ethnography online course sections, and would not apply to BSU students who are simultaneously enrolled in other BSU programs.

The Design Ethnography certificate program proposal has worked its way through the Council on Academic Affairs and Programs (CAAP)--which forwarded the proposal with a recommendation for approval on November 17, 2016; then to the Instruction, Research, and Student Affairs (IRSA) Committee on December 1, 2016; and to the Business Affairs and Human Resources (BAHR) committee on December 2, 2016.

Board Policy V.R.3.a.x. states *"an online program fee may be charged for any fully online undergraduate, graduate, and certificate program. An online program fee shall be in lieu of resident or non-resident tuition (as defined in Idaho Code §33-3717B) and all other Board-approved fees. An online program is one in which all courses are offered and delivered via distance learning modalities (e.g. campus-supported learning management system, videoconferencing, etc.); provided however, that limited on-campus meetings may be allowed if necessary for accreditation purposes or to ensure the program is pedagogically sound."*

Staff believes that the proposed online fee for Design Ethnography is consistent with the letter of Board policy. As with other market-based pricing approaches, time will tell if the on-line program mode and price level will be successful and sustainable.

Staff recommends approval.

**BUSINESS AFFAIRS AND HUMAN RESOURCES
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

BOARD ACTION

I move 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.

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes _____ No _____

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

BUSINESS AFFAIRS AND HUMAN RESOURCES
DECEMBER 15, 2016

IDAHO STATE UNIVERSITY FOUNDATION

SUBJECT

Release of easement rights on property in Idaho Falls, ID, owned by the Idaho State Board of Education, to the Idaho State University Foundation

REFERENCE

August 2016

Board approved sponsorship of Idaho National Laboratory Cybercore and Computational Collaboration Center expansion project

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

Idaho State Board of Education (Board) Governing Policies & Procedures,
Section V.I.5.b.iii
Section 58-335, Idaho Code

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

In Idaho Falls, ID, land was purchased by the Idaho State University (ISU) Foundation that included land use restrictions on the types of future activities that could be carried out in the event of future development of the property. This property has now been identified as a preferred location for the Board-sponsored Cybercore facility project in collaboration with the Idaho National Laboratory (INL). A deal has been negotiated with the original seller to lift the land use restrictions on the Foundation property. The arrangements to lift the land use restrictions include the transfer of a small section of Foundation-owned property to the sellers—this triangular half-acre parcel is contiguous to property already owned by the sellers, and, although it is in the same area as the intended Cybercore site, the half-acre parcel is not needed for the INL project (see map in Attachment 1). The Board holds an easement on the half-acre parcel. The ISU Foundation is requesting that the Board terminate its easement so the half-acre parcel of land can be transferred to the seller without the easement.

ISU has no need for and derives no benefit from the easement held by the Board.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – Map of easement location	Page 3
Attachment 2 – Termination of easement	Page 5
Attachment 3 – Quitclaim Deed of easement	Page 13

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Board's release of its (unused) easement rights on the half-acre parcel in question—which is owned by the ISU Foundation—will enable the Foundation to transfer that parcel back to the original sellers of the Foundation property, which will improve the sellers' access to the rest of their contiguous property, with no detrimental impact to the ISU Foundation or the Board. In turn, the sellers will lift

BUSINESS AFFAIRS AND HUMAN RESOURCES
DECEMBER 15, 2016

the land-use restrictions which applied to the entirety of the Foundation's property which is planned to be conveyed to the Board/ISU as the site for the new INL-leased Cybercore facility. Staff recommends approval.

BOARD ACTION

I move 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.

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes _____ No _____

BUSINESS AFFAIRS AND HUMAN RESOURCES
DECEMBER 15, 2016

UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO

SUBJECT

Updated Six-Year Capital Plan (FY18 – 23)

REFERENCE

August 2016

State Board of Education (Board) approved the University of Idaho's Six-Year Capital Plan for FY2018 through FY2023

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies & Procedures, Sections V.K.2.a and b.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

The University of Idaho (UI) is providing an updated Six-Year Capital Plan to reflect changes on two projects—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.

The UI operates the Nancy M. Cummings Research, Extension, and Education Center in Salmon, Idaho. Research conducted there includes genetic improvement, reproduction, nutrition, irrigation, and environmental impact. Facilities at the site serve barn, shop, and storage needs, and include an aging classroom attached to the equipment shop with limited internet connection, and located far from the animals and main station. A long term goal has been to provide a classroom facility on site supporting greater connectivity to teaching on campus and better workshops for producers in keeping with the extension mission. The project is envisioned to include technology equipped classrooms, a large meeting space for gatherings, a small catering kitchen, outdoor learning spaces, and necessary restroom and mechanical support spaces, utility infrastructure, and site development. This is a project newly added to the six-year plan at this time.

The UI has had a long term vision to construct a multi-purpose arena adjacent to the Kibbie Dome to serve a variety of campus events and activities in an appropriately sized 4,000 – 5,000 seat venue. The Idaho Arena will include a multi-use events floor and a practice court, as well as office, concessions, and conference space. This is an update to the six-year plan, reflecting greater detail for the line item included since the FY14 plan, previously cited as the Basketball Arena, and prior to that, the Events Pavilion.

BUSINESS AFFAIRS AND HUMAN RESOURCES
DECEMBER 15, 2016

IMPACT

These two facilities are key to the success of the university's strategic plan, supporting Goal 2, Engage, and Goal 3, Transform, engaging the community and enriching the collegiate experiences and careers of the students of the UI.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – Revised Six-Year Capital Plan

Page 3

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Board Policy V.K.2.b. specifies that *“before any institution or agency under the governance of the Board solicits, accepts or commits a gift or grant in support of a specific major project, such project must first be included on the institution’s or agency’s Board-approved six-year plan.”* Board approval of the revised six-year plan will enable the University to begin fund-raising and continue with early concept and design work for the newly-listed projects. Staff recommends approval.

BOARD ACTION

I move to approve the proposed revision to the University of Idaho's six-year capital plan for FY2018 through FY2023, as submitted in Attachment 1.

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes _____ No _____

BUSINESS AFFAIRS AND HUMAN RESOURCES
DECEMBER 15, 2016

UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO

SUBJECT

Educational Association Agreement with Navitas

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

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

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

The University of Idaho (UI) requests authorization to execute an educational association agreement to develop and implement the University of Idaho International Student Success Program. This will be a pathway program that will provide non-credit courses together with for-credit courses to international students in an initial year. After successful completion of their first year at UI, students will be eligible to matriculate as full-time non-resident students.

The UI sent out RFP Number 16-108M in May 2016 for Pathway Program for Recruiting International Students. Navitas North America (Navitas USA Holdings LLC) was the successful bidder. The parties have been negotiating the contract since August 2016 and are near a final agreement.

This agreement will provide UI with an average annual revenue stream over the initial five year term of the contract of approximately \$1.5 million per year, based on the projected number of students in the pathway program per year, which is projected to steadily grow, reaching approximately 1200 by year five. To the extent that the pathway students matriculate as full-time non-resident students, the UI also will realize the additional tuition revenue, less commission amounts to be paid to Navitas on a per student basis for the first year they are enrolled. Navitas will be responsible for the costs of providing the pathway program, UI is responsible for providing space on campus for the program.

With this contract, UI will be able to take advantage of the international presence and outreach of Navitas, as well as benefit from its expertise in on-campus pathway programs. The initial focus of the program will be international students; however, the contract allows for expansion of the program.

IMPACT

This contract will provide UI with a program that will benefit the campus by increasing the number of overall international students and, by extension, increasing the opportunities for all students to expand their international knowledge and experience. It also will provide a revenue source while, at the same time, allowing UI to take advantage of the economies of scale and marketing benefits created by associating with an entity with expertise in delivering pathway programs and with a significant international footprint.

