



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

**STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
August 9-10, 2017
Idaho State University
Pond Student Union Building Ballroom
1065 South 8th Avenue, Bldg. 14
Pocatello, Idaho**

A regularly scheduled meeting of the State Board of Education was held August 9-10, 2017 at Idaho State University in Pocatello, Idaho.

Present:

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

Andrew Scoggin (except where noted)
Don Soltman
Richard Westerberg
Sherri Ybarra, State Superintendent

Absent:

Wednesday, August 9, 2017

PLANNING, POLICY & GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS (PPGA)

1. Idaho State University (ISU) Annual Progress Report and Tour

The Board met at Idaho State University in the Pond Student Union Building, Ballroom in Pocatello, Idaho at 10:00 am (MDT). President Vailas welcomed members of the Board to the campus of Idaho State University and then escorted Board members and staff on a tour of the ISU campus. The Simplot Decision Center within the Business Administration building was the first stop on the tour. Dr. Corey Schou, Associate Dean of the College of Business, shared with the Board an update on Idaho State University's Informatics Research Institute. From there, Board members toured ISU's Measurement and Control Engineering Research Center (MCERC) with Associate Professor Dr. Chad Pope. Board members then travelled to the newly named Eames Advanced Technical Education and Innovation Complex (Eames Complex) for a presentation by the Dean of the Idaho State University College of Technology, Scott Rasmussen, on the relationship between ISU's College of Technology and Research. The final stop on the tour was the Idaho Accelerator Center (IAC) where Director of Technical Operation, Jon L. Stoner, shared with the Board recent updates and advancements of the IAC. Board members returned to the Student Union Building at 12:00 pm (MDT) where they recessed for a lunch hosted by Idaho State University in the Wood River Room.

The Board reconvened in the Idaho State University Pond Student Union Building, Ballroom for regular business. Board President, Dr. Linda Clark, welcomed everyone and called the meeting to order at 1:00 pm (MDT). She then extended appreciation from the Board and staff to Idaho State University for its hospitality.

BOARDWORK

1. Agenda Review/Approval

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Soltman/Hill): . To approve the agenda as submitted. The motion carried 7-0. Mr. Scoggin was absent from voting.

2. Minutes Review / Approval

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Soltman/Hill): To approve the minutes from the June 14-15, 2017 regular Board meeting, and July 5, 2017 Special Board meeting as submitted. The motion carried 7-0. Mr. Scoggin was absent from voting.

3. Rolling Calendar

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Soltman/Westerberg): To set August 15-16, 2018 as the date and Pocatello as the location for the August 2018 regularly scheduled Board meeting. The motion carried 7-0. Mr. Scoggin was absent from voting.

Prior to the start of the Work Session, Dr. Clark thanked Idaho State University (ISU) President Dr. Art Vailas for the morning's tour and congratulated him on ISU's progress to date. Dr. Vailas then requested a moment of personal privilege to announce his retirement from Idaho State University. Board President, Dr. Linda Clark, thanked Dr. Vailas for his years of service and accepted his retirement. She then requested Board members Richard Westerberg and Emma Atchley represent the Board on the ISU Presidential Search Committee and appointed Board member Richard Westerberg as committee chair.

Dr. Clark then shared with Board members and guests Lewis-Clark State College (LCSC) President Dr. Tony Fernandez's announcement a day earlier of his retirement from LCSC. Dr. Clark then requested Board members Don Soltman and Debbie Critchfield represent the Board on the LCSC Presidential Search Committee and appointed Board member Don Soltman as committee chair. All questions related to the ISU and LCSC Presidential searches are to be directed to the Board's Legislative Affairs and Communications Officer, Mr. Blake Youde.

WORKSESSION

A. State Board of Education – Strategic Plan – Goal 1

This item was provided in the agenda materials as an information item.

Goal 1 of the Board's Strategic Plan is **A Well Educated Citizenry** - Idaho's P-20 educational system will provide opportunities for individual advancement across Idaho's diverse population.

This goal was developed in part in recognition of the value of a highly educated citizenry to the democratic ideal identified in the state constitution and the economic benefit to the state of having an educated workforce, but also the value of a quality education to the individual and an individual quality of life. Objectives identified to move toward the broader goal focus on equitable access, adult learner re-integration into the system, educational attainment (progression through the system), and quality of the education.

Board President, Dr. Linda Clark, introduced the item by sharing with Board members her desire to engage Board members in a discussion of the current strategic plan and to review each Goal to over the next few months to ensure the Board's strategic plan is being communicated in such a way to be easily understood and accessible to stakeholders and the general public. Dr. Clark then turned the item over to Board Vice President Debbie Critchfield to lead the discussion. Ms. Critchfield opened the discussion by stating the goals on their own are great goals, however, she questions if the goals become lost when combined together in the Board's strategic plan. The Board's Chief

Financial Officer, Mr. Chet Herbst, Chief Planning and Policy Officer, Ms. Tracie Bent, and Director of Research, Mr. Carson Howell, were on hand to answer questions from Board members during the discussion. The Board's Chief Academic Officer, Dr. Randall Brumfield, was absent from the discussion due to his attendance at a State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO) conference in Minneapolis, MN. He was represented today by the Board's Academic Affairs Program Manager, Ms. Patty Sanchez.

The Board's Chief Planning & Policy Officer, Ms. Tracie Bent, shared with the Board the timing for any proposed changes to the strategic plan. She stated Goal 1 would be reviewed during this Board meeting, Goal 2 would be reviewed during the October Board meeting, and Goal 3 would be reviewed during the December Board meeting. Initial approval of a new strategic plan or any changes would also occur during the December Board meeting with final approval being granted at the February Board meeting. Board member Mr. Richard Westerberg asked if this is a rewrite of the entire plan or if this is an opportunity to make adjustments and corrections as needed. He stated the proposed format would not work well to accommodate a full rewrite of the plan. Dr. Clark responded the intent was to review the current goals and refine as needed, not to rewrite the strategic plan. Mr. Westerberg then stated his experience that items are typically added to a plan rather than removed and that it is his desire for the plan to become more concise and policy in nature with fewer key performance indicators and that he would like to see the plan shortened.

Ms. Bent shared with Board members the struggle over the years with the need to balance the plan to accommodate the entire system with a more detailed and actionable plan. She continues the intent is not for a rewrite, but rather to find a balance between the Board's plan and the ability for institutions to align their strategic plans with the Boards. Dr. Clark expressed her desire for the plan to operate systematically on behalf of the system and that the plan be encompassed system wide.

At this time, the Board began the discussion around Goal 1 of the strategic plan with Board member Mr. Don Soltman stating the need to define the system's parameters as either a P-20 or K-20 system. Board member Dr. David Hill then stated his desire for the goal to incorporate in some way those items outside of simply educating the citizens – outcomes that are not strictly academic. In his opinion, Goal 1 of the strategic plan does not seem to capture the full extent of what the Board intends to do. He continued, the strategic plan, as is, is more philosophical than practical. Dr. Clark responded the Goal should be not only across Idaho's diverse population but also across the various educational opportunities within the system itself. In response to Dr. Hill's prior statement, Ms. Bent informed Board members that Goal 2 focuses on innovation and economic development, Goal 3 focuses on data and informed decision making and Goal 4 an effective and efficient education system.

The Board's Executive Director, Mr. Matt Freeman, shared with Board members comments from stakeholders of the need for a five year plan over the education system. His response has been the strategic plan is the Board's five year plan. He continues that

somehow the Board's strategic plan does not resonate as the Board's five year plan and that this must be addressed. Dr. Hill asked the purpose of the Board's strategic plan and if the purpose is to satisfy the State of Idaho and its process or the goals of the Board and that the two should be consistent. In response, Dr. Clark asked if it would be appropriate for the Board to develop two documents, one that is shortened and concise for the Board's operational requirements, and one meeting the requirements of the state. Mr. Westerberg asked if the government's focus is on the performance indicators more than the objectives. Ms. Bent responded there are two parts to the state requirements; a strategic plan which must include the mission and vision, goals and objectives, performance measures and benchmarks. The second requirement is for the agency to submit reports on the performance measures. Mr. Westerberg expressed his support for one plan satisfying requirements of both the Board and state agencies. Dr. Clark then added her understanding of what Dr. Hill had proposed which was to produce two separate documents. One to meet the requirements set forth by the State of Idaho and one, more condensed document identifying the Board's operational requirements. Board member Emma Atchley added her belief the work of the Governor's Higher Education Task Force could inform the Board's strategic plan. She states her hesitancy to firm up or make changes to the plan until after the recommendations of the Governor's Higher Education Task Force have been made. Mr. Freeman then reminded Board members the primary call of the Governor's Higher Education Task Force is achieving the State's 60% Goal. He continues the Board's conversation today and the Governor's Higher Education Task Force are not mutually exclusive and that the work of the task force is one part of the Board's strategic plan.

Dr. Hill then proposed a rewrite of Goal 1 of the Board's strategic plan to be *"Idaho's population have opportunity to achieve the level of education they desire for their fulfillment"* effectively changing the focus from the system to the population.

At this time, Mr. Westerberg stepped away from the meeting for a media interview.

Dr. Hill continued by stating his belief that the Board needs to shift its focus towards how the system serves the individual and allows for individual opportunity. Board member Atchley stated her agreement. Dr. Clark added her support and stated the Board's current strategic plan does not include an area or focus on alternative opportunities within the system (Associate Degrees, Certificates, Certifications, etc.). Dr. Clark then asked if the missing piece of the objective for a well-educated citizenry is an objective identifying a robust system allowing for broad access to a variety of educational opportunities. Dr. Hill added the purpose of the strategic plan is to be forward looking and that the Board must recognize this shift and the need for the system to serve the individual. Dr. Clark then addressed Board member Atchley and her work as co-chair of the Governor's Higher Education Task Force Access and Affordability sub-committee. Ms. Atchley responded the sub-committee was currently looking into developing a statewide delivery system and that this should be incorporated into the Board's strategic plan. Ms. Bent added in response to Board member Atchley's comment that it may be necessary for Board members to take a step backwards and begin their discussion around the Board's mission and vision statement before discussing the goals. She continued that much of what the

Board is discussing today aligns more closely with the mission and vision statement. Ms. Critchfield then asked how many recommendations came from the Governor's Higher Education Task Force Access and Affordability sub-committee. Ms. Atchley responded a total of three with a primary focus on a statewide digital campus available anywhere at any time.

At this time, Mr. Westerberg returned to the meeting.

Ms. Critchfield continued by proposing the objectives under Goal 1 be restated to encompass them all within one statement, eliminating the need to list each objective individually. Ms. Atchley proposed rewriting Object A of Goal 1 of the Board's strategic plan to read *"Idaho's diverse population has multiple opportunities for high quality education"*. Ms. Atchley continues that setting policy and advocating is one part of the Board's role, however this is limiting. Dr. Clark then suggested this term be eliminated from Objective A of Goal 1 of the Board's strategic plan. She continues, the purpose of Objective A is to increase access and not to set policy. Dr. Clark then proposed Objective A: Access be rewritten to read *"Increase access to Idaho's educational system for all Idahoans, regardless of socioeconomic status, age, or geographic location"*.

