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COLLEGE OF SOUTHERN IDAHO

SUBJECT
College of Southern Idaho Report

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY
Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies & Procedures, Section I.M.3.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION
This agenda item fulfills the Board’s requirement for College of Southern Idaho (CSI) to provide a progress report on the institution’s strategic plan, details of implementation, status of goals and objectives and information on other points of interest in accordance with a schedule and format established by the Board’s Executive Director. President Fox will provide a 15-minute overview of CSI’s progress in carrying out the College’s strategic plan. An overview of the points to be covered is provided in Attachment 1.

IMPACT
College of Southern Idaho’s strategic plan drives the College’s integrated planning; programming, budgeting, and assessment cycle and is the basis for the institution’s annual budget requests and performance measure reports to the State Board of Education, the Division of Financial Management and the Legislative Services Office.

ATTACHMENTS
Attachment 1 – Annual Progress Report Page 3

BOARD ACTION
This item is for informational purposes only. Any action will be at the Board’s discretion.
IDAHO DIVISION OF VOCATION REHABILITATION

SUBJECT
Idaho Division of Vocational Rehabilitation Report

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY
Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies & Procedures, Section I.M.3.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION
This agenda item fulfills the Board’s requirement for IDVR to provide an annual progress report on the agency’s strategic plan, details of implementation, status of goals and objectives and information on other points of interest in accordance with a schedule and format established by the Board’s Executive Director.

Jane Donnellan, Administrator of the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, will provide an overview of IDVR’s progress in carrying out the agency’s strategic plan.

ATTACHMENTS
Attachment 1 – Idaho Division of Vocational Rehabilitation Presentation Page 3

BOARD ACTION
This item is for informational purposes only. Any action will be at the Board’s discretion.
IDaho Workforce Development Council

Subject
Workforce Development Council Update

Reference
October 2017 Board received Workforce Development Council update (agenda material only – no presentation)

Applicable Statute, Rule, or Policy
Executive Order 2017-12

Background/Discussion
Governor Otter updated the Executive Order establishing the Workforce Development Council on October 26, 2017. Trent Clark, Chair of the WDC, and Wendi Secrist, Executive Director, will provide an update on the transition, the responsibilities of the reconstituted Council and Idaho’s participation in the National Governors Association Work-Based Learning Policy Academy.

Idaho is one of six states selected by the National Governors Association to participate in a policy academy focused on scaling high-quality work-based learning.

Work-based learning blends work experience and applied learning to develop youth and young adults’ foundational and technical skills to expand their education, career and employment opportunities.

Funded by the Siemens Foundation, the policy academy will help states create and expand work-based learning opportunities that will connect youth and young adults ages 16 to 29 with career opportunities in STEM-intensive industries (those in the science, technology, engineering and math areas) such as advanced manufacturing, health care, information technology and energy. 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.

Impact
Cross-agency collaboration.

Attachments
Attachment 1 – Workforce Development Council Transition Update

Board Action
This item is for informational purposes only. Any action will be at the Board’s discretion.
BOISE STATE UNIVERSITY

SUBJECT
Boise State University – Alcohol Service Request – Double R Ranch Club Room – Basketball

REFERENCE
October 2017
Board amended second reading of Board Policy I.J. allowing institutions to request permission to provide alcohol service in designated venues for specified NCAA athletic events.

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY
Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies & Procedures, Section I.J.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION
Boise State University requests Board approval to provide alcohol service in the Double R Ranch Club Room of Taco Bell Arena as a “Permitted Event” as outlined in Board Policy I.J, prior to each home men’s basketball game for the 2017-2018 season.

The University is seeking permission to provide alcohol service in the Double R Ranch Club Room to create a gathering place for Taco Bell Arena Hardwood Club members prior to men’s home basketball games. The Double R Ranch Club Room will serve as a restaurant-style, pre-game gathering place for patrons who are members of the Hardwood Club and invited guests. In the secure area, Hardwood Club members and invited guests will also be provided light hors d’oeuvres and non-alcoholic beverages. This space will become part of the Bronco Gameday experience. It will add value to those attending Bronco basketball games by offering unique food and drink options in a lighted, temperature-controlled environment. Alcohol service will be discontinued at tip-off, but invited guests may return to the Club Room up until the end of half-time to enjoy additional food and non-alcoholic beverages.

