



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
October 18-19, 2017
Lewis-Clark State College
Williams Conference Center
4th Street and 9th Avenue
Lewiston, Idaho**

A regularly scheduled meeting of the State Board of Education was held October 18-19, 2017 at Lewis-Clark State College in Lewiston, Idaho.

Present:

Linda Clark, President	Emma Atchley
Debbie Critchfield, Vice President	Don Soltman
David Hill, Secretary	Richard Westerberg (except where noted)
Sherri Ybarra, State Superintendent (except where noted)	

Absent:

Andrew Scoggin

Wednesday, October 18, 2017

BOARDWORK

1. Agenda Review/Approval

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Soltman): To approve the agenda as submitted. The motion carried 6-0. Mr. Scoggin and Superintendent Ybarra were absent from voting.

2. Minutes Review / Approval

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Hill): To approve the minutes from the August 9-10, 2017 Regular Board meeting, the August 28, 2017 Special Board meeting, the August 31, 2017 Special Board meeting, and the September 31, 2017 Special Board meeting. The motion carried 6-0. Mr. Scoggin and Superintendent Ybarra were absent from voting.

3. Rolling Calendar

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Soltman): To set October 17-18, 2018 as the date and Lewis-Clark State College as the location for the October 2018 regularly scheduled Board meeting. The motion carried 6-0. Mr. Scoggin and Superintendent Ybarra were absent from voting.

PLANNING, POLICY & GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS (PPGA)

1. Lewis-Clark State College Annual Progress Report and Tour

The Board met at Lewis-Clark State College (LCSC) in the Williams Conference Center in Lewiston, Idaho at 11:00 am (MDT). President Tony Fernandez welcomed members of the Board to the campus of Lewis-Clark State College. Also representing LCSC were Student Body President Mr. A.J. Baron and Faculty Senate & Faculty Association Chair Dr. Amanda Van Lanen.

Dr. Fernandez proceeded with an update of LCSC's Strategic Plan by sharing with members LCSC's many successes over the past year including a record number of graduates in the prior year, an 8 percent increase in fall 2016 enrollment and successes in both the academic and athletic arenas including multiple grants and athletic achievements. President Fernandez continues the college exceeded the national average for health licensing examinations and experienced a 95 percent placement of

graduates from the spring 2016 class in a majority of programs and experienced an all-time record of 816 graduates in FY17. Dr. Fernandez then states that although LCSC continues to experience record graduation rates, there is still a need to increase retention rates. He continues LCSC now has a total of 30 Peer Mentors to help increase retention rates and continues to expand the college's Work Scholars Program which today includes 45 participating students.

Dr. Fernandez then shared with Board members LCSC experienced a decrease of 4.5 percent in fall 2017 enrollment. He continues LCSC has researched the recent decrease and found it to be due to a precipitous drop-off of transfer students from Career Technical Education programs and that a majority of these students reported they had found employment between the time they applied to LCSC and the beginning of the academic year and that this is the major reason for not continuing with their postsecondary education. Dr. Fernandez then states that although overall enrollment for fall 2017 was down, the college did experience a 4.5% increase in new students enrolling from Idaho schools, a 17.5% increase in Hispanic enrollment, a 7.8% increase in total minority enrollment, and a 7% increase in pre-college enrollment. He then shares a majority of students attending LCSC are first generation college students and the current year is the highest seen at LCSC.

Dr. Fernandez continued his presentation with an update to Board members of recent efforts to collaborate with the local economy and increase economic development citing the award of an \$840,000 National Science Foundation Grant on metal manufacturing. He shares this was a collaboration with the University of Idaho and local manufacturers providing an opportunity for 90 North Central Idaho students currently enrolled in the 10th Grade to earn an industry recognized certificate or endorsement.

Finally, Dr. Fernandez shared with the Board LCSC's efforts to leverage resources to maximize institutional strength and efficiency by repurposing positions within the college's administration to strengthen recruitment efforts with the Idaho Department of Labor, Vocational Rehab and LCSC Workforce Training Center. He shares LCSC's Capital Projects are underway and on time and that LCSC has continued to increase its College Advancement efforts by issuing \$1,216,681 in scholarships and distributions since 2009.

At this time, Dr. Fernandez concluded his presentation and asked if there were any questions from the Board.

At this time Board member Hill then asked President Fernandez's opinion on the low enrollment during summer session to which President Fernandez responded tuition was lowered and courses reorganized with no success and that it is his belief a lack of Pell Grants offered for the summer session was a major factor.

Dr. Clark then asked of the increase in enrollment of First Generation College Students and if LCSC could attribute this increase to specific outreach efforts or other factors. President Fernandez responded the enrollment of First Generation College Students at LCSC has always been high, however, the increase for the current year could be due in

part to an increase in students enrolling through the College Assistance Migrant Program (CAMP).

Board member Critchfield then asked if there was anything specific from the recommendations of the Governor's 2017 Higher Education Task Force (Task Force) that President Fernandez brought back to LCSC for implementation to which he responded the Adult Learner recommendation, adding LCSC has and will specifically implement programs directed towards adult learners. At this time Board member Clark asked President Fernandez to share his opinion of the importance of scholarships for this student population. Dr. Fernandez responded scholarship funds and institution support are extremely important to this student population.

Board member Hill then asked President Fernandez to share his opinion on the importance of student internships and programs similar to the Work Scholar Program offered at LCSC. Dr. Fernandez responded it is critical in this day and age for students to receive the kind of experience at the locations where they may be hired. Adding this has always been the case with educational programs for teachers and nurses and it makes sense for other programs as well. He continues there is a dual benefit to both the student and employer in an internship situation and that often times a student will decide on another path after experiencing the current one and that this is important too.

Board member Critchfield then asked if the Associated Students of Lewis-Clark State College (ASLCSC) President A.J. Baron had anything he wished to share with the Board. Mr. Baron responded the goal of the ASLCSC was to seek out and create more opportunities for students to receive backing and support while in college, sharing with Board members the opening of the LCSC Warrior Pantry, an on-campus food pantry.

Board member Clark then asked if the Faculty Senate & Faculty Association Chair Dr. Amanda Van Lanen had anything she wished to share with the Board. Dr. Van Lanen thanked the Board for the opportunity, highlighting the Inclusive Practices Certificate offered through the Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) as well as a new pilot program through General Education focusing on high impact practices such as undergraduate research designed to help students with these skills. Board member Atchley then asked if any of the high impact practices are working towards an online delivery to which Dr. Van Lanen responded currently all delivery is on campus, however, the plan is to work towards an online delivery to which Ms. Atchley responded with her experience that as instructors learned how to present online it often improved their skills in the classroom and she encouraged this work to continue.

At this time Superintendent Ybarra joined the meeting.

President Fernandez then invited Board members to meet directly with LCSC students representing TRiO, Residence Life, the Associated Students of Lewis-Clark State College (ASLCS), Peer Mentors, the Coeur d'Alene Center and College Assistance Migrant Program (CAMP) to discuss their experiences at LCSC.

At this time the Board recessed until 1:00pm (MDT) while Board members Clark, Critchfield, Hill, and Soltman met with LCSC students at Reid Centennial Hall, Room 202.

The Board reconvened in the Williams Conference Center on the campus of Lewis-Clark State College 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 Lewis-Clark State College for its hospitality and thanked President Tony Fernandez for the morning's tour and congratulated him on LCSC's progress to date.

WORKSESSION

A. Public Education System – Performance Reporting

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

Planning, Policy and Governmental Affairs (PPGA) Committee Chair, Ms. Debbie Critchfield, introduced the item reminding Board members of the discussion in March around streamlining performance reporting and providing the information in a condensed and clear form. She continued one of the goals of the PPGA committee was to limit the number of performance reporting measures. She then invited the Board's Chief Planning and Policy Officer, Ms. Tracie Bent, Director of Research, Mr. Carson Howell, and Chief Academic Officer, Dr. Randall Brumfield to present the annual performance report to the Board.

Ms. Bent shared with Board members the presentation today would focus on a number of different measures within the system presented by the Board's Director of Research, Mr. Carson Howell, followed by a discussion of how Board members would like to proceed on specific measures.

The first measure for discussion was the Idaho Reading Indicator (IRI) State-wide Proficiency Levels. Ms. Bent introduced this item, sharing with Board members the new requirement for the Board to review the statewide reading assessment each year and then, beginning next year, review the trajectory growth targets the Board set in rule the previous year. She continues that since this is the baseline year there will not be a discussion of if targets were met, however, the Board will be looking at the numbers for the last four years and different policy areas.

Mr. Howell shared with Board members the statewide IRI scores for the 2013-2014 cohort starting with Kindergarten as they progress through Grade 3. The IRI scores show 54% testing at grade level for the Fall IRI and 46% testing below grade level and that as the cohort progressed, those who tested at grade level for the spring IRI assessment increased to 79%, however, the Fall IRI assessment for Grade 1 dropped to 62% of students testing at grade level. He continues this drop could be attributed to a number of factors including the state's compulsory attendance age as well as "summer melt". Board member Clark then asked for clarification of the cohort and if the data is for all students tested or just those who started in Kindergarten and progressed through Grade

3. To this Mr. Howell responded the data provided is for all students tested. Dr. Clark then stated a truer picture would require data for students who start school in Idaho in Kindergarten and progress through the Idaho elementary system. At this time Superintendent Ybarra shared with Board members the change in the material tested between the Kindergarten Fall IRI assessment and Grade 1 Fall IRI assessment adding a change in the skills tested and that this is the same as a student transitions from Grade 1 to Grade 2. To this Mr. Howell responded historically there has been a decline in rates because of the change in skills tested from grade to grade. Board members then requested Board staff research the possibility of following a true cohort as well as differences between students attending full-day Kindergarten versus half-day Kindergarten.