Dr. Clark then proposed Object B: Adult Learner Re-integration of Goal 1 be rewritten to read *"Increase options for re-integration of adult learners, including veterans, into the education system"*.

Board member Atchley then shared her opinion that Objective C: Higher Level of Educational Attainment should speak more towards the individual and proposed a rewrite that would read *"Increase successful progression of individual's through Idaho's educational system"*. Dr. Clark asked if Objective C not actually the State's 60% goal and that limiting this to individuals we are eliminating those individuals achieving certificates, etc. Ms. Atchley responded yes, however, the purpose of the objective is to define a system wide goal measuring an individual's progression through the system from Kindergarten on and that the Board should not articulate degrees and certificates in the same sense as they do the Board's goals. Mr. Freeman added Objective C could be reworded to include *"post-secondary educational attainment"* rather than education system. Dr. Clark expanded on this by proposing the addition of *"culminating in successful progression through the system, resulting in a qualification, certificate or degree"* to the end of Objective C. Dr. Hill added that as written, Objective C begs the question 'what is success'. Ms. Atchley then asked if, as part of this discussion, the Board is rethinking how to define the 60% Goal? Dr. Clark responded other states are modifying their 60% Goals by eliminating the age band, and specifying the type of success achieved (certificates, associates, etc.) to be more than just completion of college. Dr. Hill responded Objective C needs to be general enough to accommodate changes while recognizing the full spectrum of possible outcomes. Board member Sherri Ybarra added the Board should also consider enabling options to increase the ability for citizens to successfully progress through Idaho's educational system, citing mastery based education and distance learning as two options for consideration.

Dr. Clark added the suggestions made today will be reviewed prior to the Board's discussion around Goal 2 of the strategic plan. Mr. Westerberg added he would refer the edits from the meeting today back to the Planning, Policy and Governmental Affairs (PPGA) for refinement and also prepare suggestions for all of the Goals of the strategic plan for Board members to review at the next meeting.

There were no additional comments or discussion from the Board.

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Hill): To authorize the Planning, Policy and Governmental Affairs Committee to respond to and approve changes requested from the Federal review of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) Consolidated State Plan. The motion carried 7-0. Mr. Scoggin was absent from voting.

B. Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) Consolidated State Plan Discussion

This item was provided in the agenda materials as an information item.

Ms. Critchfield introduced the item and reminded Board members the version of the Every Student Succeeds Act Consolidated State Plan (ESSA Plan) presented today would be the same plan Board members would be voting on during the second day of the Board meeting. She continues there have been changes since the last presentation of the ESSA Plan during the June Board meeting and that this draft incorporates the changes and updates made since the last Board meeting.

At this time, State Superintendent and Board member, Sherri Ybarra, invited key members of her staff to present the ESSA Plan to the Board. Present today were Chief Deputy Superintendent Mr. Pete Koehler, Director of Assessment and Accountability Ms. Karlynn Laraway, and Chief Policy Advisor Mr. Duncan Robb.

Ms. Laraway began the presentation with a step by step accounting of the major changes to Title I Part A of the ESSA Plan and the plans 'N' size. Board member Critchfield asked Ms. Laraway to explain to the Board the importance of the 'N' size. Ms. Laraway responded the 'N' size is used to identify students in a fair way and to especially identify those students in need of the greatest amount of supports. She continues the 'N' size will also help to mitigate instability from year to year. Board member Critchfield added the 'N' size was a frequent topic of discussion among stakeholder groups. Board member Atchley then asked the impact on schools not included in the 'N' size and how are these schools being measured? Ms. Laraway responded the Idaho State Department of Education (ISDE) recognizes these schools in the form of a report card, and that for reporting purposes, these schools are still being held accountable as long as their 'N' size for the reporting category remains at five. Board member Critchfield adds that schools not meeting the 'N' size receive state funds distributed to all schools but do not qualify for extra funding for additional title funds. Ms. Laraway adds the ISDE's Plan has proposed an 'N' size of 20 for all students and 10 for subgroups to combat this disparity. Dr. Clark

then added that Title I dollars are very limited and districts struggle to spread Title I funds to all of their K-12 schools and that because of this not all schools who are designated receive additional assistance due to limited availability of funds.

Ms. Laraway continued her presentation with an overview of the Plan's Long Term Goals. She states that under ESSA, states have the flexibility in setting what the law calls ambitious long term goals for academic achievement, graduation rate and increase in English Learners making progress towards English proficiency within the state determined timeline. Goals must also include measurements of interim progress. Stakeholder feedback focused on the need for high expectations of all students and goals that would be applicable to all schools. Board member Soltman then asked Board member Critchfield if, in her opinion, these goals would pass federal scrutiny. Ms. Critchfield responded her belief the Plan would pass and that based on the plans previously submitted, Idaho's plan is on the shorter side of the long term goals. She continues the intent is for the goals to be aggressive yet still achievable noting that by the year 2022 a student enrolling under this Plan would have already progressed through half of their educational career in Idaho. Superintendent Ybarra added that this is Idaho's plan based on stakeholder feedback and unless any portion of the plan violates the law she will not support changes from the national review. Dr. Clark added the only area she anticipates falling under scrutiny would be the Plan's lack of a single grade or rating for a district. Mr. Koehler added the state of Delaware's plan was the first to receive federal approval and that based on the review the message from the federal review is one of favoring state's designs and desires. Ms. Laraway continued the presentation with an overview of the Long Term Progress – English Language Proficiency goals.

At this time the Board recessed for a 20 minute break.

Ms. Laraway resumed the presentation by sharing with the Board the final Long Term and Interim Progress Goal – Graduation Rate to reduce the percentage of non-graduates by 75% over 6 years. She then continued the presentation with a discussion of the Plan's indicators. Board member Critchfield added that feedback from stakeholders showed the Board needed to be in a position to implement the plan during the current school year in order to begin reporting during the 2018/2019 school year. She also added that stakeholders requested the identification of both low performing and high performing schools and that in response, the identification of school's falling within the 90th percentile has been added to the current version of the plan.

At this time, Dr. Clark requested Mr. Koehler share with the Board what a non-Title I district or school might expect for funding based on the ISDE's Plan. Mr. Koehler responded school's designated as non-Title I that fall within the lowest 5% cannot expect to receive additional federal funds, however, there are funds set aside within the Superintendents budget to support these struggling schools in addition to mentorship and leadership programs provided through the ISDE.

Ms. Laraway continued her presentation of the ISDE's Plan with an update on the two areas of major change to the Plan based upon stakeholder feedback. She continues with

an overview of changes to Title II-A – Supporting Effective Instruction and that based upon a recent roundtable review of the plan with stakeholders the Plan includes an increased focus on state level activities on training for school leaders in Idaho’s evaluation framework and educator mentoring and coaching. The other significant change to the Plan based upon stakeholder feedback involves updates to Title IV-A – Student Support and Enrichment. Ms. Laraway continues this is a new program aimed at providing a well-rounded education supporting safe and healthy students and the effective use of technology. She states the ISDE has set aside approximately \$77,000 in support of this program. Mr. Koehler adds that within the Executive Branch, Title II and Title IV funds have been cut and that even with the reinstatement of some Title IV funds, it will be a struggle to distribute enough funding to all those school districts qualifying for support in these areas. Dr. Clark add that it will be essential to distribute this information to school districts and boards as the loss of Title II funds will be felt state wide. Board member Critchfield then underscored the importance of the types of professional development available to educators and asked if there a plan in place to help districts sift through requirements for this and if it is possible for the ISDE to help districts with the management of these decisions.

Ms. Karlynn concluded the presentation by sharing with Board members the next steps in the coming weeks. She states the Plan will be submitted to the Governor’s Office for review on August 12, 2017 with final submittal to the U.S. Department of Education on September 18, 2017. The U.S. Department of Education allows 120 days to review the plan. The ISDE will have 15 days to respond to feedback provided by the U.S. Department of Education’s review. Ms. Laraway states that during the next several months, the ISDE will work with their technical staff to finalize the data collection requirements and publish business rules for how the data collected will be used in accountability calculations. She adds the ISDE will also be collaborating with Board members and staff to develop a new report card and data dashboard system scheduled to go live in fall of 2018.

The ISDE’s Chief Policy Advisor, Mr. Duncan Robb, added the time allowed by the U.S. Department of Education for the ISDE to respond is a very short amount of time to respond on a plan that took more than 1 ½ years to develop. He continues that if major changes are requested at the Federal level, the ISDE will push back.

Board member Critchfield adds that based on the available comments on other plans submitted, the Board of Institutes Ranking of other plans used 3 metrics by which they rated plans, strong, medium and weak. One item considered during the review was plans was clear and easy to rank. She continues by sharing with Board members that a data dashboard qualified as weak in their system and does not allow parents and educators to make informed decisions about their school. To date, the ISDE’s Plan includes a data dashboard with no summative rating. Ms. Critchfield states her belief that as the Board implements a new plan and accountability framework it would be possible to build trust again with districts and to institute a new summative rating plan. She continues it would be wise for the Board to consider developing some type of summative system in the near future.

Mr. Westerberg then asked if the Federal review were to come back with substantive changes, would a special board meeting be required to approve those changes. He questioned the ability for the Plan to pass review by both the ISDE and the Board's Planning, Policy and Governmental Affairs (PPGA) Committee for final Board approval within 15 days. Superintendent Ybarra responded with assurances that processes are in place to enable a quick response. Mr. Westerberg then suggests PPGA committee be granted the authority to respond to any changes made in response to the Federal review lieu of a special board meeting.

Dr. Clark extended her appreciation to Board member Critchfield, Superintendent Ybarra and her team on their work finalizing the state's ESSA Consolidated Plan in such a short period of time. Dr. Clark also highlighted the benefit of stakeholder input in the process and development of this plan.

The Board meeting recessed for the evening at 3:38 pm (MDT).

Thursday, August 10, 2017 8:00 a.m., Idaho State University, Pond Student Union Building, Ballroom, Pocatello, Idaho.

Board President Dr. Linda Clark called the meeting to order at 8:00am (MDT) for regularly scheduled business. Board Member Scoggin joined the meeting at 8:00 am (MDT). There were no participants for Open Forum.

Board member Emma Atchley requested a moment of personal privilege to thank Board members, staff, and the institutions for their support during her 2016-2017 term as Board president.

Idaho State University student, Jessica Sargent, President of the Associated Body of Idaho State University then addressed the Board. Ms. Sargent shared with the Board a history of her time at Idaho State University She continued by sharing with Board members her support and admiration for ISU and that the university is a gem tucked away in Pocatello. She concluded her presentation by thanking President Vailas for his work growing and developing ISU during the term of his presidency.

Board President Clark then requested unanimous consent to remove Item 3 of the State Department of Education's agenda. There were no objections.

