



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
December 20-21, 2017
College of Southern Idaho
Herrett Center
315 Falls Avenue
Twin Falls, Idaho**

A regularly scheduled meeting of the State Board of Education was held December 20-21, 2017 at the College of Southern Idaho in Twin Falls, Idaho.

Present:

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

Andrew Scoggin
Don Soltman
Richard Westerberg
Sherri Ybarra, State Superintendent

Wednesday, December 20, 2017

BOARDWORK

1. Minutes Review / Approval

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Soltman): To approve the minutes from the October 19-20, 2017 Regular Board meeting, the November 15, 2017 Special Board meeting, and the December 5, 2017 Special Board meeting. The motion carried 8-0.

2. Rolling Calendar

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Soltman): To set December 19-20, 2018 as the date and the College of Western Idaho as the location for the December 2018 regularly scheduled Board meeting. The motion carried 8-0.

3. Agenda Review/Approval

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Hill): To approve the agenda as submitted. The motion carried 8-0.

WORKSESSION

PLANNING, POLICY & GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

A. Board of Education Strategic Plan

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

BOARD ACTION

(Westerberg): To remove the definition of Idaho's Public Education System, as stated, from the Board's Strategic Plan. The motion passed by unanimous consent.

AND

(Critchfield): To accept the system-wide performance measures listed on Tab A Page 21 of the Board materials. The motion passed by unanimous consent.

The Board met at the College of Southern Idaho (CSI) Herrett Center in Twin Falls, Idaho. Board President Dr. Linda Clark called the meeting to order at 1:00 pm (MST).

Vice President and Planning, Policy and Governmental Affairs (PPGA) Committee Chair, Ms. Debbie Critchfield, introduced the work session item reminding members the Board is scheduled to review and approve its Strategic Plan (Plan) annually in December, with the option of a final approval at the February Board meeting if significant changes are requested during the December Board meeting. She continues elements of the Strategic Plan before the Board today include recommendations from the Governor's Higher Education Task Force and that once approved the institutions and agencies under the Board will use the Board's Plan to inform their annual updates to their own strategic plans. She then invites the Board's Chief Planning and Policy Officer, Ms. Tracie Bent, and Director of Research, Mr. Carson Howell, to present the Board's Strategic Plan and answer any questions from the Board.

Ms. Bent shares with Board members the statutory framework for the Plan must include a mission and vision statement, goals, objectives tied to those goals and performance measures and benchmarks tied to the objectives. She continues the Board's overall Strategic Plan ties to the other strategic plans the Board considers each year and the strategic plans of the institutions, agencies and special health programs under the Board must be aligned to the Board's overall Strategic Plan. Ms. Bent then reminds Board members the Plans current framework, approved last year, includes three main Goals with the Board's objectives falling under one of these three main goals. She also reminds Board members this is the framework they are currently considering amending.

At this time the Board moved to a discussion on the Strategic Plan, beginning with a discussion around how to define Idaho's Public Education System within the Strategic Plan. Ms. Bent continues the proposed description of the Public Education System takes references out of the State Constitution and Code and identifies the agencies, institutions and special health programs under the Board's oversight and governance. Board member Westerberg then asks if in lieu of the proposed definition, a statement should be added to the Plan extracted directly from the State Constitution and Code to which Board member Critchfield responds perhaps a statement referencing the exact Article(s) of the State Constitution and Idaho Code could be added. Dr. Hill then asks for confirmation the Strategic Plan is a requirement of the Division of Financial Management (DFM) and not a performance plan measuring the effectiveness of the expenditure of funds. Ms. Bent responds the strategic plan requirement is a statutory requirement and DFM is charged with managing the process. She continues the Strategic Plan is tied to the budgeting process as well as identifying the Board to be good stewards of their public funding and responsibility. Dr. Hill then comments a large part of this Plan is bureaucratically useful for DFM and not a strategic plan in the typical sense, adding, as written, the Plan serves the role of satisfying the legislative intent and the need to follow up on that legislative intent. Mr. Westerberg responds with his agreement, however, he comments the Plan is also used by the institutions and agencies governed by the Board to direct their strategic plans and the more efficient the Board's Strategic Plan the better it is for these institutions and agencies while still satisfying the statutory and legislative

requirements. Ms. Critchfield then asks if a citation referencing the Board's authority within the Idaho State Constitution and Idaho Code would be beneficial to which Ms. Bent responds this is something that could be referenced when describing Idaho's Public Education System rather than calling out each item. Board member Soltman then comments it is his understanding the references were specifically requested to be added to which Ms. Bent responds the request came from the discussion at the August Board meeting. She continues now that the Board has seen what the request would look like the Board must decide if the definition of Idaho's Public Education System should remain as is or be modified. Mr. Westerberg then requests unanimous consent to remove the definition of Idaho's Public Education System, as stated, from the Plan to which there was no objection.

Ms. Bent continues by sharing with Board members the next addition to the Plan was for a new Goal 1: Educational Attainment. She states this addition did not replace the Board's existing goals, but rather moved them down. Ms. Bent then shares the new Goal 1 is in response to the Governor's Higher Education Task Force (Task Force) recommendation to restate the 60% Goal, adding the PPGA committee chose to use the language from the Task Force recommendation as the definition for Goal 1. She continues the objectives under Goal 1 are tied to the Complete College America (CCA) Game Changers adopted by the Board and included in the Complete College Idaho (CCI) Plan. Dr. Clark adds adoption of the CCA Game Changers was a recommendation of the Task Force as well. Ms. Bent adds part of the discussion in the PPGA committee was to raise the CCA Game Changers to a higher degree to where they would be more visible than they are currently within the CCI Plan.

Mr. Westerberg then comments the performance measures tend to focus on tactics and practical issues and not strategic issues, and while these may be useful, they make the Plan less useful as a strategic plan. He continues one option would be to add a citation stating "the Board supports the CCA Game Changers and will measure them" rather than call out the individual measures of the plan. Ms. Critchfield responds the purpose of the discussion today is to review the Plan and make changes, if needed. Mr. Westerberg responds he would like to see the Board work backwards, beginning with determining a Goal's objective and then determining the number of performance measures needed to meet the objective. Dr. Clark then states the Plan, as currently drafted, was an attempt by the Board to be specific in how the Board would measure the CCA Game Changers. She continues if there is a way to be more succinct while still capturing the intent to measure the CCA Game Changers then the Board should do this. Ms. Atchley then comments the Plan, as currently drafted, appears to be more of a "dashboard" than an operable strategic document adding the Board may want to consider revising the Plan to include two or three overriding ideas of what the Board would like to do and how they want to accomplish these goals. She then comments the Plan, as currently drafted, covers a lot of material the Board should and needs to review regularly, but is not necessarily key to a good strategic plan and the current document is what is required of the Board to satisfy DFM.

Mr. Scoggin then asks the purpose for creating a strategic plan and if the purpose is to guide the Board on a multi-year direction or to respond to a legislative mandate for a certain type of report meeting their requirements. To this Ms. Bent responds the challenge for the Board is how to develop a strategic plan meeting the bureaucratic requirements while still being a meaningful document for the Board to meet its goals. She continues there are no requirements on the number of goals, objectives or performance measures adding these are at the discretion of the Board.

Dr. Hill then comments the document does include a strategic plan if the performance measures were to be removed to which Mr. Westerberg responds with the need to include some performance measures and a meaningful way to determine if the objectives are being met. Dr. Clark then comments a more succinct plan would reduce the burden on the institutions.

Mr. Scoggin then asks who the Plan's audience should be, state government or every parent and student in the state. To this Ms. Critchfield responds the Strategic Plan is for the Board and is intended to be an easily referenced document meant to guide Board members and aid in the decision making process. In response Mr. Scoggin states the Plan must be a clear and easily understood document with four to five strategic goals that drive the decisions of the Board and that the Board can organize around. He continues this may even require the Board to change the current committee structure to align with the established goals.

Board member Critchfield then asks if Board members are satisfied with the four Goals as stated; Goal 1: Educational Attainment, Goal 2: Well Educated Citizenry, Goal 3: Workforce Readiness and Goal 4: Educational System Alignment. There were no objections from the Board. Mr. Howell then shares with Board members Goal 1: Educational Attainment is tied to system wide measures and what institutions would be reporting on back to the Board and would include within their strategic plans. Ms. Bent then suggests the five (5) objectives listed under Goal 1 could be condensed into a single objective "*Timely Degree Completion through the Implementation of the Game Changers*" that would include one or two performance measures the Board could use each year to measure progress. She states this is a living document and the performance measures could be updated and added to as needed. Ms. Bent adds this is an opportunity for the Board to prioritize the CCA Game Changers, beginning with one to two the first year and adding more in subsequent years. She then states it has been the experience of the Board items that are called out and reported on are the items and initiatives that are implemented, versus just a simple statement of adoption or acceptance.

Mr. Scoggin then comments if the intent of the Board is to develop a true strategic plan then it must be a plan referenced each and every time and the Board is now discussing incorporating addendums to the plan. He then asks if this Board intends to be a more focused Board or more of a high level Board adding the current format is less strategy and more managerial and does this Board want to be a strategic Board that provides support and direction to agencies under them or more of a managerial Board. Finally, he

shares his preference is for a more strategic Board but notes this changes the model of how the Board has been managed over the past many years.

Ms. Critchfield then comments the discussion today would indicate the Board is looking to develop a plan different than the current model. She then suggests the PPGA Committee could develop a second model that is more in sync with the comments received today and bring both versions back to Board at the February meeting for review and final discussion. Board member Scoggin then comments the information provided in the existing plan is extremely useful and the work before the Board is to determine how to make the plan a living, breathing document moving forward and how to make the plan work strategically. Dr. Hill then comments this could be achieved through linking the Plan's goals to the Board's Vision statement for an accessible, affordable, seamless public education system to which Dr. Clark asks if this captures the Board's Plan. She continues the Game Changers focus is on completion and the Board has spent a lot of time on completion and the three stated goals of the Board's Vision Statement to do necessarily capture completion. Ms. Atchley states "efficiency" would capture completion – timely completion, cost of completion, etc. Board member Scoggin then comments the goals ought to be achievement oriented and blended with the Vision Statement that will then drive the building blocks of the strategy.

Dr. Clark then comments one of the major recommendations of the Task Force was to rewrite the 60% Goal to include a target date of 2025. She then asks if the Board is in agreement with this new target. All Board members were in agreement.

Ms. Bent then reminds Board members of the statutory requirements for the Strategic Plan to include a mission and vision statement, goals, objectives tied to those goals and performance measures and benchmarks tied to the objectives. She then asks if it is the intent of the Board to develop two plans, one that meets the governmental requirements and a second, more condensed plan the Board can use to direct Board action and communicate the Board's goals. She continues these two plans would then be brought to the Board at the regularly scheduled Board meeting in February for final approval. Dr. Clark responds it is the intent of the Board to develop a strategic plan meeting the statutory requirement that could then be boiled down to an executive summary listing the Board's achievement oriented objectives. She continues the Plan would include three to four goals with one to two achievement oriented objectives. She then states this would require the Board to restate the Mission and Vision Statements to an active tense.

Mr. Scoggin then comments the discussion today is a new way of thinking about how this Board operates, of which the Strategic Plan is one element to which Ms. Bent responds conversations around the Strategic Plan often focus on performance measures because these are easier to focus on and understand. She continues the Board has historically struggled with how to keep the Strategic Plan focused while identifying and meeting a number of diverse interests.

Ms. Scoggin then asks if it were possible for the revisions to be shared with Board members in early January for review and comment to be submitted to the PPGA Committee prior to the February Board meeting to which the Board's Executive Director, Mr. Matt Freeman, responds if the Board were to work within the committee process to meet and provide input from each committee then this would maintain the integrity of the process. Ms. Bent adds feedback from each committee must be submitted to Board staff for compilation and review to remain within the requirements of open meeting laws and avoid a serial meeting where decisions could be made outside of an open meeting.

At this time the Work Session continued with a discussion on Postsecondary System-wide Performance Measures. Ms. Bent introduces the item, sharing with Board members one of the items for discussion around the Board's Strategic Plan centered on system-wide performance measures. She continues by stating her reluctance to continue the discussion at the regularly scheduled Board meeting in February because the Board's action in this area will impact institutions strategic plans, adding any action in February will not allow enough time for institutions to develop and align their plans with the Board's final action.

Ms. Bent continues the proposed new system-wide performance measures are focused on the Complete College America (CCA) Game Changers, however, the direction from the Board at the regularly scheduled Board meeting in June was to look at using fewer measures. Ms. Bent then states that given the overall conversation today, she would not expect the Board to wordsmith the measures but to more broadly discuss if this is the direction they wish to go. She then asks the Board to determine which of the measures are the most important for the institutions to call out in their plans.