**BUSINESS AFFAIRS AND HUMAN RESOURCES
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – RFP 16-108M

Page 3

Attachment 2 –Navitas/Navitas Holdings Contract

Page 23

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

UI administration has been diligent in keeping the Board and Board Staff informed on the institution's strategy on international student recruitment. The desired end goal—a balanced mix of international students at a level of approximately 1,200 students within the overall student population—is indicative of the solid planning and preparation that has taken place. The proposed contract provides comprehensive support for all aspects of international student recruiting while generating positive annual net revenues to the university.

Staff recommends approval.

BOARD ACTION

I move 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.

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes _____ No _____

LEWIS-CLARK STATE COLLEGE

SUBJECT

Planning & Design for a Living and Learning Complex project

REFERENCE

August 2015

The State Board of Education (Board) approved the six-year Capital Budget Request plan for Lewis-Clark State College (LCSC), which included the proposed Living and Learning Complex project

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

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

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

Lewis-Clark State College (LCSC) is requesting Board approval to proceed with planning and design for the Living and Learning Complex project.

Currently, housing options for LCSC students are limited with 340 beds available for those wishing to stay on campus. Occupancy rates are near 100% with waiting lists at the beginning of each semester. With a growing student body, meeting the demand for housing, student services, and classrooms is a priority for the college.

Specific campus needs that would be provided by the facility were identified to include:

- Housing options for 155 students
- Student Health Center
- Student Counseling Center
- Student Recreation Center
- Two general purpose classrooms
- Student individual & team study spaces
- Coffee, beverage, & snack bar
- Student testing center

The design of the Living and Learning Complex will provide a modern residence hall that will attract new students to campus and provide student-centered services. Although the feasibility study attached assumes a location, the design team will be assigned the task to evaluate multiple possible locations and identify the best location to serve the campus community.

IMPACT

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. The immediate fiscal impact is the cost of the planning and design phase of the overall project (\$1,400,000).

**BUSINESS AFFAIRS AND HUMAN RESOURCES
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

Funding for this project is to be provided through the use of institutional reserves and donated gifts. These funds will supplement money acquired through borrowing (bonding) with the debt service to be paid through student rental fees.

Overall Project:

ESTIMATED BUDGET:		FUNDING:	
Land	\$ 0	PBF	\$ 0
A/E design fees	1,400,000	General Account	
Construction	14,164,000	Agency & Gift Funds	2,000,000
5% Contingency	708,197	Federal Funds	
FF&E	<u>727,803</u>	Other (Borrowed)	<u>15,000,000</u>
Total	\$ <u>17,000,000</u>	Total	\$ <u>17,000,000</u>

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – Feasibility Study	Page 3
Attachment 2 – Costs Matrix	Page 25
Attachment 3 – Capital Project Tracking Sheet	Page 27

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The proposed project will address multiple needs which currently impact LCSC's students. This project has been on the college's six-year capital plan for more than a decade, and it fits well within the inter-related operations of other residential facilities, classrooms, and student support facilities. Assuming successful completion of the planning and design phase, LCSC has positioned itself well (with very low long-term debt) to fund the majority of the project through issuance of bonds, subject to future Board approval.

Staff recommends approval.

BOARD ACTION

I move 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.

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes _____ No _____

BUSINESS AFFAIRS AND HUMAN RESOURCES
DECEMBER 15, 2016

LEWIS-CLARK STATE COLLEGE

SUBJECT

Update of Lewis-Clark State College (LCSC) Six-Year Capital Plan to add a new Career Technical Education Building.

REFERENCE

June 2016	The State Board of Education (Board) considered and approved a change in the LCSC 6-year Capital plan in conjunction with the approval for planning and design of Spalding Hall. Previous to that time, Spalding Hall had not been considered a major capital project, based on its originally-estimated construction cost.
-----------	---

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

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

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

LCSC is requesting Board approval to add a new Career Technical Education (CTE) Building to the Six Year Capital Plan. LCSC intends to partner with local industry and the local school district to develop and construct a new CTE building to provide training in technical vocations to meet the labor force needs of the region and provide collaborative programs with the new Lewiston High School.

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.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1- Current Board-approved Six Year Capital Plan	Page 3
Attachment 2 - Revised Six-Year Capital Plan	Page 4

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Board approval of the requested update to the LCSC rolling 6-year capital improvement plan is a prerequisite for solicitation of donations for the project, as required by Board Policy V.K.2.b, which states that “*before any institution or agency under the governance of the Board solicits, accepts or commits a gift or grant in support of a specific major project, such project must first be included on the institution’s or agency’s Board-approved six-year plan.*” The revised six-year plan also moves the earlier-approved Living and Learning Complex project one year earlier (to FY2018), and eliminates the earlier-approved FY2020 auto repair/diesel mechanics project, which has been subsumed into the new \$20M CTE building project. Staff recommends approval.

BUSINESS AFFAIRS AND HUMAN RESOURCES
DECEMBER 15, 2016

BOARD ACTION

I move to approve the revision to the Lewis-Clark State College six-year capital plan as submitted in Attachment 2.

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes _____ No _____

**STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

TAB	DESCRIPTION	ACTION
1	SUPERINTENDENT’S UPDATE	Information Item
2	TEMPORARY RULE – IDAPA 08.02.03.004.01 – IDAHO CONTENT STANDARDS	Motion to Approve
3	PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS COMMISSION 2015-2016 ANNUAL REPORT	Motion to Approve
4	EMERGENCY PROVISIONAL CERTIFICATES	Motion to Approve
5	RECOMMENDATION FROM THE BIAS AND SENSITIVITY COMMITTEE	Motion to Approve

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

**STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

SUBJECT

Superintendent of Public Instruction update to the State Board of Education

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

Superintendent of Public Instruction, 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.

BOARD ACTION

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

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

**STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

SUBJECT

Temporary Rule – IDAPA 08.02.03.004.01, Rules Governing Thoroughness,
Incorporated by Reference – Idaho Content Standards

REFERENCE

April 2009	Board approved updated Idaho Content Standards.
April 2010	Board approved revision of Science Standards.
August 2015	Board approved updated Humanities and Science standards (rejected by legislature).
August 2016	Board approved updated Arts and Humanities, English Language Arts, Health, Mathematics, Physical Education, and Social Studies standards. Board approved new Computer Science Standards.

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

Idaho State Board of Education, Organization Specific Policies & Procedures, Section IV.B.9
Section 33-1612, Idaho Code
IDAPA 08.02.03.004.01, Rules Governing Thoroughness – The Idaho Content Standards

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

The Idaho Content Standards reflect statements of what students should know and do in various content disciplines and grades. Content standards are adopted statewide and reviewed every six (6) years by teams of educators and stakeholders. These standards provide a consistent foundational level of academic content needed to be successful at each grade level and to graduate from Idaho's public schools.

Citing the need for further public comments, the Idaho Legislature rejected the science standards in Spring 2016. The State Department of Education (Department) began negotiated rulemaking in April 2016 which included solicitation of public comment online and in regional face to face meetings statewide. Comments through the submission form were accepted for 23 days between when the negotiated rulemaking notice was posted on April 6, 2016 to the end of the comment period on April 29, 2016. Over 400 comments were received with the majority being positive for revised Science standards (96%). All comments were posted online on the Department website.

Following the comment period, the science standards committee met to consider all comments and make changes the committee felt were substantive and warranted. Spring of 2016, draft revised Science standards were developed and finalized in June 2016, but the standards were not sent to the Board in August

**STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

with the other revised content standards to allow for additional deliberation on possible revisions.