CONSENT AGENDA

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Soltman): To approve the consent agenda as presented. The motion carried 8-0.

Business Affairs & Human Resources – Section I Human Resources

1. TIAA – Retirement Plan Committee Appointments

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Soltman): By unanimous consent to approve the appointment of Mark Lliteras and Brian Sagendorf as members of the State Board of Education Retirement Plan Committee. The motion carried 8-0.

Business Affairs & Human Resources – Section II Finance

2. Boise State University – License Agreement between Springer Customer Service Center and LYRASIS.

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Soltman): By unanimous consent to approve the request by Boise State University to enter into a five-year license agreement with LYRASIS for approximately 2,242 journal titles published by Springer Nature in substantive conformance to the form provided in Attachment 1. The motion carried 8-0.

3. University of Idaho – Easement – McCall Campus Property Easement Access – 2nd Phase – Six Private Lot Owners.

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Soltman): By unanimous consent to approve the request by the University of Idaho enter into easements with the adjoining private lot owners, in substantial conformance to the proposed easements in Attachment 1 to the Board Materials; and also authorize the Vice President for Infrastructure to execute the final easement documents and all other documents necessary to complete the transaction as described in the materials presented to the. The motion carried 8-0.

Instruction, Research and Student Affairs (IRSA)

4. Programs and Changes Approved by the Executive Director – Quarterly Report
This item was provided in the agenda materials as an information item.

5. State General Education Committee Appointments

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Soltman): By unanimous consent to appoint Ms. Lori Barber, representing Eastern Idaho Technical College to the General Education Committee effective immediately. The motion carried 8-0.

6. College of Eastern Idaho – Program Approval Request – Associate of Arts – Liberal Studies

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Soltman): By unanimous consent to approve the request by College of Eastern Idaho to create a new Associate of Arts program in Liberal Arts as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried 8-0.

Planning, Policy and Governmental Affairs

7. President Approved Alcohol Permits
This item was provided in the agenda materials as an information item.
8. Indian Education Committee Appointments

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Soltman): By unanimous consent to approve the appointment of Mr. Jason Ostrowski, representing the College of Southern Idaho to the Idaho Indian Education Committee effective immediately and expiring June 30, 2018. The motion carried 8-0.

State Department of Education (SDE)

9. Adoption of Curricular Materials and Related Instructional Materials

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Soltman): By unanimous consent to approve the adoption of curricular materials and related instructional materials for K-12 and Humanities, 9-12 Computer Applications, K-12 Health and Wellness, K-12 Physical Education, K-12 Social Studies, and 6-12 Mathematics Open Educational Resources as recommended by the Curricular Materials Selection Committee as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried 8-0.

10. Professional Standards Commission – Boise State University; Teacher Endorsement Programs Review

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Soltman): By unanimous consent to approve the Professional Standards Commission recommendation and to approve the Exceptional Child Generalist new pathway to teaching endorsement program offered through Boise State University. The motion carried 8-0.

AND

M/S (Critchfield/Soltman): By unanimous consent to accept the Professional Standards Commission recommendation and to approve the Early Childhood Special Education new pathway to teaching endorsement program offered through Boise State University. The motion carried 8-0.

11. Professional Standards Commission – University of Idaho; Teacher Endorsement Programs Review

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Soltman): By unanimous consent to accept the Professional Standards Commission recommendation and to conditionally approve the Literacy teaching endorsement program offered through University of Idaho. The motion carried 8-0.

AND

M/S (Critchfield/Soltman): By unanimous consent to accept the Professional Standards Commission recommendation and to conditionally approve the Family and Consumer Sciences teaching endorsement program offered through University of Idaho. The motion carried 8-0.

12. Bias and Sensitivity Committee Appointments

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Soltman): By unanimous consent to appoint Region 4 school board member Teresa Berry to the Bias and Sensitivity Committee. The motion carried 8-0.

PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS (PPGA)

2. Idaho Career Technical Education Annual Report
This item was provided in the agenda materials as an information item.

State Administrator for Idaho Career Technical Education (ICTE), Mr. Dwight Johnson, presented his agency's annual report to the Board. Mr. Johnson shared with Board members that attendance at the recent ICTE Annual conference exceeded 1,000

attendees, the largest in ICTE history. He continued support for Career Technical Education at the national level has also seen overwhelming bipartisan support in recent years.

Mr. Johnson then shared with Board members the final recommendations from the Governor's Workforce Development Task Force. He states the four themes coming out of the task force recommendations are Partnerships (Industry, Education and Government), Capacity Building, Career Advising and Communications.

Mr. Johnson continued his presentation by sharing with Board members the core mission of ICTE which is to connect students to real careers, provide a talent pipeline for Idaho's businesses, and make education meaningful through applied learning. He states the current workforce and skill shortage is projected to worsen with an overall workforce shortage of 49,000 individuals and that ICTE is responding to this projected shortfall by working to attract more students in to the CTE pipeline through better career advising, expanding ICTE's capacity to attract and train students and continuing to improve the quality of programs offered. Mr. Johnson then shared with Board member's ICTE's proposed Legislative change to allow state funds and resources to begin funding CTE programs in the 7th grade. He states this change would serve a dual purpose of continuing to attract students to CTE fields as well as providing content and context to a student's 8th Grade Plan.

Mr. Johnson continued his presentation by sharing with the Board ICTE's expanded career and technical programs and development of the new ICTE Teacher Pipeline model, InSpiRE Educate. He states teachers participating in the new InSpiRE Educate model will incur no out of pocket expenses for their participation in the program. Mr. Johnson continues CTE instructors will attend two (2) one week academies plus an additional Saturday per month in trainings to achieve their endorsement. Board member Critchfield asked if other states have used a similar model, to which Mr. Johnson responded in the affirmative. Dr. Clark then asked how long the program has been in existence, to which Mr. Johnson responded the program has just launched. Dr. Clark then asked if mentors are assigned through school districts. To which Mr. Johnson responded mentors are assigned through the University of Idaho. Board member Critchfield then asked of the cost to teachers to participate in the program, to which Mr. Johnson responded there is not out of pocket expenses for a teacher's participation. Dr. Clark then shared with Board members the Governor's Higher Education Task Force K-20 Pipeline subcommittee was interested in the model shared today and requested Mr. Johnson provide the cost per participant to the Board.

Mr. Johnson continued his presentation with ICTE's recommendation to allow students to begin apprenticeships at the age of 16, two years earlier than the current age requirement of age 18. He states the Boise Independent School District will be launching a new apprenticeship program for the 2017/2018 school year offering students apprenticeship opportunities in the HVAC, Plumbing and Electrical trades. The Boise Independent School has engaged unions of each of these trades to provide training for the

apprenticeship program. Students who enrolled in this apprenticeship program will have to ability to move their apprenticeship hours earned upon graduation from high school to an accepting business where they can then finish their apprenticeship. Mr. Johnson then shared with the Board ICTE's support for this program and indicates he would like to see legislation put forward supporting a similar program for statewide implementation. This item concludes Mr. Johnson's presentation to the Board at which time he stood for questions.

Board member Hill asked if, from the Work Force Development Task Force point of view, the overarching recommendation is for the state to implement a Work Force Development Strategy with accompanying funds. Dr. Hill then complimented Idaho's Career Technical Education program as one the Board should be proud of. He finished by thanking Mr. Johnson and his staff for their work on the Work Force Development Task Force report. Dr. Hill continues by sharing with Board members his strong support of public engagement and urges the Board to increase their use of technology to reach out to students while tagging the information sent to the type of education a student is interested in. He stresses the importance of the Board being in the mobile domain and not limiting their outreach to websites and social media only.

Mr. Freeman then asked if the first recommendation of the Work Force Development Task Force was to reconstitute the Work Force Development Council and if appointments for this council are in process? Dr. Hill responded in the affirmative, stating a transition team has been appointed and their first meeting scheduled for August 16th of this year.

Dr. Clark then asked Mr. Johnson clarification on the 8th Grade Plan, noting he had indicated proposed changes in content and context. She then asked if ICTE envisions the requirement for the development of the 8th Grade Plan would be an outgrowth of the CTE course students take during middle school and if ICTE has a vision for a suggested framework for what the plans may look like. Mr. Johnson responded his staff will be reviewing these requirements and developing them over the next year. He states the intent is for greater exposure to parents and students in the 7th Grade, before students enter the 8th Grade and begin forming their 8th Grade Plan.

Dr. Clark then asked of ICTE's courses provided through the Idaho Digital Learning Academy (IDLA) and potential limitations for IDLA to deliver CTE courses and if Mr. Johnson and his staff have further defined their expectations for how many Career & Technical Education courses can be delivered through IDLA. Mr. Johnson responded ICTE has started offering classes through IDLA that can be easily delivered, for example, Fundamentals of Health Care. He continues the struggle is with those courses that would be difficult to deliver online, for example Introduction to Welding and that ICTE is in the process of exploring highbred models utilizing IDLA for the lecture portion and regional high school technical centers for the hands on portion.

There were no further questions or comments from the Board.

3. College of Eastern Idaho Taxing District Expansion

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Atchley): To approve the Resolution set forth in Attachment 1 recommending the addition of territory made up of the boundaries of Bingham County to the current territory of the College of Eastern Idaho community college district. The motion carried 8-0.

There were no comments or questions from the Board.

4. 2018 Legislation

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Soltman): To approve the proposed legislation in substantial conformance to the form provided in Attachment 2 with the amendment to Item 10 – Advanced Opportunities as discussed today and to authorize the Executive Director to add an additional piece of legislation regarding distribution of liquor funds to the four community colleges as discussed today and to make additional changes as necessary as the legislation moves forward through the legislative process. The motion carried 8-0.

Board member Critchfield introduced the item and shared with Board members the addition to the item before the Board today of the request by Idaho's Community Colleges for an increase in state funding from \$600,000 to \$800,000 to include the recently approved College of Eastern Idaho.

Superintendent Ybarra then asked if the proposed Item 10 Advanced Opportunity legislation could limit student access to advanced opportunities or dual credit funds. The Board's Chief Planning & Policy Officer, Ms. Tracie Bent responded the legislation was not designed to limit the courses a student could take, but rather to make sure the courses offered are more focused and students are more informed of the impact of taking specific courses. Ms. Bent continues by acknowledging concerns expressed over this legislation and suggests an amendment to the legislation requiring students receive advising on how dual credits could be used towards a degree or certificate. She continues the intent is not to limit what students can do, but rather to consider how their choices could impact their progress through the post-secondary system. Board Member Critchfield then asked Ms. Bent how the proposed change could impact the motion before the Board today. Ms. Bent responded the change could be made in motion. Dr. Clark then clarified for Board members the section in question as Section 4 requiring courses be designated as a General Education course. Ms. Ybarra then stated her support for a modification of the language per Ms. Bent's suggestion. She shares her concerns with the legislation as it stands now and her desire for the language and intent to be clearly understood by districts. The Board's Executive Director, Mr. Matt Freeman, then addressed the Board stating his belief the item is an advising and planning issue and suggest the addition of

language requiring 8th Grade Plans be signed by the student, parent, and counselor or advisor. He also states a requirement for an annual update of the plan could help with the advising portion. Mr. Freeman continues by sharing with Board members the main concern the legislation is trying to address is eliminating students from taking dual credit courses that do not benefit their future education endeavors and cost the state money. Mr. Westerberg stated his agreement but questions how to move forward since all legislative ideas are being voted on today. Dr. Clark responded it will be necessary for Board to have a special meeting in August to review legislative ideas.