Ms. Critchfield then asks if the institutions were provided an opportunity to weigh in on the performance measures and what their final suggestions are to which Ms. Bent responds the Council on Academic Affairs and Programs (CAAP) provided a recommendation identifying one performance measure under each goal out of the existing strategic plan as the four system-wide measures. Mr. Howell adds the Institutional Research (IR) Directors also met to discuss how the institutions could collect and report on the performance measures requested under Goal 1 of the Board's Strategic Plan. Ms. Critchfield then asked how the recommendations for the IR Directors compared with those from CAAP to which Ms. Bent responded very differently sharing CAAP provided feedback based upon the existing Strategic Plan where the IR Directors reviewed the performance measures under Goal 1 of the Board's revised Plan. Ms. Bent then shares the Board chose to create system-wide measures to as a way to monitor how institutions were aligning to the Board's Strategic Plan. Dr. Clark then comments if these elements are making a difference then this is what the Board should be focusing on. Ms. Atchley comments the performance measures are not set in stone and if one is not as relevant as expected than it can be changed.

At this time Board member Critchfield requested unanimous consent to accept the system-wide performance measures listed on Tab A Page 21 of the Board materials. There were no objections from the Board.

At this time Mr. Howell continued with an annual update to the Board on the postsecondary outcomes of students participating in Idaho's dual credit program. He begins by sharing with Board members the largest growth is seen with students taking less than 10 dual credits, however, there is growth in the number of students earning more than 30 credits up to an Associate Degree. Mr. Howell continues the number of students graduating high school with an Associate Degree has increased from (34) in 2012-2013 to (126) in 2016-2017 and there has been an increase in students taking dual credit courses across all groups, however, a significant gap remains between those students who are free lunch eligible and those who are not, white students and minority students and male students and female students. Mr. Howell then states the data shows students who plan to go to college are taking advantage of the program early on and, that since the state has been paying for students to take dual credits there has been a dramatic increase in students participating overall, especially those who would have been less included to participate in they were to pay for dual credit out of pocket.

Mr. Howell continues students who earn dual credits are more likely to attend college in the fall following high school graduation compared to students who do not earn dual credits and the more dual credits a student earns in high school, the more likely they are to attend college. Mr. Howell then shares that from 2010-2011 college attendance rates have fallen for students who earn dual credits, however, this is likely related to the expansion of the dual credit program.

Ms. Critchfield then asks how much of this reporting is shared with Legislators to which Mr. Howell responds this report is shared with Legislators annually. Dr. Hill then stats of the three or four messages to share with legislators, this should be at the top of the report. Mr. Soltman then asks the amount paid by the State in 2017 for students to take dual credits to which Chief Deputy Superintendent for the Idaho State Department of Education, Mr. Pete Koehler responds \$13,000,000 of which \$7,000,000 was budgeted.

Finally, Mr. Howell shares with Board members the first year college retention rates of students earning dual credits in high school has been fairly stable over the years and that students with more dual credits are more likely to be retained in their first year of college.

At this time, Ms. Bent shares with Board members an update on the Board's Scholarship Programs. She begins by stating that under the reorganization of the Opportunity Scholarship, the Board's research team now has enough data to identify causation and has found the Opportunity Scholarship is impacting students in their choices to continue to a postsecondary education. Ms. Bent continues Board staff and Indian Education Committee (IEC) have been in discussions on how to expand the number of students applying for scholarship, specifically minority students. She continues the low number of minority students receiving the Opportunity Scholarship is due in part to the low number of minority students applying for the scholarship, however, when looking at the percentage of students receiving the scholarship, the state's American Indian students are receiving the scholarship at a higher rate than the state's non-minority students. Dr. Clark adds the data shared with the IEC was very useful and has allowed the tribes to

focus on getting students to finish the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA), noting this has been the largest barrier for students from this population to complete the application process.

At this time Board member Hill comments on the data in the report that indicates being offered the Idaho Opportunity Scholarship increases the immediate college attendance rate for eligible students by nine (9) percentage points. He then comments on the lack of increase in the the Go On Rate and states this is statistically significant and should be researched further to determine how the Board can address the Go On Rate and how students are paying for college. Mr. Howell responds the data is only looking at students receiving the Opportunity Scholarship and not the entire population to which Dr. Hill responds the data presented today could indicate that affordability is a student's top concern and if so then perhaps the Board should consider promoting something similar to Tennessee's Promise program offering free community college. Mr. Howell then responds the data presented is only for those eligible students with a 3.0 grade point average (GPA) or higher and speaks to some of the issues with the Opportunity Scholarship. He continues with the influx of money received there was one year where the Board was able to provide new awards to more students who applied, however, since renewal awards receive priority, most of the available funds in the following years have gone to existing recipients and not new recipients. Mr. Howell then states the availability of awards is dependent on the year a student applies, adding there could be a lot of money available or very little. Board member Soltman then comments another unintended consequence of this is a student taking a course not related to their major just to the maintain scholarship.

Ms. Bent then shares with Board members there will be a proposal before the Board in the spring to lower the GPA requirement for the Opportunity scholarship, however, if the Board's request for additional funding for the Opportunity Scholarship is approved it is possible for this to create the issue of more students being added to the waiting list. Dr. Clark then asks the median GPA of the recipients to which Ms. Bent responds 3.7. Dr. Clark then asks how many students on the waiting list had a GPA of 3.0 to which Ms. Bent responded a little over 1,000 students. Dr. Clark then asks if the Board should be requesting more money for the Opportunity Scholarship at the same time the Board is considering reducing the GPA requirement to which Ms. Bent responds the request for additional funds would be for the current year and the decision to lower the GPA requirement would be after notification of the Board receiving the additional funding, or not. Dr. Clark then asks if the additional money could meet the 1,000 students currently on the waiting list plus how many more to which Mr. Howell responds if the Board were to receive the entire \$5,000,000 requested and keep the maximum award amount at \$3,500, then that would allow the Board to give a full award of the Opportunity Scholarship to an additional 1,428 students. Dr. Clark then confirms the Opportunity Scholarship is a last dollar award scholarship and asks the average award for the scholarship to which Mr. Howell responds \$3,300.

At this time the Board took a 20 minute break, returning at 3:00.

STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (SDE)

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 item sharing with Board members developments in K-12 education include an update from the Idaho State Department of Education (ISDE) Director of Federal Programs Ms. Karen Seay on the new State Technical Assistance Team (STAT) Phase I Schools pilot. She continues schools identified as in need of improvement are now referred to as Comprehensive Support Schools in the state's new ESSA Plan and the STAT Team was developed to provide support and assistance to these schools. Superintendent Ybarra then states the process begins with a needs assessment and includes a focus on leadership adding meaningful change requires schools and staff working together. Finally, Superintendent Ybarra shares the program is currently in the pilot phase with participating schools sharing feedback through Phase I.

At this time ISDE Director of Federal Programs, Ms. Karen Seay, continued with the STAT Team update. Ms. Seay states Comprehensive Support Schools identified for 2018-2019 school year include the lowest performing elementary schools and high schools with less than a 67% graduation rate. She continues the ISDE has invited leadership teams from seven schools previously identified as Priority or Focus Schools representing six districts to participate in a one year STAT Team pilot adding results from the Phase I schools will help to inform practices for the next year. Board member Soltman then asked if the STAT 2017-2018 participating schools participated voluntarily to which Ms. Seay responded in the affirmative. Board member Critchfield then asked how the ISDE will determine if the efforts of the STAT Team have been successful to which Ms. Seay responded ISDE has developed a logic model to which outcomes are being measured along the way and again at the end of the first year. Superintendent Ybarra then expressed her thanks and appreciation for the work of the STAT Team developing and implementing the project.

At this time Superintendent Ybarra requested ISDE Director of Assessment and Accountability, Ms. Karlynn Laraway, present an update to Board members on the new Idaho Reading Indicator (IRI) Pilot. Mr. Laraway shares with Board members the information provided today is a comparison of students taking both the Fall Legacy IRI and Fall Istation Early Reading Assessment (ISIP). She continues by reminding Board members the ISIP is a computer adaptive assessment with multiple subtests making up a student's overall skill level versus the IRI which is a paper and pencil assessment.

Mr. Laraway then shares with Board members a side-by-side comparison of the overall scores for students taking both the IRI and ISIP during the September administration of the Fall 2017 assessment. She states that overall the results showed an increase in the number of Kindergarten, First and Third Grade students scoring "intensive" or needing intervention. Board President Dr. Linda Clark then asks if this reduction in achievement is due in part to the fact the ISIP contains more subtests than the IRI to which Ms. Laraway responded in the affirmative and that presentation of the material being tested may be a

factor, adding students taking the ISIP are presented with five to six letters and told to select the correct answer versus the IRI where a student writes the letter on paper.

Ms. Laraway then shares with members of the Board feedback from the pilot districts has been positive stating educators from these districts felt the ISIP was a better reflection of their students current abilities and has the ability to answer two important questions; are my students at risk for failing in reading and what is the degree and intensity of instructional support my students need to be successful readers. Board member Scoggin then asks if other states are seeing the same results to which Ms. Laraway responds the IRI is unique to Idaho, however, student performance mirrors what is being seen in other states implementing an early reading assessment.

At this time Superintendent Ybarra requested ISDE Chief Deputy Superintendent, Mr. Pete Koehler, present an update to Board members on the Microsoft Imagine Academy and Adobe Create Idaho. Mr. Koehler shares with Board members the Microsoft Imagine Academy is now in its third year and includes 139 participating schools. He continues participation in this program is growing at a faster pace than it has historically, from 3,000 certifications issues in the first year (2015-2016) to a projected 8,000 certifications in the current 2017-2018 school year. Mr. Koehler continues with an update on the Create Idaho Adobe Pilot sharing the pilot includes 65 participating schools and is the first and only statewide Adobe implementation program in the United States. He continues both programs produce a valid certification for a student graduating from high school that can be taken directly into the workforce or forward to a 2-year or 4-year institution, adding this is a valid measurement of College and Career Readiness and is the direction the state should be moving.

Board member Clark then asks if any of the participating schools are middle schools to which Mr. Koehler responds a majority are high schools, however it is the intent of the ISDE to advance the program to middle schools. Board member Soltman then asks where this program fits in to the school day schedule to which Mr. Koehler responds as an instructional class or as an after school opportunity. Board member Clark adds the Maker Program is another option. Mr. Koehler then states the programs are also offered through the local public libraries as well. At this time Board member Hill asks for more information on the students participating in the program, asking if these are students who continue on to college after high school or what the data shows. Mr. Koehler responds this data is not currently available, however, ISDE is currently collecting the information and expects to have the data available by fall of next year. Board member Critchfield then shares two high schools in the Cassia County School District have implemented these programs and the feedback she has received has been excellent. The Board's Executive Director, Mr. Matt Freeman, then asks what students are specifically certified in when they complete the Create Idaho Adobe program to which Mr. Koehler and Board member Critchfield respond the entire suite of Adobe business products.

At this time Superintendent Ybarra continued with an update on the number of Alternative Authorizations issued by ISDE for the 2017-2018 school year. She begins by stating a recurring theme throughout the state is the shallow pool of applicants, especially in rural

districts and that she will be sharing with legislators in January the report prepared by Education Northwest on the teacher shortage in Idaho. Superintendent Ybarra then requested ISDE Director of Certification and Professional Standards, Ms. Lisa Colon Durham, present a summary to the Board of the number of Alternative Authorizations issued for the current school year.

Ms. Colon Durham shares with Board members a side-by-side comparison of the number of alternative authorization applications for the 2016-2017 school year compared to the number for the 2017-2018 school year and that in November of 2016 the ISDE had issued a total of 444 alternative authorizations compared to 648 in November 2017. Ms. Colon Durham then states each alternative authorization received is an individual application, noting districts put forth a lot of work assembling the applications which the Professional Standards Commission then reviews individually. Finally, Ms. Colon Durham states the need is being met, however, the state is experiencing a significant increase in alternative authorizations being issued.

At this time Superintendent Ybarra requested ISDE Director of Assessment and Accountability, Ms. Karlynn Laraway, present an update to Board members on the statewide Report Card. Ms. Laraway shares with Board members the report card requirements under the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) increase the visibility and transparency of information about the state accountability system. She continues the ISDE, in collaboration with Board staff, is in the process of engaging parents and stakeholders on the design of the new report card and it is expected the RFP will be ready for release in Spring 2018 for a December 1, 2018 completion date as required by ESSA.