The sixteen (16) member science standards committee of educators and stakeholders, comprised of new as well as previously serving members, as listed in attachment 3, reconvened in October 2016 to address and further consider public comment and to reformat the Science standards document. The changes brought forth by the committee reflect their belief that these changes should be incorporated into the standards.

The science standards attached are a revised set of standards and are a different version than what the board adopted in August 2015. Differences between the two revisions include substantial 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. In addition, the committee made revisions to the standards to accommodate and answer concerns of stakeholders and legislators centered on how ideas describing impacts on the earth and age of the Earth are expressed.

IMPACT

These changes to the proposed standards will have no discernible financial impact.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – Temporary Rule changes to IDAPA 08.02.03.004, Idaho Content Standards	Page 5
Attachment 2 – Science Standards White Paper	Page 7
Attachment 3 – October 2016 Science Standards Committee Members	Page 9
Attachment 4 – Revised Idaho Science Content Standards	Page 11

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Temporary rules go into effect at the time of Board approval unless an alternative effective date is specified by Board action. To qualify as a temporary rule, the rule must meet one of three criteria: provides protection of the public health, safety, or welfare; or is to come into compliance with deadlines in amendments to governing law or federal programs; or is conferring a benefit. Temporary rules that are approved prior to the start of a legislative session normally expire at the end of that legislative session. While not typical, there are provisions that allow an agency to present a temporary rule that has been approved prior to the start of a legislative session to the Legislature and to request they extend the rule one year. If the Legislature grants the extension the rule would then expire at the end of the following legislation. To make a temporary rule permanent the Board will have to promulgate a proposed and then pending rule incorporating the new science standards during the 2017 rulemaking cycle. If the temporary rule is extended by the 2017 Legislature a new temporary rule will not have to

**STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

promulgate a new temporary rule at that same time in order to keep the standards in place in 2017.

Idaho's science content standards were last updated in 2009. During the 2015 rulemaking cycle new science standards were adopted by the Board and incorporated by reference into Administrative Code. When the rules and incorporated science standards were presented during the 2016 legislative session both the Senate and House Education Committee members expressed concern that the public may not have had enough opportunity to provide feedback to the new standards. The standards were rejected by the Legislature to provide for additional comment and vetting. If approved by the Board, staff could ask the Legislature to extend the rule for another year.

BOARD ACTION

I move to approve the Revised Idaho Science Content Standards, the incorporated by reference document, as submitted in Attachment 3.

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes _____ No _____

AND

I move to approve the Temporary Rule amendment to IDAPA 08.02.03.004, Rules Governing Thoroughness, the Idaho Content Standards, as submitted in Attachment 1.

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes _____ No _____

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

**STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS COMMISSION

SUBJECT

Professional Standards Commission – 2015-2016 Annual Report.

REFERENCE

February 2015	Board was accepted the Professional Standards Commission 2013-2014 annual report.
February 2016	Board was accepted the Professional Standards Commission 2014-2015 annual report.

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

Sections 33-1208, 33-1251, 33-1252, 33-1253, 33-1254, and 33-1258, Idaho Code

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

In 1972, the Legislature established the Professional Standards Commission (PSC). This legislative action combined the Professional Practices Commission, established by the Legislature in 1969, with the Professional Standards Board, an advisory board appointed by the State Board of Education. The PSC consists of eighteen (18) constituency members appointed or reappointed by the Board for terms of three (3) years:

- Secondary or Elementary Classroom Teacher (5)
- Exceptional Child Teacher (1)
- School Counselor (1)
- Elementary School Principal (1)
- Secondary School Principal (1)
- Special Education Director (1)
- School Superintendent (1)
- School Board Member (1)
- Public Higher Education Faculty Member (3)
- Private Higher Education Faculty Member (1)
- Public Higher Education Letters and Sciences Faculty Member (1)
- State Career & Technical Education Staff Member (1)
- State Department of Education Staff Member (1)

The PSC publishes an annual report following the conclusion of each fiscal year to the Board regarding the accomplishments of the commission.

IMPACT

This report advises the Board regarding the accomplishments of the Professional Standards Commission at the conclusion of each fiscal year.

**STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – 2015-2016 Annual Report

Page 3

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Professional Standards Commission is established through Section 33-1252, Idaho Code. The commission is made up of 18 members appointed by the State Board of Education. Membership is made up of individuals representing the teaching profession in Idaho, including a staff person from the Department of Education and the Division of Career Technical Education. No less than seven members must be certificated classroom teachers, of which at least one must be a teacher of exceptional children and one must serve in pupil personnel services. In addition to making recommendations regarding professional codes and standards of ethics to the State Board of Education, the Commission investigates complaints regarding the violation of such standards and makes recommendations to the Board in areas of educator certification and educator preparation standards.

The Professional Standards Commission 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).

Comparison of the 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 reported Alternate Authorizations:

2014-2015		2015-2016	
Authorization	Number*	Authorization	Number
Teacher to New Certification/ Endorsement	230/244	Teacher to New Certification/ Endorsement	230/244
Content Specialist Certification/Endorsements	56/64	Content Specialist Certification/Endorsements	348/402
Pupil personnel Services Certification/Endorsements	3/3	Pupil personnel Services Certification/Endorsements	6/6
ABCTE Certification/ Endorsements	103/127	ABCTE Certification/ Endorsements	162/207
TFA Certification/ Endorsements	0	TFA Certification/ Endorsements	11/14

* Individuals may have multiple endorsements on a single certificate.

BOARD ACTION

I move to accept the Professional Standards Commission 2015-2016 Annual Report.

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes _____ No _____

**STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

SUBJECT

Emergency Provisional Certificates

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

Sections 33-1201 and 33-1203, Idaho Code

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

Emergency provisional applications were received by the State Department of Education from the following school districts:

Jerome School District #261

Applicant Name: Colby Argyle

Content & Grade Range: All Subjects (K-8)

Declared Emergency: August 23, 2016 Jerome School District Board of Trustees declared an area of need exists for the 2016-2017 school year

Summary of Recruitment Efforts: Position was advertised using various methods beginning July 2016. Two applications were received which included Colby Argyle and a district music teacher.

Years of Education or Degrees Attained: Associates Degree, Baccalaureate Degree.

Applicant Name: Roxana Camacho

Content & Grade Range: All Subjects (K-8)

Declared Emergency: August 23, 2016 Jerome School District Board of Trustees declared an area of need exists for the 2016-2017 school year

Summary of Recruitment Efforts: Position was advertised using various methods. Active recruitment for Spanish bi-literate elementary teacher applicants was conducted. Ten (10) applications were received:

- Four (4) were incomplete applications.
- One (1) received very poor recommendations from previous supervisors.
- One (1) was offered the position, but declined.
- One (1) was offered another position in the district.
- One (1) did not hold a degree or credits towards an education degree.
- One (1) had no indication of bi-literacy or references.

Years of Education or Degrees Attained: Associates Degree

Applicant Name: Jonathan Sheen

Content & Grade Range: Health (6-12)

Declared Emergency: September 27, 2016 Jerome School District Board of Trustees declared an area of need exists for the 2016-2017 school year

Summary of Recruitment Efforts: Position was advertised using various methods beginning August 2016 as that is when the position became open due to the teacher choosing to leave the district after three days on contract. Three applications were received which included Jonathan Sheen. One of the other applications had a total of 12 credits earned, and the other had no education listed.

**STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

Years of Education or Degrees Attained: Associates Degree, Baccalaureate Degree.

Madison School District #321

Applicant Name: Joshua Spencer

Content & Grade Range: All Subjects (K-8)

Declared Emergency: July 21, 2016 Madison School District Board of Trustees declared hiring emergency of Joshua Spencer

Summary of Recruitment Efforts: Position was advertised from May 27, 2016 to June 6, 2016. Prior to hiring Mr. Spencer, the district had filled six (6) positions in grades 5-6 interviewing approximately eighteen (18) applicants.