Ms. Ybarra then requested clarification of the legislation listed on page 39, Item 11 – School District Employee Personnel Files. Ms. Bent responded the purpose of the proposed legislation is to provide additional clarification on those items required to be maintained in an employee’s personnel file. She continues the legislation was drafted based on feedback from the Board’s review of teacher evaluations. Superintendent Ybarra then asked if the proposed legislation needed to be more specific in the language of what is to be retained. Dr. Clark responded with her belief that code is not the proper place for this level of instruction and expressed her discomfort with placing these instructions in code. Dr. Clark then suggested the evaluation framework may be a more appropriate place to make these changes. At this time Superintendent Ybarra requested her Chief Deputy Superintendent Mr. Pete Koehler and Director of Certification & Professional Standards Ms. Lisa Colon Durham come forward to address the Board. Ms. Colon Durham shares with Board members the primary request coming from districts is clarification on the requirement to maintain “everything used for a summative evaluation”. Mr. Koehler then added another item for consideration should be how long information is to be maintained in a personnel file and adds information maintained within a personnel file may be subject to public records requests. Mr. Koehler continues by stating his desire for the language around items required to be maintained be carefully written and clear. Dr. Clark then asked if he did not believe this could be done within the evaluation framework. Mr. Koehler confirms his belief this could be accomplished within the evaluation framework and hesitates having this information in code. Dr. Clark then added the intent of the proposed legislation is not to keep everything but only those materials used to establish evidence of meeting the requirements established within the framework. Ms. Bent then shared with the Board this is why it was decided to reference the evaluation framework in code, but not to place the requirements in code.

There were no further questions or comments from the Board.

5. Board Policy I.J. Use of Facilities – First Reading – Expansion of Alcohol on Campus

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Hill): To approve the first reading, with technical corrections, of changes to Board policy section I.J. as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried 7-1 with Mr. Westerberg voting nay.

Board member Critchfield introduced the item and invited University Presidents and counsel to present the proposed changes the Board would be considering today. Representing the University of Idaho were President Dr. Chuck Staben and University Counsel Mr. Kent Nelson. Representing Boise State University was Chief Operating Officer and Special Counsel Mr. Kevin Satterlee.

Mr. Satterlee introduced the item stating Boise State University (BSU) approached the changes to Board policy to create the right atmosphere around BSU events. He continued the intent behind the proposed changes is to streamline items brought to the Board for approval and specifically to allow pre-game activities to be conducted in an organized and managed fashion. Mr. Nelson added this is the first time the Board has been presented with a concrete proposal of this type. He adds the institutions do not wish to find themselves in a position where they are policing attendees and the proposed changes to Board policy dovetail well with city ordinances allowing open containers in the areas around home football games.

Board member Critchfield brought to the Board's attention the proposed changes were addressing two sections of the policy; one dealing with venue expansion and the other tailgating. She continues the Planning Policy and Governmental Affairs (PPGA) Committee held discussions around both items and that the PPGA committee is not comfortable with the tailgating portion of the proposal. She then states the policy is presented in a fashion where depending on the position of the Board all, part or none of the policy could move forward.

President Staben the shared with the Board that tailgating is something that occurs at all four of the state's four year colleges and universities. He acknowledges the use of alcohol on Board property is against Board policy and states this puts the institutions in legal jeopardy. He continues it is his desire for the Board to be very clear that tailgating is not allowed on Board property or that it be acknowledged and addressed in policy. Dr. Staben continues the proposal before the Board today is a recognition of what is already occurring on campus. Dr. Clark asked if there were any proposed changes in the reporting requirements to the Board. Ms. Critchfield responded in the negative and states, if this policy does not move forward, then nothing changes and institutions will remain under the current, approved policy. Dr. Clark then asked of Dr. Staben if the ordinance passed at the Moscow City Council meeting the previous Monday had any potential impact on the request before the Board today. Dr. Staben responded the passing of the ordinance by the Moscow City Council makes the situation at UI similar to that at BSU where the city will not enforce open container laws in the vicinity of facilities on game days. He then states this does not address the issue of the university being in violation of Board policy when fans are tailgating on Board property. Dr. Staben continues Moscow City Council passing the recent ordinance would create a very minor modification to the policy and a majority of items will still be enforced; underage drinking, obvious drunken behavior, etc.

At this time, Board member Critchfield requested the Boards general counsel, Ms. Jenifer Marcus come forward to answer questions from the Board. Mr. Satterlee then clarified for Board members that items in Subsection-C specifically Pages 9-11 are BSU's primary

concern and that from BSU's perspective the addition of Subsection-D to the policy is something BSU can work with whether or not it is approved. Board member Scoggin then asked Mr. Satterlee if, in his opinion, BSU is abiding by Board policy when it comes to tailgating. Mr. Satterlee responded BSU feels tailgating is not addressed in Board policy and that BSU is handling the issue appropriately on campus. Board member Critchfield then asked the Board's counsel, Ms. Jenifer Marcus, to provide guidance on how the proposed changes impact Board policy. Ms. Marcus states the current policy clearly prohibits alcohol. She continues it is her understanding the institutions have stated alcohol consumption is not allowed during tailgating and that is now a matter of enforcement. Institutions state they are following Board policy and the matter before the Board today is how to enforce the policy. She continues institutions have been focusing on behavior and that inappropriate behaviors will be addressed, however, the institutions state they do not have the resources to confirm the personal behavior of all participants.

Board member Soltman then asked the University of Idaho, if the policy were approved not to include Section-D, what would be UI's response. Mr. Nelson responded the institution would not change from their current practice.

Ms. Atchley then stated her belief the addition to Subsection-C, Tab 5, Page 10 that "institutions may bring to the Board requests to seek approval to add new or renovated facilities to the approved locations list" to be too specific and suggests amending this item to read "seek approval to add or remove facilities from the approved locations list". Board member Atchley then asked Mr. Satterlee if he acknowledges tailgating activities on campus. Mr. Satterlee responded in the affirmative. Ms. Atchley then asked if alcohol is present at these tailgating events. Mr. Satterlee responded there is no Board approved tailgating occurring at BSU. Board member Scoggin then asked if tailgating activities are not approved or sanctioned by BSU then are they prohibited. Mr. Satterlee responded it is agreed there is tailgating on campus and there is alcohol on campus. Mr. Scoggin then requested clarification that alcohol consumption during tailgating on the BSU campus is prohibited by Board policy but is still occurring. Mr. Satterlee answered in the affirmative. He then states BSU's position that if the proposed policy passes as is, then BSU will continue to move forward per the policy. If the policy does not pass then BSU will continue to address the presence of alcohol during tailgating events as they have been.

Board member Westerberg then made note of the Board's current policy which provides provisions to shield families and children from alcohol consumption and service. He then asked why these provisions had been removed from the policy put forth to the Board today. Mr. Satterlee responded that as currently written, the policy requires sections of ticketed areas allowing alcohol and others that do not. He continues that event promoters will not sell sections in this manner and that the proposed policy provides alcohol in designates areas, but that seating would not be segregated in this way. Mr. Westerberg responded Mr. Satterlee had just described alcohol service at non-athletic events and he had understood the purpose of the proposed changes to the policy was to allow for non-petitioned alcohol service at athletic events, such as BSU's "Huddle". Mr. Satterlee responded alcohol service at NCAA athletic events was addressed under Section ii. Pre-game events, Subsection IV, and would require that no one under the legal drinking age

be admitted into the event unless under the direct supervision at all times of an attendee of legal drinking age. At this time Board member Atchley reminded Board members, this is the first reading of the proposed changes and the Board is allowed to edit the policy and continues the term “youth” should be updated to the legal definition of “minor” throughout the policy.

Board member Hill then shared with the Board he finds it intellectually dishonest for the Board to have a policy and then effectively wash their hands of how the policy is effecting the institutions. He adds the Boards role should be to recognize what the institutions and municipalities are having to deal with in relation to tailgating activities occurring on Board property and for the Board to manage what is happening. He adds his discomfort for the provisions in the proposed policy to shield families and children from alcohol consumption and feels this item requires further discussion by the Board.

Board member Scoggin then asked if the intent of the proposed changes would be to expand alcohol consumption rules to all NCAA events. Mr. Satterlee responded that in relation to BSU, the proposed policy would technically allow for an expansion to all NCAA events however, the requirement for a list of approved locations limits approval of alcohol service to pre-game football events and basketball games only. Board member Clark then asked if it would be appropriate to specifically identify pre-game football events and basketball games as the only NCAA events where alcohol service is to be provided. Mr. Satterlee responded in the affirmative. Mr. Scoggin then requested clarification the term “pre-game event” applied to football only, to which Mr. Satterlee responded in the affirmative. UI President Chuck Staben added that his institution typically does not sponsor any pre-game events for anything other than football and that he does not anticipate a change to this. Mr. Scoggin then requested confirmation that UI is comfortable with this to which President Staben responded in the affirmative. Dr. Clark then requested the same confirmation from BSU to which Mr. Satterlee responded in the affirmative. Mr. Scoggin then requested confirmation from BSU and UI that both institutions will, per the proposed changes, enforce the requirement that alcoholic beverages be held in an opaque container and that individuals would not be permitted to carry, for example, open containers of beer or alcohol. UI General Counsel Kent Nelson responded in the affirmative and states this policy would make it much easier to enforce this type of rule.

Board member Critchfield then shared with the Board the PPGA committees desire to recognize tailgating is occurring and to limit changes to the Board policy to venue expansion and specific pre-game events.

Board member Westerberg states he did not find anywhere in the policy where the proposed changes support the base mission of educating students. To this UI President Staben responded the ability to offer alcohol service during on campus events helps the institution to engage alumni and donors. At this time BSU President Bob Kustra joined President Staben and adds his institution experiences the same. Board member Westerberg then comments the proposed policy, as drafted, expands student’s access to alcohol on campus and goes beyond the original notion of entertaining alumni and donors.

Board member Scoggin then asked the institutions if eliminating the word “written” to the application is an attempt to imply that an oral application is sufficient. To this Mr. Satterlee responded in the negative stating current applications are electronic and do not require a paper submittal. To this Mr. Scoggin requested the addition of “written or electronic”. He then asks if invitations are sent orally to which Mr. Satterlee responded invitations are sent electronically and that the policy could be edited to include “written or electronic” to both.