IMPACT
Approval will allow Boise State University to add to the men’s basketball games experience by improving the overall game day experience and adding value to those attending basketball games.

ATTACHMENTS
Attachment 1 – Double R Ranch Club Room Security Plan

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
At the October 2017 regular Board meeting the Board approved changes to Board Policy I.J. Use of Institutional Facilities. As part of those amendments the
institution may now bring forward requests to the Board to provide alcohol service in specified venues for specific NCAA sporting events. The amended policy retained the provision that all requests must come to the Board at the June regular Board meeting each year. Due to the time of the policy amendments, there was not an opportunity for the institutions to bring forward a request for alcohol service for the 2017-2018 Basketball season in compliance with the deadlines specified in the policy. Due to these timing issues Boise State University is bringing forward a request to provide alcohol service in the Double R Ranch Club Room in conjunction with men’s home basketball games. This request 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 requirement that these requests only be brought forward in June. 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, all other provision of this section would still be required to be met.

BOARD ACTION

I move to approve the request by Boise State University 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.

Moved by _________ Seconded by _________ Carried Yes _____ No ______

I move to approve the request by Boise State University for approval of In-suite/Club Room alcohol service in compliance with Board Policy I.J. in the Double R Ranch Club Room of the Taco Bell Arena for men’s home basketball competitions.

Moved by _________ Seconded by _________ Carried Yes _____ No ______
SUBJECT
Educator Pipeline Report

REFERENCE
August 2016 The Board reviewed and discussed available data provided in the teacher pipeline report and discussed pulling together a broader work group to provide feedback and recommendation to the Board regarding educator pipeline barriers and solutions.

April 2017 The Board reviewed an update on the Educator Pipeline and recommendations from the workgroup.

October 2017 Board reviewed and approved the first recommendation of the teacher pipeline workgroup.

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY
Sections 33-1201 -1207, Idaho Code
Idaho Administrative Code, IDAPA 08.02.02, Rules Governing Uniformity

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

The initial meeting of the workgroup was held on February 8, 2017, followed by three subgroups convening from April 27 through May 3, 2017. The group then formalized early recommendations sent to the Board on April 20, 2017. Areas considered by the workgroup included attracting and retaining candidates in teacher preparation programs; recruiting individuals into the profession through traditional, non-traditional, and alternate pathways, incentivizing and attracting educators to teach in our rural and underserved areas, and recruiting and retaining educators for hard-to-fill subject areas such as special education. On June 6, 2017, and then again on October 12, 2017, the full committee reconvened to further define recommendations identified as critical to developing Idaho’s Educator Pipeline.

1. Develop an Idaho Teacher Supply and Demand Report consisting of multiple data points to determine if, where, and why a teacher shortage exists in Idaho.
2. Begin developing a coherent policy dialogue

3. Further explore workgroup proposals outlined below:
   a. **Attract/Recruit:** Openly promote teaching as a profession to boost public perception; continue to support higher salaries and compensation packages

   b. **Prepare/Certify:** Expand options in preparation and certification to include mastery-based preparation programs that account for experiential credit; closer alignment between secondary and postsecondary education to expedite preparation for high school students interested in teaching

   c. **Retain:** Development and support for teachers including induction programs and greater teacher-leader opportunities; emphasize evaluation for the purpose of professional growth and measurable outcomes that are teacher driven

The report that follows provides baseline data on the supply and demand of instructional staff across Idaho, and suggests ways to utilize this information to ensure consistency and efficacy in addressing Idaho’s teacher pipeline issues over time. At the conclusion of this report, ten total workforce recommendations are presented for consideration, with seven prioritized for immediate action.

**IMPACT**

The attached report will help inform future initiatives of the Idaho State Board of Education related to addressing teacher shortages across the state.