Years of Education or Degrees Attained: Master's Degree.

Mountain Home School District #193

Applicant Name: Nathan Bundy

Content & Grade Range: Mathematics (6-12)

Declared Emergency: District declared emergency in October 2016

Summary of Recruitment Efforts: Position was advertised using various methods beginning April 2016. There were two applicants; one was certified the other was not. The district hired the certified teacher. On August 1st, the districts discovered that Mr. Bundy (who was already a certificated employee) had not passed the Praxis for Secondary Math. There were no other applicants in the pool.

Years of Education or Degrees Attained: Baccalaureate Degree.

West Jefferson School District #253

Applicant Name: Paiten Morton

Content & Grade Range: All Subjects (K-8)

Declared Emergency: August 11, 2016 West Jefferson School District Board of Trustees declared emergency openings.

Summary of Recruitment Efforts: Position was advertised beginning June 2016. District "had a very difficult time finding applicants or qualified people to hire"

Years of Education or Degrees Attained: Over two (2) years.

IMPACT

If emergency provisional certificates are not approved, the school districts will have no certificated staff to serve in these classrooms.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – Application Packet for Emergency Provisional Certificate Page 5

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Section 33-1203, Idaho Code requires, except in the limited fields, for all standard certificate holders prohibits the Board from authorizing standard certificates to individuals who have less than four (4) years of accredited college

**STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

training and allows the Board to authorize in emergencies, which must be declared, provisional certificates based on not less than two (2) years of college training. Each of the applicants have at least two (2) years of training from an accredited postsecondary institution.

BOARD ACTION

I move 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.

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes _____ No _____

OR

I move to approve one year emergency provisional certificates for Colby Argyle, to teach all subjects kindergarten through grade eight in the Jerome School district #261.

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes _____ No _____

I move to approve one year emergency provisional certificates for Roxana Camacho, to teach all subjects kindergarten through grade eight in the Jerome School district #261.

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes _____ No _____

I move to approve one year emergency provisional certificates for Jonathan Sheen to teach Health in grades six through twelve in the Jerome School district #261.

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes _____ No _____

I move to approve one year emergency provisional certificates for Joshua Spencer to teach all subjects kindergarten through grade eight in the Madison School District #321.

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes _____ No _____

I move to approve one year emergency provisional certificates for Nathan Bundy to teach Mathematics in grades six through twelve in the Mountain Home School District #193.

**STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes _____ No _____

I move to approve one year emergency provisional certificates for Paiten Morton to teach all subjects kindergarten through grade eight in the West Jefferson School District #253.

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes _____ No _____

**STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

SUBJECT

Idaho Bias and Sensitivity Committee recommendations to remove items from the 2017 Idaho Standards Achievement Test (ISAT) administration

REFERENCE

November 2014	The Board appointed thirty (30) committee member for a two (2) or four (4) year term. A list of ninety (90) additional members were appointed to do a one-time review.
February 2015	The Board approved the removal of an audio clip and associated items per the recommendation of the committee members.
August 2016	The Board appointed new committee members.

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

Section 33-134, Idaho Code – Assessment Item Review Committee

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

In accordance with Section 33-134, Idaho Code, the Board approved a review committee of thirty (30) individuals from each of the six (6) educational regions in the state, representing parents of students, teachers, administrators, and school board members in Idaho's public education system. The committee reviews the computer adaptive test questions on the summative ISAT developed by Smarter Balanced, in ELA/Literacy and Math, for bias and sensitivity.

The committee is authorized to make recommendations to the Board and the State Department of Education to revise or eliminate summative computer adaptive test questions from the assessment forms. The Board shall make the final determination regarding the adoption or rejection of the committee's recommendations.

The Bias and Sensitivity Committee is recommending the removal of the following items from the 2017 ISAT by Smarter Balanced Assessment:

- Three (3) ELA items
- One (1) grade 11 passage with five (5) associated items
- One (1) grade 8 passage with eleven (11) associated items
- One (1) grade 6 math items

IMPACT

If any or all items/passages are approved for removal by the Board, this action will require a new and separate item configuration for the online delivery of both the ELA and Math assessments for the state of Idaho. The work required to generate the separate test configuration will carry a one-time financial impact of \$57,000.

**STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

Additionally, the grade 8 passage ID 1507 appears on the accommodated paper test form. If this passage is approved for rejection, there will be an estimated \$30,000 cost associated with having to produce a new accommodated grade 8 ELA form. The Smarter Balanced Consortium would also need to be involved in this effort.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – 2016 Bias and Sensitivity Committee Report	Page 3
Attachment 2 – Idaho Bias and Sensitivity Review	Page 17
Attachment 3 – LABS Guidelines Handout	Page 37
Attachment 4 – Content Rater and Rules	Page 39
Attachment 5 – ISAT Bias and Sensitivity Guidelines	Page 65

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Pursuant to Section 33-134, Idaho Code, the Bias and Sensitivity Committee is charged with reviewing any new test items that have been added to any summative computer adaptive test, this includes the Idaho Standards Achievement Test for English Language Usage and Mathematics. 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, regardless of differences in characteristics, including, but not limited to disability status, ethnic group, gender, regional background, native language or socioeconomic status.

BOARD ACTION

I move 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.

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes _____ No _____

OR

I move to reject the recommendation from the Assessment Review Committee and 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.

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes _____ No _____

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH, AND STUDENT AFFAIRS
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

TAB	DESCRIPTION	ACTION
1	UNIVERSITY OF UTAH – SCHOOL OF MEDICINE REPORT	Information Item
2	BOARD POLICY III.L. CONTINUING EDUCATION AND CREDIT FOR PRIOR EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING – FIRST READING	Motion to Approve
3	BOARD POLICY III.N. GENERAL EDUCATION – FIRST READING	Motion to Approve
4	BOARD POLICY III.W. HIGHER EDUCATION RESEARCH – FIRST READING	Motion to Approve
5	BOARD POLICY III.Z. PLANNING AND DELIVERY OF POSTSECONDARY PROGRAMS AND COURSES – SECOND READING	Motion to Approve
6	BOISE STATE UNIVERSITY – BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN URBAN STUDIES AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT	Motion to Approve
7	BOISE STATE UNIVERSITY – MASTER OF ATHLETIC TRAINING	Motion to Approve
8	BOISE STATE UNIVERSITY – MASTER OF SCIENCE IN ECONOMICS AND MASTER OF ECONOMICS	Motion to Approve

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH, AND STUDENT AFFAIRS
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

9	IDAHO STATE UNIVERSITY – MASTER OF ARTS IN TEACHING	Motion to Approve
----------	--	-------------------

10	IDAHO STATE UNIVERSITY – MASTER OF SOCIAL WORK	Motion to Approve
-----------	---	-------------------

11	DUAL CREDIT RECOMMENDATIONS	Motion to Approve
-----------	------------------------------------	-------------------

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH, AND STUDENT AFFAIRS
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

SUBJECT

University of Utah, School of Medicine Annual Report

REFERENCE

June 2008	The Board approved a revised three-year contract between the University of Utah School of Medicine and the State Board of Education.
December 2013	The Board approved a revised three-year contract between the University of Utah School of Medicine and the State Board of Education.
September 2016	The Board approved a revised three-year contract between the University of Utah School of Medicine and the State Board of Education.