At this time Board member Atchley commented the results presented today show 79% of students testing at grade level after the spring assessment, but then notes a significant decline in the number of students testing at grade level after the fall assessment the following year. She asks if the fall IRI given in Grade 1 is testing the same information from the Kindergarten spring IRI assessment to which Ms. Bent responded in the negative, stating students are expected to know a higher level of information at the next Grade level and this is what students are being tested on. Ms. Atchley then asked how students are expected to learn this new information if it has not been presented to them to which Ms. Bent responded at the end of the Kindergarten year, students would have been taught the information expected for them to know when entering Grade 1 and the fall IRI will identify if students are at that level. Dr. Clark then asked if the IRI assessments stand by themselves as opposed to measuring continual growth along a scale of reasoning to which Ms. Bent responded the current IRI assessment identifies whether or not a student is reading at the expected level at that time. Dr. Clark then asked if the fall IRI given in Grade 1 tests the same material as the spring IRI given in Kindergarten or does the Grade 1 fall IRI test Grade 1 skills. To this, Superintendent Ybarra answered each assessment is testing different skills but comparing the results as though the same assessment were given to the same cohort each time. She adds that it is typical to observe a drop in scores across districts and that testing different skills between years is the primary factor related to the dip in scores. Dr. Clark added this is true at every grade level with each assessment measuring skills at that grade level and not a continuation of skills mastered. She then states the final take away from the data presented today is students are entering the system 55% proficient and leaving at 75% proficient. Board member Hill then reminded members of data showing students who do not test proficient in reading by Grade 3 do not perform as well later in their education and the data provided today shows one fourth of Idaho's students are not proficient in reading when they exit Grade 3.

At this time the Board's Executive Director, Mr. Matt Freeman, shared the data presented today is a total or aggregate comparison as students move through the system. He then asked Board members their preference for how staff measures progress and tracking of IRI scores. Dr. Clark responded it would be more insightful for the Board if staff also provided data for a true cohort, however, still need to see overall results presented today. She continues a separate issue is the use of a new test, adding the numbers provided

today will not be as useful once the new IRI has been fully implemented. To this, Ms. Bent responded one advantage of districts piloting the new IRI is that these districts are testing students using both assessments.

Ms. Bent then states there are multiple ways to group the information and asks if it would be more beneficial to the Board to see results group regionally or by high performing schools versus the current format of providing results at the individual school and district level. To this Dr. Hill responded his belief it is beneficial to look at all the data, however, the final number is what the Board should focus on. Board member Critchfield added more detail would also be useful for schools and districts.

At this time, Mr. Howell, presented to Board members scores for the Idaho Standards Achievement Tests (ISAT). He notes the statewide benchmark has been set at 100%, meaning all students meet proficiency. Mr. Howell then shares the data presented today is for students rating at or above the benchmark and that results for the English Language Assessment (ELA) portion of the ISAT have been improving (increasing) as students' progress through each grade, while the level of proficiency for the Math portion has been trending in the other direction (decreasing).

Mr. Howell continues with an overview of statewide college entrance exam scores. He shares the Board has adopted a benchmark composite score of 24 for the American College Test (ACT) and that currently, Idaho students are trending above average. He continues this is due primarily to the fact that students taking the ACT have elected to take the test because it is their intent to attend a college that accepts the ACT and that the number of students taking the ACT ranges from 6,000-7,000 annually. Mr. Howell then provided an update on the statewide scores for the Scholastic Assessment Test (SAT). He reminds Board members the state pays for and mandates all students take the SAT and that because of this a much broader group of students are taking the SAT as compared to the ACT. Dr. Clark then asked if the Board is comparing results of the SAT to all students taking the test nationwide and, if so, would it not be beneficial to compare Idaho's results with those states who also mandate every student take the test. To this Mr. Howell responded in the affirmative. Dr. Clark then requested the Board collect a separate, additional set of data comparing Idaho students against a composite of states who also test all students.

Mr. Howell then presented to members of the Board the statewide high school graduation rates, reminding Board members of the change in 2013-2014 to measure graduation rates based upon an adjusted cohort graduation rate. He continues that with an adjusted cohort graduation rate any student entering an Idaho school is added to the cohort upon enrollment and removed when they leave, stating this is also how graduation rates are reported nationally. Mr. Howell shares since 2013-14 there has been a slight increase in graduation rates from 77% to 79.5%, however, this is still below the state's target rate of 95%.

At this time Mr. Howell asked if there were any additional measures Board members would like to see related to this performance indicator to which Dr. Clark asked for information on how many students begin 9th grade and finish 12th grade within Idaho's system. Mr. Howell responded this is something that can be identified but is not available today. He then shared with members of the Board that 20% of students do not have a record of attending anywhere else, continuing, a large group of the student population leaves between their junior and senior year and that increasing the Compulsory Attendance Age is something Board members could consider in order to increase retention and completion rates. Ms. Bent then shared the data for statewide high school graduation rates shows that smaller school districts are, in general, outperforming larger school districts and that this could be a result of increased one-on-one time for teachers and students.

Mr. Howell continued his presentation with an update to Board members on the 1-Year and 3-Year Go-On Rates, sharing for the current year available, the 1-Year Go-On Rate was 48% and the 3-Year Go-On Rate was 63% and that overall, there has been a slight decline in the number of students continuing on after high school. He then shares that although the overall Go-On Rate may be flat or declining, a larger percentage of students who are going on are choosing to go to one of Idaho's public institutions. Dr. Hill then asked what is being included in the Go-On rate to which Mr. Howell responded any school receiving federal financial aid, whether that school be an in-state, out-of-state, public, private, military or technical school. Ms. Bent then added the data is provided back to school districts based upon their individual go on rates.

At this time Mr. Howell shared the data for the number of Degrees awarded and STEM Degrees awarded, stating the target has been increased over time because it has continually been met and that the current target is now 15,000 degrees and continues with an upward trend in both number of total degrees and STEM degrees awarded. Mr. Westerberg then asked if the difference between the declining Go-On rates and the increase in Degrees awarded is a result of population growth to which Mr. Howell responded the data for Degrees Awarded includes all students enrolled in a postsecondary institutions and not just Idaho students and that if an institution is able to build their student population by attracting out of state students, then those students are also counted in the number of Degrees awarded. The Board's Executive Director, Mr. Freeman then asked if the data is unduplicated to which Mr. Howell responded the data is unduplicated by degree category. Board members continued with a discussion on how best to count both the Go-On Rate and number of Degrees awarded to which Ms. Bent responded that when looking at Go-On rates compared to Degrees awarded you must also take in to consideration how long it takes for a degree to be conferred. Dr. Hill then added that 20% of Degrees awarded are STEM Degrees and the Board should consider increasing the target for the number of STEM degrees awarded based upon what is known of industry needs. Ms. Bent then responded this will be a part of the conversation at the December Board meeting when Board member's review the Strategic Plan.

Mr. Howell continued his presentation with an update to Board members on the state's Remediation Rates, sharing this data has historically been provided to the Board broken out by institution, however, the information provided today is in response to recommendations from the Governor's Higher Education Taskforce for "Systemness" and is presented as an overall view of the statewide Remediation Rates broken down by the 2-Year institutions, 4-Year institutions and overall rates. Mr. Howell continued by sharing the data with Board members, noting, the percentage of students graduating from an Idaho high school within the previous twelve (12) months identified by an institution as requiring remediation shows a significantly higher rate for students attending a 2-Year institution than those attending a 4-Year institution.

Dr. Hill then asked how the data defines the term remediation and if the need for remediation is being identified by the student and not the type of remediation being received. Mr. Howell responded the requirement for remediation is identified by the institution and not reported on the type of remediation needed.

Dr. Clark then asked if there is a standard definition for the term remediation to which Mr. Howell responded in the negative.

Board member Soltman then asked if the data is being shared with the districts to which Ms. Bent responded this is something that can be accomplished by staff working with the institutions to distribute the information. Mr. Howell added the Board will need to establish a uniformed definition of what requires remediation in order for this data to be helpful to school districts. Dr. Clark then asked why the Board would not have a standard definition for remediation, comparable to levels established with Direct Admissions, and stresses the need to eliminate the decision for remediation being made at the institutional level.

Board member Atchley then commented this goes back to the definition of a high school diploma and that a student going to college requiring remediation is not college ready. She continues this is a great disservice to both our institutions and students if they graduate high school unprepared.

Board member Westerberg then commented one of the reasons behind the Board requirement that all students take a college entrance exam is to determine if a student is capable of basic mathematics and English language skills, adding these scores are sent to the districts. To this the Board's Chief Academic Officer, Dr. Randall Brumfield stated the cut scores requiring remediation in Math or English are determined by the faculty at the individual institutions and these scores will differ by institution. He continues, students requiring remediation in English are supported in a credit bearing remediation course to achieve degree progress, however, there is progress to be made in this area with Math remediation. Dr. Clark then asked if, in light of the Governor's Higher Education Task Force recommendation for "Systemness", it is reasonable for each institution to determine the level for remediation at the level of the individual institution. To this Board member Soltman responded in a perfect system all students graduating from high school would not need remediation and maybe the Board's focus should be on the results of the Grade 3 IRI. Board member Westerberg then stated remediation is an opportunity to provide

students additional help at the next level if it is needed, however, supporting students in this area does not change the fact that a large number of students are still in need of additional help when entering the post-secondary system.

At this time, Superintendent Ybarra shared her discomfort with making policy changes based on the data presented today and that perhaps the Board should consider using the SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC) as a college entrance exam and that, in relation to the IRI test scores, there is more to the IRI test score than what is shown today and the reasoning behind remodeling the IRI is that the current format does not test comprehension. She continues cut scores for the IRI were changed dramatically and are now above the national average. She then states the need for Board members to consider mobility when evaluating scores. Ms. Bent adds the Board had, prior to the policy change, set scores to indicate if a student required remediation or could earn credit for courses based upon their college entrance exam score. She continues the Instructional, Research, and Student Affairs (IRSA) Committee looked at this very closely prior to changing the policy and that student performance on various assessments is something the Board could considered again prior to any policy decisions being made.