**ATTACHMENTS**

- Attachment 1 – Idaho State Board of Education 2017 Teacher Pipeline Report Page 5
- Attachment 2 – Idaho Pipeline Report Detail and District Classification Page 22
- Attachment 3 – Idaho State Board of Education District Survey Results Page 51
- Attachment 4 – Definitions and District Examples Page 61

**STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

In addition to the Board’s interest, there has been a great deal of interest from other state policymakers to find solutions to Idaho’s apparent teacher shortage. While there has been a general understanding that school districts and charter schools struggle for a variety of reasons commonly found across the nation, the 2017 Teacher Pipeline Report and the resulting recommendations from the Educator Pipeline Workgroup is the first comprehensive effort to investigate and provide recommendations for pipeline issues specific to Idaho.

Initial findings can begin to inform policy and define next steps based upon the workgroup’s final recommendations.
BOARD ACTION
This item is for informational purposes only. Any action will be at the Board’s discretion.
SUBJECT
Annual Evaluation Review Report

REFERENCE
June 2017 Instructional/Pupil Service Staff Evaluation Review for the 2015-2016 Academic Year – Final Report presented to the Board

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION
Pursuant to Idaho Code 33-1004B(14), a review of a sample of teacher evaluations must be conducted annually. This statute specifically states:

- A review of a sample of evaluations completed by administrators shall be conducted annually to verify such evaluations are being conducted with fidelity to the state framework for teaching evaluation, including each evaluation component as outlined in administrative rule and the rating given for each component.
- A portion of such administrators' instructional staff and pupil service staff employee evaluations shall be independently reviewed.

As with the 2015-16 Evaluation Review (summarized in the FY2017 Report), the 2016-2017 review was designed to be conducted in two parts, and built upon the finding of the FY2017 report.

The FY2017 report concluded that inconsistent communication from state entities compounded confusion created over time in the wake of multiple changes to Idaho's IDAPA 08.02.02.120. As a result, not all districts were implementing all aspects of evaluation rule with fidelity. To summarize, approximately 60% of the over 600 evaluations reviewed were found to be in compliance with the remaining 30% missing one or more critical elements of the evaluation requirements. To address the areas found to be consistently noncompliant, eight detailed recommendations were put forth in the final report encompassing the following areas:

1. Amend IDAPA 08.02.02.120 to clarify, simplify and better align with code for instructional staff, and redefine evaluation standards for pupil service staff based upon their own professional standards;
2. Make additional guidance and training available to administrators;
3. Create a coalition of representative for Idaho administrator preparation programs to define consistent measures of preparedness, including specific competencies for administrator recertification requirements;
4. Create a clearinghouse of best evaluation practices to be shared across districts; and
5. Explore the implementation of a statewide electronic evaluation management system.

Of these five strands, work has begun on all. Changes to Board Administrative rule on evaluation were put into temporary rule in fall 2017, with plans to convene professional groups in each of the pupil service areas to further define consistent practices in evaluation of these professionals. Trainings on evaluation procedures and evidence collection were conducted throughout the state from late September to late October 2017, and an administrator preparation coalition has been established. In 2017, the Legislature provided funding for the development of a clearinghouse and an evaluation management system. A request for proposals will be issued to contract with a vendor to provide this platform.

In May 2017, superintendents were notified of the pending FY2018 review and received detailed information about procedures for uploading evidence collected by administrators selected from their districts. Phase One of the 2016-2017 Evaluation Review commenced on June 8, 2017 with districts beginning to upload evidence for review. The first portion of the annual review, Phase One, focused on the requirements called out in IDAPA 08.02.02.120, including whether or not evaluations meet the fidelity of the state framework which requires an assessment of all 22 components specified in administrative rule.

Phase Two of the review was completed on October 30, 2017, focusing on district evaluation policy, and overall implementation of evaluations including a detailed review of:

(i) the evidence used in scoring teacher evaluations;
(ii) documentation of teaching observations;
(iii) progress in documenting teacher’s individual professional learning plans;
(iv) demonstration of growth in student achievement, and;
(v) proof of professional practice as shown through parent or student input, or a portfolio of professional work.

Both phases of the review process and the final meeting of reviewers to discuss findings and assist with recommendations to the Board were completed on November 3, 2017. The attached report provides the findings and recommendations from the FY2017 evaluation review process.

IMPACT

Annual evaluation reviews allow state policy makers to verify that the state framework is being implemented with fidelity and to judge the effectiveness of using the evaluation framework in conjunction with student outcomes (measurable student achievement) for determining movement on the Career Ladder. The Board may also use the information in directing changes in our teacher preparation programs to address areas of improvement for both administrators as well as instructional and pupil services staff.
STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The FY 2018 Final report includes two recommendations. Recommendations are provided from the group of Idaho Educators who participate in the annual evaluation review process. The first recommendation asks for amendments in Administrative Code (IDAPA 08.02.02) regarding additional definitions, adding the Individualized Professional Learning Plans as a measure of professional practice and clarifying retention of data regarding evidence of professional practice. The first step in clarifying the requirements regarding the retention of evidence and personnel files was taken in the Board’s approval of legislation clarifying Section 33-518, Idaho Code, and the current requirement that each “personnel file shall contain any and all material relevant to the evaluation of the employee” includes evidence of meeting the state evaluation requirements. Should this legislation be enacted by the 2018 Legislature the negotiated rulemaking process will be initiated to develop additional specificity in administrative rule. The next action point for this recommendation would take place when the proposed rule is brought to the Board in 2018 for consideration.

The second recommendation is to provide flexibility in differentiating evaluation practice between “proficient” professional staff beyond the current ability school district have to weigh the 22 components and/or four domains based on individualized professional learning plans or other priorities identified by the school district. School districts are still struggling with the implementation of the current state requirements with fidelity so, it is important for school districts and charter schools to have some level of stability in the state requirements if we hope to get to any level of uniformity in implementation of the requirements. The connection between the summative evaluation rating to the state career ladder for the distribution of salary based apportionment to the school districts and charter schools requires a level of uniformity in the application to assure and equitable distribution of available funds.

Clear guidelines for ongoing support for both administrators and teachers are represented in the recommendations that conclude this report. Continued Board support will further shape the fidelity and usefulness of educator evaluations going forward.

BOARD ACTION

This item is for informational purposes only. Any action will be at the Board’s discretion.
SUBJECT
Higher Education Task Force Recommendations – Prioritization

REFERENCE
August 2017  Board approved FY 2019 Budget Requests.
September 29, 2017  Board adopted the Governor’s Higher Education Task Force recommendations and amended the FY 2019 Budget Request to add three line items. The addition of the postsecondary degree audit/student data analytics system (K-20 Pipeline Recommendation – Guided Pathways) and the addition of $5M in Statewide Scholarships for the Opportunity Scholarship (Access and Affordability Work Recommendation - Systemically increase dollars to fund all eligible Idaho high school students…)
October 2017  Board assigned the 12 Task Force Recommendations to one or more of the Board’s standing committees for prioritization and initial implementation planning.

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

The Task Force was made up of 36 members from a broad group of stakeholders. Membership included all eight State Board of Education members, the eight Idaho public university and college presidents, postsecondary students, legislators, and business leaders. The Board formally adopted the recommendations at the September 29th Special Board meeting and amended the FY 2019 Budget Request to start implementation of items that were initially identified as needing appropriations and could be started in FY 2019 prior to a full implementation plan being developed. These items included additional funding for system-wide scholarships, with hereby an increased appropriation would allow for more students on the waiting list to be funded while additional Administrative Code amendments are made that would increase the number of eligible students. The second being a minimum funding amount that, if appropriated, would allow for Board Staff and Institution Staff to develop a scope of work and start the request for information purchasing processes. This work would move forward while waiting for system consolidation amendments identified in Recommendation 1 to be
started. Additionally, full implementation of three of the recommendations is dependent on the implementation of a degree audit/student data analytics system (Recommendations 3, 4, and 5). The request for information process is currently underway for this item.

At the October 2017 regularly scheduled Board meeting the Board assigned the various recommendations to 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 task and with identifying and recommending to the full Board prioritization of each of the recommendations assigned to them and to being work on implementation planning.

IMPACT
The discussion around the proposed implementation framework and prioritization will provide Board staff as well as staff at the institutions and agencies under the Board’s oversight and governance with direction on priority areas for developing more comprehensive plans and timelines for implementation of the recommendations.

ATTACHMENTS
Attachment 1 – Standing Committee Prioritization Page 5
Attachment 2 – Recommendation Matrix Page 8

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
As part of the Task Force’s process, the individual work groups identified a number of short and long-term actions that would, in part, move forward the implementation of the individual recommendations. In some instances, there may be additional short or long-term actions that may be identified for moving forward the recommendations or a recommendation may be chosen as a priority item.

Prioritization of the recommendations does not necessarily indicate one recommendation will be fully implemented prior to another recommendation. In many cases work toward implementation will be initiated simultaneously while in other instances implementation may be subject to other state processes, such as the annual legislative budget setting process and may not be able to be fully implemented until a later date even though initial work has been completed. In most cases, the order of priority will only influence work when resources, including time, are limited and a decision must be made on which recommendation or strategy will be initiated or funded first.

As part of the planning and implementation process, the Board committees may create additional technical committees or workgroups. Any implementation work contingent on Board action will be brought back to the full Board for final action.
BOARD ACTION

I move to accept the priority order of the committee assignments as specified in Attachment 1.

Moved by ________ Seconded by _________ Carried  Yes ____ No ____
SUBJECT
State Accountability System – Student Engagement Survey

REFERENCE

October 2015  The Accountability Oversight Committee presented recommendations to the Board regarding changes to be made to the state’s accountability system, in preparation for submission of a new ESEA waiver

February 2016  The Board received an update on the timeline for the Accountability Oversight Committee to bring recommendations forward

October 2017  Board assigned the 12 Task Force Recommendations to one or more of the Board’s standing committees for prioritization and initial implementation planning.

April 2016  The Accountability Oversight Committee presented recommendations to the Board regarding removal of the ISAT proficiency and college entrance exam graduation requirements. The Board adopted the recommendation that the ISAT proficiency graduation requirement be removed and rejected the recommendation that the college entrance exam graduation requirement be removed.

August 2016  Board approved proposed rule IDAPA 08.02.03.111 through 114, to implement a new accountability system for the State of Idaho

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

The state public school accountability system is currently outlined in Chapter 45, Title 33 Idaho Code and Administrative Code, IDAPA 08.0203.112. Since the creation of the accountability provisions in 1997 there have been many changes at both the state and federal level. The current changes at the federal level with the reauthorization of the Elementary Secondary Education Act through the Every Student Succeeds Act provide the state with the opportunity to develop a single accountability system that meets both the state and federal accountability needs.

In January 2016, the State Board of Education Accountability Oversight Committee was charged with bringing forward recommendations to the Board that were in alignment with the Task Force recommendations for a new state accountability system (Recommendation 5 – 2013) and would meet the federal accountability requirements. Following the Board’s adoption of the Accountability Oversight Committee recommendations, Board staff initiated the negotiated rulemaking process including conducting public forums in each region of the state to allow for the thorough discussion of the proposed new state accountability system and encourage feedback. Board staff presented and facilitated discussions to gather feedback on the proposed rule amendments and accountability system at:

- The Idaho Association of School Administrators annual conference;
- The Southern Idaho Conference Superintendents meeting;
• The Idaho School Boards Association annual conference; and
• Seven public forums held in Coeur d’ Alene, Lewiston, Idaho Falls, Pocatello, Twin Falls, Nampa, and Boise.

The new accountability system was established through the rulemaking process in 2016 and was accepted by the Legislature in 2017, becoming effective for the 2017-2018 school year. The accountability system includes all federally required indicators, places schools into three categories, and then within each category divides the indicators between student achievement and school quality. The majority of the federally required indicators fall under student achievement, however, states are required to have at least one school quality indicator. The initial accountability framework recommendations included absenteeism as a school quality indicator, but in the process of conducting the public forums there was a large amount of the feedback received against using school absentisim as a school quality indicator. This indicator was removed from the final version of the accountability system.

To meet the federal accountability requirements the school quality indicator must be able to be administered to every student and be able to broken out by subgroup. Working with Department of Education staff, it was determined that for the first year, a student engagement survey could be administered through the Idaho Standards Achievement Test administration that would meet our federal requirements for the 2017-2018 school year and help inform the development of a longer term survey solution. Department staff indicated that if a survey was going to be administered through the test administration then there was a very limited amount of time available to get the survey questions to the testing vendor. In order to meet these time constraints staff identified a number of nationally developed surveys that had already gone through a survey validation process that could be used. A small workgroup was formed consisting of Department and Board staff to review the surveys. Concurrently, a request for feedback was sent out to state lawmakers and education stakeholder groups requesting initial feedback on what they would like to see in a student engagement/school quality survey. The initial feedback received was able to be categorized into the following categories:

• School Safety and Security,
• Teacher Quality,
• School Quality and Culture, and
• Student Persevarance and College and Career Opportunities.

Additional feedback asked that the Board take into consideration the methods for delivering the survey in regard to school and district impact, the time it would take students to complete the survey, and that the survey take into consideration the various grade levels being surveyed.

In reviewing the available valid surveys initially identified the group determined the four categories met all student engagement survey developed and tested by Panorama. The Panorama survey was also developed in a way that would allow
Idaho to use specific sets of questions under various categories while still maintaining the integrity of the survey. The Panorma Student Survey broke questions out by grades 3-5 and 6-12, allowing for grade specific questions. The survey also included the following categories that were chosen based on their alignment with the initial feedback received:

- School Climate – Perceptions of the overall social and learning climate of the school,
- School Teacher-Student Relationships – How strong the social connection is between teachers and students within and beyond the school,
- School Safety – Perceptions of student physical and psychological safety while at school, and
- Grit – Perceptions of how well students are able to persevere through setbacks to achieve important long-term goals. (Grit would only be administered to students in Grades 9-12).

Each set consisted of five questions, resulting in a total of 13 questions for students in grades 3 through 5, 16 questions for students in grades 6 through 8 and 21 questions for students in grades 9-12. In general terms the survey questions look outward toward the students engagement with the teacher and the school.

Following selection of the survey and process for the 2017-2018 administration an additional email was sent out to state lawmakers and the education stakeholder groups with the survey questions (Attachment 1), information on how the questions were developed and by whom, and a link to detailed information from Panorama on how the survey was validated to assure the questions were not leading. Additional information regarding the Panorama validation process may be found at: [https://www.panoramaed.com/panorama-student-survey](https://www.panoramaed.com/panorama-student-survey). Based on the limited feedback that was received the survey and method for administration for the 2017-2018 school year was presented to the Board at the October 2017 Board meeting with a request that the Board provide any concerns they may have on the survey or the administration of the survey for the first year. Hearing none, staff moved forward with the implementation of the survey for the 2017-2018.

**IMPACT**

Following additional input, the student engagement school quality survey is being brought back to the Board to give the Board the opportunity to adjust the planned administration of the survey in the 2017-2018 school year.

**ATTACHMENTS**

Attachment 1 – Panorama Student Engagement Survey Page 5
Attachment 2 – AdvancEd Student Engagement Survey Page 11

**STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Following the October 2017 Board meeting article ran in Idaho Ed News under the headline “Schools and Teachers to be Graded on What Kids Say.” This article generated additional feedback from teachers and some school administrators over
the survey that was chosen for the 2017-2018 school year. Board staff and the Chair of the Planning, Policy and Governmental Affairs Committee met with the education stakeholder representative organizations and a representative from the Department of Education to further discuss the survey on November 20th, 2017. While the groups did not express full support of the Panorama survey they did indicate that they understood that this first year the survey would mainly be used to help inform the process for developing and administering the three surveys required by the state accountability system (Student Engagement, Parent Engagement, and Teacher Engagement). While the survey is also being used to meet the federal requirements for at least one school quality measure it only accounts toward 10% of the calculation for determining school performing in the lower 5%. The groups were assured that due to the timelines required for getting the questions to the testing administrator there was not time to gather additional feedback on the surveys and that there would be multiple opportunities for individuals to participate in the selection and or development of the three surveys that will be used starting in the 2018-2019 school year.

Following this meeting, the State Superintendent contacted the Executive Director and Board President to discuss the possibility of using AdvancED’s student engagement survey. All public high schools in the state are accredited by AdvancED and have access to the survey. For the first year AdvancED is willing to allow all public schools in Idaho to use their student engagement survey (Attachment 2). The AdvancEd survey is broken up by elementary school, middle school, and high school grades. Each grade range for the survey consists of four demographic questions and then 20 survey questions. In general terms the questions focus on how the student sees himself or herself and looks internally at their engagement with their education. The survey does not include questions regarding student safety and security.

BOARD ACTION
This item is for information purposes only. Any action will be at the Board’s discretion.