Finally, Superintendent Ybarra requested ISDE Chief Policy Advisor, Mr. Duncan Robb, share with Board members an update on the ISDE's 2018 Legislative agenda. Mr. Robb begins by stating ISDE continues working to establish Rural Education Support Networks designed to provide assistance to rural school districts wishing to coordinate efforts to share educational resources. Mr. Robb then shares the next legislative item relates to Mastery Education and would allow ISDE to scale the program by removing the existing cap to allow other districts and schools to participate. The third item on the ISDE's Legislative agenda is related to Advanced Opportunity to simplify paperwork and reporting requirements to ISDE. Mr. Robb continues ISDE intends to put forth proposals to amend the policy related to Safe and Drug Free Schools that would allow schools to use tobacco tax revenues to improve school climate and safety and to include the Idaho School for the Deaf and Blind as a beneficiary of tobacco tax revenues. Finally Mr. Robb shares ISDE intends to work on legislative designed to incentivize Idaho's teachers to teach in rural and hard-to-fill positions.

2. Mastery Based Education Update

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

State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Ms. Sherri Ybarra, introduced the item sharing with members of the Board a conversation she had with Governor Jeb Bush while attending the 2017 National Summit on Education Reform where he was very

complimentary of Idaho's work on Mastery Based Education. She continues by stating she received similar feedback from other conference participants who were very complimentary of Idaho's efforts related to Mastery Based Education, Advanced Opportunities and statewide funding of the SAT exam. Superintendent Ybarra then invited the Idaho State Department of Education (ISDE) Chief Policy Advisor, Mr. Duncan Robb, to provide an update on ISDE's Mastery Based Education efforts.

Mr. Robb begins by sharing with Board members the successes of Venture Alternative High School's Mastery Based program. He continues Venture Alternative High School is part of the Coeur d'Alene School District and began implementation of their Mastery Based Education program this year and has already seen promising results. Scores in student English Language Arts (ELA) Performance have gone from 72.4% scoring below basic in 2015 to 39.5% in 2017. Math scores have improved from 82.8% scoring below basic in 2015 to 64.9% in 2017 and average combined scores for the Scholastic Assessment Test (SAT) have increased from 734 in 2016 to 847 in 2017. Mr. Robb concludes his presentation by sharing with Board members a breakdown of how state funds allocated for Mastery Based Education have been used by school districts, sharing the largest expense has been to cover the cost of salaries and benefits.

At this time, Dr. Clark requested an update from Superintendent Ybarra on the details of the phone conference with the U.S. Department of Education to review Idaho's Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) Plan scheduled for December 28, 2017. She continues the main concerns is the plan's lack of an A-F Grading System. She continues states who also elected to not include this grading system in their plan and opted for a more personalized learning approach have had their plan approved seamlessly. Dr. Clark then reminds Board members that as the State Education Agency (SEA) the Board owns and is responsible for Idaho's ESSA plan and is eager to hear from the U.S. Department of Education on any changes that are required.

There were no additional questions or comments from the Board.

3. Annexation/Excision Request – Coeur d'Alene School District (#271)/Lakeland School District (#272)

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Ybarra/Soltman): To accept the recommendation of the hearing officer and to deny the petition for excision and annexation of property from Lakeland School District 272 to Coeur d'Alene School District 271. The motion carried 8-0.

State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Ms. Sherri Ybarra, introduced the item sharing with Board members approval of the petition by the Board would allow for the proposal to be submitted to the school district electors residing in the area described for annexation/excision in the petition. She continues the hearing officer findings indicate the excision of the territory, as proposed, would not leave a school district with a bonded debt in excess of the limits prescribed by law; however, there are no findings that the excision

and annexation is in the best interest of the children residing in the area described in the petition.

There were no questions or comments from the Board.

4. Annexation/Excision Request – Coeur d’Alene School District (#271)/Post Falls School District (#273)

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Ybarra/Atchley): To accept the recommendation of the hearing officer and to reject the petition for excision and annexation of property from Post Falls School District 273 to Coeur d’Alene School District 271. The motion carried 8-0.

State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Ms. Sherri Ybarra, introduced the item sharing with Board members approval of the petition by the Board would allow for the proposal to be submitted to the school district electors residing in the area described for annexation/excision in the petition. She continues the hearing officer findings indicate the excision of the territory, as proposed, would not leave a school district with a bonded debt in excess of the limits prescribed by law; however, there are no findings that the excision and annexation is in the best interest of the children residing in the area described in the petition.

There were no questions or comments from the Board.

5. Annexation/Excision Request – Sugar-Salem School District (#322)/Fremont School District (#215)

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Ybarra/Critchfield): To accept the recommendation of the hearing officer and to approve the petition for excision and annexation of property from Fremont School District No. 215 to Sugar-Salem School District No. 322 based on the findings that the annexation and excision is in the best interest of the children in the area in question and the excision of the property from Fremont School District No. 215 will not leave the district with a bonded debt in excess of the limits prescribed by law. The motion carried 8-0.

State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Ms. Sherri Ybarra, introduced the item sharing with Board members approval of the petition by the Board would allow for the proposal to be submitted to the school district electors residing in the area described for annexation/excision in the petition. She continues the hearing officer findings indicate the excision of the territory, as proposed, would not leave a school district with a bonded debt in excess of the limits prescribed by law and the excision and annexation is in the best interest of the children residing in the area described in the petition. Superintendent Ybarra then relayed a question asked of her as to when the election would be held, to

which the Board's Chief Planning & Policy Officer, Ms. Tracie Bent responded the next county election which would most likely be in May as most county elections are in November and May.

6. Professional Standards Commission – Annual Report

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Ybarra/Atchley): To accept the Professional Standards Commission 2016-2017 Annual Report as submitted in Attachment 2. The motion carried 8-0.

State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Ms. Sherri Ybarra, introduced the item reminding Board members the Professional Standards Commission (PSC) publishes an annual report following the conclusion of each fiscal year to report the activities of the PSC to the Board. She then invites the Idaho State Department of Education (ISDE) Director of Certification and Professional Standards, Ms. Lisa Colon Durham, to provide the PSC annual report to the Board.

Ms. Colon Durham begins her presentation by sharing with Board members the PSC consists of 18 constituency members who are nominated by their respective stakeholders and then appointed by the Board for a term of three years. She continues the PSC has five (5) standing committees; Authorization Committee, Budget Committee, Executive Committee, Professional Development Committee, and Standards Committee, and the overview today will focus on updates from the Authorizations Committee, Executive Committee and Standards Committee.

From the Authorization Committee, Ms. Colon Durham reports there were 19,117 total certificated educators employed statewide during the 2016-2017 school year and the number of educators working with an alternative authorization was 4.78%. She continues this total has been increasing steadily since the 2014-2015 school year.

Ms. Colon Durham continues with an update from the PSC Executive Committee which reports that of the 30,000 total certified educators during the 2016-2017 school year the PSC received 67 written complaints of alleged educator ethical misconduct, out of which 32 cases were opened. She then states that during the same year, 49 cases were closed; 28 of which probable cause was found with disciplinary action taken and 21 where no probable cause was found. Ms. Colon Durham continues that during the same year, PSC staff conducted one (1) certification denial hearing and nine (9) educator ethical misconduct hearings. Finally, Ms. Colon Durham highlights for the Board the decline in the number of Application Discrepancy Violations from 2015-2017 school year with 16 violations to the 2016-2017 school year with 2. Ms. Colon Durham contributes this decline to the requirement by the ISDE Certification Department at the end of 2015 that an individual submit transcripts for all renewals, regardless of auditing.

Ms. Colon Durham concludes her presentation with an update from the PSC Standards Committee. She continues the Standards Committee reviews 20% of the educator

preparation standards and endorsements each year and that the following were reviewed during 2016-2017 and will be brought forward for Legislative approval in 2018; Idaho Core Teacher Standards, Administrator, Audiology, Bilingual and English as a New Language, Career Technical Education, Speech-Language Pathologist, and World Languages. Ms. Colon Durham then updates the Board on the educator preparation program reviews completed during 2016-2017 stating Boise State University completed a full review and both the University of Idaho and Lewis-Clark State College completed focused reviews. Finally, Ms. Colon Durham shares the following new programs for certification were reviewed and approved by the State Board of Education in 2016-2017; Boise State University – Health, Lewis-Clark State College – Communication and Psychology, and University of Idaho – Literacy, Family and Consumer Sciences.

At this time Dr. Clark asks if the PSC intends to obtain discrete numbers for each type of alternative authorization issued to which Ms. Colon Durham responds in the affirmative. Board member Soltman then asked where the opposition for alternative routes to certification comes from to which Ms. Colon Durham responds concern for alternative routes has been primarily due to the PSC having not conducted an educator preparation review of non-traditional programs. She continues the PSC has scheduled for review the American Board for Certification of Teacher Excellence (ABCTE) and Teach For America (TFA) programs and that once the reviews are complete the results should assist in alleviating some of the concern. Board member Atchley then asks if the creation of a hostile work force climate is considered to be inappropriate conduct and if the PSC ever addresses this issue, to which Ms. Colon Durham responds this would most likely fall under a Code of Ethics Violation.

There were no additional questions or comments from the Board.

7. Professional Standards Commission – Emergency Provisional Certificates

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Ybarra/Soltman): To approve one-year emergency provisional certificates for Laura Plomer, Grace Campos, Kimberly Koepnick, Susan Oakes, Frances Stapp, Kristi Dorris, Eleanor Shinham, Dean Cox, Jeremy Campbell, Ronald Miller, Tammie Smith, Greshen Clegg, Rodney Worthington, James Broyles, Lary Lawson, Chelcy Rodriguez and Amber Cable to teach the content area and grade ranges at the specified school districts as provided herein. The motion carried 8-0.

There were no 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 (Critchfield/Scoggin): To meet in executive session pursuant to Section 74-2016(1)(c), Idaho Code, “To acquire an interest in real property which is not owned by a public agency.” A roll call vote was taken and the motion carried 8-0.

AND

M/S (Critchfield/Scoggin): To meet in executive session pursuant to Section 74-206(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 or individual agent, or public school student.” A roll call vote was taken and the motion carried 8-0.

Board members entered in to Executive Session at 4:15 pm (MST).

M/S (Soltman/Scoggin): To go out of Executive Session. The motion carried 8-0.

Board members exited Executive Session at 7:33pm (MST) and recessed for the evening.

Thursday, December 21, 2017 8:00 a.m. (MST), College of Southern Idaho, Herrett Center, Twin Falls, Idaho.

Board President Dr. Linda Clark called the meeting to order at 8:00am (MST) for regularly scheduled business. There was one (1) participant for Open Forum.

OPEN FORUM

Ms. Rachel Swenson, Middle School Dance Specialist at Idaho Fine Arts Academy and President of Idaho Dance Education Organization, addressed the Board to encourage members to include an Endorsement in Dance as an option for Educators in the State of Idaho. Ms. Swenson states dance is one of the four major art forms recognized globally, nationally and statewide, however, is the only major art form in Idaho without a teacher certification. She continues the current licensing requirements make it so dance as an art form is taught by non-experts or not taught at all and that to be literate in the arts students must receive specific knowledge and skills.

There were no questions or comments from the Board.

CONSENT AGENDA

BOARD ACTION

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

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

1. Boise State University – Elsevier Library Subscription License Agreement

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Soltman): By unanimous consent to authorize Boise State University to enter into a five-year license agreement, for an amount not to exceed \$2,531,256,59, with Elsevier as outlined herein. The motion carried 8-0.

2. University of Idaho – Easement Agreement – University of Idaho’s Center for Organic Studies near Sandpoint, Idaho

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Soltman): By unanimous consent to approve the request by the University of Idaho for authority to grant an easement of Northern Lights, Incorporated, in substantial conformance to the form submitted to the Board in Attachment 1, and to authorize the University’s Vice President for Infrastructure to execute the easement and any related transactional documents. The motion carried 8-0.

Instruction, Research and Student Affairs (IRSA)

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

Planning, Policy and Governmental Affairs (PPGA)

4. Idaho State University – Special Education Director Endorsement Program Review

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Soltman): By unanimous consent to accept the Professional Standards Commission recommendation and to approve the Idaho State University Special Education Director endorsement program for conditional approval contingent on a Focused Visit in 2018. The motion carried 8-0.

5. University of Idaho – Facilities Naming – Rock Creek Ranch

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Soltman): By unanimous consent to approve the request by the University of Idaho to include the Rinker family name in the University’s interest in the Rock Creek Ranch, including in the name of the facility itself should the University acquire title pursuant to Board approval. The motion carried 8-0.

6. Idaho Indian Education Committee Appointments

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Soltman): By unanimous consent to appoint Mr. Gary Aitken, as the Kootenai Tribe tribal chair representative, effective immediately and expiring June 30, 2022. The motion carried 8-0.

7. President Approved Alcohol Permits Report

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

State Department of Education (SDE)

8. Lewis-Clark State College – State Team Focused Visit Report

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Soltman): By unanimous consent to approve the recommendation of the Professional Standards Commission to accept the State Team Focused Visit Report for Lewis-Clark State College as submitted. The motion carried 8-0.

PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS (PPGA)

1. College of Southern Idaho Annual Progress Report

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 thanking College of Southern Idaho (CSI) President Dr. Jeff Fox for his hospitality hosting Board members and staff at this meeting. She then invited President Fox to present his annual update to the Board.

Dr. Fox begins by welcoming members of the Board to the College of Southern Idaho campus and extends his thanks and appreciation to CSI staff for their work and efforts coordinating the Board meeting. Dr. Fox proceeds by sharing a brief video highlighting CSI’s efforts attracting adult learners to return to their education at CSI. He continues his update by sharing with Board members CSI continues to build upon its commitment to the local community and now offers more than 60 community education courses in

partnership with Head Start, Office on Aging, Trans IV Bus service, CSI Refugee Center, Boys & Girls Club and the Idaho STAR program. Dr. Fox then shares the many success of CSI's Athletic Programs, work cultivating economic partnerships across the local community and efforts supporting development of the local workforce.

Dr. Fox continues with an update on the CSI Bridge Program. He states the program was launched in 2016 to target those students not planning to attend college after high school and that during the first year a total of 28 students participated in the program, 85% enrolled at CSI for the fall semester, 83% are still enrolled one year later and the fall-to-fall retention rate for this student group is 28% higher than the rest of the student population. Dr. Fox then reports the same success for the 2017 program, stating a total of 41 students participated and 94% enrolled at CSI for the fall semester. He continues the Bridge Program has been a huge success getting students who were not even considering college to go on.

Dr. Fox then shares with members of the Board an update on CSI's Annual Enrollment and Dual Credit Enrollment. He states CSI has experienced a drop in enrollment of Career Technical Education students due largely in part to the low unemployment rates in the Magic Valley. He continues the enrollment of academic students has also dropped due to the same reason, however, dual credit enrollment has increased dramatically over the same period stating the number of students enrolling in dual credit has increased from 2,245 during the 2012-2013 school year to 3,942 during the 2015-2016 school year to 5,353 during the 2016-2017 school year. Dr. Fox then shares the fall-to-fall retention rate has increased from 53% in 2012 to 60% in 2015 and that graduation rates have increased from 18% in 2010 to 21% in 2013.

Finally, Dr. Fox provides an update on the CSI Foundation sharing CSI has maintained a strong relationship with the foundation which is one of the top community college foundations in the nation and has awarded more than \$2,000,000 in scholarship funds for CSI students.

There were no questions or comments from the Board.

2. Idaho Division of Vocational Rehabilitation Annual Report

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 requirement for the Idaho Division of Vocational Rehabilitation (IDVR) to provide an annual update to the Board. Ms. Critchfield then invited IDVR Administrator, Ms. Jane Donnellan, to present the annual report. Ms. Donnellan begins by sharing with Board members IDVR has three distinct programs of the agency; Vocational Rehabilitation, Extended Employment Services, and the Council for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing and that a majority of the presentation today will focus on the Vocational Rehabilitation program. Ms. Donnellan then shares the Vocational Rehabilitation program is a state and federally funded program with a 21.3% match requirement whose mission is to prepare individuals with disabilities

for employment and community enrichment. She continues IDVR has 73 counselors in 8 regions located throughout Idaho.

Ms. Donnellan then shares with Board members that in FY2017 there were a total of 1,835 successful outcomes, a 444% increase in customer wages after receiving IDVR services, and that 82% of IDVR customers who achieved or maintained employment reported their wages as their primary means of support. She continues the average hourly rate for IDVR customers in FY2017 was \$12.84; which equates to 63.7% more than the average Idaho wage and that for every dollar the state invests, over \$9.00 will be paid back to the State.

Ms. Donnellan continues with an update on IDVR's efforts to grow their business outreach and engagement plans which include hiring a business liaison, enhanced external website, and development of business outreach materials for use throughout the state. Finally, Ms. Donnellan shares with members of the Board IDVR's line item budget request for FY2019 include one (1) full time employee (FTE) to manage a Cost Reimbursement and Ticket to Work program and \$82,600 in State General Funds for the purpose of supporting one additional FTE for the Council for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing.

There were no questions or comments from the Board.

3. Workforce Development Council Transition Update, National Governors Association Work-Based Learning Policy Academy
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 they received an update from the Workforce Development Council (WDC) as part of the materials from the October Board meeting, however, due to a scheduling conflict WDC Chair, Mr. Trent Clark was not able to present the update to the Board at that time. Board member Critchfield then invited Mr. Trent Clark and WDC Executive Director, Ms. Wendi Secrist, to present their update to the Board.

Mr. Clark begins by sharing with Board members Executive Order 2017-12 shifted the Workforce Development Council from an advisory council to the Department of Labor to the Executive Office of the Governor. He continues the Workforce Development Council is now an industry lead organization comprised of appointed council members and that along with the recommendations of the Workforce Development Council Task Force (WDCTF) the Governor will be putting forward for Legislative approval fundamental changes to the statute governing the WDC. Mr. Clark specifically cites three areas that would be the focus of change: to increase public awareness of and access to career education and training opportunities, improve the effectiveness, quality and coordination of programs and services designed to maintain a highly skilled workforce, and help providing for the most efficient use of federal, state and local workforce development resources. Finally, Mr. Clark stresses the importance of outreach and a two-way line of sight between jobseekers and employers. He continues one component of this is the

training and education of jobseekers and states the WDC will be relying heavily on the Board for development and implementation.

At this time Dr. Hill shares his satisfaction with the Governor's acceptance of the WDCTF recommendations and continues by emphasizing to Board members these recommendations are not just something to do but are essential.

At this time, WDC Executive Director, Ms. Wendi Secrist, shares with Board members an update on the National Governors Association (NGA) Work-Based Learning Policy Academy. She continues Idaho is one of six states selected by the NGA to participate in a policy academy focused on scaling high-quality work-based learning to help develop strategies to connect youth and young adults with career opportunities in STEM-intensive industries. Finally, she shares through the policy academy, states will share best practices, develop plans to identify and scale high-quality programs and develop policies to support and sustain work-based learning initiatives.

There were no questions or comments from the Board.

4. Boise State University – In-suite/Club Room Alcohol Service – Double R Ranch Club Room in Taco Bell Arena – Men's Basketball, 2017-2018 Season

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Soltman): To approve the request to waive the requirement in Board Policy I.J.2.c. that all requests for alcohol service in conjunction with NCAA athletic events be made at the regularly scheduled June Board meeting for the 2017-2018 basketball season. The motion carried 7-1 with Mr. Westerberg voting nay.

AND

M/S (Critchfield/Soltman): To approve the request for approval of In-suite/Club Room alcohol service in compliance with Board Policy I.J. in the venues identified for the 2017-2018 home basketball competitions. The motion carried 7-1 with Mr. Westerberg voting nay.

Planning, Policy and Governmental Affairs (PPGA) Committee Chair, Ms. Debbie Critchfield introduced the item, stating the request before the Board comes from Boise State University (BSU) for approval to provide alcohol service in the Double R Ranch Club Room of Taco Bell Arena as a "Permitted Event". She then reminded members the Board approved changes to Board Policy I.J. at the October 2017 regular Board meeting to allow institutions to bring forward to the Board request to provide alcohol service in specified venues for specific NCAA sporting events, however, the amended policy retained the provision that all requests must come to the Board at the regular June meeting each year. Ms. Critchfield continues that due to the timing of the policy amendments, there was not an opportunity for BSU to bring forward a request for alcohol service for the 2017-2018

Basketball season in compliance with the deadlines specified in the policy and this is why the policy is being brought forth today.

Finally, Ms. Critchfield adds the request by BSU is in compliance with the provisions set forth in Board policy I.J. in that the venue and the sport are specified in the policy, however, the request does not comply with the requirements that these requests only be brought forward in June, and that to facilitate this request, the Board is also being asked to waive the requirement in Board policy I.J.2.c. regarding the June requirement and that BSU will still be required to meet all other provisions of this section of policy.

Board member Westerberg then states the Board has waived policy before for compelling issues, however, the request before the Board today is a request for alcohol service for a basketball season that is now half over and he is not sure this qualifies as a compelling issue. Board member Critchfield responds the understanding of the policy in October was that this would be in effect. She continues by stating her agreement with Board member Westerberg, however, in this case there was a misunderstanding of the timing. Board member Hill then comments the item before the Board today is for a technical adjustment rather than an exception to policy.

Board member Scoggin then comments the motion read today differs from that provided in his Board agenda materials to which Board member Critchfield responds in the affirmative. She continues the item was originally brought to the Board by Boise State University for their venue only, however, it was decided to change the motion to include any location identified in policy for basketball for the current season and that the motion is not for an expansion of locations. Board member Westerberg then states he was under the impression the policy provides for annual approval in June for all venues and locations to which Board member Critchfield responds the request in June would be for a continuation of alcohol service at the venues stated in policy. Board member Westerberg responds the policy was changed to allow alcohol service at venues other than football with the option to come to the Board annually for approval of new locations. Board member Critchfield responds it is the understating of the PPGA Committee that institutions with stated venues would have the ability to serve alcohol during the basketball season at those venues this year, however, they have later learned this would have been outside of the June request timeline and that the motion today is to waive the June request timeline for the current season. Board member Westerberg then asked if approval of the motion would waive the requirement for all basketball venues to which Board member Critchfield responded only for those venues stated in policy. The Board's Chief Planning and Policy Officer, Ms. Tracie Bent, shares with Board members the policy identifies the Boise State University Double R Ranch Room at Taco Bell Arena and University of Idaho Lighthouse Center Bud and June Ford Clubroom as the only two locations where alcohol service is allowed at home basketball games.

There were no additional comments or questions from the Board.

5. 2017 Teacher Pipeline Report – Baseline Data and Final Recommendations
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, sharing with Board members the report presented today provides baseline data on the supply and demand of instructional staff across Idaho, and suggests ways to utilize the information to ensure consistency and efficiency in addressing Idaho's teacher pipeline issues over time. She then invites the Board's Educator Effectiveness Program Manager, Ms. Christina Linder, to present the 2017 Teacher Pipeline Report.

Ms. Linder begins by reminding Board members of the charge given to the Educator Pipeline Committee from the Board to replace anecdotal information with fact and to insure consistent data. She then recognized the Board's Principal Research Analyst, Dr. Cathleen McHugh, for her work compiling the report shared with the Board today.

Ms. Linder continues that one of the key findings of the report is that retention, not production, is the main issue. She states that of the approximately 1,800 certificates issued annually, 33% do not serve in an Idaho school. Ms. Linder then shares the state's attrition rate remains steady at 10%, compared to 8% nationally, and that 76% of the state's attrition rate is made up of teachers leaving the teaching workforce prior to reaching retirement age. She continues this equates to 1 out of every 20 classrooms in Idaho being led by an individual who has not been fully certified or met the minimum requirements.

Ms. Linder continues her presentation with an update on the teacher supply in Idaho. She states the most recent data available from the 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 school years shows an average of 845 individuals have been prepared by institutions in Idaho each year, however, the data from the 2016-2017 school year shows that of the total 1,952 instructional certificates issued in Idaho, a total of 1,234 individuals actually taught in Idaho of which 821 were prepared by an Idaho institution. She then states the share of total certificates issued to individuals who are not employed as instructional staff in an Idaho Public School equates to 37%. Finally, she states the need for more information in order to understand where candidates are coming from, what institutions they are being prepared by, and where they are choosing to teach, in state versus out of state, especially in Idaho communities located in or near border communities. Ms. Linder concludes this portion of her presentation with an update on the average number of certificates issued by content area, noting the gains made in the number of certifications for both Special Education and STEM Content areas. She then shares Boise State University (BSU) and Lewis-Clark State College (LCSC) have made significant gains in these areas and she commends both institutions for their efforts.

At this time Ms. Linder continues with an update to Board members on teacher demand in Idaho. She states the definition of "demand" is characterized by the number of teacher retirements plus the number of new teachers needed due to growth in student populations. Ms. Linder then shares, based upon this definition, 360 teachers in Idaho

are retiring annually and the Idaho annual average growth rate is 233. Based upon this information, Idaho schools would need 593 new teachers entering the field each year. She continues, if Idaho issues an average of 1,873 instructional certificates each year, with approximately 1,200 accepting teaching jobs, then the annual surplus of teachers should be between 600 and 1,000 every year, however, the data shows Idaho is steadily losing 10% of its teaching population every year which indicates 1,140 teachers are leaving Idaho's classrooms each year for reasons other than retirement. Ms. Linder continues by sharing with Board members the largest area of attrition, approximately 15%, is seen with new teachers after only one year of teaching. She continues that of the 2013-2014 new teacher cohort, the state has seen a loss of 30% by the 2016-2017 school year, or the end of the fourth year teaching. She continues the decline in attrition could be due in part to the fact that teachers are placed on a renewable contract at the end of the fourth year, however more data is needed to determine why teachers are leaving and if they are leaving voluntarily or being exited out. Ms. Linder concludes this portion of her presentation by sharing with Board members the rate of attrition by region, noting Regions 4 and 6 consistently have the highest rate at 15% and 16% respectively, however the remaining regions are not far behind averaging 13%.