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

Idaho Code §33-3720

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

Since July 1976, the State Board of Education (Board) has had an agreement with the University of Utah School of Medicine (UUSOM) to reserve a specific number of seats for Idaho residents at the in-state tuition and fee rate established by UUSOM for residents of Utah. The Board makes annual fee payments in support of such Idaho resident students enrolled under this agreement. In the 2016 Legislative session, two additional seats per year were approved for this cooperative agreement. The program now provides opportunities for ten Idaho students annually to attend UUSOM through a cooperative agreement. A total of forty Idaho students can be enrolled in this four-year program.

As part of this agreement, UUSOM provides the Board an annual report which includes information regarding the established tuition and fees for Utah residents for the upcoming academic year, the names of students accepted for the upcoming school year, and a summary of the academic progress of continuing students enrolled.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – University of Utah School of Medicine
Annual Report for 2016

Page 3

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

As part of the Board's contract with 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.

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH, AND STUDENT AFFAIRS
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

BOARD ACTION

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

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH AND STUDENT AFFAIRS
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

SUBJECT

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

REFERENCE

June 2013	The Board received recommendation from the Educational Attainment Task Force including recommendations for a statewide portfolio approval process for credit for prior learning.
October 2013	Board Approved first reading the Board Policy III.L.
December 2013	The Board approved second reading of proposed amendments to Board Policy III.L.
October 2016	The Board approved the first reading of proposed amendments to Board Policy III.L.

APPLICABLE STATUTES, RULE OR POLICY

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

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

The Board approved an initial first reading of this policy at their October 20, 2016 meeting; however, the wrong version of the draft policy was included with the agenda materials. Due to the differences between both versions, the proposed amendments to Board Policy III.L are being presented to the Board for another first reading.

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

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

At the June 2013 Board meeting the Workforce Development Council's Educational Attainment Task Force made three recommendations to the Board for reaching the Board's educational attainment goal. One of these

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH AND STUDENT AFFAIRS
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

recommendations was that the Board establish a statewide portfolio approval process for awarding credits based on prior learning and experience. The recommendation was forwarded to Board staff for further development.

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

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

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

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

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

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

IMPACT

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

ATTACHMENTS

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

Page 5
Page 11

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH AND STUDENT AFFAIRS
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

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.

Board staff recommends approval.

BOARD ACTION

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

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes _____ No _____

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH, AND STUDENT AFFAIRS
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

SUBJECT

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

REFERENCE

February 27, 2014	The Board approved the first reading of proposed new Policy III.N, General Education.
April 17, 2014	The Board approved the second reading of proposed new Policy III.N, General Education.
January 22, 2015	The Board approved a waiver to Board Policy III.N.4.a as it applies to Associate of Applied Science Degrees for the 2015-2016 academic year.
April 2015	The Board approved the first reading of proposed amendments to Board Policy III.N.
June 2015	The Board approved the second reading of Board Policy III.N.

APPLICABLE STATUTES, RULE OR POLICY

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

BACKGROUND / DISCUSSION

Board Policy III.N., General Education outlines the statewide General Education Framework, which provides guidance to Idaho's public institutions in identifying courses that meet the General Education Matriculation (GEM) competencies for the facilitation of seamless transfer.

Consistent with Board Policy III.N faculty discipline groups representing all institutions meet annually to ensure consistency and relevance of General Education competencies related to their discipline. At last year's General Education Summit, a concern arose regarding a technical writing class that was identified as a GEM oral communication class. The Oral Communication discipline group believed the course did not align with the national discipline expected outcomes. This led to a conversation with the General Education Committee on June 10, 2016 and subsequently amendments to the oral communications competencies.

In alignment with General Education Committee recommendations, proposed amendments include requiring students to meet all six competencies upon completion of a course.

IMPACT

Approval of the proposed amendments will provide increased uniformity to the general education framework bringing the outcomes rubric into alignment with the national discipline expected outcomes.

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH, AND STUDENT AFFAIRS
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – Board Policy III.N, General Education – First Reading Page 3

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The General Education Committee and the Oral Communications discipline convened during this year's General Education Summit held on October 5, 2016 to discuss concerns regarding the oral communication GEM course competencies and to discuss amendments brought forward by the discipline group.

The Statewide General Education Committee reviewed and approved the recommended amendments at their October 5, 2016 meeting with minor changes. CAAP reviewed the proposed changes at its November 17, 2016 meeting and recommends approval.

Staff recommends approval.

BOARD ACTION

I move to approve the first reading of the proposed amendments to Board Policy III.N, General Education as presented in Attachment 1.

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes _____ No _____

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH, AND STUDENT AFFAIRS
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

SUBJECT

Proposed Amendments to Board Policy III.W., Higher Education Research, First Reading

REFERENCE

June 17, 2010	Board approved a second reading to Board Policy III.W. Higher Education Research
August 11, 2011	Board approved first reading to Board Policy III.W. Higher Education Research
October 20, 2011	Board approved a second reading to Board Policy III.W. Higher Education Research
March 23, 2012	Board approved Higher Education Research Council IGEM Program Guidelines
October 10, 2014	Board approved an amendment to the Center for Advanced Energy Studies Tenant Use Agreement and Consortium Agreement, adding the University of Wyoming and directed BSU, ISU, and UI to report annual to Board on institution related CAES activities through the Higher Education Research Council.

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies and Procedures, Section III.W., Higher Education Research Council Policy

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

The Board's Higher Education Research Policy, III.W. was established to recognize Idaho's universities role as a driving force in innovation, positive economic impact, and enhanced quality of life for Idaho. By developing and leveraging the State's unique research expertise and strengths, Idaho's universities will serve as catalyst and engine to spur the creation of new knowledge, technologies, products and industries. This in turn will lead to new advances and opportunities for economic growth and enhance the Idaho's reputation as a national and international leader in excellence and innovation.

The Higher Education Research Council (HERC) of the Idaho State Board of Education is responsible for advising the Board on the implementation of strategies that increase the quality and quantity of research in Idaho, encourage continued public and private support of research, enhance the quality and quantity of academic research produced, increase faculty eligible to compete for research funds, where appropriate, development of Idaho public institutions' research infrastructure and the development and implementation of a higher education statewide strategic plan for research.

In addition to establishing the purpose and responsibilities of HERC, Board Policy III.W. outlines minimum reporting and program requirements for those research

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH, AND STUDENT AFFAIRS
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

programs administered by HERC on behalf of the Board. In March of 2012 new funding was appropriated to the Board's system-wide needs budget for the purposes of further research as well as ongoing funding to Boise State University, Idaho State University and the University of Idaho for activities associated with the Center for Advanced Energy Studies. The funds were appropriated under the umbrella of the Governor's initiative referred to as the Idaho Global Entrepreneurial Mission (IGEM). The IGEM vision is to leverage private-industry guidance and the talent and expertise of Idaho's research universities to commercialize innovative and viable technologies that will strengthen Idaho's economy. The ongoing appropriation totals \$1M to the Department of Commerce for innovation grants and to manage the Commerce IGEM Council; \$2M to the institutions for the Center for Advanced Energy Studies; and \$2M for competitive state university research under the direction of HERC. To facilitate the work of HERC the Board approved guidelines for the use of the funds by HERC. HERC conducted a competitive process and awarded three year projects with the initial funds. Proposed Amendments, incorporate these program requirements into Board Policy III.W.

Proposed amendments will also incorporate Board action from the October 10, 2014 Special Board meeting requiring Boise State University, Idaho State University, and the University of Idaho to report annually to the Board on institution related CAES activities through HERC. Additional amendments will make technical corrections and update minimum reporting requirements to better align with the current array of research programs administered by HERC.

IMPACT

Approval of the amendments to Board policy III.W. will provide for more applicable minimum reporting requirements for all programs funded through HERC and incorporate past Board action that was intended to be ongoing into Board policy consistent with the Board Bylaws.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 - Board Policy III.W., Higher Education Research – 1st
Reading

Page 5

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The proposed changes incorporate past action taken by the Board regarding reporting Center for Advanced Energy Studies 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.