Board member Scoggin then stated his agreement with Board member Westerberg’s concern the policy, as written, had the potential to expand student access to alcohol on campus. To this Board member Atchley responds the average students age is somewhere in the mid-20’s, far within the legal drinking age, however, she continues she would not want the Board to be perceived as encouraging underage drinking.

At this time, Board member Critchfield asked if it would be appropriate for the policy to be returned to the Board for a second first reading addressing the changes, additions, and deletions discussed today. The additions included at a prohibition from students entering the alcohol service areas and that alcohol service areas remain separate from non-alcohol service areas. It was the agreement of the Board to move forward with the changes requested today and for the policy to come back as a second reading.

There were no further questions or comments from the Board.

At this time the Board recessed for a short break returning at 10:15 am (MDT)

6. Board Policy IV. E. Division of Career Technical Education – First Reading – Definition of Existing Career Technical Education Program Types

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Hill): To approve the first reading of Board Policy IV.E. Career Technical Education as provided in Attachment 1. The motion carried 8-0.

Board member Critchfield introduced the item explaining to Board members the purpose of the item is to formalize definitions of existing Career Technical Education (CTE) program types to insure consistency statewide.

There were no further comments or questions from the Board.

7. Master Educator Premium – Final Standards, Scoring Rubrics and Templates

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Atchley): To approve the Master Teacher Premium Plan as outlined in Attachment 2, including the standards and characteristics specified in Attachment 5. The motion carried 8-0.

Board member Critchfield introduced the item, stating teacher's meeting a list of qualifications are eligible to apply for a \$4,000 premium that can be received each year and that the premium is paid directly to the teacher. She continues the 2016-17 school year the first year teachers could begin the process of gathering artifacts to assemble into their portfolio. Ms. Critchfield then shared with Board members the rubric for determination of being a master teacher is the most important part of the plan and that a positive vote today would allow the rubric to be shared with school districts and teachers to allow for them to know how teachers will be scored. She continues the State of Ohio's program was referenced frequently by committee members as they were assembling and forming the rubric. Board member Clark added teachers and stakeholders were very involved in the development of the rubric, meeting weekly during the development process. Board member Atchley then asked who reviews the rubrics and makes the final determination of a teacher's eligibility. Dr. Clark responded the recommendation will be for a peer review submitted at the state level and not the district level and that the Board will determine the final process.

At this time Board member Scoggin requested the amount of funding appropriated for this program per year. Dr. Clark responded the legislature has established a \$4,000 premium per teacher, however, it is not known how many teachers will qualify so the total available funding is still unknown. To this Mr. Scoggin asked if the legislature has identified a pool of money or if the funding is open ended. Dr. Clark responded a line item will need to be requested for the first year's payments. Ms. Critchfield then added the master teacher designation is open ended with no cap on the number of teachers who can qualify adding those who score accordingly on the rubric will be awarded the premium. She then reiterated Dr. Clark's comment that it will not be known how many teachers are eligible for the premium until teachers are able to begin to move through the process. Board member Soltman then stated his desire for the Board to request a funding pool from the legislature to avoid a situation similar to what is currently being experienced with Advanced Opportunities. Dr. Clark responded her belief the legislature would also like a pool from which the premiums could be awarded. She continues the rubric has been developed to a very high standard that is artifact based and stringent requiring a tremendous amount of effort on the part of educator's who wish to apply and that based on this she would not expect a large number of teacher's to apply.

At this time the Board's Communications and Legislative Affairs Officer, Mr. Blake Youde shared with Board members his conversations with a handful of legislators have resulted in the understanding the legislature will need to begin setting funding aside now for this program. He continues these legislators acknowledge the first two years of premium payments will be the highest dollar amount which will then begin to taper off in later years.

The Board's Chief Planning and Policy Officer, Ms. Tracie Bent then shared with Board the legislation, as currently written, does not cap the number of individuals and any

individual qualifying will receive the payment and that once available funds have been drawn down, the funds will come from the public school stabilization fund. She continues the legislation was written in such a manner the rubric is high enough that only a small majority of educators will qualify.

Board member Scoggin then asked if the program, as currently outlined, does not allow for a teacher to gain the mastery premium until three years after Board approval. Dr. Clark responded in the negative, stating the current school year is the first year. To this Mr. Scoggin questioned if the rubric could be retroactive. Board member Critchfield responded the legislation states Fiscal Year 2018 (FY18) as the first year money could be extended.

Board member Atchley then shared with Board members her conversations with teachers seeking information on the details of the plan and requests the Board act quickly to allow enough time for teachers to compile their artifacts and documentation. Dr. Clark added the plan must be shared with educators and school districts and requests the plan be provided on both the Board's and Idaho State Department of Education's websites and discussed at regional meetings.

Chief Deputy Superintendent for the Idaho State Department of Education (ISDE), Mr. Pete Koehle, then shared with Board members excerpts from Idaho State code Section 33-1004I specifying in addition to the minimum qualifications for a master educator designation, local school districts may develop and require additional qualifications and that local school districts may develop plans that recognize groups of teachers based on measurable student achievement goals aligned with the school districts continuous improvement plans. He continues this allows local school districts to develop their own plans following the State Board's rubric and that the Board would approve the district's plan. Mr. Koehler continues the Superintendent Ybarra has instructed her staff to begin looking into allocation of funds from the 2019-20 budget. He states the difficulty with this is not knowing how many teachers will qualify and that a feasibility study is under way to determine this. Dr. Clark then asked if a district does not elect to develop their own plan if the default will be the state's plan. Mr. Koehler responded in the affirmative. Dr. Clark then asked if the Board could expect to have plans submitted for approval over the coming months to which Ms. Bent responded the Bonneville school district has submitted their plan for Board approval.

Superintendent Ybarra then shared with Board members concerns and questions she has received in regards to the Master Teacher Premium, specifically comments from teachers and district leaders on the need for the rubric to be issued without delay. She also shares with the Board concerns she has received from as to the geographical make-up of the teachers on the committee developing the rubric. To this Dr. Clark responded that initially teachers from across the state were represented on the development committee, however, when the schedule was put out for the committee to meet every Friday until completion a majority of committee members fell away. Dr. Clark continues the final committee members came from the Treasure Valley and Twin Falls area, however, this was not the make-up when the committee had first started. Dr. Clark adds

the Idaho Education Association (IEA) and Idaho Association of School Administrators (IASA) were also both heavily involved.

Finally, Dr. Clark cautioned any “tweaks” to the plan may lead teachers to believe the bar is moving and to make any modifications to the plan during the 3 year timeline would be very problematic for teachers collecting their information. She continues the Board would need to be very strategic about when to make any modifications, if any, to the plan.

There were no further questions or comments from the Board.

8. Proposed Rule IDAPA 08.02.03.115 – Rules Governing Thoroughness – Data Collection.

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Hill): To approve changes to the proposed rule IDAPA 08.02.03.115, as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried 8-0.

There were no comments or questions from the Board.

9. Proposed Rule Docket 08-0401-1701, Rules Governing the Idaho Digital Learning Academy.

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Atchley): To approve changes to Proposed Rule Docket 08-0401-1701, as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried 8-0.

There were no comments or questions from the Board.

10. Proposed Rule Docket #08-0501-1701 – Rules Governing Seed Certification

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Soltman): To approve changes to proposed rule Docket 08-0501-1701, as presented in Attachment 1. The motion carried 7-0. Ms. Atchley recused herself from voting.

There were no comments or questions from the Board.

11. Proposed Rule Docket #47-0101-1701 – Rules Governing the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation – Incorporated by Reference – Field Service Policy Manual

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Hill): To approve the Division of Vocational Rehabilitations Field Services Policy Manual as submitted in Attachment 2. The motion carried 8-0.

AND

M/S (Critchfield/Atchley): To approve Proposed Rule Docket 47-0101-1701 as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried 8-0.

Mr. Soltman asked if there is any way to remove this requirement from rule to which Ms. Bent responded Board staff is working towards that end with the Division and stakeholder groups.

There were no further comments or questions from the Board.

12. Proposed Rule Docket #55-0103-1701 – Rules of Career Technical Schools

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Atchley): To approve Proposed Rule Docket 55-0103-1701 as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried 8-0.

There were no comments or questions from the Board.

13. Proposed Rule Docket #55-0104-1701 – Rules Governing Idaho Quality Program Standards Incentive Grants and Agricultural Education Program Start-up Grants.

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Hill): To approve Proposed Rule Docket 55-1014-1701 as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried 8-0.

There were no comments or questions from the Board.

BUSINESS AFFAIRS AND HUMAN RESOURCES (BAHR - HR)

Section I – Human Resources

1. Chief Executive Officer Salaries

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Soltman): To approve the amended employment agreement for Dr. Robert Kustra as President of Boise State University. The motion carried 8-0.

AND

M/S (Westerberg/Hill): To approve the amended employment agreement for Dr. Chuck Staben as President of the University of Idaho. The motion carried 8-0.

Business Affairs and Human Resources (BAHR) Committee Chair Mr. Westerberg introduced the item and shared with Board members the absence of amended employment agreements for Idaho State University President Art Vailas and Lewis-Clark State College President Tony Fernandez is due to their announced retirements at the end of the current school year.

There were no comments or questions from the Board.

2. Idaho Public Television – Agency Director Compensation

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Soltman): To approve an hourly rate of \$52.84 (annual salary of \$109,907.20) for Ron Pisaneschi as General Manager of Idaho Public Television, effective June 18, 2017. The motion carried 8-0.

There were no comments or questions from the Board.

3. Multi-Year Employment Agreement – Head Women’s Basketball Coach – Gordon Presnell – Boise State University

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Soltman): To approve the request by Boise State University to enter into a four year, seven month employment agreement with Gordon Presnell, Head Women’s Basketball Coach, commencing on August 13, 2017 and terminating on March 31, 2022, at an initial base salary of \$230,000 with raises and supplemental compensation provisions, as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried 8-0.

Board member Westerberg introduced the item. Board member Scoggin stated the termination provision of the agreement seemed excessive and that in his experience a one to two year payout is more appropriate.

Boise State University's (BSU) Chief Operating Officer and Special Counsel Mr. Kevin Satterlee responded this is a standard provision in both the Board's and BSU's multi-year employment agreements. He continues that if the employee is removed for cause then the institution can terminate without benefits, but if the removal is for convenience then it falls under this provision. Board member Scoggin responded it may be more appropriate to simply defer to the standard and that a review may be in order to insure state funds are correctly appropriated.

The Board's Executive Director, Mr. Matt Freeman responded the Board has a standard template for single year and multi-year coach's contracts that are not in Board policy but have been adopted by the Board and that these are items which can be reviewed at any time. Board member Clark added it would seem reasonable for the Business Affairs and Human Resources (BAHR) committee to review these templates and possibly recommend changes.

Section II – Finance

1. FY 2019 Line Items

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Atchley): To approve the Line Items for the agencies and institutions as listed in Attachments 1 and 2, and to authorize the Executive Director to approve the MCO and Line Item budget requests for agencies and institutions due to the Division of Financial Management and Legislative Services Office on September 1, 2017. The motion carried 8-0.

