

BOARDWORK
DECEMBER 19, 2018

1. Agenda Approval

Changes or additions to the agenda

2. Minutes Approval

BOARD ACTION

I move to approve the minutes from the October 17-18, 2018 Regular Board meeting, and November 8, 2018 Special Board meeting as submitted.

3. Rolling Calendar

BOARD ACTION

I move to set December 18-19, 2019 as the date and the College of Southern Idaho as the location for the December 2019 regularly scheduled Board meeting.



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

DRAFT MINUTES

**STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
October 17-18, 2018
Lewis-Clark State College
Williams Conference Center
4th Street and 9th Avenue
Lewiston, Idaho**

A regularly scheduled meeting of the State Board of Education was held October 17-18, 2018 at Lewis-Clark State College, Lewiston Idaho. Board President Dr. Linda Clark presided and called the meeting to order at 11:00am PST.

Present:

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

Don Soltman
Richard Westerberg
Sherri Ybarra, State Superintendent

Absent:

Andrew Scoggin

Wednesday, October 17, 2018

BOARDWORK

1. Agenda Review/Approval

BOARD ACTION

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

2. Minutes Review / Approval

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Hill): To approve the minutes from the August 15-16, 2018 Regular Board meeting, August 30, 2018 Special Board meeting and September 28, 2018 Special Board meeting as submitted. The motion carried 7-0. Mr. Scoggin was absent from voting.

3. Rolling Calendar

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Atchley): To set October 16-17, 2019 as the date and Lewiston as the location for the October 2019 regularly scheduled Board meeting. The motion carried 7-0. Mr. Scoggin was absent from voting.

PLANNING, POLICY & GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS (PPGA)

1. Lewis-Clark State College (LCSC) Annual Progress Report

The Board met at Lewis-Clark State College in the Williams Conference Center, in Lewiston, Idaho at 11:00 am (PST). President of Lewis-Clark State College (LCSC), Dr. Cynthia Pemberton, welcomed Board members and staff to campus. Dr. Pemberton then explained that LCSC's annual progress report has provided in the agenda materials and invited students, alumni and faculty to have an informal discussion with Board members about their experiences at the college.

At this time, the Board recessed for lunch returning at 1:00pm PST.

WORKSESSION**PLANNING, POLICY & GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS (PPGA)**

1. Performance Reporting/Outcomes Based Funding Performance Measures Review

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

Planning, Policy and Governmental Affairs (PPGA) Committee Chair, Mr. Don Soltman, introduced the item sharing with Board members the purpose of the Work Session is to start with a review of the Board's performance measures and then move to a discussion on Outcomes Based Funding (OBF). Mr. Soltman then reminded Board members the information presented will include the system-wide performance measures for the years 2013-2016 as well as the limited data for the new metrics approved by the Board at the 2017 Regular December meeting. He then invited the Board's Chief Planning and Policy Officer, Ms. Tracie Bent, and Chief Research Officer, Dr. Cathleen McHugh, to share the update with the Board.

Dr. McHugh began the presentation with an update on the Cost per Credit Hour which is the measure the Board uses to determine the cost to the institutions for providing academic courses divided by the number of credits weighted by the Board's weighting scheme. The benchmark for this measure is for the cost per weighted credit hour to be less than \$500, which all of the 4-year institutions meet. Boise State University (BSU) has the lowest cost per weighted credit and has remained flat for the last four years. The other institutions are higher with a gradual uptick, however, with the exception of the last year the other institutions met their institution established benchmarks. Dr. McHugh then reported all of the institutions have had an increase in their financials, with Lewis-Clark State College (LCSC) being the lowest, and that BSU had an increase in the number of weighted credit hours. For the 2-year institutions, Eastern Idaho Technical College (EITC) Cost per Credit Hour was much higher than the other 2-year institutions. The trend for the 2-year institutions has been an increase in the cost per credit hour, however, the financials reflect a decrease in the weighted credits which is driving up the cost per weighted credit hours, which is a function of decreasing weighted credits and not an increase in cost. Board member Westerberg then comments the current benchmark is not clear and request Board staff to reevaluate this benchmark to determine if this should be measured system-wide or by individual institution. Board member Clark then requests the definition for a weighted credit hour to which Dr. McHugh responds weighted credit hour is defined as credits that are taken at each institution and weighted according to the Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) Code and that if a program is more expensive to run then it would be weighted higher than a program that is less expensive to run.