Staff recommends approval.

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH, AND STUDENT AFFAIRS
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

BOARD ACTION

I move to approve the first reading of Board Policy III.W., Higher Education Research as submitted in Attachment 1.

Moved by_____ Seconded by_____ Carried Yes_____ No_____

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH, AND STUDENT AFFAIRS
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

SUBJECT

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

REFERENCE

April 2011	Board approved the first reading of the proposed amendments to Board Policy III.Z, Planning and Delivery of Postsecondary Programs to include the inclusion of statewide program responsibilities into policy.
June 2011	Board approved the second reading of the proposed amendments to Board Policy III.Z. Planning and Delivery of Academic Programs and Courses as amended.
June 19, 2013	The Board was presented with proposed corrections to institutions' statewide program responsibilities.
August 15, 2013	The Board approved the first reading of the proposed amendments to Board Policy III.Z, Planning and Delivery of Postsecondary Programs and Courses to include updating institutions statewide responsibilities.
December 2013	The Board approved the second reading of Board Policy III.Z.
June 18, 2015	The Board approved the first reading of Board Policy III.Z.
August 13, 2015	The Board approved the second reading of Board Policy III.Z.
October 20, 2016	The Board approved the first reading of the proposed amendments to Board Policy III.Z that updates institutions statewide program responsibilities.

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

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

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

Council on Academic Affairs and Programs (CAAP) identified several program names and degree titles that needed to be updated within the Statewide Program Responsibility chart in Board Policy III.Z. CAAP and Board staff also proposed amendments to the provision under subsection 2.b.i, that would clarify the statewide program responsibilities list will be "updated" by the Board every two years.

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.

IMPACT

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

ATTACHMENTS

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

Page 3

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Current Board Policy requires the “statewide program list shall be reviewed for alignment by the Board every two years.” Following close consultation between Board staff, institutions, and Instruction, Research, and Student Affairs (IRSA) members. It is clear that the alignment process is vague and infeasible, which provides explanation for its lack of occurrence. The proposed language provides clarity and actionable guidance with regard to this item.

Board staff and CAAP recommend approval as presented.

BOARD ACTION

I move 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.

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes _____ No _____

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH AND STUDENT AFFAIRS
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

BOISE STATE UNIVERSITY

SUBJECT

New Bachelor of Arts in Urban Studies and Community Development

REFERENCE

August 2016 Based on approved line item request titled "Public Service Initiative" for \$2 million.

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

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

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

Boise State University (BSU) proposes to create a new Bachelor of Arts (BA) degree in Urban Studies and Community Development. 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.

Most existing urban studies programs focus on large, global, industrial cities, such as New York and San Francisco. The proposed program will be different in that it focuses on the challenges faced by communities in the Intermountain West. Cities and towns in the Intermountain West have unique cultural, economic, environmental and political dynamics, typically have a strong interdependence with adjacent rural areas, and are often geographically isolated.

Idaho is often labeled a rural state because of its vast open space, agricultural and forestry industries, and overall low population density. However, it is largely urban when considering demographics and economic activity: about 1.45 million or 87% of Idaho's estimated 1.67 million residents live in designated urban areas, which are defined as communities with a core population of at least 10,000.

Graduates will develop expertise in a range of fields that include economics, public policy, program evaluation, community building, and public communication; that expertise will enable them to address urban issues and challenges having to do with community development.

Graduates will be well prepared for a variety of graduate programs at the state's three universities. They will also have available to them a diverse array of career paths, include community development coordinators, economic development analysts, nonprofit program coordinators, urban demographers, city managers, and real estate project coordinators.

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH AND STUDENT AFFAIRS
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

Currently there are no other similar programs offered by Idaho public institutions. Programs in other states include Bachelor's degrees in Urban Ecology at University of Utah; Geography-Urban Studies and Urban and Metropolitan Studies at Arizona State University; Urban and Regional Development at the University of Arizona; Urban Studies at the University of Washington-Tacoma; Community Development at Portland State University, and Urban Studies and Planning at the University of Denver.

IMPACT

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.

The program will be resourced in three ways:

- Much of the coursework will be provided using already-existing faculty members and coursework.
- Additional capacity will be provided by two faculty lines devoted to the program, which result from reallocation of resources from the discontinued Community and Regional Planning program and reallocation of a faculty line from the Department of History.
- The above resources will enable BSU to get the program up and running. Expansion will be facilitated if BSU is successful in receiving the FY18 Line Item Request to the legislature, which includes two faculty lines that would be devoted to this program.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment1 - BA in Urban Studies & Community Development proposal Page 5

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The proposed program falls within the mission of BSU, and will create graduates who are prepared to work in a variety of fields supporting local communities and will be excellent preparation for graduate studies at all three Idaho universities.

BSU submitted a new FY18 line item request as part of their Public Service Initiative, which includes two faculty lines for the proposed program. This funding would enable the institution to expand the program. If not funded, BSU will still be able to move forward with implementation; however, the program would have more modest enrollment growth and increased constraints variety of electives available to students.

BSU's request to create a new BA in Urban Studies and Community Development is consistent with their Service Region Program Responsibilities and their Five-year Plan for Delivery of Academic Programs in Region III. Consistent with Board Policy III.Z, no institution has the statewide program responsibility for planning or community development programs.

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH AND STUDENT AFFAIRS
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

The proposal includes letters of support from leaders of eleven Idaho cities: Boise, Meridian, Caldwell, Lewiston, Eagle, Bonners Ferry, Blackfoot, Middleton, Orofino, Coeur d'Alene, and Ammon.

The proposal went through the program review process and was recommended by to the Council on Academic Affairs and Programs (CAAP) on November 17, 2016 and to the Committee on Instruction, Research, and Student Affairs (IRSA) on December 1, 2016.

Staff believes that there is sufficient justification, based on regional need, for BSU to create the proposed program. Staff recommends approval.

BOARD ACTION

I move 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.

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes _____ No _____

THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK

BOISE STATE UNIVERSITY

SUBJECT

New Master of Athletic Training Program

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

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

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

Boise State University (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.

Although many graduates from the proposed program will enter into Athletic Training positions, others will find employment in jobs that include high school teachers with responsibilities for athletic training, athletic instructors, fitness trainers, and orthopedic equipment salespersons. Additionally, the program is excellent preparation for professional schools that graduate physicians, physician's assistants, physical therapists, etc.

The extensive clinical training included in athletic training program necessitates face-to-face offering of the program and requires the offering institution develop extensive ties to local clinical sites and other stakeholders in the area. The proposed new program will continue BSU's long standing offering of athletic training degrees in the Treasure Valley, which contains the largest portion of Idaho's population. Northern Idaho is served by the University of Idaho, which recently transitioned from a baccalaureate program to a master's level athletic training program; it additionally offers a Doctor of Athletic Training degree. Eastern Idaho is served by Idaho State University's recently-created master's level program.

BSU's athletic training program is located in the College of Health Sciences, where it joins nursing, radiologic science, respiratory care, and social work in the array of programs in the college; it therefore contributes to the diversity of interaction available for faculty members and students.

The proposed program will commence summer of 2018. The program will be 24 months in duration, totaling 50 academic credits, and will include six semesters (including summers) of clinical practice for athletic training. The program will admit an initial cohort of 10-12 students annually, with the potential growth to 15 students annually.

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH AND STUDENT AFFAIRS
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

IMPACT

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.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – Master of Athletic Training program proposal

Page 5

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

As provided in the program proposal, the Commission on Accreditation of Athletic Training Education (CAATE) announced in May 2015 that the entry-level Athletic Training degree level will be changing from a baccalaureate to a master's level. Fall 2022 will be the last allowed admission to an accredited undergraduate athletic training program. The creation of the proposed program represents the second step of transitioning degree levels.