Board member Westerberg introduce the item and then requested the Financial Vice-President's from the 4-year institutions come forward to answer questions from the Board related to the proposed line items. Representing Idaho State University (ISU) was Interim Chief Financial Officer Mr. Brian Hickenlooper. Representing Boise State University (BSU) was Vice President and Chief Financial Officer Mr. Mark Heil. Representing the University of Idaho (UI) was Vice President for Finance Mr. Brian Foisy and representing Lewis-Clark State College (LCSC) was Vice President for Finance and Administration Mr. Todd Kilburn. Mr. Westerberg then reminded Board members of the parallel path for this year's line item requests. He continues the Board is submitting line items as the Governor's Higher Education Task Force continues to work on their recommendations for higher education and anticipates financial recommendations coming from the task force that may supersede some of the line items shown here today.

Mr. Westerberg then requested the Board's Chief Financial Officer, Mr. Chet Herbst, to review with Board members the system wide requests. Mr. Herbst shared with the Board that since the Board's previous review of the line items at the June meeting, the Business Affairs and Human Resources (BAHR) committee has met to review line items further with the Department of Financial Management (DFM). He continues, comments received from DFM included requests for more clarity and an increased emphasis on the impact of

the requested line item (student retention, the state's 60% goal, etc.). Additionally, DFM has requested each line item clearly indicate how a request from one institution would benefit the state's other public institutions. Mr. Herbst then shared with the Board a majority of line item requests are from the 4-year institutions and that system wide requests include sustainability funding for the Idaho Regional Optical Network (IRON), increase funding of graduate medical education statewide and special programs such as increased funding for state scholarships.

At this time, Mr. Mark Heil shared with Board members that BSU's two line item requests had been submitted in accordance with the guidelines provided by the Board. He continues BSU's request for a Public Service Initiative would be a new program within the School of Public Service designed to develop and equip students to become public service leaders. He continues this programs is made possible in part to a restructuring of the College of Social Sciences and would include the addition of 10.66 full time positions (FTP). Mr. Heil then shared with the Board that BSU's request supports Goal 1 of the Board's Strategic Plan for a Well Educated Citizenry, Objective C – Higher Level of Educational Attainment as well as Goal 2 of the Board's Strategic Plan Innovation and Economic Development, Object A – Workforce Readiness in addition to Goal's 1-4 of BSU's Strategic Plan.

Mr. Heil continues BSU's second line item request for Career Readiness and Graduate Production would allocate funds to develop a more coordinated model of career advising services to support the student body. He continues this line item will fully connect advising roles across the academic process and will fund further expansion of BSU's Bridge to Careers program.

At this next, Mr. Brian Hickenlooper shared with Board members ISU's request for an Expansion of Health Sciences and Work Force needs. He continues this request will go towards funding ongoing salaries and operating expenses. Mr. Hickenlooper states this request supports Themes 2 and 3 of ISU's Core Themes and the Board's 5 Year Plan to expand the Occupational Therapy program to southwest Idaho.

Mr. Brian Foisy then provided to Board members a summary of UI's request to fund Phase II of the institution's Library Investment in Support of Achieving R1 Carnegie Classification. He continues this request is to expand the research and instructional capacity of the institution's library. Mr. Foisy shares with Board members the library is a core element of UI and a point of access for many students and contributes directly to the academic success of UI's students.

Mr. Foisy then presented to Board members UI's second request to expand student success and support. He continues the counseling and testing center on campus has been experiencing a noticeable increase for both emergency and non-emergency services beyond what the center can currently support. Funding received would allow for the addition of two cases managers to provide crisis intervention and case management services.

At this time, Board member Atchley noted that both ISU and UI submitted requests related to library materials and asks what kind of systemic behavior exists within the library institution's library systems and if we are we combining and leveraging library services across the institutions. To this UI President Dr. Chuck Staben responded the Dean of Libraries for each institution work closely with one another, however, these are individual institutions and licensed materials are for individual institutions and the licensing companies typically do not support system wide licenses. At this time the Board's Executive Director, Mr. Matt Freeman, confirms this fact with Board members. Board member Atchley then asked if this were still the case if the Board were to develop a system wide request. To this Mr. Freeman responded he did not know. Board member Clark then stated this would be something worth pursuing.

At this time Mr. Todd Kilburn shared with Board members the two line item requests submitted by LCSC. He stated LCSC's Access and Completion request was designed to expand on LCSC's successful programs to better meet the needs of current and future students. LCSC's second request has to do with compliance issues and is a request for the addition of an Environmental Health and Safety compliance officer.

At this time Mr. Westerberg shared with Board members the BHR committee reviewed both the community college and agency requests and that in the interest of time these requests were not presented to the Board today. Mr. Westerberg also noted the institutions have done a good job of aligning their requests to the Board's 60% goal and other initiatives.

Board member Clark then noted the absence of a place holder for Outcomes Based Funding (OBF). To this Mr. Herbst responded the placeholder for OBF can be found under the system wide request for colleges and universities. Dr. Clark then asked how the Board intends to balance the recommendations of the Governor's Higher Education Task Force and line item requests from the institutions and agencies. To this Mr. Westerberg responded the institutions have agreed to pull their line items request in support of OBF if that were to be a recommendation of the Governor's Higher Education Task Force.

At this time Board member Scoggin asked for clarification on when the line item requests were due to the Department of Financial Management (DFM). Mr. David Hahn of DFM was present to respond to questions asked by the Board and informed members the deadline for agencies to submit budgets to DFM and the Legislative Services Office (LSO) was September 1st. The Governor will then form his budget recommendations and submit to the Legislature at the end of December. Mr. Freeman then asked Mr. Hahn if the Board were to submit a budget with a place holder for OBF without a dollar figure attached would DFM and LSO accept this or would they prefer a dollar figure. To this Mr. Hahn responded DFM's preference would be for a dollar figure to be attached.

There were no further questions or comments from the Board.

2. FY2019 Capital Budget Requests

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Hill):To approve the capital projects listed in the table in Attachment 1 on Page 5 from Boise State University, Idaho State University, the University of Idaho, and Lewis-Clark State College for submission to the Permanent Building Fund Advisory Council for consideration for Permanent Building Fund support in the FY2019 budget cycle. The motion carried 8-0.

AND

M/S (Westerberg/Hill):To approve the Six-Year Capital Improvement Plans for FY2019 through FY2024 for Boise State University, Idaho State University, the University of Idaho, Lewis-Clark State College, and Eastern Idaho Technical College, as provided in Attachments 2-6. The motion carried 8-0.

Mr. Westerberg introduced the item. There were no questions or comments from the Board on the first motion. After the reading of the second motion, the Board's Executive Director, Mr. Matt Freeman shared with Board members the Six-Year Capital Improvement Plans are the institution's way of notifying the Board of upcoming building projects and that approval of the Six-Year Capital Improvement Plans authorizes institutions to begin fund raising. Board member Scoggin then asked if the Six-Year Capital Improvement Plans are submitted to the Legislature. To this the Board's Chief Financial Officer, Mr. Chet Herbst, responded that upon Board approval, the plans are sent to the Department of Public Works (DPW) and the Permanent Building Fund Advisory Council (PBFAC) will then review the plan, prioritize the requests submitted and ration funds accordingly. He continues the funds allotted are typically much less than requested. Board member Scoggin then asked if, based on Board approval today, the institutions could begin fundraising based on the amounts approved by DPW and PBFAC. To this Mr. Freeman responded it would depend on the project and project's financing.

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

This item was provided in the agenda materials as an information item.

There were not comments or questions from the Board.

4. Idaho National Laboratory – Progress Report

This item was provided in the agenda materials as an information item.

Board member Westerberg introduced the item and then requested the Board's Chief Financial Officer, Mr. Chet Herbst, provide a progress update. Mr. Herbst shared with Board members negotiations are underway with the Idaho State University Foundation to purchase the site for the Computer Integration Center in the amount of \$1,000,000. He

continues geotechnical surveys, Phase I environmental site surveys and expanded ALTA surveys are also underway.

Mr. Herbst continues the Idaho State Building Authority (ISBA) will utilize the Construction Manager at Risk (CMAR) approach to carry out the project and that the CMAR will assist in selection of the Architect, oversee construction contractors and provide a Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP) at the outset. He then shares with Board members the winning CMAR Team will be a joint effort between JeDUNN Construction and Engineered Structures Incorporated (ESI). He continues conceptual design work is in progress and scheduled for completion in March of 2018, and that project financing should be finished by September 2017 in order to break ground prior to winter conditions allowing 12 weeks for site development and 64 weeks for building construction resulting in a substantial completion date of February 2019.

Mr. Herbst then shared with Board members upcoming actions for Board approval include approval of the project documents including the purchase/sale agreement with the ISU Foundation, approval of the sub-lease between INL/BEA and supporting lease documents with ISBA. The Board will also be required to review and approve project financing and construction plans and report progress to the Legislature per SCR105. Mr. Herbst continues potential risks for consideration include the prevention of issuance of bonds due to a change in the interest rate environment, potential for federal non-appropriation, potential for non-renewal of the leases, and potential the educational benefits of one or both facilities may be found to be unsuitable.

At this time the Board's Executive Director, Mr. Matt Freeman, reminded Board members of the complexity of a transaction of this size and scope. He continues Board staff is continuing their work on the documents to insure the requirement set forth in legislation for the project's educational benefit be written into a binding document, clarifying the Board is not responsible for the design or construction of the buildings and finally clarification around the Board's responsibility and involvement maintaining the facilities.

There were no further questions from the Board.

5. Boise State University – Center for Materials Science Research Project – Construction Phase

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Soltman): To approve the request by Boise State University for construction of the Materials Science Research Center for a total cost not to exceed \$50.5 million subject to financing approval at a future Board meeting. The motion carried 8-0.

There were no comments or questions from the Board.

At this time the Board recessed for lunch at 12:00 pm (MDT) and reconvened at 12:40 pm (MDT).

6. Idaho State University – Bengal Pharmacy – Annual Report

This item was provided in the agenda materials as an information item.

Vice President for Health Sciences, Dr. Rex Force, presented to the Board Idaho State University's Bengal Pharmacy annual report in the form of a short video highlighting the work of the Bengal Pharmacy and its impact on the rural communities it serves. At the video's conclusion Board member Hill asked Dr. Force if he found the amount of available bandwidth to be a challenge for the operations of the Bengal Pharmacy. To this Dr. Force responded both the tele-health and tele-pharmacy programs would benefit from an expanded bandwidth network. Board member Critchfield then asked if there were plans for ISU to expand the Bengal Pharmacy to other communities to which Dr. Force responded there have been discussions with Gritman Medical Center to expand the program to Kendrick, Idaho. Board member Soltman then asked Dr. Force for clarification on how the programs' net-profit shown during the presentation is allocated. To this, Dr. Force responded the profit is shared between the ISU Foundation and the College of Pharmacy.

