



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

**November 8, 2018
Office of the State Board of Education
Len B. Jordan Building, 3rd Floor
Boise, Idaho**

A special meeting of the State Board of Education was held November 8, 2018 in the large conference room of the Office of the State Board of Education, Len B. Jordan Building, in Boise, Idaho. Board President Linda Clark presided and called the meeting to order at 3:30 pm Mountain Time.

A roll call of members was taken.

Present:

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

Andrew Scoggin
Don Soltman
Richard Westerberg
Sherri Ybarra, State Superintendent

STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (SDE)

BOARD ACTION

1. Assessment Item Review (Bias and Sensitivity) Committee Recommendations

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Ybarra/Hill): To approve the recommendation of the Assessment Review Committee and remove one (1) Grade 5 ELA item (Item number 130300) from the 2019 item pool of the Idaho Standards Achievement Test. The motion carried 8-0.

Superintendent of Public Instruction, Ms. Sherri Ybarra, introduced the item sharing with Board members approval of the recommendation from the Bias and Sensitivity Committee (Committee) would remove one (1) Grade 5 English Language Arts (ELA) item from the 2019 Idaho Standards Achievement Tests (ISAT) by Smarter Balanced Assessment pool. The Director of Assessment and Accountability for the State Department of Education, Ms. Karlynn Laraway, adds the item has been recommended for removal because the Committee felt the item represented an idiom, or unfamiliar phrase for all students, and therefore is inaccessible to all students. Ms. Laraway then reminds Board members that assessment items are confidential and available for use by all states participating in the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium and that publically disclosing the assessment item would compromise its validity for use by other states, therefore, the specific item being requested for removal was made available to Board members prior to the Board meeting and is not available for the public to view.

Board member Soltman then expresses his thanks for the work by the members of the Bias and Sensitivity Committee, noting the time commitment involved with the work of the Committee.

There were no additional questions or comments from the Board.

2. Pending Rule Docket No. 08-0202-1801, Rules Governing Uniformity, Standards for Initial Certification of Professional School Personnel

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Ybarra/Atchley): To approve Pending Rule Docket No. 08-0202-1801 as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried 8-0.

Superintendent of Public Instruction, Ms. Sherri Ybarra, introduced the item sharing with Board members the item has been brought forward based on the recommendation of the Public Standards Commission and approval would allow for two new endorsements for middle school composite areas; Social Studies 5-9 and Science 5-9.

Board member Critchfield then asked if there had been changes since the June Regular Board meeting when the proposed rule docket was initially brought forward for approval. Director of Certification and Professional Standards for the State Department of Education (SDE), Ms. Lisa Colon Durham responds there have been two changes, based upon public comment. The first change was in reference to the Science Middle School Level endorsement replacing “physics” with “physical science” to allow for coursework in chemistry. The second change was in reference to the Pupil Service Staff Certificate and includes a change in language to best define continuing education units for Pupil Service Staff Certificate holders that fifteen (15) clock hours are equivalent to one (1) semester credit. Linda asks if an individual takes a continuing education course totaling ten (10) hours, would they then have to take an additional ten (10) hour course to meet this requirement. Ms. Colon Durham responds in the negative stating the required credits are a compilation of units taken over the five year renewal cycle. Dr. Clark then asks if all of the hours can be continuing education hours to which Ms. Colon Durham responds in the affirmative, adding for individuals holding a Bureau of Occupational License, any of the hours they use to renew their occupational license can be used to renew their Idaho Education Credential.

Board member Scoggin then requested a definition of the term “contact hours”. Ms. Colon Durham responds she is not aware of a definition and that the SDE definition is based upon the number of hours of instruction received, whether online or in person. Mr. Scoggin then asked if there is concern that a misunderstanding could arise without a clear definition of the term “contact hours”. Superintendent Ybarra responds the SDE can research the term and provide a definition, adding, this item has been brought forward by the Professional Standards Commission and the language used in the proposed rule is the same language used in the past. The Board’s Chief Planning and Policy Officer, Ms. Tracie Bent, adds the language is a new requirement that ties to those individuals who have occupational licenses issued by the Bureau of Occupational Licenses and that “contact hours” is a generally accepted term on the occupational licensing side.

There were no additional questions or comments from the Board.

PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS (PPGA)

1. Pending Rule Docket No. 08-0104-1801 – Rules Governing Residency Classification

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Soltman/Scoggin): To approve Pending Rule Docket No. 08-0104-1801 as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried 8-0.

Planning, Policy and Governmental Affairs (PPGA) Committee Chair, Mr. Don Soltman, introduced the item reminding Board members approval of the proposed amendments

will update and simplify references for determining student residency for tuition purposes. Additionally, Mr. Soltman shares the public comment period for the proposed amendments ended October 24, 2018 and there were no comments received or changes made to the original proposal.

There were no questions or comments from the Board.

2. Pending Rule Docket No. 08-0113-1802 – Rules Governing the Opportunity Scholarship Program

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Soltman/Westerberg): To vacate Pending Rule Docket No. 08-0113-1802 as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried 8-0.

Planning, Policy and Governmental Affairs (PPGA) Committee Chair, Mr. Don Soltman, introduced the item reminding Board members approval of the proposed amendment would amend the student eligibility and application requirements to allow for a portion of the Opportunity Scholarship awards to be used for individuals who have earned 24 or more postsecondary credits. Additionally, Mr. Soltman shares the public comment period for the proposed amendments ended October 24, 2018 and that one comment in favor of the proposed rule was received through this process. Additionally, Board staff met with the postsecondary institutions Financial Aid Directors to discuss implementation of the scholarship on the campuses and to gather feedback. As a part of this process, the Financial Aid Directors provided two additional comments on the proposed rule; specific language regarding the processing of the Adult Learner applications by Board staff and for the Board to consider adding additional language regarding the credit hour requirements for continued eligibility of the “traditional” Opportunity Scholarship applicants. Staff have incorporated one change in the pending rule in response to the application processing deadline.

Board member Hill then requested clarification on the definition of an adult learner provided in the agenda materials. Dr. Hill notes the definition, as written, implies an individual attending a postsecondary institution, accredited or not, at any time during the previous 24 months could qualify as an adult learner, and is this what the Board intended when developing the requirements for the scholarship. The Board’s Chief Planning and Policy Officer, Ms. Tracie Bent, responds the intent was for individuals to earn credits from any institution, have a break of service for 24 months from any institution and to use the award at a public postsecondary institution in Idaho. Dr. Hill then shares the example of an individual who leaves military service and then enrolls in a postsecondary course, at either a private or public institution, and that as currently written, the definition would disqualify individuals in this situation for 24 months and is this what the Board intends. Board member Critchfield then comments the Board has worked to remove as many barriers to postsecondary education as possible, especially for this population and the Board should work to increase access for the adult learner population and not inhibit it.

Board member Scoggin then shared his concern the definition, as written, could have the unfortunate result of allowing individuals to qualify for the scholarship who attend any institution not accredited by a body recognized by the Board and that by default, this would exclude Idaho citizens and because of this, the 24 month period should be applicable for all applicants.

Board member Atchley then asks if the Board recognizes education received through military service to which Ms. Bent responds, credit for Prior Learning (PL) is granted through the institutions and, as long as an institution is accredited by a body recognized by the Board or transferable to an Idaho institution, then the credits would be recognized and would count towards the twenty-four (24) credits earned. Dr. Clark then comments the credits would be recognized, but would had to have been earned prior to the 24 month period immediately prior to applying for the scholarship. Ms. Bent confirms this and adds if the credits are not awarded until an individual attends an institution, then those credits would not apply to the twenty-four (24) credits earned.

Board member Atchley then asks if the requirement for an individual to have not attended a postsecondary institution at any time during the twenty-four (24) month period immediately prior to application is to differentiate the adult learner from the Traditional Opportunity Scholarship, noting a Traditional Opportunity Scholarship recipient can take a year off and still receive the award. Ms. Bent responds the Traditional Opportunity Scholarship is awarded up to four (4) years after graduating from high school, however, a student may request a leave of absence or other qualifying item that would allow an extension of the scholarship award. Ms. Bent then states the Traditional Opportunity Scholarship is available to students that may have earned some credits, and it is possible for students to return to their postsecondary education as an adult and still apply for the Traditional Opportunity Scholarship, however students must maintain full-time status, where Adult Learner Opportunity Scholarship students are allowed the flexibility to attend part-time.

Dr. Hill then states his concern with the requirement that a student has not attended a postsecondary institution at any time during the twenty-four (24) month period immediately prior to application, noting, as written, this would equal a length of time greater than two years, or twenty-four (24) months.

Dr. Hill then comments on the eligibility requirement that a student must be pursuing their first undergraduate certificate or degree and that, as written, the language specifically discriminates against stacking credentials and is specifically narrowed to allow only an individual who attempted but did not finish any credential to receive their first credential and does not allow for retraining, upscaling, or stacking of credentials and in his opinion, this is wrong. Ms. Bent responds the language in code regarding Adult Learners is fairly open and would allow some discretion in this particular instance. She then shares with Board members it was the intent of legislators for the Adult Learner Opportunity Scholarship to be used to obtain an individual's first meaningful certificate or degree and not to be used as a retraining tool. Board member Atchley then comments the Eligibility Definition of an Undergraduate Student as described in code (IDAPA 08.01.13.101.01)

implies a non-adult learner who receives multiple certificates or degrees as part of their progression towards a degree is still eligible because they are seeking their first professional degree. Ms. Bent responds the language references traditional students who are recipients of the Traditional Opportunity Scholarship may use the scholarship to earn a baccalaureate degree even if you already received a certificate as long as it is the natural progression of a program up to a baccalaureate degree. For Adult Learner Opportunity Scholarship students, the language prohibits the stacking of credentials.

Finally, Dr. Hill shares the example of a traditional student who begins their postsecondary education at a 4-year institution who then drops out due to circumstances out of their control and then later decides to continue their postsecondary education by enrolling in a single course at the community college level. At completion of this course the student would have enough credits to earn an Associate's Degree, and would then be precluded from applying for the Adult Learners Opportunity Scholarship. Ms. Bent responds by sharing with Board members a possible solution for this type of situation would be for the Board to allow adult learners the ability to stack credentials up to a baccalaureate degree, the same as traditional students. Dr. Hill responds it would be his preference for the Board to develop a broader definition that would allow more scope for these particular circumstances. Ms. Bent then reminds Board members the Board has the authority to amend a pending rule as long as the amendments fall within the scope of the rule making process and the changes the Board is discussing today would be within that scope. If the Board were to vacate the pending rule Board members would have to approve another temporary rule at the end of the next session in order to make the awards for the next year, but this would allow time for Board staff to work with legislators to draft new proposed and pending rules for the next year.

There were no additional questions or comments from the Board.

3. Pending Rule Docket No. 08-0202-1802 - Rules Governing Uniformity - Alternate Route to Administrator Certification

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Soltman/Critchfield): To vacate Pending Rule Docket No. 08-0202-1802 as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried 8-0.

Planning, Policy and Governmental Affairs (PPGA) Committee Chair, Mr. Don Soltman, introduced the item reminding Board members approval of the proposed amendment would establish an alternate route for non-traditional individuals to receive an Administrator Certificate. Additionally, Mr. Soltman shares the public comment period for the proposed amendments ended October 24, 2018 and that four comments were received opposing the creation of the alternate route. Mr. Soltman then states that based upon comments received, it is his desire to vacate the proposed rule to allow additional time for Board staff to research and develop a new rule.

Board member Critchfield then shares with Board members the purpose of working with stakeholders to develop an alternate path for administrators was a result of other legislative action coming forward during the recent legislative session and that working with legislators, the Board agreed to gather stakeholders together to have a conversation around an alternate route for administrators. The information shared during this conversation as well as other conversations indicate there is more work to be done developing an alternate route for administrators. The Board's Chief Planning and Policy Officer, Ms. Tracie Bent, adds it is her understanding the authors of the original bill introduced during the 2018 legislative session intend to introduce the bill again during the 2019 legislative session.

There were no additional comments or questions from the Board.

4. Pending Rule Docket No. 08-0202-1803 – Rules Governing Uniformity – Educator Credentials

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Soltman/Hill): To approve Pending Rule Docket No. 08-0202-1803 as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried 8-0.

Planning, Policy and Governmental Affairs (PPGA) Committee Chair, Mr. Don Soltman, introduced the item reminding Board members approval of the proposed rule would allow for a small technical correction and provide clarification without changing current practices.

There were no questions or comments from the Board.

5. Pending Rule Docket No. 08-0202-1804 – Rules Governing Uniformity – Professional Endorsement

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Soltman/Atchley): To approve Pending Rule Docket No. 08-0202-1804 as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried 8-0.

Planning, Policy and Governmental Affairs (PPGA) Committee Chair, Mr. Don Soltman, introduced the item reminding Board members approval of the proposed rule would Provide school districts with a process for determining whether out-of-state instructional staff and pupil service staff are eligible for the Professional Endorsement. Additionally, Mr. Soltman shares the public comment period for the proposed rule ended October 24, 2018 and that one comment was received stating there were no objections to the proposed rule and that no changes have been made to the rule between the proposed and pending rule stages.

There were no questions or comments from the Board.

6. Division of Career Technical Education - Pending Rule Docket No. 08-0202-1805
– Rules Governing Uniformity – Educator Credential – Occupational Specialist Endorsements

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Soltman/Critchfield): To vacate Pending Rule Docket No. 08-0202-1805 as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried 8-0.

Planning, Policy and Governmental Affairs (PPGA) Committee Chair, Mr. Don Soltman, introduced the item and then invited the Administrator for the Division of Career Technical Education, Mr. Dwight Johnson, and Director of Teacher Certification and Professional Development for the Division of Career Technical Education, Ms. Kristi Enger, to present the pending rule to the Board. Ms. Enger provided a summary of the amendments made to the pending rule in response to comments received during the public comment period that ended October 24, 2018.

Dr. Clark then shares with Mr. Johnson and Ms. Enger that she has received input and comments from school districts that do not support the proposed amendments. Mr. Johnson responded the Division of Career Technical Education (Division) is aware of the comments and has responded appropriately.

Board member Critchfield then comments it was her understanding the purpose of the proposed rule is to provide consistency in awarding certificates and endorsements for individuals wanting to become Career Technical Education (CTE) teachers. She then asks if there is a preference in the process for looking at a skill based certification process rather than a pathway, adding this is one of the comments she has heard repeatedly and she hopes the Division is using this opportunity to insure what is being formalized in code for the first time is actually what will serve Idaho schools the best. Mr. Johnson responds with his agreement and that it is the Division's desire to develop meaningful endorsements that connect to programs of study with Idaho's CTE programs. Ms. Enger adds the skill sets included in each of the endorsements and their language align with the standards and the program standards identified, with the help of industry as well as secondary and postsecondary faculty, and the subsets of skills shown with each endorsement align and represent what is needed for that endorsement.

Board member Critchfield then shares after having heard from the schools and districts this rule would impact the frustration expressed weighs heavily on her support of this rule. Board member Clark adds she too has received significant feedback from the school districts and that while none of the feedback has expressed concern with reducing the number of endorsements, all of the feedback she has received has expressed dissatisfaction with the process and she is concerned school districts and stakeholders

feel they were not heard or actively engaged in the process and are concerned with the lack of a crosswalk for their existing certificated employees. Finally, Dr. Clark shares school district have asked the Board to not take action on this item and allow time for additional input and that the Board is very much committed that stakeholders be involved in the process.

Board member Soltman then asks what would be the impact if the Board were to not move forward with the pending rule. Mr. Johnson responds the Division would wait another year and continue to engage stakeholder feedback and input.

There were no additional questions or comments from the Board.

7. Pending Rule Docket No. 08-0203-1803 – High School Graduation Requirements

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Hill/Scoggin): To approve Docket No. 08-0203-1803, Rules Governing Thoroughness, High School Graduation Requirements, as amended. The motion carried 8-0.

Planning, Policy and Governmental Affairs (PPGA) Committee Chair, Mr. Don Soltman, introduced the item reminding Board members the proposed amendments would incorporate changes approved by the Board at the April 2018 Regular Board meeting and suggested amendments identified during the negotiated rulemaking process with stakeholders and the Board's discussion at the August 2018 Regular Board meeting during the Work Session. Approval of the pending rule would allow the rule to be published in the Administrative Bulletin and forwarded to the 2019 Legislature for consideration. Additionally, Mr. Soltman shares the public comment period for the proposed rule ended October 24, 2018 and that nine comments were received. In response to these comments, amendments have been made to include school to work programs, clarify that the "thesis" requirement is a written "thesis", and clarify that the school district or charter school has full discretion on which options are available to their students to meet the senior project requirement.

Board member Hill requested clarification on the proposed Senior Project definition, noting that as written, the definition implies completion of a postsecondary certificate or degree at the time of high school graduation or an approved pre-internship or school to work internship program may be used to meet the senior project requirement, without any form of written thesis and it was his understanding during the October 2018 Regular Board meeting this route would still require a form of written thesis. The Board's Chief Planning and Policy Officer, Ms. Tracie Bent, responds the addition of "written report or thesis" could be added as part of the rulemaking process. Board member Critchfield then asks if the requirement for a written thesis would be at the discretion of the local school district to which Ms. Bent responds the current requirement, with the exception of those that are meeting the senior math requirement, is the written report is required for a senior project except for those that are meeting the requirement with a postsecondary certificate or

degree or approved pre-internship or internship program. Currently, there is discretion on the requirement of a written report for students using a certificate or degree or approved pre-internship or internship program to meet the requirement and the language proposed by Dr. Hill would add a written thesis or report to those that are using the exception language to meet the senior project requirement.

Dr. Hill then comments it was his understanding from the discussion during the August 2018 Regular Board meeting Work Session that Board members were comfortable with continuing to allow various more practical means of meeting the senior project requirement since the purpose of it was to demonstrate skills that could not otherwise be demonstrated by exams or tests, but that a written thesis or report would still be required. Board member Critchfield responds she is hesitant to add the written thesis or report as a requirement, as there are other avenues for students to present a senior project, and she is concerned the requirement would be seen as writing a report just for the sake of writing a report. Ms. Critchfield then states she would prefer the requirement for a written thesis or report be left to the discretion of the local school districts to determine the best fit for the student and the particular project they choose. Board member Atchley then comments completion of a postsecondary certificate or degree would include writing skills, however, internships may not. Ms. Atchley then suggests an approved pre-internship or school to work internship may be used to meet the requirement, provided a written report is submitted to the local education agency (LEA). Ms. Critchfield then asks if presentation of the senior project could be in a form other than a written report or thesis. After much discussion, Board members modified the proposed definition of the senior project as follows.

“The senior project is a culminating project to show a student’s ability to analyze, synthesize and evaluate information and communicate that knowledge and understanding. A student must complete a senior project by the end of grade twelve (12). Senior projects may be multi-year projects and may be group or individual projects, approved pre-internship or school to work internship program at the discretion of the school district or charter school. The project must include elements of research, communication of a thesis using experiential learning or integrated project based learning experiences and presentation of the project outcome. Completion of a postsecondary certificate or degree at the time of high school graduation may be used to meet this requirement”.

There were no additional questions or comments from the Board.

8. Division of Career Technical Education - Pending Rule Docket No. 08-0203-1804 – Rules Governing Thoroughness – Incorporated by Reference - Career Technical Education – Program Content Standards

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Soltman/Scoggin): To approve Pending Rule Docket No. 08-0203-1804 as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried 8-0.

Planning, Policy and Governmental Affairs (PPGA) Committee Chair, Mr. Don Soltman, introduced the item reminding Board members approval of the proposed rule changes will add additional Career Technical Education (CTE) subcategories into the existing content standard areas approved by the Board at the June 2016 Regular Board meeting. Additionally, Mr. Soltman shares the public comment period for the proposed amendments ended October 24, 2018 and that two comments were received; one comment in favor of the proposed rule and one comment stating there were no objections to the proposed amendments. Finally, Mr. Soltman states there were no changes between the proposed and pending rule stages.

There were no questions or comments from the Board.

9. University of Idaho - Pending Rule Docket No. 08-0501-1801 – Rules Governing Seed and Plant Certification

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Soltman/Atchley): To approve Pending Rule Docket No. 08-0501-1801 as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried 8-0.

Planning, Policy and Governmental Affairs (PPGA) Committee Chair, Mr. Don Soltman, introduced the item reminding Board members approval of the proposed rule would allow for the rule to move forward through the rulemaking process and to go forward for public comment.

Additionally, Mr. Soltman shares in an effort to amend the seed certification standards approval process that would replace the rulemaking process with a more meaningful process the University of Idaho was directed to work with the impacted stakeholder groups to form consensus on a path forward. A group of stakeholders met on September 14, 2018 to discuss options. A smaller group will be meeting to formulate alternatives to the rulemaking process, however, no update has been received on the progress of this group to date.

There were no questions or comments from the Board.

10. Division of Vocational Rehabilitation – Pending Rule Docket No. 47-0102-1801 - Rules and Minimum Standards Governing Extended Employment Services

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Soltman/Scoggin): To approve Pending Rule Docket No. 47-0102-1801 as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried 8-0.

Planning, Policy and Governmental Affairs (PPGA) Committee Chair, Mr. Don Soltman, introduced the item sharing with Board members the public comment period ended on October 24, 2018 and that no public comments were received and that there have been no changes between the proposed and pending rule states.

There were no questions or comments from the Board.

11. Division of Career Technical Education – Pending Rule Docket No. 55-0103-1801 – Rules of Career Technical Schools

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Soltman/Westerberg): To vacate Pending Rule Docket No. 55-0103-1801 as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried 8-0.

Planning, Policy and Governmental Affairs (PPGA) Committee Chair, Mr. Don Soltman, introduced the item and then invited the administrator for the Division of Career Technical Education (Division), Mr. Dwight Johnson, to present the proposed changes to the Board.

Mr. Johnson begins by sharing with Board members the proposed amendments would move career technical education (CTE) school funding from a model based on student average daily attendance (ADA) to an enrollment based model. The proposal would not affect the base funding for CTE programs but would be in addition to the current base funding to be distributed between the state approved CTE high schools. The goals of the new funding model are to recognize that student enrollment drives the teacher and equipment funding needs for a program, to incentivize CTE high schools to insure their students have the necessary skills to be successful after graduation, to allow the Division to utilize the Idaho System for Educational Excellence (ISEE) to more accurately collect enrollment data and to insure accuracy so that requests for increased CTE school funding will be more accurate and reliable. The public comment period ended on October 24, 2017 and the Board office received six comments, all in opposition of the proposed rule. The Division worked with school districts and stakeholders to amend the pending rule to address the concerns identified during the public comment period.

Board member Scoggin asks if the amendments developed in response to the comments are subject to a new public comment period. The Board's Chief Planning and Policy Officer, Ms. Tracie Bent, responds the negotiated rulemaking process requires the

pending rule, with amendments, to be republished, however, there is no requirement for another 21 day public comment period. The next opportunity for individuals to comment on the rule would be when the rule comes before the legislature for approval, at which time legislators will make the decision to accept or reject the rule in part or in whole.

Board member Critchfield shares her concern the public was not given an opportunity to comment on the proposed amendments. Dr. Clark adds she has received feedback from the school districts that they were left out of the process and she finds it difficult to approve a rule given the stakeholder input she has received.

Mr. Scoggin asks how schools would be impacted if the rule was not passed, adding he understood the funding formula was to be used as a mechanism for allocating funds and not obtaining total funds. Mr. Johnson responds the proposed funding formula is a mechanism for distribution and also for identifying the need for additional funding based on enrollment. Dr. Clark then asks if the impact would be immediate or as new schools are added. Mr. Johnson responds immediate, adding the Division is aware of two new high schools that will begin operating in the near future and when these schools come online, they will split funding with existing schools. Dr. Clark asks when the two new schools are expected to be operating to which Ms. Bent responds if the schools were to begin operations in the 2019-2020 school year, then their funding would come from the fiscal year 2020 budget, and this is the budget legislators will be considering during the 2019 session. Mr. Scoggin then asks if under the existing model funds will increase due to the increased enrollment from the two new high schools. Mr. Johnson responds under the current model the Division cannot use the ISEE system because the CTE program has partial days and the ADA system does not recognize these days, they must be hand collected by the school districts and this creates a lack of reliability with the data being submitted and reported. Dr. Clark then asks if the districts could move to an enrollment model if they provided the attendance data by hand. Mr. Johnson responds not unless the pending rule is approved. Dr. Hill asks if the Division has considered a temporary rule to which Mr. Johnson responds in the negative. Dr. Clark asks is this a possibility to which Ms. Bent responds this would not qualify for a temporary rule. Dr. Clark then asks if the Division has submitted a budget request to which Mr. Johnson responds in the affirmative, for the same amount as the previous year. Dr. Clark then asks why the Division would not request more money if it was known more money would be needed. Mr. Johnson did not respond.

There were no additional questions or comments from the Board.

EXECUTIVE SESSION (Closed to the Public)

M/S (Critchfield/Scoggin): To go into 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 into Executive Session at 5:35 pm MST.

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

Board members exited Executive Session at 6:15 pm MST.

OPEN MEETING

The Board reconvened in Open Session at 6:17pm MST where Board President Clark read the following statement:

“The Board convened in Executive Session to consider an exempt matter which is permissible under the Open Meeting Law, Idaho Code, Title 74, Section 206(1)(b). The Board concluded its discussion and took no action on the matter discussed. If action is necessary in this matter it will occur at a future meeting properly noticed under the Open Meeting Law”.

OTHER BUSINESS

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

M/S (Hill/Critchfield): To adjourn the meeting at 6:17pm pm MST. The motion carried 8-0.