Currently, Idaho State University offers a Master of Science in Athletic Training, which was created to meet a specific demonstrated need in Eastern Idaho for athletic trainers at the secondary school level as well as for other athletic health care personnel. The University of Idaho also offers a Master of Science in Athletic Training, which prepares individuals to work in consultation with, and under the supervision of physicians to prevent and treat sports injuries and associated conditions.

BSU proposes to admit a cohort of 10-12 students annually, with a potential growth to a cohort size of 15 students depending on availability of academic and physical resources. Projected enrollments were determined using existing capacity, which is based on existing personnel and infrastructure, and which is limited to cohorts of 12 and a total enrollment of 24.

BSU's request to create a new Master of Athletic Training is consistent with their Service Region Program Responsibilities and their Five-year Plan for Delivery of Academic Programs in Region III. Consistent with Board Policy III.Z, no institution has the statewide program responsibility for athletic training programs.

The proposal went through the program review process and was recommended for approval by the Council on Academic Affairs and Programs (CAAP) on November 17, 2016 and to the Board's on Instruction, Research, and Student Affairs (IRSA) committee on December 1, 2016.

Staff believes that there is sufficient justification, based on regional need, for BSU to create the proposed program.

Board staff recommends approval.

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH AND STUDENT AFFAIRS
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

BOARD ACTION

I move 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.

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes _____ No _____

THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK

BOISE STATE UNIVERSITY

SUBJECT

New Master of Science in Economics and Master of Economics degree

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

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

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

Boise State University (BSU) proposes to create a new program that will award 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.

Graduates will be prepared for careers that regularly make use of economic concepts and quantitative methods. They will be highly skilled in economic analysis, forecasting, statistical analysis, and political economy, and will be able to use their skills and knowledge to develop and shape policy, to inform business decisions, to analyze data, and to manage organizations.

Graduates of a master's program in economics fall into the category of having "deep analytical talent." The McKinsey Global Institute estimated that the supply of "deep analytical talent" in the U.S. in 2008 was approximately 150,000 positions. They estimate that "in a big data world, we expect demand for deep analytical talent could reach 440,000 to 490,000 positions in 2018." That is a tripling of positions over 10 years.

The program is being built on the foundation of a successful Bachelor's degree in the Department of Economics. It will add a set of new graduate-level economics courses, and will thereby strengthen existing graduate business programs such as our MBA and MS in Accountancy. It will also provide coursework for students in graduate programs such as public policy and administration, political science, health sciences, geosciences, engineering, and mathematics.

The University of Idaho (UI) offers a Master of Science in Applied Economics, which is focused on solving complex issues involving agriculture, communities, and natural resources.

IMPACT

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. Instructional capacity to offer a set of new graduate courses will be provided via reallocation of university funds to create two new graduate teaching assistantships; those assistantships will enable a restructuring of a large undergraduate course, which, in turn, will free up faculty instructional capacity for the graduate program.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – MS/Master of Economics program proposal

Page 5

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

BSU states that students will graduate with a set of competencies that will be highly valuable to government, industry, and non-governmental organizations: economic analysis, forecasting, statistical analysis, and political economy. The MS program will emphasize research and will require completion of a thesis. The Masters program will require completion of a three-credit capstone course and project. The intended audience for the Masters is students or others in the community seeking skills in economic and quantitative analysis for career advancement and/or careers in more quantitative and analytical fields.

Currently, the University of Idaho offers an MS in Applied Economics, which has a focus in the areas of agriculture and natural resources. The program is designed to prepare students for management, research, and policy positions in the public and private sectors of the economy, and for further graduate study. Neighboring states with similar programs include Utah State University, offering an MS in Applied Economics and an MS/MA in Economics and the University of Oregon, offering an MA/MS in Economics.

BSU projects 16 initial enrollments during its first year of implementation, which was determined based on anticipated teaching and supervision capacity of up to 15-20 students per cohort given the current number of faculty members and anticipated graduate assistant resources.

BSU's request to create a new Master of Science in Economics and Master of Economics is consistent with their Service Region Program Responsibilities and their Five-year Plan for Delivery of Academic Programs in Region III. Consistent with Board Policy III.Z, no institution has the statewide program responsibility for economics programs.

The proposal went through the program review process and was recommended for approval by the Council on Academic Affairs and Programs (CAAP) on November 17, 2016 and the Board's on Instruction, Research, and Student Affairs (IRSA) committee on December 1, 2016.

Staff believes sufficient justification exists, based on regional need for BSU to create the proposed program, which can be of added value to the student and the state in light of BSU's proximity to much of the state's governmental structure and economic activity.

Board staff recommends approval.

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH AND STUDENT AFFAIRS
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

BOARD ACTION

I move 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.

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes _____ No _____

THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK

IDAHO STATE UNIVERSITY

SUBJECT

New Master of Arts in Teaching

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

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

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

Idaho State University is requesting the addition of a Master of Arts in Teaching Program (MAT). 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. This degree will target a demonstrated need in the State of Idaho for qualified personnel in the secondary school setting. 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.

The program will be a cohort model with a timeline for completion based upon six (6) consecutive semesters, Summer semester through Spring semester. The program will be offered entirely online to serve interested parties throughout the state and provide greater access to our rural communities.

Program objectives are to increase options in pathways to teaching for content experts and career-changers who already hold a bachelor's degree, to create an educator preparation program that provides an incentive to seek teacher certification by promising higher starting salaries due to the simultaneous completion of a master's degree and to maximize enrollment in existing College of Education courses scheduled in the regular course rotation.

IMPACT

The MAT will not require any additional funding or new courses but will consist of a redistribution of existing courses to provide graduates with a bachelor's degree in a specific content area the pedagogical knowledge and skills necessary for initial certification as a teacher in Idaho. ISU does not anticipate that the MAT will negatively impact the current Master of Education (M.Ed.) in Secondary Education degree. The M.Ed. in Secondary Education focuses on fully-certified teachers seeking deeper pedagogy and content knowledge. The population targeted for the MAT program will be persons with an existing bachelor's degree who are seeking initial certification.

There could be an impact on the *Certification Only* programs as students elect to pursue a master's degree and certification rather than just certification. There would be no appreciable loss in overall enrollment and tuition, as equivalent

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH, AND STUDENT AFFAIRS
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

graduate credit coursework would replace undergraduate coursework and ultimately result in official, recorded program completion gains for the college. Graduate courses in the current rotation would also be maximized.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – Master of Arts in Teaching proposal

Page 3

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

ISU projects approximately 12-20 initial enrollments at the start of the program. Upon implementation, cohort enrollment will be capped at 20 candidates.

ISU's request to create a new Master of Arts in Teaching is consistent with their Service Region Program Responsibilities and their Five-year Plan for Delivery of Academic Programs in Region III. Consistent with Board Policy III.Z, no institution has the statewide program responsibility for educator preparation programs.

The proposal went through the program review process and was recommended for approval by the Council on Academic Affairs and Programs (CAAP) on November 17, 2016 and to the Board's Instruction, Research, and Student Affairs (IRSA) committee on December 1, 2016.

Board staff recommends approval.

BOARD ACTION

I move 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.

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes _____ No _____

IDAHO STATE UNIVERSITY

SUBJECT

New Master of Arts in Social Work

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies & Procedures, Section III.G, Section V.R.3.b.iv.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

Idaho State University is currently approved to offer a Bachelor of Arts (BA) degree in Social Work and is now proposing to add a Master of Social Work (MSW) degree. Currently, the BA program prepares graduates for generalist professional practice. A new MSW program would prepare graduates for advanced professional practice in an area of concentration 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.