Mr. Howell then shared with Board members data on the number of students earning thirty (30) credits per year. He states this is not currently a strategic measure and therefore does not have a benchmark, however, this is tied to Complete College America's 15 to Finish initiative and is a focus of discussion. Mr. Howell then shares more than 50% of enrolled students are attending part time and that of all the enrolled students, currently 13%-14% are taking thirty (30) or more credits per year. Board member Soltman then acknowledged North Idaho College's 15-to-Finish program where students who take 15 credits receive 3 free credits the following semester.

Mr. Howell continued with an update to the Board on retention rates for first-time, full-time students stating the benchmark for the 4-Year institutions has been set at 85% and the retention rate is currently at 74.2%. For the 2-Year institutions the benchmark has been set at 75% and the retention rate is currently 54.4%.

Mr. Howell then shared with members of the Board information on the Graduation Rates for the 4-Year and 2-Year institutions 100% of the time and 150% of the time. He states the benchmark for both institutions is set at 50% and the graduation rate for the 2-Year Institutions is around 10% for on-time completion, 100% of time, and 20% for 150% of time. On-time, 100% completion, for the 4-Year institutions is 18.6% and 40.9% for 150% of time. Mr. Howell then reminds Board members this data is for first-time, full-time students.

Board member Hill then comments the Boards own data shows students taking 30 credits per year is a high predictor to finishing on-time in four years. Board member Soltman then asked why, with growth in dual-credit, are on-time graduation rates not higher. To this Dr. Brumfield responded by asking Board members where the Board wants to be in regards to these numbers, adding this will help to fashion a direction of where to go moving forward. Additionally, he adds the importance of remembering a majority of

students are not full-time, but adult learners with dependents and this must be considered as the Board moves forward. Board member Critchfield voiced her support and reminded Board members of the importance to expand work related credits and experience and the need to help these students to finish. Ms. Bent then shares the work of institutions in this area has been impactful, however, the results have remained flat, even with the efforts of the Board and institutions.

Mr. Howell then provided an update on the 60% Progress Goal, stating the latest census data available is from 2015 and shows progress to be 42%. He continues the 2016 census date is scheduled for release on October 18, 2017.

Mr. Howell continued with an update on Dual Credit Headcount and Credit Hours sharing in 2016 students took 95,000 dual credit hours and that this number increased drastically in 2017 with students taking 143,000 dual credit hours. He continues there has been huge growth in dual credit and the number of students participating and that one of the driving factors has been a policy change related to the Fast Forward program allowing students to take dual credit courses paid for through Fast Forward. He states the increase in dual-credit hours is also driving the increase in total enrollment at postsecondary institutions. At this time Board member Soltman responded this can also have a negative effect as well, if institutions are no longer having to offer entry level courses, such as English and Math 100 courses, they are forced to lay off faculty. Board member Clark then stated the need for Board members to ask how dual credits contribute to a degree and making sure these credits are meaningful if they are to count towards a degree and if students are taking the right dual credit courses it should impact the 1-Year and 2-Year Graduation rates. Board member Critchfield then stated there should also be some correlation with remediation and that the increase in dual credit hours should be leading to a decrease in remediation rates. Board member Westerberg added the increase in dual-credits should have affected much of what was presented to the Board today, Go-On Rate, Remediation Rate, On-Time Completion, etc. but it has not.

At this time, Ms. Bent shared with Board members the Annual Dual-Credit report has been basic in past years, however, a more comprehensive report will be presented at the December meeting. She then asked if Board members had any specific items they would like covered in the report to which Board member Westerberg responded it would be helpful for members to have information from other states on how long it has taken them to reach their goals especially in regards to dual-credit.

Dr. Clark then asked if students taking dual credits have been surveyed on how they are utilizing the credits and if they have impacted their decision to go on. To this Mr. Howell responded a survey of first year postsecondary students was conducted last year and one of the areas of focus was how dual credits impacted a student's decision to go on to a postsecondary education. Dr. Clark then stated she would also like similar questions asked of junior year and senior year high school students.

At this time Board member Atchley stated the importance for Board members to consider the economic impact of dual credit courses as they relate to the money appropriated by

the legislature and if the funding is leading to the intended result. To this Ms. Bent responded the annual dual credit report will include demographic information on students who would be expected to go on as well as those who do not. She continues the Board should also consider the impact of dual credit on the institutions and should consider a deeper look at the current policies related to dual credits.

Dr. Brumfield then shared that for dual credits to really be effective it must be used as an opportunity to engage students and not just as a path to graduation, asking are the dual credits offered intentional and strategic or just offered because they are available. To this Dr. Clark responds the ability to offer dual credit courses at the high school is dependent on the staff and resources available, adding some of the courses that have been approved are a reflection of the staffing reality.

Mr. Howell concluded his presentation with an updated to Board members on Advanced Placement (AP) Enrollment and Examinations. He shares that, similar to dual credit courses, AP courses are also paid for through Fast Forward funds and there has been a continuous increase since 2013-2014 in the number of students taking AP exams.

At this time Ms. Bent asked Board members for any additional comments or direction for staff prior to bringing the Board's Strategic Plan forward for approval at the December Board meeting. She then reminds Board members of the Governor's Higher Education Task Force recommendations and ask Board members to begin considering priorities. Dr. Clark then requested Board members take a deep look at the goals to make sure they are the right goals.

Finally, Board member Critchfield shared with Board members the K-12 Student Engagement survey that will be used in the 2017-2018 school year as the school quality measure chosen by Board to identify the lowest performing schools. Board member Critchfield reminded the Board that originally the school quality measure was going to be student absenteeism and the three surveys were going to be developed and implemented in the 2018-2019 school year. Through the public feedback process student absenteeism was rejected, leaving only the surveys for use as the school quality measure. Of the three surveys, only the student engagement survey could be given in a way that would meet the federal requirements for use in identifying the lowest performing schools. The Department of Education identified a process using the statewide testing vendor for administering the survey in 2017-2018 that would limit the impact on the schools. Using feedback from stakeholders and legislators, three areas were identified for the survey to cover. Department and Board staff worked together to identify surveys that had already gone through a validation processes. The survey is included in the agenda material as attachment 30. During the coming year additional work will be done to determine if an existing survey can be used or if we want to go through the process of creating validated Teacher Engagement and Parent Engagement Surveys. The results and feedback on this year's Student Engagement survey will be used to inform the process for next year's Student Engagement survey. Board member Critchfield asked the Board if they had any concerns moving forward with the Panorama Survey and administering it with the ISAT. There were no objections.

There were no additional questions or comments from the Board.

At this time the Board recessed for a fifteen minute break, returning at 3:15 pm (MDT).

STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (SDE)

During the regularly scheduled Board meeting in August it was announced that starting in October, the Idaho State Department of Education's portion of the agenda would move to Wednesday afternoon.

1. Developments in K-12 Education

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

State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Sherri Ybarra introduced the iteming by sharing with Board members two Idaho schools had recently been recognized by the U.S. Department of Education as National Blue Ribbon Schools – Horseshoe Bend Elementary in Horseshoe Bend and J. Russell Elementary in Moscow. Superintendent Ybarra continued by updating Board members on her recent visits with Superintendents from Regions III, IV and V, the incredible turnout at this year's Hispanic Youth Summit with a record 700 students in attendance, her recent visit at the Advanced Opportunities training as well as a recap of her Parent Group meeting where the discussion centered around the Climate Survey and specifically school safety and bias in the questions. Finally, Ms. Ybarra shared with members of the Board the Idaho State Department of Education (ISDE) has been preparing for release two Public Service Announcements, one related to bullying and the other geared towards educators.

At this time, Superintendent Ybarra invited her Associate Deputy Superintendent of Public School Finance, Mr. Tim Hill, to share with Board members ISDE's request for the upcoming year beginning July 1, 2018. Mr. Hill started his presentation by bringing to the Board's attention the total change in the funds requested for 2018-2019 was an increase of \$113,602,500 or 6.8%. Mr. Hill continues Section 3: Statutory/Maintenance and Section 4: Statutory/Maintenance (Governor's Task Force) of ISDE's budget are not requests, but estimates of the costs required based upon current law and that these two requests represent a majority share of ISDE's total budget request. He continues Section 3: Statutory/Maintenance are those items that are not necessarily tied to the Governor's Higher Education Task Force where Section 4: Statutory/Maintenance (Governor's Task Force) are. Mr. Hill then states Section 6: Line Item Requests (Governor's Task Force) and Section 7: Line Item Requests (Other) are the 2018-2019 line item requests being submitted to the legislature for approval

At this time, Board member Critchfield asked for clarification of ISDE's Line Item Request 6.a. and if the request is for equipment to which Mr. Hill responded the request is for technology, infrastructure, and instructional management system maintenance. Ms. Critchfield then asked for more information on the one-time statewide Wi-Fi services request to which ISDE Chief Deputy Superintendent Pete Koehler responded the original

contract for statewide Wi-Fi services was for a term of five years, however, districts were allowed to buy in after the initial start date and that the one-time request is for those remaining districts.

At this time the Board's Executive Officer, Mr. Matt Freeman, asked how the request for an additional \$2,000,000 in support of College and Career Advisors and Student Mentors would be distributed to the districts. Mr. Hill responded currently those schools with 100 or more students in Grade 8 through Grade 12 received the greater of \$14,000 or \$58.00 per student and those schools with fewer than 100 students in Grade 8 through Grade 12 received the greater of \$7,000 or \$140.00 per student. He continues that approval of the additional \$2,000,000 funding request would result in an increase of \$4,000 for schools with greater than 100 students in Grade 8 through Grade 12 for a total of \$18,000. Schools with fewer than 100 students in Grade 8 through Grade 12 would receive an increase of \$2,000 for a total of \$9,000 or \$180.00 per student.