Prior to moving to the next item, Board member Westerberg requested an opportunity to clarify with Board members the recommendations from the Governor's Higher Education Task Force will take priority over the line items submitted by the institutions. Board member Clark then asked how the Legislative Services Office (LSO) would approach this and if they are typically amenable to changes. To this the Board's Executive Director, Mr. Matt Freeman, responded LSO does allow for budget provisions and if the Board did have recommendations from the Governor's Higher Education Task Force there would be an opportunity to add or remove line item requests.

7. Idaho State University – Agreements Between ISU and the Idaho College of Osteopathic Medicine (ICOM)

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Soltman): To authorize Idaho State University to enter into the License Agreement for Space with the Idaho College of Osteopathic Medicine as presented in Attachment 1. The motion carried 8-0.

AND

M/S (Westerberg/Soltman): To authorize Idaho State University to enter into the Joint Operations and Services Agreement with the Idaho College of Osteopathic Medicine as presented in Attachment 3. The motion carried 8-0.

Vice President for Health Sciences, Dr. Rex Force explained the item before the Board today was a request to construct an Anatomy and Physiology Lab for the Idaho College

of Osteopathic Medicine (ICOM). He continues the construction of the lab would double the capacity for training ICOM students, ISU students and high school students from the Treasure Valley.

Board member Clark then asked if this was a request to construction an addition within the existing lab to which Dr. Force responded this would be an addition to the exterior of the building and the addition would not consume any more of ICOM's existing parking.

8. University of Idaho – WWAMI Medical Education Building Improvements and Expansion – Additional Project Authorization Request – Planning and Design

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Atchley): To approve the request by the University of Idaho to implement the Planning and Design phases of a capital project for improvements and expansion of the former Business Technology Incubator in support of the curriculum and program needs of the WWAMI Medical Education Program, for an amount not to exceed \$3,620,000, as described in the materials submitted to the Board. Approval includes the authority to execute all necessary and requisite consulting and vendor contracts to fully implement the Planning and Design phases of the project. The motion carried 8-0.

There were no comments or questions from the Board.

9. University of Idaho – Amendment to Media Rights Contract - Learfield

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Hill):To approve the request by the University of Idaho for approval of the proposed amendment to the Learfield contract in substantial conformance to the terms set forth in Attachment 1 to the Board materials, and to authorize the Vice President of Finance to execute all necessary documents associated therewith. The motion carried 8-0.

There were no comments or questions from the Board.

STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (SDE)

Prior to the Idaho State Department of Education beginning their presentation to the Board, Dr. Clark announced that starting in October, the Department's portion of the agenda will move to Wednesday afternoon.

1. Developments in K-12 Education
This item was provided in the agenda materials as an information item.

Superintendent of Public Instruction Sherri Ybarra introduced the iteming by sharing with Board members this is an update to the Board and not a discussion over whether or not to continue using the Idaho Standards Achievement Tests (ISAT).

Idaho State Department of Education (ISDE) Director of Assessment, Ms. Karlynn Laraway, began the presentation by sharing with Board members stakeholder feedback of the assessment. She continues ISDE plan moving forward is to partner with Assessment Solutions Group (ASG). Ms. Laraway states ASG is not a vendor but a consultant assisting states and organizations in their review of programs to aide in the decision making process. She continues the first steps in this process are to begin recruiting members to form a committee, holding focus groups and surveying the citizens of Idaho. Finally, Ms. Laraway states the Goal of the ISDE is to work towards meaningful engagement with stakeholders. At this time Board member Atchley asked if the survey will be designed to engage all citizens and not just those who have an issue with the testing. ISDE's Deputy Chief Superintendent, Mr. Pete Koehler, responded the survey design will be managed by ISDE's Communications Director, Ms. Allison Westfall, who will use her expertise to design a survey that is responsive to all individuals. Board member Critchfield then asked if proposed Task Force had been named to which members of ISDE responded in the negative. Ms. Critchfield then cautioned the importance of the name in conveying to teachers and stakeholders the importance of the Task Force. In response to Board member Critchfield's comment, Superintendent Ybarra responded this is something the Department is aware of and working on. Board member Clark then expressed her support of Board member Critchfield's comment and again stressed the importance of making clear the purpose of the Task Force.

At this time Superintendent Ybarra shared with Board members an update on the Idaho Reading Indicator (IRI). She states the ISDE has documented gains in a number of participating schools. She then requested Mr. Koehler update Board members on the Math Diagnostic. Mr. Koehler stated ISDE's target is to develop a math diagnostic tool for K-12 students than can be used in the field. From here Mr. Koehler provided an additional update on the IRI to Board members. He states 38 participating schools measured growth of 20% or greater and that of 166 Local Education Agencies (LEA's) there were only 12 that showed either no growth or regression. Mr. Koehler did share with Board members one area of concern and that was the initial score for incoming Kindergartners is moving backwards. Board member Critchfield then asked if ISDE has plans in place to address this issue to which Mr. Koehler responded this is a collaborative effort to convenience the importance of pre-Kindergarten education. Board member Clark then asked Mr. Koehler to provide ISDE's target for the goal to which Mr. Koehler responded 85% of students reading at grade level by the end of 3rd grade, adding ISDE is actively conducting training on the new IRI. He added the greatest change is the heavy emphasis on comprehension. Dr. Clark then asked if schools and districts had aligned their goals with those of the ISDE to which Mr. Koehler responded his reluctance to answer based upon the variety of factors contributing to the score.

At this time Deputy Superintendent Koehler continued his presentation to Board members with an update on Advanced Opportunities as requested by Board members during the June Board meeting. He shared one concern raised is the majority of students benefiting from Advanced Opportunities are those from large urban areas and families where the expectation is to continue on to college. Mr. Koehler then walked Board members through a breakdown of the most current data available on Advanced Opportunities. Board member Clark then asked how the ISDE plans to draw more America Indian and other minority students to Advanced Opportunities. Mr. Koehler responded ISDE has been developing and conducting seminars for high school counselors and university and college transition coordinators on how to engage more students with Advanced Opportunities. Finally, Mr. Koehler shared the total cost to the state for Advanced Opportunities for FY17 was \$7,000,000.

2. Idaho Mastery Education Network Update

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Ybarra/Hill): To endorse the Superintendent of Public Instruction's proposal to amend Section 33-1632, Idaho Code, as identified in Attachment 1. The motion passed 8-0.

Superintendent Ybarra introduced the item and shared with Board members the legislation will require amendment and the Superintendent is requesting the Board's support in achieving legislative approval.

Superintendent Ybarra then introduced ISDE's Director of Mastery Education, Ms. Kelly Brady. Ms. Brady shared with Board members a total of 21 schools and districts have expressed interest in participating in the Mastery Based Education program, two of which were present to share their experiences with Board members today. Ms. Brady then introduced Ms. Kerry Brooks and Mr. Kevin Hill from the Moscow school district and Mr. Jeff Klamm from North Valley Academy. Both schools presented to Board members their positive experiences with Mastery Based Education. Board member Critchfield then asked Mr. Klamm his opinion of the biggest challenge for parents when it came to using a Mastery Based Education program. Mr. Klamm responded changing the traditional mind-set. He added for teachers, the greatest challenge is the mind-shift from no longer being a lecturer but more of a mentor. Mr. Hill added the greatest challenge for the Moscow school district was parent's expectations of their child's progress being shown in percentages rather than proficient. Board member Critchfield then asked what is the largest school participating in the pilot. To which Mr. Hill responded the Moscow School District with 2,200 students and 170 teachers. Board member Clark asked if the district participated as a whole to which Mr. Hill responded in the affirmative. Board member Scoggin then expressed his appreciation for the diversity of the participating schools, but questioned why the Boise area was not represented. To this Ms. Brady responded that schools from this area had not applied and that this was the same for Region V. Board member Scoggin then asked if it was cause for concern the largest population was not

participating to which Ms. Brady responded she expects more school districts to opt in as the movement gains momentum.

3. Proposed Rule Docket #08-0202-1701, Rules Governing Uniformity – Professional Standards Commission Recommendations
This item was removed from the agenda August 10, 2017
4. Proposed Rule – Docket #08-0202-1702 – Rules Governing Uniformity – Incorporated by Reference – Standards for Idaho School Buses and Operations

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Ybarra/Soltman): To adopt the revised Standards for Idaho School Buses and Operations as submitted in Attachment 2. The motion carried 8-0.

AND

M/S (Ybarra/Soltman): To approve Proposed Rule Docket #08-0202-1702, Rules Governing Uniformity – Incorporated by Reference, Standards for Idaho School Buses and Operations, as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried 8-0.

There were no comments or questions from the Board.

5. Proposed Rule Docket #08-0203-1703 – Rules Governing Thoroughness – Incorporated by Reference – Extended Content Standards

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Ybarra/Hill): To approve the amendments to the Idaho Extended Content Standards as submitted in Attachment 2. The motion carried 8-0.

AND

M/S (Ybarra/Hill): To adopt the Idaho Extended Content Standards Core Content Connectors as submitted in Attachments 3 and 4. The motion carried 8-0.

AND

M/S (Ybarra/Critchfield): To approve the proposed rule Docket #08-0203-1703, Rules Governing Thoroughness, Incorporated by Reference, as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried 8-0.

Superintendent Ybarra introduced the item and shared with Board members the content standards in front of the Board today are for those students with severe cognitive disabilities.

There were no further comments or questions from the Board.

6. Proposed Rule Docket #08-0203-1704 – Rules Governing Thoroughness – Incorporated by Reference – Special Education Manual

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Ybarra/Scoggin): To approve the revised Idaho Special Education Manual as submitted in Attachment 2. The motion carried 8-0.

AND

M/S (Ybarra/Critchfield): To approve Proposed Rule Docket #08-0203-1704, Rules Governing Thoroughness – Incorporated by Reference, Idaho Special Education Manual, as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried 8-0.

Superintendent introduced the item then invited ISDE's Director of Special Education, Dr. Charlie Silva, to come forward to answer any questions from the Board. Board member Clark asked Dr. Silva how often the manual is updated to which Dr. Silva responded on an as needed basis. She continues the plan is for a substantive update but that has not yet occurred.

There were no further questions or comments from the Board.

7. Proposed Rule Docket #08-0203-1705 – Rules Governing Thoroughness – Idaho Content Standards – Science, Drivers Education, Information and Communication Technology

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Ybarra/Soltman): To adopt the revised Idaho Science Content Standards as submitted in Attachment 2. The motion carried 8-0.

Superintendent Ybarra introduced the item and then invited ISDE's Director of Academics, Mr. Scott Cook come forward to answer any questions from the Board. At this time, Board member Scoggin requested an overview of the process for redesigning the standards after the comments from legislators during the last legislative session. Mr. Cook responded the science standards are in their second year of review. He states the legislators had requested the department send the standards out for additional public comment and review and that ISDE accommodated this request accepting comments online through their website in addition to holding six face-to-face meetings throughout

the state. HE continues the revisions proposed today are a result of the public meetings and review. Board member Clark then asked if, in his opinion, Mr. Cook feels the department has developed a complete set of science standards to which Mr. Cook responded in the affirmative.