Given the current state of the profession for employment opportunities, Southeast Idaho (Regions 5 and 6) community need, and ISU student need, an MSW program at ISU is necessary. Local (regional) job openings are expected to be over 70 per year for the next three years. Economic data and forecasts indicate that social work related jobs are likely to be one of the top areas of growth in Idaho well into the next decade. Social work job openings are growing at a local, state, and national rate that significantly exceeds other job opportunities. Our purpose is to develop a quality, primarily seated, MSW program. Boise State University offers its MSW program both on campus and fully online. BSU has primary statewide responsibility for Social Work programs with a shared responsibility with ISU for programs in Region 5 and 6. Given Southeast Idaho's student base of first generation students and face-to-face learning styles, a fully online program offered to Idaho students will not adequately meet student learning needs within the State or the need for qualified professionals within our profession and community. We are proposing an option for students which will be based on quality, face-to-face interactions with intense faculty supervision and contact.

IMPACT

The enrollment in other programs at ISU will not be impacted. Students who earn a BA in Social Work from ISU typically go on to gain their masters from another

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH, AND STUDENT AFFAIRS
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

institution which creates hardship in terms of expense and travel. With a local program, students will be able to concentrate their time on study and remain engaged in the local community while earning their degree. An MSW program at ISU would offer BA level students an alternative to traveling or enrolling in an online program to earn their graduate degrees.

ISU proposes to charge a professional fee consistent with Board Policy V.R.3.b.iv. at \$200 per semester. Total credit hours for completion of the program are 60 graduate credits for the traditional two-year program and 45 graduate credits (including 12 field credits) for the advanced standing program. Student fees are necessary to cover specialized accreditation fees and costs associated with the field practicum.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – Proposal for the Master in Social Work

Page 5

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

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. This policy provides the criteria that must be met in order to designate a professional fee for a Board approved academic program. This includes programs which lead to credential or licensure, requires accreditation, entails extraordinary program costs, and aligns with traditional academic offerings of the institution. Based on the information provided in the proposal, staff finds that the request to assess the professional fee meets policy requirements.

ISU's request to create a new Master of Social Work is consistent with their Statewide Program Responsibilities and their Five-year Plan for Delivery of Academic Programs in Region V and VI. Consistent with Board Policy III.Z, BSU has the statewide program responsibility for Master of Social Work with a shared responsibility with ISU in Regions V and IV.

The following represents Social Work programs being offered by public postsecondary institutions:

Institution	Program Title	CIP Code	Degree Level	Location(s)	Regional/Statewide	Method of Delivery
ISU	Social Work	44.0701	BA	ISU Campus	Regional	Hybrid
BSU	Social Work	44.0701	BA	Boise Twin Falls	Regional	Traditional
BSU	Social Work	44.0701	MSW	Boise	Statewide	Traditional and On-line

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH, AND STUDENT AFFAIRS
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

BSU	Social Work	44.0701	MSW	Lewiston Coeur d'Alene Twin Falls	Statewide	Traditional
LCSC	Social Work	44.0701	BA, BS	LEW/CDA	Regional	classroom
NIC	Social Work	44.0701	AA	Coeur d'Alene	Regional	Traditional
CSI	Social Work	44.0701	AA	CSI Campus	Regional	Traditional with some portion avail online

The proposal went through the program review process and was recommended for approval by the Council on Academic Affairs and Programs (CAAP) on November 17, 2016 and to the Board's Instruction, Research, and Student Affairs (IRSA) committee on December 1, 2016.

Board staff recommends approval.

BOARD ACTION

I move 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.

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes _____ No _____

I move 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.

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes _____ No _____

THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH AND STUDENT AFFAIRS
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

SUBJECT

Dual Credit Work Group Recommendations

REFERENCE

October 2016 Board was provided with the initial recommendations of the Dual Credit workgroup.

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

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

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

At its February 2016 meeting, the State Board's Instruction, Research, and Student Affairs (IRSA) Committee asked Board staff to assemble a 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.

In close consultation with State Department of Education staff, the substantive focus of the work was divided into three categories: teachers, courses and administrative procedures. On average, each of the three groups met approximately weekly over five weeks to develop their recommendations. The recommendations were discussed among Board and Department staff, distilled down to one set of recommendations, and then returned to the workgroup members for their approval. The recommendations are an amalgamation of the three subcommittees' recommendations.

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

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

The recommendations were brought before the Board as an information item and discussion item at the October 2016 Board meeting.

The recommendations include:

1. Providing scholarships/incentives for current high school teachers who want to take the necessary courses to be certified to teach dual credit courses.
2. For those students who take academic dual credit courses, make the General Education Matriculation (GEM) framework, defined in Board Policy III.N. General Education, the focus.

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH AND STUDENT AFFAIRS
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

3. Requiring institutions and high schools to work jointly to identify alternatives to commercial text books, especially for GEM courses.
4. Encouraging the institutions to offer more evening, summer, and online courses/programs specific to dual credit credentialing.
5. Standardizing more meaningful intake processes and orientations for both post-secondary faculty and the approved high school faculty.
6. Standardizing the site visit process by which high school dual credit teachers are evaluated. Include a requirement that building administrators be notified of site visits prior to the classroom visit.
7. Identifying each institution's minimum requirements for an instructor to teach dual credit sorted by institution and discipline, and post this information in a single location.
8. Creating a standard template for voluntary use by districts and institutions regarding methods and levels of compensation processes and amounts for dual credit teachers.
9. Providing a state sponsored one or two day statewide institute for dual credit instructors to learn more about guidelines, policy requirements and changes, and other relevant matters.
10. Identifying who approves applicants to teach dual credit courses, how applicants are approved, and post this information in a centralized location.
11. Gathering from the institutions their respective hiring practices for dual credit instructors and posting this information in a centralized location.
12. Administering through the Board office, the dual credit enrollment participant survey.

IMPACT

The adoption and implementation of these recommendations offers an opportunities to provide consistency and transparency of processes; generate greater efficiencies, such as the streamlining and centralization of certain administrative functions; 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.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – Dual Credit Workgroup Recommendations	Page 5
Attachment 2 – REL Northwest Research Report	Page 7

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations 1 and 4 reference “certification” or “credentialing” for dual credit teachers. There is currently no state certificate or credential required to teach dual credit courses in a secondary setting other than the standard teacher certifications required for elementary or secondary teachers. Board Policy III.Y. Advanced Opportunities requires instructors (teachers) teaching dual credit to meet the academic requirements for faculty and instructors teaching at a postsecondary institution or provisions must be made to ensure instructors are

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH AND STUDENT AFFAIRS
DECEMBER 15, 2016**

capable of providing quality college level instruction through ongoing support and professional development. The ongoing support and professional development is determined by the institution offering/transcripting the credits.

Recommendations 7, 10, and 11 all pertain to identifying institutions' requirements for instructors (e.g. hiring practices, approval of teachers/applicants) and providing that information in a central location, which could be combined into a single recommendation. Variations on the recommendations could be implemented through amendments to Board Policy III.Y. or through incentives to encourage changes in institution policies regarding textbooks and teachers for dual credit courses.

Reginal Education Laboratory (REL) Northwest researched Dual Credit in Idaho between the 2011-12 and 2014-15 school years. The report titled, "Getting Ahead With Dual Credit: Dual-Credit Participation, Outcomes, and Opportunities in Idaho" is attached. This research report may be important to future Dual Credit discussion in Idaho.

BOARD ACTION

I move to direct Board and Institution staff to develop recommendations and implantation timelines in alignment with the Dual Credit Workgroup recommendations and bring back for Board consideration at a later date.

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes _____ No _____

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK