

PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
OCTOBER 19, 2017

TAB	DESCRIPTION	ACTION
1	LEWIS-CLARK STATE COLLEGE – ANNUAL REPORT	Information Item
2	WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL REPORT	Information Item
3	BOARD POLICY I.J. USE OF INSTITUTIONAL FACILITIES – 2ND READING	Motion to Approve
4	BOARD POLICY IV.E. DIVISION OF CAREER TECHNICAL EDUCATION – 2ND READING	Motion to Approve
5	GOVERNOR'S HIGHER EDUCATION TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS	Motion to Approve
6	TEACHER CERTIFICATION – ALTERNATIVE PROGRAM – CONTENT SPECIALIST	Motion to Approve
7	TEACHER CERTIFICATION – ALTERNATE STATE APPROVED ASSESSMENT	Motion to Approve

PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
OCTOBER 18-19, 2017

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
OCTOBER 19, 2017

LEWIS-CLARK STATE COLLEGE

SUBJECT

Lewis-Clark State College Annual Report.

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies & Procedures,
Section I.M.4.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

This agenda item fulfills the Board's requirement for Lewis-Clark State College to provide an annual progress report on the institution's strategic plan, details of implementation, status of goals and objectives and information on other points of interest in accordance with a schedule and format established by the Board's Executive Director.

IMPACT

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

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – Annual Report

Page 3

BOARD ACTION

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

PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
OCTOBER 19, 2017

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
OCTOBER 19, 2017

SUBJECT

Workforce Development Council Report

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

Section 72-1336, Idaho Code

Executive Order 2015-02 – Establishing the Workforce Development Council for planning and oversight of the state's workforce development system

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

The Workforce Development Council was created by Governor Phil Batt in 1996 by consolidating four advisory groups that dealt with workforce development issues. The Workforce Development Council has served as the state workforce board under the Job Training Partnership Act, the Workforce Investment Act and currently under the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act. The Council's 26 members are constituted from the following:

- a. Representatives of business and industry shall comprise at least 40% of the members;
- b. At least 15% of the members shall be representatives of local public education, postsecondary institutions, and secondary or postsecondary vocational educational institutions;
- c. At least 15% of the members shall be representatives of organized labor based on nominations from recognized state labor federations;
- d. Representatives from the Department of Commerce, Department of Labor, the State Board of Education, Division of Professional-Technical Education and the Superintendent of Public Instruction; and
- e. A representative of a community-based organization.

The Council is responsible for advising the Governor and the State Board of Education as appropriate and at regular intervals on items that include but are not limited to:

- a. Development of the statewide strategy for workforce development programs;
- b. Development of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) State Plan
- c. Preparation of the annual report to the US Secretary of Labor as required under section 103 of WIOA;
- d. Development and continuous improvement of comprehensive State workforce services and performance measures;
- e. Development of a statewide employment statistic program and a plan for comprehensive labor market information;
- f. Development of technological improvements to facilitate access to and improve the quality of workforce system services and activities; and
- g. Development of comments at least once annually on the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act.

PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
OCTOBER 19, 2017

To fulfill the responsibility of the Workforce Development Council as outlined in statute and executive order, Trent Clark, Chair of the Workforce Development Council, will be making the Council's report to the State Board of Education.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – Workforce Development Council Report

Page 3

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Idaho Workforce Development Council was established to provide strategic direction and oversight of Idaho's workforce development system. The Council members represent business, workers, education, state and local government and community based organizations. The primary role of the Council is to advise Governor C.L. "Butch" Otter and the State Board of Education on strategies designed to yield high quality workforce investment services for Idaho's businesses, job seekers, and students.