There were no further questions or comments from the Board.

M/S (Ybarra/Atchley): To adopt the revised Idaho Driver Education Content Standards as submitted in Attachment 4. The motion carried 8-0.

There were no comments or questions from the Board.

M/S (Ybarra/Atchley): To adopt the revised Idaho Information and Communication Technology Content Standards as submitted in Attachment 5. The motion carried 8-0.

There were no comments or questions from the Board

M/S (Ybarra/Atchley): To approve proposed rule Docket #08-0203-1705, Rules Governing Thoroughness, Incorporation by Reference, Idaho Content Standards, as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried 8-0.

There were no comments or questions from the Board

8. Temporary Rule – IDAPA 08.02.02.015.02 – Rules Governing Uniformity – Endorsements – Pupil Service Certificates – Occupational and Physical Therapy Endorsements

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Ybarra/Hill): To approve the temporary rule amendment to IDAPA 08.02.02.015.02, Rules Governing Uniformity, as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried 8-0.

There were no comments or questions from the Board

9. Nampa-Vallivue School District Boundary Excision/Annexation

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Ybarra/Soltman): To accept the recommendation of the hearing officer and to approve the petition for excision and annexation of property from Nampa School District No. 131 to Vallivue School District No. 139. The motion carried 8-0.

Superintendent Ybarra introduced the item and requested ISDE's Chief Deputy Superintendent, Mr. Pete Koehler, come forward to answer any questions from the Board.

At this time, Board member Critchfield asked for clarification on the motion to which Mr. Koehler responded Board approval of the motion would allow the school district to move forward with adding the request to the ballot for the affected area for voter approval. He states the Board's approval is for the item to move forward and brought to voters for approval. Board member Scoggin then asked for confirmation that the Board is following the process. Mr. Koehler responded the motion accepts the findings of the hearing information and confirms this is in the best interest of the children. To this Board member Scoggin responded yes, but how is the Board to know. Board member Critchfield then expressed her discomfort with not knowing the background of the motion to which Mr. Koehler responded both school district boards deliberately took a neutral stance and this is part of the process. He adds the request was made due to the fact the properties making the request, although currently located within the Nampa school district, are physically closer to the Vallivue school district.

10. Professional Standards Commission Appointments

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Ybarra/Hill): To appoint Kristopher "Topher" Wallaert as a member of the Professional Standards Commission for the remainder of the three-year term which began July 1, 2015, and will end June 30, 2018, representing Elementary Classroom Teachers. The motion carried 8-0.

There were no comments or questions from the Board.

11. ESSA Consolidated State Plan

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Ybarra/Westerberg): To approve Idaho's Every Student Succeeds Act Consolidated State Plan and to authorize the State Superintendent of Public Instruction to submit the plan to the U.S. Department of Education on behalf of the State Board of Education. The motion carried 8-0.

INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH, AND STUDENT AFFAIRS (IRSA)

1. Five-Year Plan Presentation

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Hill/Westerberg): To approve the Five-Year Program Plan as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried 8-0.

Board member Hill introduced the item and then requested the Board's Chief Academic Officer, Mr. Randall Brumfield and Academic Affairs Program Manager, Ms. Patty Sanchez to present the Board's Five-Year Program Plan.

Ms. Sanchez started the presentation by reminding Board members Policy III.Z is in place to insure institutions are meeting the state's educational and work force needs. Ms. Sanchez then shared with the Board the Planning Process behind development of the five year plan and an overview of each institution's plan.

At this time, Board member Scoggin requested clarification on the Board's role with the Five-Year Program Plan to which Dr. Hill responded the Board's role is to confirm if the proposed programs fall within the institution's mission and are appropriate. Board member Scoggin then stated his preference for program approval to remain with Instruction, Research, and Student Affairs (IRSA) committee and that only programs that may create an issue be brought to the Board.

Ms. Sanchez resumed her presentation with a program inventory update. She states this update is required per policy and specifies each institution must provide to the Board an existing list of programs currently being offered. She continues Board staff is currently working on development of a new online program tracking software system.

Board member Atchley then states that based on the information presented today, it would appear there are a large number of new programs being added relative to the number of students enrolling at each institution and asks if institutions are eliminating programs as they add programs. She feels the addition of so many programs runs the risk of depleting available resources when you try to give something to everyone and the Board needs to seriously consider the addition of new programs. To this Ms. Sanchez responded the programs proposed today are projections and may not come to fruition. She states this is the essence of the plan allowing institutions the opportunity to share with the Board what the programs they wish to pursue. The Board's Executive Director, Mr. Matt Freeman then voiced his support for Board member Atchley's concern of adding too many programs. He adds the current trend seems to be towards boutique programs or sub-specialization at the baccalaureate level and this has the potential to spread finite resources very thin or place the burden on students in the form of tuition increases. He adds he has concerns when the trend is towards meta-majors yet the Board continues to receive proposals for boutique majors. At this time Dr. Clark requested the IRSA committee review meta-majors and program proliferation.

The Board's Chief Academic Officer, Dr. Randall Brumfield, states his desire for the Five-Year Program plan to be operational, adding the information is valuable information that should be packaged in a way that is meaningful to the Board. Board member Scoggin added his recognition of the work by many individuals in developing the Five-Year Program Plan but he questions if this is the efficient method to achieve the end goal or if the Board should consider other options.

2. Idaho State University – College of Education – Teacher Preparation Programs Update

This item was provided in the agenda materials as an information item.

Board member Hill introduced the item reminding Board members of the request from the Board for Idaho State University (ISU) to provide an update on improvements to the university's teacher preparation programs at this meeting. Representing ISU were Associate Vice President for Institutional Effectiveness in Academic Affairs Ms. Selena Grace, Interim Dean for the College of Education Dr. Karen Appleby and Assistant Dean Dr. Mark Neill.

Ms. Grace shared with Board members the information presented today is an update on those programs placed on probation as well as progress of various other initiatives within the College of Education. She continues ISU has addressed the finding's resulting from a site visit by the Professional Standards Commission (PSC) and that ISU will have documentation the elements of concern have been addressed by the next PSC site visit in the fall.

Ms. Grace continues by addressing staff comments in the agenda materials specific to alternate certification routes. She states that during ISU's review of the programs placed on probation, it was discovered, in the opinion of ISU, conflation between how an institution is providing an institutional recommendation and what is viewed as an alternate route in policy. She continues when a potential student contacts ISU for information on alternate routes to teacher certification the institution will refer to the IDAPA Standards 08.02.02 Rules Governing Uniformity and then compare those standards to that students work experience and prior coursework to determine if the candidate has satisfied the IDAPA Standards and, if not, what they would need to do in order to meet the IDAPA standards. Ms. Grace shares the IDAPA's standards are built in to the curriculum across all the institutions, however, the outcomes at each institution differ. She states the lack of specificity in the IDAPA Standards and identified student learning outcomes creates a wide range of flexibility across the institutions in determining how a student can meet the outcomes. Ms. Grace then shares with the Board part of the challenge when an individual contacts ISU for an institutional recommendation is these are individuals from outside of ISU's system yet they are being held to the same standards as student's enrolled in ISU's College of Education. She adds this creates a challenge for the institution to demonstrate they are meeting their student learning outcomes while still being flexible with institutional recommendations for alternate routes to certification.

Board member Hill then asked how to fix the problem. To this Dr. Appleby responded there are a lot of complexities to fixing this problem but stresses the importance of consistency with what is expected of teachers once they enter the classroom adding this would help institutions to sign off on institutional recommendation for certification. Dr. Hill then asked if such consistency is created by Board action, modifications to IDAPA, or by institutions working together to set these standards. Ms. Grace responded the current situation is similar to that of general education statewide stating one of the ways transparency and consistency in general education were created across all the institutions

was a result of each disciplinary identifying common learning outcomes and the various curriculums and courses all having the same outcomes associated with them. To this Board member Clark states that within a system designed to prepare teachers to teach within that same system the outcomes and expectations must be common. She reminds Board members the Deans and staff of the College of Education from each institution were involved in formation of the career ladder in determining and putting into place the standard expectations and outcomes of individuals completing a traditional education program and they should be able to do the same for alternate routes to certification. She continues another option would be to no longer allow individual institutions to work in the realm of qualifying teachers and to centralize this task under the Board. She adds in light of the state's current teacher shortage it is incumbent for the Board to respond in a way that facilitates qualified individuals to become certified and not put up barriers.

At this time Superintendent Ybarra requested clarification on the Idaho State Department of Education's (ISDE) role in relation to alternate routes to certification. To this Ms. Grace responded the PSC makes the recommendations with support from ISDE staff. Board member Soltman then asks if this is an opportunity to expand the use of competencies. Dr. Clark responds in the affirmative, stating this could also be an opportunity to change the system and stresses the importance of coming to a resolution to place more teachers in the classroom.

At this time Board member Hill asked if it were the desire of the Board to request the College of Education from each institution develop a proposal that would ensure consistency to create the outcomes the Board is seeking. To this the Board's Chief Planning and Policy Officer, Ms. Tracie Bent, responded the framework in administrative rule addressing alternative routes does allow for flexibility, however, when you change the routes you lose consistency. She states that what appears to be an issue is that some of the requirements for traditional routes are proposed for the alternate routes. Dr. Hill then asked if both the institutions and Board office should work jointly on a proposal to which Ms. Bent responded this is already in process. Dr. Mark Neill then asked for clarification on this item to which Ms. Bent responded it was her understanding the Board's Educator Effectiveness Program Manager, Ms. Christina Linder, has contacted the Deans of the Colleges of Education at each institution and that she will follow up to make sure this has been done.

There were no further questions or comments from the Board.

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

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Hill/Westerberg): To approve the first reading of the proposed amendments to Board Policy III.N, General Education as presented in Attachment 1. The motion carried 8-0.

Board member Hill introduced the item and requested the Board's Chief Academic Officer, Dr. Randall Brumfield share with Board members the proposed changes to Policy III.N. Dr. Brumfield states the first change relates to Associate of Applied Science (AAS) degrees and clarifies an AAS degree must include a minimum of three general education courses including institutionally designated courses. The second change provides for direction and clarification of the responsibilities of the faculty discipline groups serving on the state's General Education Committee (GEM) to insure competencies are up to date and appropriate for learning. Dr. Brumfield concludes by sharing with Board members the third and final change adds the requirement for the Board's Chief Academic Officer to serve as chair of the GEM committee.

There were no comments or questions from the Board.

4. Board Policy III.P. Students – I.T. Title IX – Second Reading

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Hill/Critchfield): To approve the second reading of amendments to Board Policy III.P. Students and I.T. Title IX as submitted in Attachments 1 and 2. The motion carried 8-0.

There were no comments or questions from the Board.

OTHER BUSINESS

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

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Critchfield): To adjourn the meeting at 3:00 pm (MDT). The motion carried 8-0.