Board member Soltman then asked of the line item request for an increase in funding for Mastery-Based Education and if the long term goal is for an incremental approach. To this Superintendent Ybarra responded the cohort was not of sufficient size to collect data for what ISDE wanted to accomplish and that it was the intent of the ISDE to open and expand the program to more schools who have expressed interest. She continues there is no answer when Idaho would move to a mastery based system and this is a work in progress. Board member Clark then shared her understanding the original pilot included whole districts as well as individual schools and asked if ISDE would be reporting on the results from the first part of the project. To this Superintendent Ybarra responded in the affirmative, however, the pilot was drafted in phases and issues are still being addressed, specifically testing and how to utilize the SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC) with a Mastery Based system. Dr. Clark then asked if participating schools and districts were provided guidance and guidelines based on information provided by other states participating in a mastery based program to which Superintendent Ybarra responded in the affirmative. Dr. Clark then then requested Board members share with the Superintendent any specific questions they would like addressed to which Board member Critchfield asked of the possibility for Board members to tour participating schools and districts to see the program first hand to which Superintendent Ybarra responded in the affirmative. Dr. Clark then stated that from the perspective of a policy board the importance of learning from these initial participants where they have encountered issues and roadblocks and that the Board will need to put in place a framework to allow this process to move forward. To this Superintendent Ybarra responded this is why the ISDE has approached this as an incubator or pilot program.

At this time, Associate Deputy Superintendent, Mr. Tim Hill, continued his presentation by reviewing with Board members Section 7: Line Item Requests (Other) stating these are specific line item requests not related to the recommendations of the Task Force. Board member Soltman then asked why ISDE elected to use the phrase "discretionary" in items a. and b. versus "operational" to which Mr. Hill responded the statute uses the term "discretionary" and that is reflected in the request. Mr. Hill then concluded his presentation by reviewing with Board members the final line items.

Superintendent Ybarra continued her update by inviting Chief Deputy Superintendent Mr. Pete Koehler to share with Board members ISDE's recent improvements to the Infinite Campus Portal. Mr. Koehler shares the site was found to be cumbersome and difficult to navigate and has now been redesigned and renamed to the SDE Application Portal adding although the name has changed, the requirements have not. He continues the changes and updates were driven primarily by stakeholder feedback and found to be cost efficient and require fewer licensing requirements and limitations.

Mr. Koehler then update Board members on improvements to the Parent Portal. He shares this is an ongoing project between the ISDE and Idaho Digital Learning Academy (IDLA) that has been in development for the past year. The project has been named the Parent Education Resource Center (PERC) and is a resource for parents of students from pre-K through the senior year of Idaho. He adds the Idaho content standards will be tied to the portal which is scheduled for a formal launch in February 2018 and to become fully operational by June 2018.

At this time Superintendent Ybarra continued with an update on the new Idaho Reading Indicator (IRI) Pilot program sharing more than 2,000 students identified as "At Risk" are making gains, however, the IRI is an indicator and was never intended to be used for accountability but to identify struggling students.

Superintendent Ybarra then invited her Director of Assessment and Accountability, Ms. Karlynn Laraway, to present to the Board preliminary data from the new IRI Pilot. She shares the new IRI has been administered to just over 13,000 students at 58 schools in 37 districts. Ms. Laraway continues the new ISIP assessment, administered through Istation, is an early reading assessment measuring reading development for students in Grades K through 3. ISIP is a fully computer adaptive assessment serving 4 million students in 48 states that tests students in the critical areas of reading as developmentally appropriate and supports English Learners and students with disabilities. Ms. Laraway continues with a side-by-side comparison of scores from the Legacy assessment and ISIP assessment broken down by grade level. Results from the ISIP assessment showed an increase in the number of students in Kindergarten and Grade 1 not meeting benchmark (compared to results from the Legacy test), however, she shares this is to be expected. Scores begin to level out in Grade 2 with another dip in students reaching benchmark at Grade 3. Ms. Laraway adds feedback from participating districts has been positive, primarily due to the ability of the ISIP assessment to identify a need for intervention early on as well as data being both immediate and actionable.

Board member Critchfield then asked if results from successful districts are being shared with other districts to which Ms. Laraway responded in the affirmative. Ms. Critchfield then shared with Board members discussions with individuals who have approached her with concerns over the Istation vendor. To this Superintendent Ybarra responded there has been a lot of discussion around this topic, specifically with the vendor setting the cut score, however, the ISIP cut scores and assessment are nationally normed. She

continues, it is standard practice for companies to sell interventions with their product, and although she understands concerns around this, it is outside of ISDE's control.

Finally, Ms. Laraway shared with Board members that pilot schools are administering both the Legacy IRI and ISIP IRI to students and this must be done within one (1) week of each other in order to achieve comparable data for these students.

There were no additional questions or comments from the Board.

2. Approval to Operate an Elementary School with Less than Ten (10) Pupils in Average Daily Attendance

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

State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Ms. Sherri Ybarra, introduced the item by reminding Board members of the requirement for the Idaho State Department of Education (ISDE) to approve schools with less than ten (10) pupils and then report these schools to the Board. Board member Soltman asked for clarification from Superintendent Ybarra on how to handle schools with fewer than ten (10) students to which Superintendent Ybarra responded the decision to maintain these schools lies with the local school district. Board member Soltman then commented on the high cost of educating students at schools with fewer than ten (10) students. To this, ISDE Associate Deputy Superintendent Mr. Tim Hill responded the current support unit value of approximately \$98,000 seems to provide sufficient funding for these small programs to continue serving students in remote areas without having to bus students for an extended period of time in order for them to attend a larger school in a neighboring community or district. Board member Critchfield then shared with the Board her experience as a Cassia County School Board Trustee when explaining the financial implications of operating a small school were met with strong resistance.

There were no additional questions or comments from the Board.

3. Pending Rule – Docket No. 08-0203-1702, Rules Governing Thoroughness, College Entrance Examination

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Ybarra/Westerberg): To approve Pending Rule Docket No. 08-0203-1702, Rules Governing Thoroughness – College Entrance Examination, as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried 7-0. Mr. Scoggin was absent from voting.

State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Ms. Sherri Ybarra, introduced the item by reminding Board members of the rule change effective March 2016 removing the Compass assessment as an option to meet the requirement for students to take a college entrance exam (CEE) before the end of their eleventh grade year to meet graduation requirements. She continues the final administration of the Compass assessment was on November 1, 2016, which could potentially impact students graduating in 2018 and that

this rule change would allow students who took the Compass exam prior to its final administration to meet the CEE graduation requirement.

Board member Clark then asked if the exception pertained only to special education students to which Director of Assessment and Accountability for the Idaho State Department, Ms. Karlynn Laraway, responded the circumstances would apply to any student citing specific examples of their inability to take the test and meet the graduation requirement through no fault of their own. Board member Critchfield then asked how many exceptions the Idaho State Department of Education (ISDE) had granted under this provision during the previous year to which Ms. Laraway responded none due to the fact the rule had yet to be proposed. Board member Clark then shared her belief the language as written does not meet the original intent adding there are no parameters around what an extenuating circumstance may be. To this Superintendent Ybarra responded it is not the intent of ISDE to allow students to not take the test. Board member Westerberg then stated his belief a reasonable amount of discretion by ISDE is appropriate in addition to an annual report to the Board. Board member Hill then expressed his support with the modified language. Ms. Atchley then shared her belief that if another college exam is taken it would not warrant reporting to the Board, only if a student was exempted from taking a college entrance exam. Board members then agreed to vote on the motion as presented with no changes.

There were no additional questions or comments from the Board.

4. Temporary and Pending Rule Docket No. 08-0203-1708, Rules Governing Thoroughness, Incorporation by Reference – Idaho English Language Proficiency Assessment Achievement Standards

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Ybarra/Critchfield): To adopt the amended Idaho English Language Proficiency Assessment Achievement Standards as submitted in Attachment 2. The motion carried 7-0. Mr. Scoggin was absent from voting.

AND

M/S (Ybarra/Atchley): To approve Pending and Amended Temporary Rule Docket No. 08-0203-1708, Rules Governing Thoroughness, Incorporation by Reference, as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried 7-0. Mr. Scoggin was absent from voting.

There were no questions or comments from the Board.

5. Pending Rule, Docket No. 08-0203-1711, Rules Governing Thoroughness, Idaho Alternate Assessment Achievement Standards

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Ybarra/Hill): To approve the Amended Idaho Alternate Assessment Achievement Standards as submitted in Attachment 2. The motion carried 7-0. Mr. Scoggin was absent from voting.

AND

M/S (Ybarra/Hill): To approve the Pending Rule Docket No. 08-0203-1711, as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried 7-0. Mr. Scoggin was absent from voting.

There were no questions or comments from the Board.

6. Idaho Bias and Sensitivity Committee Recommendations to Remove Items from the 2018 Idaho Standards Achievement Test (ISAT) Administration

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Ybarra/Hill): To adopt the recommendation of the Assessment Review Committee for the removal of the one (1) English language arts item as submitted. The motion carried 7-0. Mr. Scoggin was absent from voting.

There were not questions or comments from the Board.

At this time Board members moved to go in to Executive Session.

EXECUTIVE SESSION (Closed to the Public)

M/S (Crithfield/Hill): To meet in executive session pursuant to Section 74-2016(1)(b), Idaho Code, "To consider the evaluation, dismissal or disciplining of, or to hear complaints or charges brought against, a public officer, employee, staff member of individual agent, or public school student." A roll call vote was taken and the motion carried 7-0. Mr. Scoggin was absent from voting. Board members entered in to Executive Session at 4:40 pm (MDT).

M/S (Crithfield/Hill): To go out of Executive Session. The motion carried 7-0. Mr. Scoggin was absent from voting. Board members exited Executive Session at 5:17pm (MDT) and recessed for the evening.

Thursday, October 19, 2017 8:00 a.m., Lewis-Clark State College, Williams Conference Center, Lewiston, Idaho.

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

CONSENT AGENDA

BOARD ACTION

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

Audit

1. Boise State University – Research Foundation Agreement

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Hill): By unanimous consent to approve the Operating Agreement between Boise State University and the Boise State University Research Foundation. The motion carried 7-0. Mr. Scoggin was absent from voting.

Business Affairs & Human Resources (BAHR) – Section II Finance

2. Idaho State University – Replacement and Upgrade of Idaho State University (ISU) campus-wide

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Hill): By unanimous consent to approve the request by Idaho State University to replace and upgrade the university's network switching hardware, for an amount not to exceed \$2,693,000. The motion carried 7-0. Mr. Scoggin was absent from voting.

3. University of Idaho – Disposal of Real Property – Aberdeen Research and Extension Center, Bingham County

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Hill): By unanimous consent to approve the request by the University of Idaho to dispose of 2.01 acres of land, as described in Attachment 1, for the sum of \$15,400 and to authorize the Vice President for Infrastructure to execute all necessary transaction documents for conveying this real property, as proposed in the materials presented to the Board. The motion carried 7-0. Mr. Scoggin was absent from voting.

Instruction, Research and Student Affairs (IRSA)

4. State General Education Committee Appointments

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Hill): By unanimous consent to appoint Dr. Cher Hendricks, representing University of Idaho to the General Education Committee effective immediately. The motion carried 7-0. Mr. Scoggin was absent from voting.

Planning, Policy and Governmental Affairs (PPGA)

5. Data Management Council Appointments

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Hill): By unanimous consent to approve the appointment of Luke Schroeder to the Data Management Council for the remainder of the term from July 1, 2017 to June 30, 2019. The motion carried 7-0. Mr. Scoggin was absent from voting.

6. Indian Education Committee Appointments

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Hill): By unanimous consent to appointment of Mr. Marcus Coby, as the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes tribal chair designee, effective immediately and expiring June 30, 2022. The motion carried 7-0. Mr. Scoggin was absent from voting.

AND

M/S (Critchfield/Hill): By unanimous consent to appoint Mr. Graydon Stanley, representing North Idaho College, effective immediately and expiring June 30, 2022. The motion carried 7-0. Mr. Scoggin was absent from voting.

AND

M/S (Critchfield/Hill): By unanimous consent to appoint Ms. Tina Strong, representing Coeur d'Alene Tribal School, effective immediately and expiring June 30, 2021. The motion carried 7-0. Mr. Scoggin was absent from voting.

7. Idaho State University – Facility Naming – Meridian Health Science Center

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Hill): By unanimous consent to approve the request by Idaho State University to rename the “Meridian Health Science Center,” located at 1311 E. Central Drive, Meridian, ID, to the “Sam and Aline Skaggs Health Science Center. The motion carried 7-0. Mr. Scoggin was absent from voting.

8. President Approved Alcohol Permits Report
This item was provided in the agenda materials as an information item.

State Department of Education (SDE)

9. Emergency Provisional Certificates

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Hill): By unanimous consent to approve one-year emergency provisional certificates for Demsie Butler, Danielle Chavez, Mindy Nield, and Aaron Tayson Beck to teach the content area and grade ranges at the specified school districts as provided herein for the 2017-2018 School Year. The motion carried 7-0. Mr. Scoggin was absent from voting.

PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS (PPGA)

2. Workforce Development Council Annual Report
This item was provided in the agenda materials as an information item.

Workforce Development Council (WDC) Chair, Mr. Trent Clark, was scheduled to present the WDC Annual Report to the Board, however, due to a scheduling conflict, Mr. Clark was unable to attend the Board meeting. The WDC Annual Report was included in the agenda materials for Board members to review.

3. Boise State University/University of Idaho - Board Policy I.J. Use of Facilities – Second Reading – Expansion of Alcohol on Campus

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Soltman): To approve the second reading of changes to Board policy section I.J. as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried 6-0 with Mr. Westerberg voting nay. Mr. Scoggin was absent from voting.

Planning, Policy and Governmental Affairs (PPGA) Committee chair, Ms. Debbie Critchfield, introduced the item, reminding Board members of the discussion and comments from the August Board meeting and that the item before the Board today is a

second reading and includes the Board's comments from the August meeting. She then identifies an error on Tab 3, Page 10 of the PPGA Agenda Materials and shares Paragraph 2 should read *"Only patrons who hold tickets to the athletic event shall be allowed into the event"*.

There were no additional questions or comments from the Board.

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

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Soltman): To approve the second reading of Board Policy IV.E. Career Technical Education as provided in Attachment 1. The motion carried 7-0. Mr. Scoggin was absent from voting.

Planning, Policy and Governmental Affairs (PPGA) Committee chair, Ms. Debbie 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 questions or comments from the Board.

5. Governor's Higher Education Task Force Recommendations – Implementation Matrix

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Hill): To approve the Task Force Recommendation priority order and committee assignments as specified in Attachment 1. The motion carried 7-0. Mr. Scoggin was absent from voting.

Planning, Policy and Governmental Affairs (PPGA) Committee Chair, Ms. Debbie Critchfield introduced the item, stating that the discussion today around the proposed implementation framework for the Governor's Higher Education Task Force recommendations would provide Board staff as well as staff at the institutions and agencies under the Board's oversight and governance with direction on priority areas for developing more comprehensive plans and timelines for implementation of the Task Force recommendations. She then invited the Board's Chief Planning & Policy Officer, Ms. Tracie Bent, and Chief Academic Officer, Dr. Randall Brumfield, to present the final recommendations of the Governor's Higher Education Task Force (Task Force) to the Board. She explained to Board members each recommendation would be presented along with a recommendation for committee assignments by the Board.

Ms. Bent shares with Board members the first recommendation of the Task Force for Efficiencies, Cost Savings and Service. She continues a majority of the functions within this recommendation would fall under the Board's Business Affairs and Human Resources (BAHR) Committee, however, some student based functions would fall under the Instruction, Research and Student Affairs (IRSA) Committee. It was determined by members of the Board the BAHR committee would take the lead with those items specific to student affairs delegated to the IRSA committee. Ms. Bent shared with Board members implementation of this recommendation would not require changes to Idaho Code or Administrative Code, however, it may require changes to Board Policy as well as a budget request.

Ms. Bent then shared with Board members the second recommendation of the Task Force to review and update the 60% Goal. Board members determined this recommendation would be assigned to the Planning, Policy and Governmental Affairs (PPGA) Committee with support from the Board's Director of Research and Institutional Research staff from each institution. The Board's Executive Director, Mr. Matt Freeman, reminded Board members the recommendation will also restate the 60% Goal from 2020 to 2025 and that restatement of the goal would be brought to the Board for approval at the December meeting.

The third recommendation of the Task Force was for Structural Change and System Improvements. Board members determined this recommendation would be shared between the PPGA and IRSA committees. Ms. Bent then explained to Board members changes in policy related to K-12 education would require a change in administrative code and would go through the Idaho State Department of Education (ISDE) and PPGA committee. The IRSA committee would take responsibility for the recommendations related to postsecondary education. Ms. Bent then shared with Board members changes to Administrative Code or Rules would begin with the next rule making cycle and implemented the following year if accepted by the Legislature. At this time, Board member Atchley asked for a status update on the recommendation for a statewide Digital Campus to which Ms. Bent responded the Digital Campus is one area preliminary identified as falling under the IRSA committee. She continues the Board will need to review all of the recommendations and then determine a timeline for implementation of each recommendation. At this time Board member Clark added the Digital Campus would require a dedicated committee to make this a reality. She continues this committee can be formed at whatever point is appropriate and that it is not reasonable to expect existing committees to take this on. At this time Board member Hill stated his agreement and commented he also would like a special committee formed for this purpose that would report to the IRSA committee. Ms. Bent then reminded Board members each committee has the ability to form work groups to specialize in specific areas. At this time, the Board's Chief Academic Officer, Dr. Randall Brumfield, shared with Board members that university provosts have been informed of the recommendations and are aware of the need for work group assignments to accomplish some of the recommendations. The Board's Executive Director, Mr. Matt Freeman, then reminded members that as the Board works through the recommendations and process, staff will require guidance from the Board in prioritizing the recommendations.

At this time, Ms. Bent shared with the Board the fourth recommendation of the Task Force to develop and implement a comprehensive P-20 Guided Pathways program. This recommendation was then assigned to both the PPGA and IRSA committees. Ms. Bent then stated the recommendation would most likely require changes to Idaho Code, Administrative Code, and Board Policy and that full implementation would take up to three years, beginning in FY19 and ending in FY21. Board member Hill then stressed the need to parallel the Board's work on this recommendation with the recommendations of the Governor's Workforce Development Task Force.

Ms. Bent then shared with Board members the fifth recommendation of the Task Force to Improve Certificate and Degree Completion. This recommendation was assigned to the IRSA and PPGA committees with IRSA taking the lead. Ms. Bent informed Board members this recommendation would require changes to Idaho Code, Administrative Code, and Board Policy and would also require the Board to put forth a budget request.

At this time, Ms. Bent shared with the Board the sixth recommendation of the Task Force to provide a Statewide Digital Campus. This recommendation was assigned to the IRSA committee. Ms. Bent then shared with Board members the recommendation would require changes to Board policy and additional budget requests and that implementation of this recommendation would be in FY20, however, planning would start in FY19. Board member Hill then stated this could fit within the fourth recommendation of the Task Force and that the Board should rationalize overlaps and consider combining the digital learning recommendation from Task Force recommendation four with this recommendation. Ms. Bent then stated the Board will begin review of those recommendations requiring budget requests in June for FY20.

Ms. Bent then shared with Board members the seventh recommendation of the Task Force for a systematic increase in funding. This item was assigned to the BAHR committee and would require an additional budget request. Board member Westerberg then asked for clarification of the recommendation, noting that as listed in the agenda materials, the recommendation indicated an increase in general dollars, not specific to scholarships. As co-chair of the work group making the recommendation, Board member Atchley explained the request was for an increase in scholarship dollars to provide greater access to college through scholarships. Mr. Freeman added as a point of clarification, the recommendation should read *"Systematically increase scholarship dollars to fund all eligible Idaho high school students while not losing sight of the goal of lowering cost/improving access"*.

Ms. Bent then introduced the eight recommendation of the Task Force for Outcomes Based Funding. This recommendation was assigned to the BAHR committee and would require a budget request and for the Board and staff to work closely with legislators and stakeholders for approval.

The ninth recommendation of the Task Force introduced by Ms. Bent was Adoption of the Recommendations of the Governor's Workforce Development Task Force and was assigned to the IRSA committee. Board member Westerberg then asked if in addition to making committee assignments, the purpose of reviewing the recommendations was to also permit the Board's committees to move ahead with the work necessary to implement the recommendations to which Dr. Clark responded in the affirmative. Dr. Clark also noted the Board must be aware of staff assignments as well, to which Mr. Westerberg commented on the need for Board members to establish reasonable priorities for the Task Force recommendations.

Ms. Bent then introduced the tenth recommendation of the Task Force for a Competency –Based System and was assigned to the IRSA committee. Ms. Bent continues the recommendation would require changes to Board policy and could be implemented within the first year, however, it could take up to five years for institutions to implement.

The final two recommendations of the Task Force were to Partner with Industry (#11) and counting Workforce Training towards Degree or Certificate Completion (#12). Both recommendation were assigned to the IRSA committee and would require changes to Board policy. The twelfth recommendation to allow Workforce Training towards Degree or Certificate Completion would require a budget request.

After assigning each recommendation to a Board committee for implementation, the discussion moved to how to prioritize the recommendations presented today. Mr. Westerberg commented on the need to prioritize the recommendations to help staff work towards implementation and then added the eight recommendation for Outcomes Based Funding would be one of his top priorities. The Board then requested allowing 3 – 4 weeks for committees and staff to map out the recommendations and present them in prioritized order at the December Board meeting.

There were no additional questions or comments from the Board.

6. Proposed Mastery-Based Route to Certification: Alternative Authorization – Content Specialist

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Soltman): To approve the initial concept of a mastery-based program for teacher certification for individuals who meet the requirements of the alternative authorization – Content Specialist route to certification with final approval based on consideration of the modules and assessments identified in Attachment 1. The motion carried 7-0. Mr. Scoggin was absent from voting.

Planning, Policy and Governmental Affairs (PPGA) Committee Chair, Ms. Debbie Critchfield introduced the item, sharing with Board members that approval of the proposed certification program through the alternative authorization-content specialist would allow Board staff to begin working with experts to create the modules and assessments for the

program. She then invited the Board's Chief Planning & Policy Officer, Ms. Tracie Bent, and Educator Effectiveness Program Manager, Ms. Christina Linder, to present the proposed program to members of the Board.

Ms. Linder shares with Board members during the previous year approximately 600 teachers were in the classroom under some kind of alternate certification route typically in response to an emergency situation or shortage primarily in rural districts. She continues that currently the Board has approved two alternate routes to certification, however one route is light on support for candidates and the other cumbersome and the proposal before the Board today is for a program that acknowledges a more mastery based approach that still fits within Board policy. In all cases the candidates must meet Idaho's certification standards and pass board approved assessment.

At this time Board member Hill asked if the proposed program eliminates the time constraints encountered with the current alternate routes to certification and allows a person to receive full credit for what they already know to which Ms. Linder responded in the affirmative. Superintendent Ybarra then expressed her support for the proposed program as one option to address Idaho's teacher and educator shortage. Board member Soltman then asked if the program would be tied to a specific institution or left up to the applicant to advance through the program to which Ms. Linder responded the proposed program is currently in the concept phase and this is something to consider as the program is developed further. At this time Board member Critchfield added this is an opportunity for Board members to weigh in heavily on implementation of the program and the next steps. Board member Clark adds it is the intent of the Board and PPGA Committee to engage stakeholders as well. Finally, Ms. Bent shared, the request before the Board today is for initial approval and that once the modules have been developed they would need to pass the review process prior to being returned to the Board for final approval.

There were no additional questions or comments from the Board.

7. Alternative Assessment for Individuals Pursuing Certification through Alternative Authorization – Content Specialist: *Uniform Standard for Evaluating Content Competency Rubric*

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Hill): To approve the state assessment: Uniform Standard for Evaluating Content Competency for individuals entering an alternate authorization to certification as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried 7-0. Mr. Scoggin was absent from voting.

AND

M/S (Critchfield/Soltman): To direct the Professional Standards Commission to evaluate and bring forward recommendations on additional state-approved assessments and qualify scores that may be used for certification purposes as well as updated qualifying scores on the existing PRAXIS II assessments. The motion carried 7-0. Mr. Scoggin was absent from voting.

Planning, Policy and Governmental Affairs (PPGA) Committee Chair, Ms. Debbie Critchfield introduced the item, sharing with Board members that approval of the proposed alternate assessment would create a second state assessment that could be used by individuals seeking certification through an alternate route. She then invited the Board's Chief Planning & Policy Officer, Ms. Tracie Bent, and Educator Effectiveness Program Manager, Ms. Christina Linder, to present the proposed program to members of the Board.

Ms. Linder begins by sharing with Board members the need to consider a more reasonable entrance assessment for those individuals seeking alternate certification. She continues for those individuals on an alternate route, the PRAXIS II is not a reasonable assessment and that Board members may want to consider a uniform standard for evaluating content or a competency rubric similar to the accepted measure used by states to show teachers were "highly qualified" in their content area under No Child Left Behind. She continues the proposed rubric would be comprised of simple worksheets for documenting knowledge and experience with a rubric that uniformly measures basic content knowledge.

Superintendent Ybarra then asked if an individual on an alternate route would still be required to take the PRAXIS to which Ms. Linder responded in the affirmative, stating every candidate would be required to take that PRAXIS to show they have either met the standard or as a needs assessment. Superintendent Ybarra then asked what would happen if a candidate completed the alternate certification route but was not able to pass the PRAXIS to which Ms. Linder responded if an individual cannot pass the PRAXIS then the state would lose them from the classroom.

At this time Board member Critchfield shared with the Board discussions from the prior legislative session around eliminating the current process for certification and that the proposal before the Board today is not intended to water down the assessment, but rather to provide proven individuals a route to a certificate sufficient to establish the needs of school districts throughout the state.

Board member Soltman then asked if stakeholder feedback on this particular item was considered to which Ms. Linder responded the item was discussed at the most recent Educator Pipeline meeting where a majority of stakeholders voted in the affirmative. To this Board member Clark added school districts have clearly expressed the need for alternate routes to certification in order to help fill positions within their districts.

At this time Superintendent Ybarra again shared her discomfort with granting this group of educators an exception on taking the PRAXIS to which Ms. Linder responded with her agreement this could give the perception of watering down the standards, however, the current policy requires applicants pass the PRAXIS prior to stepping in to the classroom and it is commonly known that current practices are not in compliance with this policy and a solution must be brought forward.

Board member Clark then asked how long an individual could be in the classroom prior to taking, and passing, the PRAXIS to which Ms. Bent responded administrative rule requires individuals currently on the Content Specialist Alternative Authorization pass a Board approved assessment and the proposed item would allow them to enter the classroom while on the alternate route and, that while on an alternate route, individuals are authorized on an interim certificate which is a one year certificate, renewable up to three years. She continues an individual could end up not being able to renew, however, the proposal presented in the previous item does still have individuals taking the PRAXIS when entering the program to identify areas on weakness in content knowledge and an individual would take the PRAXIS again when exiting the program. Board member Hill then asked if this in effect would be a way of formalizing, at the state level, for district use, the acceptability of a candidate on an alternative pathway to which Ms. Linder responded in the affirmative.

There were no additional questions or comments from the Board.

At this time, the Board recessed for a 10 minute break, returning at 9:40 am MDT.

BUSINESS AFFAIRS AND HUMAN RESOURCES (BAHR - HR)

Section I – Human Resources

1. University of Idaho – Multi-Year Employment Agreement – Men’s Basketball Head Coach

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Atchley): To approve the request by the University of Idaho to extend the multi-year employment contract with Don Verlin, as the Men’s Basketball Team Coach for four years for a term extending through June 30, 2021 plus other adjustments to terms in substantial conformance to the form submitted to the Board in Attachment 2. The motion carried 7-0. Mr. Scoggin was absent from voting.

Business Affairs and Human Resources (BAHR) Committee Chair Mr. Westerberg introduced the item and shared with Board members the terms of the contract before the Board today is for a term greater than three years and annual compensation in excess of \$200,000 therefore approval by the Board is required.

University of Idaho General Counsel, Mr. Kent Nelson, was present to answer questions from the Board. Mr. Nelson shared with Board members a brief overview of the agreement. He states the contract extends the term from 2017-2021 for four years with no change in salary. He continues the term for automatic extension based upon team record was removed as well as terms related to change of conference, automatic pay increases and supplemental numbers.

There were not questions or comments from the Board.

2. University of Idaho – Multi-Year Contract – Head Men’s Football Coach

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Atchley): To approve the request by the University of Idaho to extend the multi-year employment contract with Paul Petrino, as Men’s Football Head Coach, for a term expiring June 30, 2022 (or as further extended pursuant to the terms of the contract) plus other adjustments to terms, including an annual car allowance of \$4,800 per year, in substantial conformance to the form submitted to the Board in Attachment 2. The motion carried 7-0. Mr. Scoggin was absent from voting.

Business Affairs and Human Resources (BAHR) Committee Chair Mr. Westerberg introduced the item and shared with Board members the terms of the proposed employment agreement for Coach Petrino could potentially exceed both three years and annual compensation in excess of \$200,000 therefore approval by the Board is required.

University of Idaho General Counsel, Mr. Kent Nelson, was present to answer questions from the Board. He shares the contract extends the term to 2022 for a total of five years with an automatic extension based on a team record of eight wins or more.

There were no questions or comments from the Board.

Section II – Finance

1. FY 2018 Colleges and Universities “Summary of Sources and Uses of Funds”
This item was provided in the agenda materials as an information item.

Business Affairs and Human Resources (BAHR) Committee Chair Mr. Westerberg introduced the item and shared with Board members the purpose of today’s report is to provide to Board members a high level overview of the institutions’ sources of funding and expenditures. He then invited the Board’s Chief Financial Officer, Mr. Chet Herbst, to share the report’s findings with Board members.

Mr. Herbst shares the sources and uses report as presented covers the state's four year institutions with the information presented for all four institutions together under system reports followed by individual breakouts by institutions. He adds the report provides Board members with an idea of the scope and scale of operations within the institutions.

There were no questions or comments from the Board.

2. Idaho State University – Facilities Use Agreement between Idaho State University (ISU) and the Idaho College of Osteopathic Medicine (ICOM) for use of ISU Facilities

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Atchley): To authorize Idaho State University to enter into the Facility Use Agreement with the Idaho College of Osteopathic Medicine as presented in Attachments 1 and 2. The motion carried 7-0. Mr. Scoggin was absent from voting.

Business Affairs and Human Resources (BAHR) Committee Chair Mr. Westerberg introduced the item and shared with Board members the Idaho College of Osteopathic Medicine (ICOM) is working towards provisional accreditation, and their accrediting body – the Commission on Osteopathic College Accreditation (COCA), requires a contingency plan in the event the ICOM building is not substantially complete and ready for classes in August 2018. He continues Idaho State University (ISU) has agreed to provide ISU facility space, on a temporary basis, for use by ICOM students in the event completion of the ICOM facility is delayed and that the agreement Board members are voting on today meets COCA's requirements for use of ISU facilities by ICOM in the event of such a contingency.

Associate Dean for Clinical Research for Idaho State University Division of Health Sciences, Dr. Rex Force and General Counsel for Idaho State University Ms. Joanne Hirase-Stacey were present to answer questions from the Board. Dr. Force shares with Board members the items before them today are contingency plans put in place for use of Idaho State University (ISU) facilities by ICOM should the ICOM building not be constructed on time. Use of ISU space by ICOM would occur after hours or when ISU students are not occupying the space and collection of rates would apply. Dr. Force continues the likelihood of this contingency being executed is not anticipated, however, the request was brought forth by at the request of the ICOM accrediting body.

There were no questions or comments from the Board.

3. Idaho State University – Amendment to the License Agreement for Space between Idaho State University (ISU) and the Idaho College of Osteopathic Medicine (ICOM) for use of the ISU Anatomy and Physiology (A/P) Lab

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Atchley): To authorize Idaho State University to amend the License Agreement for Space with the Idaho College of Osteopathic Medicine as presented in Attachments 1 and 2. The motion carried 7-0. Mr. Scoggin was absent from voting.

Business Affairs and Human Resources (BAHR) Committee Chair Mr. Westerberg introduced the item and shared with Board members the proposed amendment to the License Agreement the Board will be voting on today establishes a contingency plan to deal with a possible delay in the completion of the Anatomy and Physiology Lab expansion project.

Associate Dean for Clinical Research for Idaho State University Division of Health Sciences, Dr. Rex Force and General Counsel for Idaho State University Ms. Joanne Hirase-Stacey were present to answer questions from the Board. Dr. Rex Force shares with Board members the agreement relates to the build out of the Idaho State University (ISU) Anatomy and Physiology Lab on the Meridian Campus. He continues ISU received notification in August they would be the recipient of a large gift from the ALSAM Foundation that would prolong the planning and construction phase for the project. He states the contingency would allow for ISU and Idaho College of Osteopathic Medicine (ICOM) use of the lab and will likely occur.

There were no questions or comments from the Board.

4. University of Idaho – Police, Fire, and EMS Services Contract Approval between the University of Idaho (UI) and City of Moscow

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Atchley): To approve the request by the University of Idaho to enter into a contract with the City of Moscow, in substantial conformance to the proposed contract in Attachment 1 to the Board materials, and to authorize the University of Idaho's Vice President for Infrastructure to execute the final document. The motion carried 7-0. Mr. Scoggin was absent from voting.

Business Affairs and Human Resources (BAHR) Committee chair, Mr. Richard Westerberg, introduced the item informing Board members the University of Idaho (UI) has contracted with the City of Moscow for police law enforcement services since 1966. He continues the most recent contract between the City of Moscow and UI was approved by the Board at the August 2010 meeting and the item before the Board today is a three

year renewal of the previously approved agreement adding the initial term of this agreement is from October 1, 2017 through September 30, 2020 with one three-year optional renewal and that after the three-year optional renewal, the contract will continue on a year to year basis until terminated by either party.

There were no questions or comments from the Board.

5. University of Idaho – Nancy M. Cummings Research, Extension, and Education Center Project – Planning and Design Phases

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 a classroom and office facility at the Nancy M. Cummings Research, Extension, and Education Center, for a total project cost of \$2,160,000, as described in the materials submitted to the Board. This approval includes the authority to execute all consulting and vendor contracts necessary to implement the planning and design phases of the project. The motion carried 7-0. Mr. Scoggin was absent from voting.

Business Affairs and Human Resources (BAHR) Committee Chair, Mr. Richard Westerberg, introduced the item sharing with Board members the request before the Board today is for authorization to allow the University of Idaho (UI) to proceed with the Planning and Design phases only of a Capital Project to design and construct a proposed classroom and office facility and the Nancy M. Cummings Research, Extension, and Education Center (NMCREEC).

There were no questions or comments from the Board.

6. University of Idaho – West Campus Utilities Distribution Systems and Infrastructure Improvements & Expansion Project – Planning and Design

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Hill):to approve the request by the University of Idaho to implement the Planning and Design phases of a capital project to design and construct West Campus Utilities Distribution Systems and Infrastructure Improvements and Expansion, on the main campus of the University of Idaho, for a total project cost of \$3,500,000, as described in the materials submitted to the Board. Approval includes the authority to execute all consulting and vendor contracts necessary to implement the Planning and Design phases of the project. The motion carried 7-0. Mr. Scoggin was absent from voting.

Business Affairs and Human Resources (BAHR) Committee Chair, Mr. Richard Westerberg, introduced the item sharing with Board members approval of this request would authorize the University of Idaho to proceed with the Planning and Design phases

only of a Capital Project to design and construct West Campus Utilities Distribution Systems and Infrastructure Improvements and Expansion.

There were no questions or comments from the Board.

7. FY 2019 Line Item Budget Requests

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Atchley): To authorize the Executive Director to amend the FY2019 System-wide Needs Budget Request adding the Enterprise Resource Planning line item, as described in Attachment 1, as the Board's number two priority system-wide request, in addition to the previously-submitted Degree Audit/Student Data Analytic System request as the number one priority request, and the previously submitted Idaho Regional Optical Network item as the Board's number three priority system-wide request. The motion was withdrawn.

Business Affairs and Human Resources (BAHR) Committee Chair Mr. Richard Westerberg introduced the item reminding Board members of the action at the August Board meeting to approve two line item requests relevant to the recommendations of the Governor's Higher Education Task Force. He continues since that time the Higher Education President's Council has met and requested the Board consider an additional line item request to explore establishing a system-wide Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) system and this is the item for consideration before the Board today. The Board's Chief Financial Officer, Mr. Chet Herbst, was present to answer any questions from the Board.

Board member Clark then shared Board staff has been advised the timing of the request is not good. Board member Hill then stated his discomfort with the motion as read, adding the ERP request should be listed as the third priority to which Mr. Westerberg responded that if Board members are uncomfortable with the motion then perhaps they should consider not adding the ERP request.

Board member Atchley then commented that if the state is willing to make a large scale investment in higher education the Board should take advantage of that to which Dr. Clark responded one of the concerns would be the desire of policy makers for the institutions to become a part of the state's ERP system and that she did not believe this was the outcome the institution presidents were seeking when making the request. Ms. Atchley then asked if institutions have expressed a desire to remain outside of the state system to which the Board's Chief Financial Officer, Mr. Chet Herbst responded there has to be interaction and flow of information between the institutions ERP systems and the state's ERP system which is made more complicated by the archaic system currently in use by the state. He continues the modules procured by the state for their replacement system are common features of an ERP system procured by the institutions and suggests the state could build their ERP system based upon what the institutions already have in place, adding if the Board were not to pursue this line item it would be prudent for the institutions

to work closely with the state as they acquire a new state ERP system. Dr. Clark states her agreement, adding that as the Board looks at centralizing back office functions this would be a consideration as well.

At this time Board member Westerberg suggested withdrawing the motion and not including the line item in the request. Dr. Clark agreed and then strongly encouraged the institutions to work closely with the state as they procure a new state ERP system. The Board's Executive Director, Mr. Matt Freeman added that based upon previous conversation around task force recommendations, of which this one is, this could be incorporated into the work plan and prioritized by the Board within that discussion.

Board member Westerberg then requested unanimous consent to withdraw the motion.

There were no additional questions or comments from the Board.

INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH, AND STUDENT AFFAIRS (IRSA)

1. University of Utah School of Medicine – Annual Report

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

Instruction, Research and Student Affairs (IRSA) Chair, Dr. David Hill introduced the item, reminding Board members as part of the Board's contract with the University of Utah School of Medicine (UUSOM), the Board receives an annual report providing program information to include an overview of the four-year curriculum and clerkships. Board member Hill then invited the Board's Chief Financial Officer, Mr. Chet Herbst, to present the UUSOM Annual Report to the Board.

Mr. Herbst shared with Board members that during the 2016 Legislative session, two additional seats per year were approved for this cooperative agreement increasing the number of available positions to ten (10) students per year with the state providing \$40,000 in funding per student with an equal contribution from each students. Mr. Herbst continues the program has been a good investment for the state with the same number of physicians returning to Idaho has have gone through the program.

There were no questions or comments from the Board.

2. Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (EPSCoR) – Annual Report

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

Instruction, Research and Student Affairs (IRSA) Chair, Dr. David Hill introduced the item, reminding Board members of the requirement for the Established Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (EPSCoR) to provide an annual update to the Board. He then invited EPSCoR Committee Chairman, Mr. Laird Noh to present the EPSCoR Annual Report to Board members. Accompanying Mr. Noh were Dr. Janet Nelson, Interim Project Director and Mr. Rick Schumaker, Assistant Projector Director.

Mr. Laird reports to the Board EPSCoR's previous Director, Dr. Peter Goodwin, was recently named President of the University of Maryland Center for Environmental Science and that Dr. Janet Nelson has temporarily taken on the role of Interim Project Director and that Provost and Executive Vice President of the University of Idaho, Mr. John Wiencek, will assume Dr. Nelson's role as an EPSCoR committee member in an interim capacity.

At this time, Dr. Janet Nelson presented EPSCoR's Annual Report to Board members, sharing 0.29% of the National Science Foundation (NSF) total research funding was awarded to Idaho in FY14-16 up from 0.26% six years ago and that total NSF funding to Idaho for FY16 was \$23,000,000 up 56% from 2008. Dr. Nelson then shared with Board members proposed legislation at the national level that would redistribute state's eligibility for EPSCoR funding. Dr. Nelson finished the annual report with an update on the active NSF EPSCoR Projects.

At this time, Board member Critchfield asked how the proposed federal legislation would impact the state of Idaho to which Dr. Nelson responded if the appropriations dropped it could affect the entire program, however, the current proposed bill would not impact Idaho directly.

Board member Hill then recognized Dr. Nelson's willingness to move into the interim position and thanked her for her work submitting EPSCoR's proposals.

There were no additional questions or comments from the Board.

3. Boise State University – New, Master of Science in Genetic Counseling and Online Fee

BOARD ACTION

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

AND

M/S (Hill/Westerberg): To approve the request by Boise State University to designate an online program fee for the Master of Science in Genetic Counseling in the amount of \$982 per credit in conformance with the program budget submitted to the Board in Attachment 1. The motion carried 7-0. Mr. Scoggin was absent from voting.

Instruction, Research and Student Affairs (IRSA) Chair, Dr. David Hill introduced the item stating the request before the Board today is for a new program to award a Master of Science in Genetic Counseling. Dr. Hill continues the program will be offered wholly online and will operate under the fee guidelines in Board Policy as they pertain to wholly online programs. Board member Hill then requested Boise State University (BSU) Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, Dr. Martin Schimpf, present BSU's proposal to Board members as well as answer any questions from the Board.

Dr. Schimpf explains to Board members the role of a genetic counselor is to help individuals understand and adapt to the implications of the genetic contributions to disease and that in order to practice as a certified genetic counselor a master's degree from an accredited program is required. He continues that nationally the demand has increased 85% since 2006 and in the Treasure Valley the number of job openings has doubled since 2012 and often go unfilled for long periods of time due to the lack of programs offered in the region. Dr. Schimpf states the proposed program has been developed in response to the large demand for genetic counselors and would be available to all Idaho residents. He continues the program is currently seeking to obtain Accredited New Program status with the Accreditation Council of Genetic Counselors (ACGC) in time to allow students to enroll for the fall 2019 semester. It is anticipated the program would admit a cohort of 15-17 students annually with a cost of \$55,000 to complete. Dr. Schimpf shares the program cost is significantly lower than other programs available to Idaho residents adding the lowest cost alternative to BSU's proposed program is on campus in Salt Lake City, Utah.

Board member Soltman then asked for clarification on how the program cost was determined to which Dr. Schimpf responded BSU tries to find programs the marketplace will support however, will often need to rely on out of state tuition to support some programs adding, the cost per credit for this program is higher if you attend as non-resident and the program will be monitored on an annual basis and adjusted as appropriate.

At this time Board member Critchfield asked if there was any involvement by industry stakeholders when initially developing the program to which Dr. Schimpf responded in the affirmative sharing the Dean for the College of Health Sciences meets regularly with an advisory board that includes Executive Officers from local hospitals who have identified the lack of genetic counselors as an area of high need.

Board member Westerberg then asked for additional information on the pricing structure for the program, noting his concern for the difference in pricing for in-state students versus out-of-state students for online programs. Finally, Mr. Westerberg congratulated BSU on moving aggressively to provide online programs, such as this, in response to current demands. Dr. Schimpf responded a breakdown of the program financials is included in the Board materials and that as the program grows and scales it is expected the cost will go down. In response to Board member Westerberg's concern over pricing for resident versus non-resident students, Dr. Schimpf shares all on-line degree programs are priced equally, however, for resident students because students are not on campus, additional

fees for the use of on-campus facilities are not assessed. At this time Board member Hill shares with Board members these same issues were discussed in both the Instruction, Research and Student Affairs Committee and Business Affairs and Human Resources Committee as well as the need for guidance to institutions around online programs and formulating fees. Dr. Hill then reminds Board members there is a very real distinction between undergraduate online programs and graduate online programs, adding extremely highly specialized programs, such as the one before the Board today, require specialized faculty and are expensive and institutions must be able to recover their costs.

At this time Board member Atchley referenced the Budget Notes provided in the support materials, noting specifically that almost 30% of the programs costs go to services outside of the program. Dr. Schimpf confirms this is correct and necessary due to the high costs for the university to utilize external marketing firms to promote their online programs, stating 40% - 50% of the cost of the program was going towards this purpose. Dr. Schimpf shares BSU has successfully lowered the costs involved with promoting online programs by housing this function internally and is constantly reviewing the administrative overhead related to online programs to determine the true costs of the online programs offered.

Board member Atchley then reminds Board members that historically graduate programs presented to the Board have tended to exaggerate the demand and projected student population and asks at what point a program is considered to not be viable. Dr. Schimpf responds online programs are not supported by state appropriation funds and the ongoing costs of online programs must be supported by tuition revenue. He continues the programs are reviewed annually to determine viability. Dr. Hill then asked if the cost for a program could go down to which Dr. Schimpf responded if a program were to scale the cost could go down.

There were no additional questions or comments from the Board.

At this time Board member Westerberg excused himself from the meeting to attend a personal matter. Mr. Westerberg was absent for the remainder of the meeting.

4. Board Policy III.P. Students – First Reading

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Hill/Atchley): To approve the first reading of amendments to Board Policy III.P. Students creating a new subsection 17. Student Vaccine Informational Material as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried 6-0. Mr. Scoggin and Mr. Westerberg were absent from voting.

Instruction, Research and Student Affairs (IRSA) Chair, Dr. David Hill, introduced the item stating the request before the Board today is for approval of a proposed amendment to Board Policy requiring four year institutions to provide informational material regarding vaccine's to students at the time of admissions. Dr. Hill continues approval today would eliminate the need for legislative changes requiring the institutions provide the material.

Board member Hill then invited the Board's Chief Academic Officer, Dr. Randall Brumfield, to present the proposed changes to the Board as well as answer any questions from Board members.

There were not questions or comments from the Board.

5. Board Policy III.N. General Education – Second Reading

BOARD ACTION

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

Instruction, Research and Student Affairs (IRSA) Chair, Dr. David Hill, introduced the item stating the request before the Board today is for approval of a proposed amendment to Board Policy to provide guidance to Idaho's public institutions in identifying courses that meet the General Education Matriculation (GEM) competencies for the facilitation of seamless credit transfer for students. He then invited the Board's Chief Academic Officer, Dr. Randall Brumfield, to present to the Board the proposed changes as well as answer any questions.

Dr. Brumfield shares with the Board two changes added to the proposed amendment after the first reading. The first change was to insure institutionally designated courses that are part of the general education curriculum transfer as an institutionally designated course across institutions. The second change designates a reporting structure for the state General Education Committee to report to the Council on Academic Affairs and Programs.

There were no questions or comments from the Board.

6. Complete College Idaho Plan – Guided Pathways – Update

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

Instruction, Research and Student Affairs (IRSA) Chair, Dr. David Hill introduced the item, stating the material presented today was an update to the Board on the Complete College Idaho Guided Pathways Plan. Board member Hill then invited the Board's Chief Academic Officer, Dr. Randall Brumfield, to present his update to the Board.

Dr. Brumfield begins his report by reminding Board members the purpose behind sharing the information today is to provide the Board with an overview of Guided Pathways, he also notes Guided Pathways are a Complete College America (CCA) Game Changer. Dr. Brumfield continues that nationally 1 in 3 first-time, full-time freshmen students graduate with a bachelor's degree in four years and for Idaho that number drops to less than 1 in 5 students. For students attending a two year state community college 25% of full-time students graduate in three years and 10% in two years. In Idaho, less than 8%

of full-time associate degree candidates graduated in two years from a state community college. He continues there are many factors attributed to this, however, the largest factor seems to be students taking more credits than what is required primarily due to poor decisions by students when selecting courses and poor academic behaviors.

Dr. Brumfield continues guided pathways can provide a clear roadmap for students to complete their academic programs 'on time' when leveraged by timely academic and student support and include a meta-major concept allowing students to explore a field of majors while continuing to make degree progress. Dr. Brumfield then shared examples of how Idaho's colleges and universities have leveraged guided pathways at their institutions and how guided pathways can impact a student's quality of life.

Board member Hill then asked how the recommendation from the Governor's Higher Education Task Force for P-20 Guided Pathways relates to the material presented today. To this Dr. Brumfield responded with the difficulty in knowing simply because there are few examples of P-20 Guided Pathways to refer to.

Board member Atchley then asked if guided pathways could contribute to individuals being forced in to an area of study they do not wish to take, adding the importance of not discouraging more exploratory course work that could open students up to other options and the Board must weigh the ability of students to make choices. To this Dr. Brumfield responded the purpose behind guided pathways is not to force students in to a field outside of their interests but to insure flexibility between intended fields. To this Board member Atchley responded students must know and understand the financial implications of their choices while also having the freedom to make choices for themselves. Board member Clark adds her belief that meta-majors and guided pathways provide a broader perspective of options available within an area of interest.

There were no additional questions or comments from the Board.

OTHER BUSINESS

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

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Hill): To adjourn the meeting at 11:24 am (MDT). The motion carried 6-0. Mr. Scoggin and Mr. Westerberg were absent from voting.