BOARD ACTION

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

PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERMENTAL AFFAIRS
OCTOBER 19, 2017

BOISE STATE UNIVERSITY/UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO

SUBJECT

Board Policy I.J. Use of Institutional Facilities and Services – Second Reading

REFERENCE

April 2011

The Board approved additions to Board Policy I.J. to make permanent the conditions under which the Board can approve the sale or consumption of alcohol in conjunction with NCAA football games (section 2.c). Prior to this policy change, the institutions were bringing requests for exceptions to Board Policy I.J. annually to allow for the consumption of alcohol in suite areas and at pregame corporate events.

June 2015

The Board approved requests from the universities to establish secure areas for pregame events for ticket holders with structured alcohol service for the 2015 football season.

June 2016

The Board denied requests from the universities to establish secure areas for pregame events for ticket holders with structured alcohol service for the 2016 football season. In addition the Board denied the request by the University of Idaho to allow game patrons for home football games to bring alcohol for personal consumption to designated tailgating areas.

June 2017

The Board deferred consideration of proposed amendments to Board Policy I.J. until such time as a single proposal could be brought forward from the universities.

August 2017

The Board approved the first reading of proposed amendments to Board Policy I.J. with the stipulation that the requirement for a “written or electronic” invitation be added and the term “youth” be changed to “minors,” add no students are allowed in alcohol service areas and maintain the separation of alcohol service areas from areas where no alcohol is served.

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies & Procedures, Section I. J. Use of Institutional Facilities and Services.

PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERMENTAL AFFAIRS
OCTOBER 19, 2017

Idaho Administrative Code, IDAPA 38.04.07.305.02

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

Board policy I.J. sets out the provision by which the institutions under the Board's direct governance may allow for the consumption of alcohol on campus. The proposed amendments brought forward by the University of Idaho and Boise State University would expand alcohol service on institution campuses and allow:

- Designate certain venues where alcohol may be served for campus events to include certain NCAA athletic events under the same conditions as has been provided in Board policy. The institution President could then approve the plan, subject to annual Board approval, and issue a permit in those limited facilities as happens with other campus events where alcohol is served. The Board would receive an annual report instead of being required to consider annual permission.
- Add the ability for a CEO to permit a designated pregame event for valid ticket holders under conditions prescribed in Board policy.
- Outside of athletic events, the amendments will also update prior requirements for non-NCAA events, to have a defined seating area where alcohol beverages may be possessed and consumed at entertainment events. This section of policy is problematic with concerts, performances and similar events and for their promoters as it is difficult to set aside a section of seating for patrons consuming only non-alcoholic beverages – or vice versa.
- Add a new section 2.d addressing conditions under which game patrons and their private guests may consume alcohol as part of tailgating functions.

IMPACT

Approval of the proposed amendments will allow for the drinking of alcohol in designated tailgating areas and retain the requirement for annual Board approval.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – proposed policy revisions, Section I.J.

Page 6

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Boise State University and the University of Idaho have jointly proposed amendments to the Board's policy regarding the service of alcohol in institution facilities or on institution properties (Board Policy I.J.). Idaho Administrative Code, IDAPA 38.04.07.305.02 prohibits the consumption or distribution of alcohol in common spaces of State facilities, and IDAPA 08.01.08.100 prohibits the sale, possession or consumption of alcoholic beverages in college or university owned, leased, or operated facilities and on campus grounds, except as provided in the State Board of Education Governing Policies and Procedures. Board Policy Section I.J. sets the provision by which alcohol may legally be sold, possessed or

PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
OCTOBER 19, 2017

consumed in institution facilities.

Board Policy I.J. 2.6 currently allows the presidents of the institutions to approve waivers of the prohibition against alcohol service and allow service of alcohol for events on campus (under specified conditions that are not in conjunction with student athletics events) and then immediately report to the Board staff on those events. Alcohol service may be allowed with prior Board approval in conjunction with NCAA football pregame events. Alcohol service in conjunction with any other student athletic event is prohibited.

No comments were received, outside of the August 2017 Board meeting, to the policy amendments between the first and second reading. The second reading of the policy includes those amendments that were specifically requested by the Board at the August 2017 Board meeting. These include:

1. changing the term “youth” to “minor”
2. reinstating the written permission requirement and expanding it to “written or electronic”
3. reinstating the prohibition of minors in the alcohol service area of pre-game events
4. reinstating the separation of alcohol service areas with non-alcohol service areas.

The language that was originally proposed to be eliminated that was reinstated by the Board at the August 2017 Board meeting is highlighted. Other amendments made between the first and second reading are indicated in red text.

The proposed policy revisions to non-NCAA events include:

1. expanding the current requirement for a “written” invitation to include “written” or “electronic”.

The proposed amendment to the policy regarding the sale or consumption of alcohol in conjunction with NCAA athletic events will:

1. expand permission to allow alcohol service at all NCAA athletic when specified in subsection 2.c.i. and confine the alcohol service to specific venues and sports listed in the policy (only football and basketball are being requested at this time, future expansion of event types and venues would require an amendment to Board policy);
2. allow minors to be present in the alcohol service areas in in-suite areas only, as long as they are under the direct supervision of an adult;
3. allow individuals who have purchased admission and their ticketed guests to enter alcohol service areas without a written personal invitation from the institution President.

Five venues at Boise State University, one venue at Idaho State University and

PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERMENTAL AFFAIRS
OCTOBER 19, 2017

two venues at the University of Idaho are identified as approved locations.

In addition to the amendments proposed by the universities the attached draft includes an increase in the per instance liability limits from \$500,000 to \$1,000,000. This amendment would bring the policy in compliance with the minimum liability insurance coverage required by Risk Management for permitted events.

BOARD ACTION

I move to approve second reading of changes to Board policy section I.J. as submitted in Attachment 1.

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes ____ No ____

PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
OCTOBER 19, 2017

DIVISION OF CAREER TECHNICAL EDUCATION

SUBJECT

Board Policy IV.E. Career Technical Education, Second Reading

REFERENCE

October 2014

Board approved the second reading of amendments to Board Policy IV.E., incorporating the Idaho Agricultural Education Quality Program Standards approved August 2014, by reference.

August 2017

Board approved the first reading of amendments to Board Policy IV.E. adding current definitions of terms used and secondary program descriptions.

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies & Procedures, Section IV.E

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

These proposed amendments to Board policy IV.E. Division of Career Technical Education formalize the definitions of existing career technical education program types to ensure consistency among all programs statewide and career technical education assessments. The definitions complement the Career Technical Education Workplace Readiness Standards which were adopted by the Board in 2016, and incorporated by reference into IDAPA 08.02.03.004.

IMPACT

The policy will have a positive impact on program delivery, as it will provide a clear framework for how career technical programs should be structured and delivered. There will be no fiscal impact, as the definitions of required assessments reflect current practices. Long term fiscal impact will be determined as the number of students taking the assessment(s) increases.

ATTACHMENTS

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

Page 3

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Board Policy IV.E. details policies and procedures specific to the Division of Career Technical Education (Division) and the statewide career technical programs it administers that do not fall under the other Board policies. The Division of Career Technical Education has been going through a process of identifying practices that have developed over the years, but were not brought forward to the Board for formal approval. Formal Board approval of these practices through policy provides for a higher level of transparency and consistency of in their continued implementation.

PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
OCTOBER 19, 2017

There were no comments received between the first and second readying of the Policy and there have been no changes made to the second reading.

Staff recommends approval.

BOARD ACTION

I move to approve the first reading of Board Policy IV.E. Career Technical Education as provided in Attachment 1.

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes _____ No _____

POLICY, PLANNING AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
OCTOBER 19, 2017

SUBJECT

Governor's Higher Education Task Force Recommendations – Implementation Matrix

REFERENCE

August 2017	Board approved FY 2019 Budget Requests.
September 29, 2017	Board adopted the Governor's Higher Education Task Force recommendations and amended the FY 2019 Budget Request to add three line items. The addition of the postsecondary degree audit/student data analytics system (K-20 Pipeline Recommendation – Guided Pathways) and the addition of \$5M in Statewide Scholarships for the Opportunity Scholarship (Access and Affordability Work Recommendation - Systemically increase dollars to fund all eligible Idaho high school students...)

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

On January 6, 2017, Governor C.L. "Butch" Otter identified the need to focus on the postsecondary part of Idaho's K-through-Career education system and announced the creation of a Higher Education Task Force (Task Force) charged with studying the state of higher education in Idaho. The Task Force was charged with looking at initiatives underway, proven practices that support postsecondary access and completion, and the State's role in funding higher education. In addition, the Task Force was asked to make recommendations that focus on postsecondary access and completion, lead toward a more rapid progress in meeting the Board's 60% College Attainment goal, and transition the state-funding formula for higher education to a formula that rewards outcomes toward completion.

The Task Force was made up of 36 members from a broad group of stakeholders. Membership included all eight State Board of Education members, the eight Idaho public university and college presidents, postsecondary students, legislators, and business leaders. Membership was drawn from across the State.

The Task Force first convened in February 2017 to begin discussions. The Task Force identified four areas of focus: the K-20 Education Pipeline; Postsecondary Access and Affordability; Postsecondary Funding Formula; and Outcomes Supporting the Workforce. Members were assigned to one of these four groups based on their interest and expertise. A separate, smaller group was formed to specifically focus on communication, buy-in, support and execution of the Task Force recommendations. The final work group reports (Attachment 2) and recommendations (Attachment 1, Column 1) were presented to the full Task Force and unanimously adopted on September 15, 2017. The Board formally adopted the recommendations at the September 29th Special Board meeting and amended the FY 2019 Budget Request to start implementation of items that were initially

POLICY, PLANNING AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
OCTOBER 19, 2017

identified as needing appropriations and could be started in FY 2019 prior to a full implementation plan being developed. These included additional funding for system-wide scholarships, the increased appropriation would allow for more students on the waiting list to be funded while additional Administrative Code amendments are made that would increase the number of eligible students. The second being a minimum funding amount that if appropriated would allow for Board Staff and Institution Staff to develop a scope of work and start the request for information purchasing processes while waiting for system consolidation amendments identified in Recommendation 1 to be started. Additionally, full implementation of three of the recommendations is dependent on the implementation of a degree audit/student data analytics system (Recommendations 3, 4, and 5).

IMPACT

The discussion around the proposed implementation framework will 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 recommendations.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – Recommendation Matrix – for discussion	Page 5
Attachment 2 – Task Force Subcommittee Reports	Page 9

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

As part of the Task Force's process, the individual work groups identified a number of short and long-term actions that would, in part, move forward the implementation of the individual recommendations. In some instances there may be additional short or long-term actions that may be identified for moving forward the recommendations or a recommendation may be chosen as a priority item. Some actions may take a longer timeframe to implement than "low-hanging fruit" identified as part of a lower priority recommendation. It is anticipated that the Board's standing committees will flesh out recommendation timelines and actions in collaboration with the institutions and agency impacted by the recommendations and their respective staff. The Board committees may create additional technical committees or workgroups.

Recommendations highlighted in yellow in Attachment 1 may be initiated independently; however, full implementation is dependent on the implementation of other recommendations.

The presidents of the colleges and universities met for a retreat on October 3, 2017. As part of this conversation, several of the presidents expressed concern and skepticism about the efficacy and feasibility of a system-wide degree audit and analytics system. Some felt it would duplicate current campus systems, and may not ultimately achieve any savings. The presidents ultimately recommended that the Board-approved budget line item for such a system be replaced with a line item

POLICY, PLANNING AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
OCTOBER 19, 2017

for a centralized enterprise resource planning feasibility study. In particular, the focus would be on centralizing software supporting finance, human resources, procurement and information technology. This recommendation will be considered as a separate action item under the Business Affairs and Human Resources (BAHR) agenda.

In light of the concerns shared by presidents, staff have researched the conceivability and value proposition of the Task Force recommended system-wide degree audit and analytics program. Such a program would facilitate multiple student-level outcomes sought through Task Force recommendations such as system-wide degree progression and guided pathway initiatives. In addition to postsecondary efforts, such a program would strengthen K-12 initiatives around dual credit and college and career advising. It would not be the intent for such a program to replace or duplicate any existing programs the institutions may have. Rather, this program would be a tool to extract data from existing institution programs to perform analysis and help facilitate transfer and articulation between institutions, provide a program for those that do not have a system in place, or provide added capabilities for those that have limited systems or do not have systems that allow for students to review their degree progress. As such, the first step would necessarily require meeting with the institutions' Chief Information Officers and Provosts to inventory current degree audit and analytics programs and capabilities.

BOARD ACTION

I move to approve the Task Force Recommendation priority order and committee assignments as specified in Attachment 1.

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes ____ No ____

POLICY, PLANNING AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
OCTOBER 19, 2017

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
OCTOBER 19, 2017

SUBJECT

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

REFERENCE

August 2016

The Board reviewed and discussed available data provided in the teacher pipeline report and discussed pulling together a broader work group to provide feedback and recommendations to the Board regarding educator pipeline barriers and solutions.

April 2017

The Board reviewed an update on the Educator Pipeline and recommendations from the workgroup.

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

Sections 33-1201 -1207, Idaho Code

Idaho Administrative Code, IDAPA 08.02.02, Rules Governing Uniformity

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

The Board was presented with a first look at various data points throughout the educator pipeline during the December 2015 Board meeting and received a more comprehensive review at the August 2016 Board meeting. During the discussion at the August 2016 Board meeting, it was determined that a broad group of stakeholders who are impacted at the various points in the pipeline should be brought together to form comprehensive recommendations for supports and improvements to Idaho's educator pipeline. The workgroup was made up of individuals nominated by the various stakeholder representative organizations with a focus on those individuals working in our public school system and approved teacher preparation programs along with additional state policy makers.

At the April 2017 Board meeting, the Board received an update on the work of the Educator Pipeline Work Group and reviewed the initial recommendations. The focus of the work on pipeline issues fell into three main categories, *Attract and Recruit*, *Prepare and Certify*, and *Retain*. Specific strategies proposed in that update for further exploration by the *Prepare and Certify* Subcommittee include:

Prepare/Certify: Alternative routes and “Grow Your Own” strategies

- **Strategy:** Remove certification barriers to include: “Mastery-based” preparation programs that account for experiential credit, resulting in lower costs and shorter preparation time; closer alignment between secondary and postsecondary education to expedite preparation for high school students interested in teaching
- **Possible Measure:** Increased enrollment in teacher preparation pathways
- **Strategy:** Create a “Grow Your Own” pathway specifically for current paraprofessionals in good standing with their district

PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
OCTOBER 19, 2017

- **Possible Measure:** Decline in requests for Alternative Authorizations, decline in “out of field” teaching assignments, decline in long-term substitute positions

Administrative Code currently allows for both “Non-Traditional” routes to certification and Alternative Authorization for certification. There are currently two Board approved “Non-Traditional” routes to certification, American Board for Certification of Teacher Excellence (ABCTE) and Teach for America (TFA). There are three Alternative Authorizations: Teacher to New Certification, Content Specialist, and Pupil Personnel Services. In addition to the three alternative authorizations for certification there are additional alternative authorizations for individuals with a certificate to earn additional content or grade range endorsements.

Once an individual has completed a non-traditional program or is on an alternative authorization route to certification three year interim certificate is issued with all of the rights and privileges of an individual with a standard five year renewable certificate. Interim certificates are not renewable after three years and include additional annual requirements. Alternative Authorizations may be completed by working with a consortium established at the school district level using either an approved “traditional” educator preparation program or other approved program (including non-traditional routes).

Alternative authorizations/certification routes have been authorized by the Board in some form since 1993 and were moved to IDAPA 08.02.02 in 1997. In 2003 the Board approved the replacement of what had been allowed for alternative authorization with more specific requirements, effective July 1, 2006. The purpose of these authorizations was to provide individuals with strong subject matter background but limited experience with educational methodology an expedited route to certification. The alternative authorizations for certification were originally defined as routes specific to meeting an emergency district need. Over the years, the Content Specialist authorization has progressed to a route designed to recognize the value individuals with deep content knowledge may bring to the classroom, and allows for an expedited route to certification for these individuals. A common example of this would be an individual working for Simplot as a biologist, with a graduate degree in biology, choosing to become a teacher.

The Content Specialist authorization requires individuals to meet the initial qualifications in a below to be considered and to complete the requirements in be as part of the authorization.

- a. Initial Qualifications.
 - i. A candidate must hold a baccalaureate degree or have completed all of the requirements of a baccalaureate degree except the student teaching or practicum portion; and

PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
OCTOBER 19, 2017

- ii. The hiring district shall ensure the candidate is qualified to teach in the area of identified need through demonstrated content knowledge. This may be accomplished through a combination of employment experience and education.
- b. Alternative Route Preparation Program -- College/University Preparation or Other State Board Approved Certification Program.
 - i. At the time of authorization a consortium comprised of a designee from the college/university to be attended or other state board approved certification program, and a representative from the school district, and the candidate shall determine the preparation needed to meet the Idaho Standards for Initial Certification of Professional School Personnel. This plan must include mentoring and a minimum of one (1) classroom observation by the mentor per month, which will include feedback and reflection, while teaching under the alternative authorization. The plan must include annual progress goals that must be met for annual renewal;
 - ii. The candidate must complete a minimum of nine (9) semester credit hours or its equivalent of accelerated study in education pedagogy prior to the end of the first year of authorization. The number of required credits will be specified in the consortium developed plan;
 - iii. At the time of authorization the candidate must enroll in and work toward completion of the alternative route preparation program through a participating college/university or other state board approved certification program, and the employing school district. A teacher must attend, participate in, and successfully complete an individualized alternative route preparation program as one (1) of the conditions for annual renewal and to receive a recommendation for full certification;
 - iv. The participating college/university or other state board approved certification program shall provide procedures to assess and credit equivalent knowledge, dispositions and relevant life/work experiences; and
 - v. Prior to entering the classroom, the candidate shall meet or exceed the state qualifying score on appropriate state-approved content, pedagogy, or performance assessment.

As written, the current Content Specialist authorization allows for a competency or mastery-based process of assessment through the established consortium referenced in subsection b.i above. The minimum requirement is that the individual meet the state certification standards. While this has traditionally been shown through the earning of credits, the administrative code does not require credits be earned to show competency as long as there has been some form of evaluation/assessment that the applicable standards have been met.

This proposal specifically addresses the work groups preliminary recommendation to develop a “mastery-based” preparation program that is more flexible than current routes to certification, and accounts for experience and pre-

PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
OCTOBER 19, 2017

existing knowledge resulting in lower costs and shorter preparation time. The final Work Group recommendations are scheduled to be brought to the Board at the December 2017 Board meeting

Attached is a proposal for a new certification program to be used by districts who have identified an individual they feel is uniquely and highly qualified to teach in a subject area and willing to utilizing the Content Specialist Authorization. Of these two programs only the ABCTE program has participated in the Content Specialist route. In addition to the non-traditional programs, candidates and school districts may go through this alternative route with a traditional approved educator preparation program.

IMPACT

Approval of the following proposed certification program through the alternative authorization – content specialist will allow Board staff to begin working with experts to create the modules and assessments for the program. In consultation with experts in instructional technology and teacher effectiveness measures, such a program would take up to one year to develop. Board approval will allow the creation of a program in which districts and individuals interested in teaching will have a more cost-effective, flexible route by which to enter the profession while still requiring the individual meet the same standards as those completing traditional educator preparation programs. Final approval of the program would be contingent on the finished modules and assessments coming back to the Board for consideration at a later date.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – Introduction to alternative certification program for Content Specialists	Page 7
Attachment 2 – Alternative program detail - Pathway Descriptions, Entry Points and Idaho Core Standards Alignment	Page 11

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In addition to the Board's interest, there has been a great deal of interest by other state policymakers in looking for solutions to address the difficulty many school districts and charter schools have in hiring certificated staff. While there has been a general understanding that school districts and charter schools experience difficulty in hiring for a variety of reasons, and that this is common in states across the nation, the Teacher Pipeline Report and the resulting recommendations from the Educator Pipeline Workgroup is the first comprehensive effort Idaho has taken in looking at the many variables at play within our state.

The goal of the workgroup is to have a larger supply of high quality and effective educators available for all students around the state, regardless of geographic area or subject being taught. Board staff recommend initial approval of this alternative program for certification that is grounded in evidence of mastery in content and pedagogy, and is both flexible and rigorous. The final work group

PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
OCTOBER 19, 2017

report will be presented to the Board at the December 2017 Board meeting.

National studies have been mixed on the effectiveness of alternative authorization to certification. Most research shows with the proper screening, strong partnerships at the district level, and substantial mentoring and supports, alternative routes to certification can be viable options to teacher certification that produce quality teachers. Most of these reports will also include the caveat that the success of the individual and the impact of that individual on student outcomes also depends on the details of the alternate authorization requirements and the standards they are held too. Staff recommend approval of the proposed program and a thorough analysis of existing as well new routes to certification. The analysis should focus on the effectiveness of teachers who have entered the classroom on an alternative authorization and the impact these individuals have had on student outcomes in comparison to teachers who have entered the classroom through a traditional program.

BOARD ACTION

I move to approve the initial concept of a mastery-based program for teacher certification for individuals who meet the requirement of the alternative authorization – Content Specialist route to certification with final approval based on consideration of the modules and assessments identified in Attachment 1.

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes ____ No ____

PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
OCTOBER 19, 2017

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
OCTOBER 19, 2017

SUBJECT

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

REFERENCE

December 2003	Board approved the PRAXIS II as the state approved assessment for certification purposes and set qualifying scores
April 2017	The Board reviewed an update on the Educator Pipeline and recommendations from the workgroup. Recommendations included removing barriers to certification.

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

Sections 33-1201 -1207, Idaho Code
Idaho Administrative Code, IDAPA 08.02.02.042.02(b)(v)

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

At the April 2017 Board meeting, an update on the work of the Educator Pipeline Work Group and their early recommendations were reviewed and discussed. The update focused on three main categories in addressing the pipeline issues, *Attract and Recruit, Prepare and Certify, and Retain*. One key recommendation was to explore strategies around a “mastery-based” way to assess teaching knowledge, that accounts for experience and pre-existing knowledge.

Administrative Code (Administrative Rule) requires individuals seeking teacher certification to receive a qualifying score on a state approved content, pedagogy or performance assessment. Currently the only state approved content, pedagogy or performance assessment is the PRAXIS II. The PRAXIS II is a content area assessment. Qualifying scores were set by the Board based on recommendations from the Professional Standards Commission at the December 2003 Board meeting, effective September 1, 2004, since that time there have been a few updates to the qualifying scores in individual subject areas at the June 2005, April 2006, June 2006, and October 2006 Board meetings. The Board has not approved any changes to the qualifying scores on the PRAXIS II since October 2006. The PRAXIS II as a content knowledge assessment is both relevant and rigorous, however, those seeking to enter the teaching profession as a change in career often need time or additional coursework/experience to be able to pass all of the applicable areas in the assessment. This is especially the case when a candidate’s degree is aligned to the content area they seek to teach, but not an exact match or when teaching in K-8 grade ranges where the assessment may be much broader than the focused content area an individual may have been employed in. At this time there are no other approved content knowledge assessments and no pedagogical knowledge or performance assessments that have been approved by the Board.

PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

OCTOBER 19, 2017

The Alternate Route to Certification – Content Specialist requires applicants to receive a qualifying score on an appropriate state-approved content, pedagogy, or performance assessments prior to entering the classroom. This route is designed for individuals that already possess deep content knowledge, but lack the pedagogy learned through traditional programs and the performance demonstrated through in-service experiences, resulting in the pedagogy and teacher performance skills being learned while on this route. This leaves content as the most obvious area to propose a new method of assessment. It is also in line with the recommendations of the pipeline committee to look toward more experiential and mastery-based methods for assessing competency. The following is a new, content knowledge assessment proposed for those seeking to enter the classroom under and alternative authorization, specifically the Content Specialist Route.

The proposed assessment is comprised of simple worksheets for documenting knowledge and experience, with a rubric that would uniformly measure basic content knowledge before a candidate on an alternate route enters the classroom as the teacher of record. This Uniform Standard for Evaluating Content Competency is modeled after the accepted measure that was used by states to show teachers were "Highly Qualified" in their content area under previous No Child Left Behind requirements.

This rubric allows points to be earned for coursework, work experience related to the content area, and volunteer work/service to the community related to the content area. For a single content area, 100 points must be earned to qualify, with five points given for each postsecondary content credit earned, two points for each year of work experience documented, and one point for each instance of documented service.

The rationale for granting five points per credit hour rests in the minimum number of credits required for a content endorsement as outlined in IDAPA 08.02.02.021-024. If a candidate can produce transcripts documenting at least 20 credits in the content area they are seeking to teach, he/she immediately qualifies. If a candidate does not have this number of credits, experiential knowledge can be counted through application of content.

IMPACT

Approval of the following proposed alternate assessment will create a second state assessment that could be used by individuals seeking certification through an alternate route.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – Proposed Alternative Assessment: Uniform Standard for Evaluating Content Competency Page 5

PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
OCTOBER 19, 2017

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Board staff reviewed a variety of alternatives, with this being the most cost effective and efficient. Praxis Core, a general test for those wishing to enter education, was considered. This assessment establishes a very low bar in only the most basic skills and, considering the cost at \$150 per candidate, did not appear to be a reasonable alternative. Another option was to accept a lower cut score on the content-specific Praxis II test; but a number of these tests are not regularly available, and some form of content assessment must be completed prior to entering the classroom.

The Uniform Standard for Evaluating Content Competency is recommended as an alternate assessment for entering the classroom on an alternative authorization, specifically the Content Specialist route, to establish that the candidate has relevant experience and/or knowledge in the desired teaching field. The Alternate Authorization – Content Specialist Route requires the hiring district ensure the candidate is qualified to teach in the area of identified need; that a consortium made up of a representative of the approved educator preparation program, the school districts, and the candidate determine the preparation needed to meet the Idaho Standards for Initial Certification of Professional School Personnel; and that the candidate receive ongoing mentoring including at least one classroom observation by the mentor per month. Initially the scoring and evaluation of the new state-approved assessment would be managed by the Board office. School districts and candidates wishing to use the new assessment would be required to agree to regular reporting on the progress these teachers were making and their impact on student outcomes. Should there be any indication that these educators were performing at a lesser rate than those who entered the Content Specialist Route using the PRAXIS II assessment, then Board staff would return to the Board and request the assessment be discontinued as an approved assessment.

BOARD ACTION

I move to approve the state assessment: Uniform Standard for Evaluating Content Competency for individuals entering an alternate authorization to certification as submitted in Attachment 1.

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes ___ No ___

AND

PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
OCTOBER 19, 2017

I move 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.

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes ___ No ___