Ms. Linder continues her presentation by sharing with Board members the prevalence of certifications through Alternative Pathways throughout the state. She continues approvals for alternative authorizations increased 17% between FY16 and FY17 and that 931 teachers, or nearly 5% of Idaho's teacher population, is not fully certified. She then states the percentage of teachers on some form of interim certificate has increased in every region over the last two years, but particularly in Region IV where the number of alternative authorizations doubled in 2015-2016. She then states that after discussions with administrators from Region IV the increase was due to a great need and not a desire to try new or different programs. Finally Ms. Linder shares that effective July 1, 2016, the Teacher to New Certificate was split out to include two separate certification options, one for an existing certificated teacher to receive a different type of certificate and one for an existing certificated teacher to add an endorsement or specialty to their current certificate. She continues it would be beneficial for the Board to compel the Idaho State Department of Education (ISDE) to collect the information in such a way as to allow the paths to be reported on individually. She adds this would provide a clearer picture to the Board on the areas of greatest need and how these needs are being met.

At this time, Ms. Linder recaps policy questions for the Board's consideration based upon the items presented today, beginning with the gap between the number of annual certificates issued and the number of certificated teachers teaching in Idaho's public schools. She asks if Idaho is losing these individuals to more competitive border states, noting that even with the Career Ladder Idaho's average teacher salary still ranks 47 out of 50 states. She continues other possibilities are these individuals are being drawn to more competitive non-teaching professions, are unable to find jobs in their area of preparation or are simply unwilling to accept jobs in a particular geographic region. Ms. Linder then states that whatever the reason, the need for more conclusive data is clear in order to fully understand why these individuals are choosing not to teach in Idaho's public schools and to allow the Board to discern any patterns between those who stay in Idaho

and those who do not. Ms. Linder then stresses the need to look at those teachers who do choose to stay in Idaho, but leave the profession within five years. She adds it is important to know if these individuals are exiting voluntarily or if they are being released. She continues the Board needs the ability to look at how these individuals are being prepared and if there are higher exit numbers by those coming to the profession on an interim certificate. Finally Ms. Linder states there is a high possibility Idaho is losing these teachers due to the higher compensations offered by neighboring/border states as well as a lack of support for new teachers. At this time Board member Hill asks for clarification on what is meant by a lack of support to which Ms. Linder responds a lack of mentoring for new teachers. Board member Clark then reminds Board members the recommendation by the K-12 Taskforce for a Career Ladder had two purposes; one to entice individuals in to the profession at levels comparable to entry level STEM jobs (\$40,000) and also to retain teachers with a salary at the top of the scale (\$60,000). Dr. Clark continues one other issue about lack of support is the lack of ability for an individual in the teaching profession to earn a career wage. She continues as everyone knows a tremendous amount of effort was put forth by the Legislature to put the Career Ladder in place over a 5 year period it was without the second element and it is important to recognize support for teachers is more than mentoring, but also insuring the ability for educators to continue to earn a higher level of pay. Ms. Linder then states this is also a recommendation of the Educator Pipeline Committee as well. She then comments Region II has some of the most remote and rural regions in the state, yet the region consistently has one of the lowest attrition rates in the state. Ms. Linder states her belief the mentoring model in place at Lewis-Clark State College contributes greatly to the low attrition rates for the region and this is something that should be explored further.

Finally, Ms. Linder concludes her presentation by sharing with members of the Board the recommendations from the Educator Pipeline Committee beginning with finalizing the format for a standardized teacher supply and demand report to include consistent data definitions for the purpose of gauging progress towards measurable goals. She also suggests bringing together an external steering committee that can continue shaping the report and definitions moving forward. Next, Ms. Linder suggests establishing a process to ensure alignment between policy recommendations and critical teacher pipeline data and finally to begin implementation of the workgroup recommendations that are supported by the data provided regarding Idaho's teacher pipeline. Ms. Linder then shares with members of the Board the key recommendations addressing the two major findings of the report which are Induction Support and More Efficient Pathways to Certification. She then states additional recommendations include attracting talent and creating incentives to teach, alternate routes and "grow your own" strategies, and finally, development and support for all teachers, including induction programs, evaluation feedback, and teacher leadership opportunities.

There were no additional comments or questions from the Board.

At this time the Board recessed for a ten minute break, reconvening at 10:00 am (MST).

6. Annual Evaluation Review Report

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, sharing with Board members annual evaluation reviews allow state policy makers to verify the state framework is being implemented with fidelity and to judge the effectiveness of using the evaluation framework in conjunction with student outcomes for determining movement on the Career Ladder. She continues the Board may also use the information in directing changes to teacher preparation programs to address areas of improvement for both administrators as well as instructional and pupil services staff. Ms. Critchfield then invited the Board's Educator Effectiveness Program Manager Ms. Christina Linder to present the Annual Evaluation Review Report to the Board.

Ms. Linder reports there are few changes to the 2016-2017 Evaluation Review and the report has been posted to the Board's website. Board member Clark then asks if there is a way to calculate or monitor the number of teachers leaving the system due to resignation in lieu of disciplinary action to which Ms. Linder responded the evaluation review does not include these individuals because they are being let go. She continues districts have provided feedback stating they would like a way to identify these individuals. Dr. Clark then states it is significantly unfair for administrators working with individuals on plans or disciplinary issues who are not shown anywhere and that it would appear all administrators are giving high evaluations because the data for lower performing individuals is not listed. She then states the need for tracking how many teachers leave by way of this route. Board member Soltman then asks if overall most administrators are conducting evaluations appropriately and with integrity to which Ms. Linder responds in the affirmative. Board member Critchfield then states her belief the Board is providing the appropriate amount of support and assistance for administrators to accomplish what the Board is asking of them.

There were no additional questions or comments from the Board.

7. Governor's Higher Education Task Force Recommendations – Prioritization

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Hill): To accept the priority order of the committee assignments as specified in Attachment 1. The motion carried 8-0.

Planning, Policy and Governmental Affairs (PPGA) Committee Chair, Ms. Debbie Critchfield introduced the item reminding members the Board assigned the various recommendations of the Governor's Higher Education Task Force (Task Force) to the Board's standing committees; Business Affairs and Human Resources (BAHR), Instruction, Research and Student Affairs (IRSA), and Planning, Policy and Government Affairs (PPGA). The committees were then tasked with identifying and recommending to

the full Board prioritization of each of the recommendations and to begin work on implementation planning.

There were no questions or comments from the Board.

8. State Accountability System – Student School Quality/Engagement Survey
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 sharing with Board members the student engagement school quality survey is being brought back to the Board today to give the Board the opportunity to adjust the planed administration of the survey for the 2017-2018 school year. She then states the survey is being administered separately from the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) requirements to identify schools in need of additional support. Board member Critchfield then invites Superintendent Ybarra to present the recommendations to the Board and answer any questions.

Superintendent Ybarra states that fundamentally districts are already conducting the AdvancED Survey to yield information on student engagement, student emotion, and to gauge how students feel about and perceive their world. She continues districts have requested a survey they are familiar with and trust. Superintendent Ybarra then states if this is the direction the Board wishes to go she suggests taking another look at the AdvancED survey.

Superintendent Ybarra then shares feedback from local superintendents about the perception of the original survey voted on by the Board in October, stating the proposed survey was poorly designed and that the AdvancED survey was clearly aligned to the outcomes from the stakeholder groups that met over the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) plan as well. She continues the survey is free this first year and a great opportunity for business in Idaho. Superintendent Ybarra then states her other concern is attaching the survey to a test which was originally proposed in October due to timing constraints. Finally, she states if the AdvancED survey can meet the needs of districts and what they are already doing then the Board should take advantage of this. Superintendent Ybarra shares the cost for the AdvancED survey after the initial year is estimated to be approximately \$200,000.

Board member Soltman then asks if a motion would be required to which Board member Clark responds a motion would be required if the Board were to change the test. Dr. Clark continues by sharing the Board office has received a significant amount of input through the Superintendents Association and regional meetings expressing concerns over the content of the original survey. Board member Scoggin then asked for additional information on the concerns received by the Board office to which Dr. Clark responds overall the questions were biased. Board member Critchfield then states the two proposed surveys are very different from one another and that when discussing with stakeholder groups what it was they wanted to learn from the survey three themes were identified; school safety, teacher quality, and student engagement. She continues that

when originally reviewing survey options the one presented in October encapsulated these three themes and that at the time the stakeholders felt the survey selected satisfied what they were trying to achieve. Dr. Clark then shares the AdvancED survey, as it exists, does not hit all of these areas, however, within the suite of assessments offered the Board can have a survey designed to meet the State's needs. Superintendent Ybarra then states her concern with knowing some of the questions asked in the current survey are biased and still choosing to move forward. Board member Westerberg then asks if the series of public meetings produced any negative comments to which Board member Critchfield responds there were no public meetings, however, the Board did receive input prior to investigating survey options and then reviewed the available options with stakeholders. Board member Westerberg then states the survey selected must be trusted to which Superintendent Ybarra responds other states are also using the AdvancED survey and that it is widely accepted.

At this time Board member Soltman made a motion to use the AdvancED survey for the 2017-2018 school year. The motion was seconded by Board member Atchley.

Board member Scoggin then states if the Board now has more time then would it be appropriate to investigate and vet the AdvancED survey with stakeholders before going to motion. Superintendent Ybarra responds the previous timeline the Board was under was due to determining how to administer the survey to the entire state and that one way to do this was to attach the survey to a test which required Board approval at the October Board meeting. She continues the new opportunity with AdvancED eliminates the need to attach the survey to a test. Dr. Clark then asks if legislators have had an opportunity to review the AdvancED survey. Board member Critchfield then asks if there is a new deadline to which Superintendent Ybarra responds in the negative, noting the ESSA plan states there will be a survey and that it must be in place for administration in the spring.

Board member Critchfield then states one consideration with any survey is for it to be grade appropriate adding it is her understanding the AdvancED survey is geared towards secondary students, however, there is the ability to adjust the language with the AdvancED survey to be grade appropriate. Superintendent Ybarra confirms this to be correct. She then states the Board will need to finalize a contract with AdvancED if they decide to use this survey, otherwise the Board may find themselves working against another deadline if they were to hold off for too long. Board member Scoggin again states his concern the Board is acting prematurely noting this survey has not been reviewed with stakeholders and that the suite of options mentioned have not been reviewed by the Board. Dr. Clark then asks if the Board were to wait until the regularly scheduled meeting in February to make a decision would that be a workable timeframe. Superintendent Ybarra then requested Idaho State Department of Education (ISDE) Chief Policy Advisor, Mr. Duncan Robb, address the proposed timeframe.

Mr. Robb states that if ISDE were to begin the vetting process immediately after the holiday break it would allow enough time for ISDE to fully vet the AdvancED survey. Superintendent Ybarra responds with her belief the Board would need to hold a special Board meeting in January to meet the deadline. She continues ISDE will bring the

proposed AdvancED survey to the stakeholder groups for review and input and then bring to the Board for a Special Board meeting mid-January. Dr. Clark then asks for clarification that AdvancED was suggesting their “stock” assessment for the current year and any customization would follow in subsequent years to which Superintendent Ybarra responded in the affirmative. Board member Atchley then requests the contract length if the Board were to select AdvancED to which Dr. Clark responds the first year is at no cost and then contract with the Board beyond that point.

At this time Board member Soltman withdrew his previous motion to use the AdvancED survey for the 2016-2017 school year. The withdrawal of the motion was seconded by Board member Atchley. Board member Atchley then comments if superintendents, parents, teachers and students feel the survey is valuable then she supports moving forward, however, if the survey will only serve to collect data that may not be of value to the Board then this must be considered. Dr. Clark then comments the survey is a required element of the state’s ESSA plan, noting there were a number of additional options proposed to stakeholders that were rejected overwhelmingly for a survey. She continues by stating the importance for the selected survey to provide the right information and not just be an exercise in taking a survey. Dr. Clark then states her concern with using a “stock” survey for the current year but notes the Board must start somewhere and if AdvancED does provide the ability for the Board to customize the survey then that would be a good thing. Board member Westerberg then comments it is not just about which survey is selected but also about the process followed and ensuring that process is open and transparent.

At this time Mr. Robb reminds Board members the AdvancED survey is on a different platform and this would require additional training for those educators not already on the existing platform, specifically those administrators in the middle and elementary school grades. Dr. Clark then asks for a reasonable expectation to distribute the information to the stakeholder groups to which Board member Critchfield responds the week of January 15th would allow for schools to be back in session from the holiday break for two weeks prior to the Board holding a Special Board meeting. Board member Scoggin then suggests ISDE contact stakeholder groups requesting they distribute the AdvancED survey to their members for review and comment to be returned to ISDE by January 10, 2018. Superintendent Ybarra then stresses the importance for the Board to act quickly in order to allow enough time for stakeholder feedback, contracting, and training.

There were not additional questions or comments from the Board.

INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH, AND STUDENT AFFAIRS (IRSA)

1. Complete College America and Complete College Idaho Report
This item was provided in the agenda materials as an information item.

Instruction, Research and Student Affairs (IRSA) Committee Chair, Dr. David Hill, introduced the item sharing with Board members the presentation today from staff and institutions will provide an update to the Board on gains made toward the implementation

of Complete College America (CCA) “Game Changer” strategies and the effectiveness of initiatives supported by CCI funding. He continues the information provided in the report today will provide an opportunity for the Board to evaluate progress and provide feedback on the work being pursued. Dr. Hill then invites the Board’s Chief Academic Officer, Dr. Randall Brumfield and representatives from the state’s higher education institutions to provide an update to the Board and answer any questions Board members may have.

Representing the state’s community colleges are Dr. Todd Schwarz, Executive Vice President and Chief Academic Officer for College of Southern Idaho, Brenda Pettinger, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs for College of Western Idaho, and Dr. Lita Burns, Vice President for Instruction for North Idaho College.

Dr. Schwarz begins his presentation by sharing with members of the Board an update on the CCA Game Changer – Timely Degree Completion (“Full Time is 15”). He continues the focus of College of Southern Idaho (CSI) has been management of student progress and that CSI’s implementation of mandatory student advising has contributed greatly to this measure. He then states the number of credits a student has accomplished has increased from 46% to 60% in three years. Dr. Schwarz continues with an update on the CCA Game Changer – Remediation Reform (Corequisite Remediation) sharing CSI has made significant strides towards remediation reform as evidenced by the early implementation of emporium and accelerated models and that most recently CSI has moved more purposely in the direction of Corequisite remediation and seen success rates in English remediation increase from 38% in 2014 to 78% in 2017 and Math remediation increase from 41% to 50% for the same time period. Dr. Schwarz continues additional strategies implemented by CSI include Structured Schedules to create learning communities and block schedules in varying forms and Guided Pathways to Success (GPS) including academic maps, milestone maps and a focus on metamajors. Dr. Schwarz then shares an update on CSI’s Transition Coordinator Model stating the College was able to higher eight (8) full-time employees with funds appropriated in 2016 who are now deployed throughout Region IV in most of the high schools and five middle schools to work with and advise students on the steps needed to continue to postsecondary education.

Board member Hill then states CSI’s Transition Coordinator Model is very powerful and asks for the degree of coverage in the local region to which Dr. Schwarz responds 17 schools with a staff of 12 and that the coverage is growing.

Dr. Schwarz continues four (4) additional full-time Dual-Credit Advisor/Coordinators were added with funds appropriated in 2017 and that CSI has used funds appropriated in FY2018 to increase instruction and tutoring efforts in STEM focused areas as well as launch the Bridge to Success Program. Finally Dr. Schwarz states the common theme is clear – time with students matters and student engagement matters.

Board member Atchley then asks if there is something the Board should be doing to reduce the need for remediation at the postsecondary level, citing more rigorous demands at the high school level or possibly requiring a high school student take four years of math.

Dr. Schwarz responds this has been attempted and that raising the bar is not necessarily the best solution. Board member Atchley then asks if Dr. Schwarz has a sense of either a direct or indirect relationship between a student's high school Grade Point Average (GPA) and their college success to which Dr. Schwarz responds it is about money, noting students who are successful in college have the financial means to attend.

At this time Brenda Pettinger shares with members of the Board an update on College of Western Idaho's (CWI) implementation of the Complete College America Game Changers. She states beginning with FY2016, CWI received line item funding for three (3) Complete College Idaho measures; General Education Reform, Remediation Transformation, and Advising Transformation. She continues the new General Education Program of Study was launched in fall 2015 and that completion of the program results in an academic certificate. She then shares that at the end of the programs first year (2015-2016) a total of eight (8) certificates were awarded. This number has since increased to 81 certificates awarded at the end of the 2016-2017 academic year and that in 2017 CWI received commendation from the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU) for this program. Ms. Pettinger then shares CWI received funding this same year for their Math Remediation Transformation and the funds were used to implement CWI's Math Solutions Center (MSC). She continues the MSC is an Emporium and competency-based model using a diagnostic exam to identify areas of college-level competency and deficiency and that students receive individual learning plans containing only the modules required to meet competencies for the math pathway of their declared major. Ms. Pettinger continues that after implementation CWI discovered that students were scoring lower than expected, and, as a result CWI transitioned to a Basic Skills Education (BSE) for these students that was non-credit bearing and free to all students. She continues that currently the Emporium Model is being used for students needing significant remediation, and the Corequisite model is serving those students needing moderate remediation for college-readiness. Finally, Ms. Pettinger updates Board members on CWI's advising transformation to an Appreciative Inquiry Advising Model designed to meet the needs of individual students and to more effectively monitor student progress.

Dr. Clark then congratulates CWI on their progress to date and shares at the Complete College America convening there was a strong emphasis for open institutions, such as CWI, to implement a two tiered remediation model.

At this time Dr. Lita Burns shares with members of the Board an update on North Idaho College's (NIC) implementation of the Complete College America Game Changers beginning with Math Pathways. Dr. Burns states NIC's Math department, in collaboration with institution faculty, have defined three math pathways; Quantitative Reasoning, Statistics and STEM and that in addition to the three Math pathways, NIC has also designed math courses specific to the program requirements for Career Technical Education students. Dr. Burns continues the result has been an alignment of the curriculum to reduce the number of courses, and therefore credits, students are required to take in a math sequence.

Dr. Burns then shares an update on NIC's Co-requisite Remediation stating the co-requisite model in English has seen remarkable results. She continues students enrolled in English 101/114C successfully complete English 101 at higher rates than students placed directly into English 101 and those same students enrolled in English 101/114C also successfully complete English 102 at higher rates than those students enrolled directly into English 101 and then enroll in English 102. Finally, Dr. Burns shares NIC has seen an 84% decrease in enrollment for English 099, resulting in an estimated savings of \$275,000 in the cost of tuition for students. Dr. Burns continues with an update on NIC's Math Co-requisite Remediation efforts, stating NIC's revision of the traditional pre-requisite math sequence to align curriculum with a math pathway has resulted in a 68% increase in the number of students entering a college level Quantitative Reasoning course from fall 2013 to fall 2017 and a 20% decline in the number of students enrolled in a Developmental Math course over the same period.

Dr. Burns continues with an update on NIC's "3 for Free" program designed to change student's behavior of considering 12-credits to be full time. She continues the idea is to encourage students to successfully complete at least 15 credits in a semester, and, degree seeking students who do complete 15 credits in a semester are then eligible to receive 3 credits tuition free the next semester they enroll for at least 15 credits. She then shares since the programs launch in fall 2017, a total of 119 students participating in the program received an average of \$435 for a total of \$50,800 awarded.

Dr. Burns then shares with Board members an update on NIC's implementation of Guided Pathways to include the identification of six (6) focus fields and program mapping. She continues the six (6) focus fields identified include Business Administration and Management; Manufacturing and Trades; Arts, Communications and Humanities; Social Sciences and Human Services; Science Technology, Engineering and Mathematics and Health Sciences/Health Professions and that each focus field contains programs of study leading to a Transfer degree or Career Technical Education (CTE) degree or certificate. Dr. Burns then states program mapping includes four-semester and six-semester maps for students to use as guides towards program completion and that program maps have been developed for all 46 transfer programs and most CTE programs offered at NIC.

Finally, Dr. Burns ends her presentation with an update on the Complete College Idaho Funds received in FY17. She states the funds received were used to support a full-time Retention and Completion coordinator and a part-time Transition Coordinator. Dr. Burns continues the role of the Retention and Completion coordinator was to identify critical areas of concern related to retention and completion and the role of the Transition Coordinator is to engage with students, parents and staff at the Region I high schools.

Dr. Clark then thanks the representatives from the community colleges and states the importance of providing the information shared today with the state's Legislators.

At this time the Complete College America (CCA) and Complete College Idaho (CCI) report continues with an update from the state's 4-year institutions represented by Dr. James Munger, Boise State University Professor and Vice Provost for Academic

Planning, Dr. Laura Woodworth-Nye, Idaho State University Provost and Executive Vice President, Dr. Lori Stinson, Lewis-Clark State College Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, and Dr. John Wiencek, University of Idaho Provost and Executive Vice President.

Dr. Munger begins by sharing with Board members in 2005 Boise State University (BSU) created a Freshman Success Task Force to address unacceptably low first-year retention and 6-year graduation rates. He continues analysis identified early academic success as the best predictor of first-year retention and, in response, BSU undertook a variety of initiatives to promote early academic success including reforming Math remediation, English remediation and implementation of a Learning Assistance Program.

Dr. Munger continues by sharing during the 2005-2006 school year BSU restructured the existing emporium model to a structured schedule, face-time model in which students received appointments for a self-paced computer lab experience where peer and non-peer tutors provided help. He then states change continued into fall 2009 with the development of a 2-year Math Learning Center (MLC) plan that included implementation of a different software package, a focus on Math problem solving, identification of the specific Math skills a student needed to master, and increased efforts to intervene if students were not engaged. Dr. Munger shares the results were dramatic with the pass rates in Remedial Math almost doubling from the 2005-2006 school year to 2016-2017 school year. He continues noticeable improvements have also been seen with the College Algebra and Calculus pass rates as a result of the improvements in Remedial Math.

Next, Dr. Munger updated the Board on BSU's English placement and remediation reform beginning with the development of "The Write Class" placement algorithm followed by a new co-remediation course known as English 101+. Dr. Munger reports these efforts have led to a decline in the repeat rate for English Composition from 13% to 5%. Finally, Dr. Munger shares an update on BSU's Learning Assistance Program. Launched in fall 2011, the program's focus is on helping students to learn the material through facilitated study sessions scheduled outside of class time to discuss course content and serve as a catalyst for group problem-solving. He continues the Learning Assistance Program is one of four key investments BSU has made with the CCI funding allocated by the Legislature.

Finally, Dr. Munger shares BSU's focus moving forward is on at risk student groups. He continues this will require an increase in need based financial aid for this student group as well as a greater understanding of the multiple factors affecting a student's ability to attend and complete their college education.

At this time Dr. Laura Woodworth Nye shares with members of the Board an update on Idaho State University's (ISU) implementation of the Complete College America Game Changers. She begins by stating at the time, the programs presented today were considered risky and untested, however, the data shows the programs have and do work. Dr. Woodworth Nye continues her presentation with an update on the Bengal Bridge Program, sharing the line item funding received for this program has been hugely

important for the implementation and sustainment of the program. She then states the program is aimed towards at risk, Pell eligible, first time students and that 167 students enrolled in the summer 2017 program, up from just 35 students in 2015 adding the retention rate for this student population is in the 80th – 90th percentile. Dr. Woodworth Nye then shares ISU's First Year Transition program, which is an expansion of the Bengal Bridge program to a full-year program, has also experienced great success with more than 19,000 individual contacts in 2017. Finally, Dr. Woodworth Nye provides an update on ISU's new Student Opportunity Development (SOD) Program. She continues the SOD program was developed with funds allocated in FY17 and serves to assist students with transitions between majors, college to career options, and streamlining and promoting ISU's Experiential Learning Assessment (ELA) process allowing students to earn academic credit for prior work experience.

Dr. Woodworth Nye continues by updating Board members ISU has employed Math Pathways and Corequisite Remediation to better prepare students for college level courses. She then shares ISU has created numerous incentives for students to enroll in 15 credits or more each semester, including a "Tuition Lock" available to Idaho residents who complete a minimum of 15 credits and remain in good academic standing each semester. Finally, Dr. Woodworth Nye shares ISU has developed Major Academic Plans or MAPs for almost every degree ISU offers, which are a four-year course schedule including all requirements necessary to achieve a degree while providing recommendations for course sequencing and configuration.

At this time Dr. Lori Stinson shares with members of the Board an update on Lewis-Clark State College's (LCSC) implementation of the Complete College America Game Changers beginning with the launch of an online co-requisite English remediation course. She continues, LCSC has developed four (4) distinct math pathways for Elementary Education, Liberal Arts, Statistics and STEM and that LCSC's incentives students to take 15 credits a semester by structuring the College's primary merit-based scholarships in such a way that students who complete 30 credits at the end of each academic year and maintain a 3.0 cumulative GPA will earn increases to their scholarship awards.

Dr. Stinson continues with an update to the Board on how LCSC utilized line item funding in support of Complete College Idaho. She states the focus was on General Education and increasing the number of full-time faculty, addressing "Bottlenecks" in high performing majors and programs, a Math & Science Tutoring Center and a separate Writing Center to provide student tutoring and support in relevant subject areas and a bilingual recruiter to work with the College Assistance Migrant Program (CAMP) staff at LCSC's Boise office.

At this time Dr. John Wiencek shares with members of the Board an update on University of Idaho's (UI) implementation of the Complete College America Game Changers. He begins by stating UI has made substantial progress in the areas of Corequisite Support, Academic Maps, Proactive Advising and Math Pathways. Dr. Wiencek continues UI has not actively implemented a "15 to Finish" program due in part to the fact that 60% or more

of the current student population is taking 15 credits or more and that if UI were to implement a “15 to Finish” program the focus should first be on Centralized Advising.

At this time Board member Hill asks of all four provosts why the Math faculty at their institutions do not support Corequisite remediation to which Dr. Woodworth Nye responds the Math faculty have worked hard on this issue and the main problem from the perspective of the Math faculty is the students are under prepared for Corequisite courses. Additionally, students on some of the STEM pathways require a stronger Math foundational knowledge base and the Math faculty has struggled with how to handle this.

Dr. Clark then states she finds it commendable how each institution has taken the structure and framework of the CCA Game Changers and applied them to their own institution, adding, based upon today’s presentations, the wise use of the CCI appropriations by the Idaho Legislature cannot be questioned.

The Board’s Executive Director, Mr. Matt Freeman commends the Provosts from each institution on the reports provided today and continues these reports will help to support the 60% Goal and showing Legislators the funding is working.

There were no additional questions or comments from the Board.

2. Remedial Education Report

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

Instruction, Research and Student Affairs (IRSA) Committee Chair, Dr. David Hill, introduced the item sharing with Board members the report today is intended to review the effectiveness of remedial education at the public institutions and is to be used to evaluate the different models being used and provide a resource for the Board to improve delivery of remedial education across institutions. Dr. Hill then invited the Board’s Chief Academic Officer, Dr. Randall Brumfield and Director of Research, Mr. Carson Howell to provide an update to the Board and answer any questions Board members may have.

Mr. Howell begins the presentation by stating the remediation report provided today would be of greater use in policy decisions by both the Board and local K-12 districts if the Board were to establish a statewide definition to identify students who are academically less prepared and if the definitions of the approved models are clearly identified and the implementation of those modes is done with fidelity. Mr. Howell continues by stating the need to fully engage both the Institutional Research and Academic staff on the models being used.

Board member Hill then asks the purpose behind having a remediation report to which Dr. Brumfield responds the purpose of the report is to help inform the Board on progress made towards the effectiveness of Corequisite Game Changers to which Dr. Hill asks if this could not be subsumed in to the Complete College America (CCA) and Complete College Idaho (CCI) reports. At this time the Board’s Chief Planning and Policy Officer, Ms. Tracie Bent shares the Board office regularly receives requests from other state

policy makers about the State's remediation rates. She continues the Remediation Report was added to Board policy because the Board was making significant changes in how to deliver remediation and the Board at that time wanted to review the effectiveness of those policies and that the models were being implemented with some form of fidelity. Dr. Hill then comments feedback from the institutions has been the models as implemented have variability depending on the student population and the use of assessments such as ALEKS improves this. Dr. Brumfield then suggests different Math pathways require different levels of preparedness and a one size approach is not necessarily the best approach and the Board must bear in mind what remediation looks like for different pathways. Mr. Howell then comments Corequisite remediation is a reporting requirement back to CCA. Dr. Hill then comments he would like to discuss further the elements of the report moving forward, stating the reporting should follow practice and not practice following reporting. Dr. Clark then asks if the format is listed in policy to which Ms. Bent responds the requirement is to report on the effectiveness and success rates of remediation.

There were no additional questions or comments from the Board.

At this time Board recessed for lunch, returning at 12:45pm (MST).

3. Board Policy III.S. Remedial Education – First Reading

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Hill/Westerberg): To approve the First Reading of proposed amendments to Board Policy III.S. Remedial Education as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried 7-0. Mr. Scoggin was absent from voting.

Instruction, Research and Student Affairs (IRSA) Committee Chair, Dr. David Hill, introduced the item sharing with Board members the proposed amendments would update the Board's existing policy on remediation to better align with changes identified by Complete College America (CCA) to help with implementation and student support.

There were no questions or comments from the Board.

4. Board Policy III.Z. Delivery of Postsecondary Programs – First Reading

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Hill/Westerberg): To approve the first reading of proposed amendments to Board Policy III.Z. Planning and Delivery of Postsecondary Programs and Courses as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried 7-0. Mr. Scoggin was absent from voting.

Instruction, Research and Student Affairs (IRSA) Committee Chair, Dr. David Hill, introduced the item sharing with Board members the discussion at the August 2017

regular Board meeting as to whether the plan was still meeting its intended goal for program planning. He continues the proposed amendment before the Board today is to move the planning document from five years to three years in an effort to provide the Board with a better understanding of where institutions are aligning their focus with regard to the postsecondary programs.

There were no questions or comments from the Board.

5. Board Policy III.P. Students – Second Reading

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Hill/Westerberg): To approve the second reading of amendments to Board Policy III.P. Students creating a new Subsection 17. Student Vaccine Informational Materials as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried 7-0. Mr. Scoggin was absent from voting.

Instruction, Research and Student Affairs (IRSA) Committee Chair, Dr. David Hill, introduced the item sharing with Board members approval of the proposed amendments would require the state's four year institutions provide informational material regarding vaccine's to students at the time of admission. He continues approval by the Board today would eliminate the need for legislative changes requiring institutions provide the informational material.

There were no questions or comments from the Board.

6. Program Enrollment Summary – Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies and Procedures, Section III.G.8 – Postsecondary Program Approval and Discontinuance

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

Instruction, Research and Student Affairs (IRSA) Committee Chair, Dr. David Hill, introduced the item reminding Board members of the provision added to Board Policy III.G. Subsection 8 in response to Board member inquiries regarding the status of new graduate programs and whether institutions met their projected enrollments from initial proposal submission. He continues this report is intended to help Board members to evaluate whether programs are meeting expectations regarding continued student interest and sustainability. Dr. Hill then invites the Board's Chief Academic Officer, Dr. Randall Brumfield to provide an update to the Board and answer any questions Board members may have.

At this time Board member Scoggin joined the meeting.

The Board's Chief Academic Officer, Dr. Randall Brumfield shares with Board members the report today is for those programs proposed during the 2010-2011 Academic Year to allow Board staff to collect the 6-year graduation numbers for Baccalaureate programs,

however, in this particular year, only Graduate level programs were proposed. He continues the report includes the projected enrollment information provided by the institutions for each program in their policy proposal but does not include projected graduation rates as this information was not required at the time of submittal, however, the requirement has been added for new program proposals. Dr. Brumfield then states the report indicates the programs proposed were somewhat ambitious as to their program projections, however, the report does indicate steady increases in enrollment for most of the programs listed.

Dr. Hill then states most of the applicants were over optimistic as to the time required for programs to meet their projected goals, however, the report indicates progress is being made. Board member Atchley then comments the viability of a program is based upon meeting the projected enrollment and if the projected enrollment is twice the actual enrollment then the program will cost more for students. She continues she would like for institutions to review these programs for their viability and avoid the current trend of offering so many degrees they are no longer concentrating their focus but are trying to be everything to everyone. Dr. Clark then asks how institutions are supporting the costs of programs that fall short of their projected enrollment to which Dr. Brumfield responds Board staff can follow up with institutors on these specific programs. Board member Westerberg then comments it may be of benefit for institutions to report to the Board their expected actions moving forward for programs with significantly differing numbers. Board member Scoggin then comments this should be somewhat self-regulating as institutions work within their budgets and the funds available. The Board's Executive Director, Mr. Matt Freeman then states in recent years Boise State University has adopted a 3-year Sunset for new programs that do not hit projections and that these programs are then at risk of being phased out. Dr. Brumfield then adds a Sunset Clause is now included on proposal forms for any new programs.

There were no additional questions or comments from the Board.

7. Boise State University – Master of Science in Respiratory Care

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 Respiratory Care in substantial conformance to the program proposal submitted as Attachment 2. The motion carried 8-0.

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 Respiratory Care in the amount of \$500 per credit in conformance with the program budget submitted to the Board in Attachment 2. The motion carried 8-0.

Instruction, Research and Student Affairs (IRSA) Committee 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 Respiratory Care. 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. Dr. Hill then requested Boise State University (BSU) Professor and Vice Provost for Academic Planning, Dr. James Munger, present BSU's proposal to Board members as well as answer any questions from the Board.

Board member Soltman asks if an entry level position in respiratory therapy requires a bachelor's degree to which Dr. Munger responds in the negative, however, the proposal before the Board today is intended to serve those individuals who have advanced or wish to advance to a leadership position, health administration position or a teaching position. Dr. Munger continues the need for this degree has been identified by the accrediting Board to which Board member Soltman responds he is not opposed to the program or the offering, however, in his opinion, the program's enrollment numbers may be too optimistic. Dr. Munger responds the program has been designed to be self-sustaining and that state funds will not be used for the operation of the program. Board member Atchley then questions the lack of state investment in the program to which Dr. Munger responds state funds are not used for the program's instructional costs, however, the program does receive initial startup costs from BSU's eCampus initiative and is then self-sustaining after that. Board member Atchley then states there are underlying infrastructure and administrative costs involved with this and every program that are not necessarily covered by a course fee to which Dr. Munger responds these programs are charged an administrative service fee to help offset these costs. Board member Westerberg comments if a program is not successful then the institution risks losing the upfront development costs it has invested in the program. He continues by applauding BSU for their efforts to offer more online courses to which Dr. Munger responds the eCampus initiative has studied the viability of programs offered and where there is need to be able to choose the programs offered moving forward.

There were no additional questions or comments from the Board.

8. College of Eastern Idaho – Associate of Science Degree

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Hill/Atchley): To approve the request by the College of Eastern Idaho to create a new Associate of Science degree as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried 8-0.

Instruction, Research and Student Affairs (IRSA) Committee Chair, Dr. David Hill, introduced the item stating the request before the Board today is for a new Associate of Science degree program. He continues approval of the academic program would allow College of Eastern Idaho (CEI) students to enroll in the Associate of Science Degree program as degree-seeking undergraduates beginning in Spring 2018.

There were no questions or comments from the Board.

9. Idaho State University – Doctor of Physical Therapy Program Expansion to Meridian Health Sciences Center

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Hill/Critchfield): To approve the request by Idaho State University to approve the Doctor of Physical Therapy Program Expansion to Meridian as presented. The motion carried 8-0.

Instruction, Research and Student Affairs (IRSA) Committee Chair, Dr. David Hill, introduced the item stating the request before the Board today is for an expansion of the existing Doctor of Physical Therapy Program at Idaho State University (ISU) in Pocatello to include a cohort of students at the ISU Meridian Health Sciences Center (MHSC).

There were no questions or comments from the Board.

AUDIT

1. FY2017 Financial Statement Audits – College and Universities Audit Findings Report

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Soltman/Atchley): To accept from the Audit Committee the Fiscal Year 2017 Financial Audit Reports for Boise State University, Idaho State University, University of Idaho, Lewis-Clark State College, and Eastern Idaho Technical College, as submitted by Moss Adams LLP in Attachment 1. The motion carried 8-0.

Audit Committee Chair, Mr. Don Soltman, introduced the item stating the reports shared today were conducted by the independent certified public accounting firm, Moss Adams LLP and includes an auditor's opinion on the basic financial statements prepared by each of the five institutions. Mr. Soltman then invites the Board's Chief Financial Officer, Mr. Chet Herbst, to present the findings to Board members as well as answer any questions.

Mr. Herbst shares the independent certified public accounting firm, Moss Adams, found the financial statements submitted by the five (5) institutions fairly stated the financial operations of the institutions. He continues there were two significant findings for Boise State University (BSU) related to internal controls for Research and Development and one significant finding for Idaho State University (ISU) related to the posting of journal entries and that both institutions have identified actions to correct and prevent recurrence of the noted problems. Finally, Mr. Herbst shares the financial statements have been submitted to the State Controller's Office as part of the consolidated state reports. Board

member Soltman then shares the timeframe for when these audits must be completed is extremely short and he thanks the institutions for their work to provide the requested information in such a short amount of time.

There were no additional questions or comments from the Board.

2. FY2017 Financial Statement Audits – College and Universities’ Financial Ratios
This item was provided in the agenda materials as an information item.

Audit Committee Chair, Mr. Don Soltman, introduced the item stating the ratios and analyses presented today provide to the Board the financial health and year-to-year trends at each of the institutions. Mr. Soltman then invites the Board’s Chief Financial Officer, Mr. Chet Herbst, to present the findings to Board members as well as answer any questions.

Mr. Herbst begins by sharing the four (4) primary financial ratios are the Primary Reserve Ratio, Viability Ratio, Return on Net Assets Ratio and Net Operating Revenues and that these ratios are used to develop the Composite Financial Index (CFI). Mr. Herbst states these ratios are used by both private and public institutions and provide a tool for institutions to review their own performance over time as well as to synchronize with the analytical processes used at other institutions. Mr. Herbst continues with an update on each of the ratios, beginning with the Primary Reserve Ratio stating this ratio measures the sufficiency of resources and their flexibility and is a good measure for net assets and that the benchmark is for an institution to have the ability to operate at 40 percent on its own. Next, Mr. Herbst shares the Viability Ratio measures the capacity to repay total debt through reserves and the benchmark for this ratio is 125 percent. He continues the Return on Net Assets ratio measures whether an institution is better off financially this year than last and that the benchmark for this ratio is 6 percent. Mr. Herbst then shares the Net Operation Revenues Ratio measures whether an institution is living within its available resources and the benchmark for this ratio is 2 percent. Mr. Herbst then states the Composite Financial Index combines the four ratios to calculate an institution’s overall financial health and the national benchmark score for this ratio is a minimum of 3. Mr. Herbst then shares the difficulty in comparing institutions to one another as each institution has different goals, he continues it may be more fitting to evaluate each institution over time and compare the results to that institution’s own strategic plan.

Mr. Herbst then adds Board staff is considering adding two additional ratios to the annual report in the coming year; the Debt Burden Ratio to measure an institution’s dependence on borrowed funds and the Age of Capital Assets to measure an institution’s recent versus deferred investments.

Finally Mr. Herbst shares with members of the Board the downgrade by Moody’s Investors Service (Moody’s) of the overall higher education sector from stable to negative on December 5, 2017. He continues this is based upon Moody’s projections that projected revenues for public institutions will not keep up with projections over the next several years for increased operating expenses.

Dr. Clark then asks if the Moody's downgrade will have an immediate negative effect on the ability for Idaho's institutions to bond to which Mr. Herbst responds not on any of the items the Board is voting on today but it could for future projects. Dr. Clark then asks if Mr. Herbst has any sense of the point value of the downturn and how much it would affect each institution to which Mr. Herbst responds this would depend primarily on each institution individually.

There were no additional questions or comments from the Board.

3. FY2017 College and Universities' Unrestricted Net Position Balances

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

Audit Committee Chair, Mr. Don Soltman, introduced the item reminding Board members of the requirement for institutions to maintain fund balances sufficient to stabilize their operating budgets should there be a decrease in state funding or fluctuations in enrollment and tuitions revenue. He continues all four (4) of the affected institutions have met the Board's 5 percent reserve target in FY2017. Mr. Soltman then invites the Board's Chief Financial Officer, Mr. Chet Herbst, to present the findings to Board members as well as answer any questions.

Mr. Herbst shares overall there has been a positive trend and that all four (4) of the state's 4-year institutions are at or above the Board's established 5 percent benchmark. He then states that in general the institutions are operating under very tight budgets and this information is good to share with legislators and the public to dispel the notion that institutions are "sitting on a mound of cash".

There were no questions or comments from the Board.

4. Lewis-Clark State College – Foundation Operating Agreement

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Soltman/Scoggin): To approve the revisions to the Operating Agreement between Lewis-Clark State College and Lewis-Clark State College Foundation, Inc. as presented in Attachment 1. The motion carried 8-0.

Audit Committee Chair, Mr. Don Soltman, introduced the item sharing the proposed revisions would update the agreement to reflect a three-year extension from March 2018 to March 2021 and provide clarity within the conflict of interest form to align more clearly with Board Policy. He continues this is being brought to the Board prior to the end of the three year cycle because it is adding gifting to the agreement.

There were no questions or comments from the Board.

BUSINESS AFFAIRS AND HUMAN RESOURCES (BAHR)

Section I – Human Resources

1. Idaho State University – Multi-Year Employment Agreement – Men’s Football Head Coach

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Hill): To approve the request by Idaho State University to enter into a multi-year employment agreement with Rob Phenicie as Men’s Football Head Coach, for a term expiring January 21, 2021 (or as per the terms of the contract) as presented in Attachment 2. The motion carried 8-0.

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

There were no questions or comments from the Board.

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

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Atchley): To approve the University of Idaho’s request to amend the multi-year employment contract for the Men’s Basketball Team Head Coach, which was approved by the Board on October 19, 2017, in substantial conformance to the Amendment form submitted to the Board in Attachment 1. The motion carried 8-0.

Business Affairs and Human Resources (BAHR) Committee Chair Mr. Westerberg introduced the item and shares 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. He continues elimination of the erroneous automatic 4 percent annual increase included in the original contract does not negate either the duration or total compensation thresholds in this particular case.

There were no questions or comments from the Board.

Section II – Finance

1. Board Policy V.B. Budget Policies – First Reading

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Atchley): To approve the first reading of the proposed amendments to Board policy V.B., Budget Policies, as presented in Attachment 1. The motion carried 8-0.

Business Affairs and Human Resources (BAHR) Committee Chair Mr. Westerberg introduced the item. He then invites the Board's Chief Financial Officer, Mr. Chet Herbst, to present the item to the Board as well as answer any questions.

Mr. Herbst begins by sharing approval of the proposed amendments would clarify and streamline the Occupancy Cost request procedures and associated notification and verification reports submitted to the Division of Financial Management (DFM) and Legislative Services Office (LSO). He continues there should not be any financial impact to current budgets beyond improving the accuracy of estimates and final computations of Occupancy Costs. Mr. Herbst adds the amendments also incorporate the Board's guidance on minimum financial reserve levels into Board policy.

There were no questions or comments from the Board.

2. Board Policy V.E. Gifts and Affiliated Foundations – First Reading

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Critchfield): To approve the first reading revisions to Board policy V.E. and use of the associated affiliated foundation agreement template, as presented in Attachments 1 and 2, respectively. The motion carried 8-0.

Business Affairs and Human Resources (BAHR) Committee Chair Mr. Westerberg introduced the item. He then invites the Board's Chief Financial Officer, Mr. Chet Herbst, to present the item to the Board as well as answer any questions.

Mr. Herbst begins by sharing approval of the proposed amendments would bring the text of the existing policy into conformance with current practice. He continues the updated policy enables continued close oversight of funds/gifts/properties being conveyed between an institution and an affiliated foundation.

There were no questions or comments from the Board.

3. FY2019 Permanent Building Fund Advisory Council Recommendations 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 sharing with Board members the Governor's Permanent Building Fund (PBF) priorities for FY2019 are for an increased focus on deferred maintenance needs over construction of new facilities. He then states the PBF recommendations

shared today are intended to aid institutions as they work to address the highest priority items on their deferred maintenance lists.

The Board's Chief Financial Officer, Mr. Chet Herbst, shares with Board members DPW was very receptive to Board staff's efforts to engage DPW on the needs and trends of the State's higher education system and that the institutions have done an excellent job leveraging the limited funds available to them. Dr. Clark then requested Mr. Herbst share with Board members the same information shared with DFM this week to which Mr. Herbst responds the recommendation from the PBF for FY19 is \$17,000,000 for deferred maintenance. He continues deferred maintenance at the State's 4-year institutions is estimated at \$995,000,000 and that nationally the average across public institutions for deferred maintenance is \$110/square foot and the State's 4-year institutions have 15 million square feet of space to maintain. He continues this is a significant continuing issue for the Board and the nation.

There were no additional questions or comments from the Board.

4. Boise State University – Authorization for Issuance of General Revenue Bonds

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Atchley): To approve the finding that the Center for Materials Science Research is economically feasible and necessary for the proper operation of Boise State University, and to approve a Supplemental Resolution for the Series of 2018A Bonds, the title of which is as follows:

A SUPPLEMENTAL RESOLUTION of the Board of Trustees of Boise State University authorizing the issuance of General Revenue Project Bonds, in one or more series, of Boise State University; delegating authority to approve the terms and provisions of the bonds and the principal amount of the bonds up to \$20,702,000; authorizing the execution and delivery of a Bond Purchase Agreement upon sale of the bonds; and providing for other matters relating to the authorization, issuance, sale and payment of the bonds

And to approve a not to exceed budget for the Micron Center for Materials Research of \$52,250,000. The motion carried 8-0.

AND

M/S (Westerberg/Hill): To waive the appraisal requirement set forth in Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies & Procedures, Section V.I.2.f. for Boise State University to purchase the Alumni and Friends building from the Boise State University Foundation. The motion carried 8-0.

Business Affairs and Human Resources (BAHR) Committee Chair Mr. Richard Westerberg introduced the item sharing with Board members the item before the Board today is to combine the bond financing for the Micron Center for Materials Research (MCMR) and acquisition of the Alumni and Friends Center. He continues the proposed financing plan makes efficient use of resources while keeping Boise State University (BSU) within the Board's maximum debt coverage limit and prudently addressing the risk associated with the current construction costs at a time of high volatility of building costs throughout the country. Mr. Westerberg then shares BSU senior administration had coordinated in advance with the Board's Executive Director and fiscal staff on the approach being proposed today. He then invites Mr. Kevin Satterlee, Boise State University Vice President and Special Counsel, and Mr. Mark Heil, Boise State University Vice President and Chief Financial Officer to present the item and answer any questions from the Board.

Mr. Satterlee begins by sharing Board policy does not allow institutions to acquire real estate without an appraisal of the real property. He continues the property Boise State University (BSU) wishes to acquire is the Alumni and Friends Center adding the facility has already been constructed and currently exists on the BSU campus. He then states the current economic market has provided an opportunity for BSU to issue the bonds at a lower rate and forego future rent payments if BSU were to acquire the facility now. Mr. Satterlee continues the primary reason for the bond issuance is in relation to the Micron Center for Materials Research (MCMR), stating approval of the motion by the Board would allow BSU to increase the project's contingency to account for market volatility in the current construction market.

Board member Scoggin asks how this motion would impact BSU's debt ratio to which the Board's Chief Financial Officer, Mr. Chet Herbst, responds the ratio would increase from 4.78 percent to 5.68 percent. Board member Soltman then asks how this motion would impact BSU's Moody's Investors Service Rating to which Mr. Heil responds BSU's current rating is AA3 and he does not anticipate a change.

There were not additional questions or comments from the Board.

5. Idaho State University – Endowment of One-Time NCAA Money

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Critchfield): To approve the request by Idaho State University to transfer \$549,267.00 of one-time money to an endowed fund within the Idaho State University Foundation, to be used as set forth in the NCAA-approved spending plan as described in Attachment 1. The motion carried 8-0.

Business Affairs and Human Resources (BAHR) Committee Chair Mr. Richard Westerberg introduced the item. He then invites the Board's Chief Financial Officer, Mr. Chet Herbst, to present the item to the Board as well as answer any questions.

Mr. Herbst begins by sharing with Board members Board approval is required for the transfer of institutional funds to one of its affiliated foundations, unless one of the specific exceptions listed in the policy applies, and in this instance the exceptions do not apply. He continues following transfer of Idaho State University (ISU) funds, the resulting foundation endowment will benefit the university's student-athletes and programs.

There were no questions or comments from the Board.

6. University of Idaho – Authorization for Issuance of General Revenue Bonds

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Critchfield): To approve a Supplemental Resolution for the Series 2018A Bonds, the title of which is as follows:

A SUPPLEMENTAL RESOLUTION of the Board of Regents of the University of Idaho authorizing the issuance of General Revenue Refunding Bonds, delegating authority to approve the terms and provisions of the bonds and the principal amount of the bonds up to \$35,000,000, authorizing the acceptance of the winning bid for sale of the bonds; and providing for other matters relating to the authorization, issuance, sale and payment of the bonds. The motion carried 8-0.

Business Affairs and Human Resources (BAHR) Committee Chair Mr. Westerberg introduced the item sharing with Board members the item before the Board today is a request by the University of Idaho (UI) to replace existing debt incurred for essential University infrastructure. He continues the proposed issuance of refunding bonds at fixed interest rates is a prudent strategy to replace the current debt structure which would expose the university to unpredictable and volatile varied interest rates after 2017.

There were no questions or comments from the Board.

OTHER BUSINESS

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

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Westerberg/Critchfield): To adjourn the meeting at 1:45pm (MST). The motion carried 8-0.