Dr. McHugh continues the update by sharing with Board members the Dual Credit summary which measures total credit hours earned and the unduplicated headcount of participating students. Dr. McHugh also shares with the Board based upon the increasing

amount of dual credits awarded, it may be time for the Board to consider using measures, other than just production, to measure the success of dual credit.

Dr. McHugh then shares with the Board an update on the Retention Rate measure and the Board's new performance measures for Graduation, Remediation, Gateway Courses and Progress. During the update for the Graduation performance measures, Board members entered into a discussion on the types of certificates to include in the Board's system-wide performance measures and if these measures should reflect the state's 60% Goal (Goal) and include certificates of less than 1-year. The Board's Executive Director, Mr. Matt Freeman, reminded Board members the Goal is a population goal and not a graduation goal and inclusion of certificates of less than 1-year would be received positively by lawmakers. Ms. Bent then shares with Board members that if certificates of less than one (1) academic year are to be included in the system-wide Graduation measure the Board will need to expand the definition for this measure to include certificates of less than one (1) academic year, identify certificates to be counted and set a benchmark for this measure to be approved by the Board at the Regular December meeting. Additionally, if certificates of less than one (1) academic year are to be counted towards the Goal, then the Board will need to determine what can be counted for the population and will have to make assumptions for identifying where the Goal is at between the decennial censuses, however, because the data does not include certificates at all, the Board will need to consider alternate means to calculate the percentage to be added to the data. Dr. Hill then comments it is very importance for the Board to understand the data for certificates of less than one (1) academic year and how these relate to the production of stackable credentials. Dr. Clark adds this is an area where the Board could partner with the Workforce Development Council. Ms. Bent then cautions Board members that as the Board focuses on different measures the focus can shape behavior and a potential unintended consequence could be an increase in the number of certificates awarded to the detriment of the number of baccalaureate degrees awarded which is an area originally identified as a need when the Goal was established. Board member Westerberg then shared with Board members his concern with the Board's ability to measure certificates in a meaningful way, adding, the intent of the Goal is to produce the workforce of the future for the jobs of the future and not minimum wage jobs of the future. If certificates lead to a living wage job then they would support the Goal, but it could be difficult for the Board to define this. Dr. Hill then comments on the importance for the Board to publicly recognize the importance of certificates in educating the population for the jobs of the future.

Mr. Westerberg then asks if the Board plans to provide staff with guidance on the benchmarks for this measure, suggesting the benchmark for degrees and certificates should be to meet the Goal. Mr. Freeman responds when the Board first adopted the Goal in 2010 it had identified benchmarks for each of the individual institutions in order to attain the Goal, however, the institution specific benchmarks were never formally adopted by the Board. If the Board now sets a benchmark for degrees and certificates to meet the Goal it needs to be at the institutional level to be meaningful. Ms. Bent then confirms within the Board's Strategic Plan there will be a system-wide benchmark, established by the Board, with each institution providing data at the institution level. Dr. Clark then asks

if the overall Goal is 60%, how then do you distill that down to the institution goals if the Goal includes certificates and the general population. Ms. Bent responds Board staff had previously developed a trajectory based upon a trend of performance happening at the time with the institutions and staff would now need to go back and look at that work again in partnership with the institutions. Board member Atchley comments this will change the data since we are talking about a different period of time with the Goal changing to 2025 and the Board needs to make sure this is factored into a revised trajectory. Additionally, the census data will change as the state's population continues to grow and people continue to move to Idaho who have a good educational background.

During Dr. McHugh's update to the Board on the Remediation performance measure, Board members expressed interest in no longer including this as part of the Board's Strategic Plan. Board members did however express interest in continuing to collect information at the institution level in order to monitor progress in this area.

Dr. McHugh continued with an update on the performance measure for Timely Degree Completion, during which Board members expressed an interest in including On Time Completion, to include the percent of undergraduate, degree-seeking students completing 30 or more credits per academic year, in the Board's Strategic Plan. Additionally, Board members determined the performance measure for Programs Offering Structured Schedules should be removed from the Board's Strategic Plan but remain as a system-wide performance measure.

At this time, Board members recessed for 15 minutes, returning at 2:30pm MST.

Planning, Policy and Governmental Affairs (PPGA) Committee Chair, Mr. Don Soltman, introduced the item reminding Board members this portion of the Work Session would focus on Outcomes Based Funding (OBF). He then invited the Board's Chief Fiscal Officer, Dr. Carson Howell, to share the update with the Board.

Dr. Howell begins by sharing with Board members the proposed OBF model was developed by a technical committee whose membership includes representatives from each of the eight colleges and institutions, Mr. David Hahn from the Division of Financial Management, Ms. Janet Jessup from the Legislative Services Office, Mr. Kurt Liebich from the Business Community and Ms. Kathleen Watkins from the Division of Career Technical Education. Dr. Howell then walked the Board through the mechanics of the model, including the metric, measures and weights, all of which are focused on student outcomes. Additionally, Dr. Howell shared with the Board the rationale behind the proposed metric, measures and weights and that the model is based on three separate categories of funding, College and Universities, Community Colleges and Career Technical Education for four categories of outcomes, Completion, High Impact Multiplier, At-Risk Multiplier and On-Time Graduation Multiplier.

Board member Westerberg asked how the technical committee arrived at the weighting scheme for the 1-year equivalent (30 or more credits after degree completion) for the college and universities, specifically why this item was assigned a weight of 0.10 as

opposed to a weight of 0.25. Dr. Howell responds members of the technical committee felt it more appropriate to incentivize completion of a degree or certificate greater than 1-year and this is reflected in the weighting scheme.

Board member Soltman then asked how the allocation of the funds will be managed. Dr. Howell responds Board staff will utilize the Statewide Longitudinal Data System to track students as they move through their degree progression and from one institution to the next. Mr. Westerberg then asks if a student completes a 2-year program through a community college and then moves to a 4-year college or university and graduates, would they be considered for a 1-year completion twice. Dr. Howell responds in the negative, adding a student would be counted once for the 1-year equivalent at a weight of 0.10 and then once for a Bachelor's degree at a weight of 1.00. Dr. Howell then provides another example of a student who completes an Associate's degree and then transfers to a 4-year college or university and completes a Bachelor's degree, the Associate's degree would be weighted at 0.50 and the Bachelor's degree at 1.00. The Board's Executive Director, Mr. Matt Freeman, then shares with Board members the focus of the OBF model is on progression and degree completion and that the allocation of funds is awarded after a student completes their degree. Board member Hill then asked if the model takes into account credits earned at the secondary level and asks if these credits are earned at the college or university or carried by the student. Dr. Howell responds the student, to which Dr. Hill comments this creates a strong incentive for the colleges and institutions to aggressively recruit students who have earned a large amount of dual-credits. Dr. Howell responds the technical committee felt this was something that should be encouraged. Mr. Westerberg then comments the Board must consider this in terms of the behavior it incents and if this is the same behavior the Board also wants to incentivize. Dr. Howell then states the weights in the OBF model are deliberate and that the technical committee felt strongly the model should not be utilized as a "cost model" but rather to incentivize completion and specifically completion of Bachelor's degrees.

Dr. Howell continued his update with an overview on how the technical committee arrived at the weights for the three additional multipliers; High Impact, At-Risk and On-Time Graduation and that the committee felt these additional multipliers should add up to an additional 1.00 but not exceed in order to keep the focus of the model on overall completion.

Ms. Atchley then asked if the current model would incentivize the colleges and universities to award Associate degrees as opposed to a traditional 4-year path. Dr. Howell responds in the affirmative, adding, this would most likely be an incentive for the 4-year institutions, adding, this may result in more transfer students enrolling at the state's 4-year college and universities. Mr. Westerberg then asks if the awards are stackable to which Dr. Howell responds in the affirmative. Mr. Westerberg then comments if the degrees are stackable then the behavior of the colleges and universities would be to award a certificate, followed by an Associate's degree and then a Bachelor's degree and that he had assumed the model would be deductible and not stackable. Mr. Freeman adds the model, as currently presented is stackable, however, the allocation, in terms of a dollar value, for the 2-year community colleges would be approximately one-half of what a 4-

year college or university would receive. Mr. Westerberg then shares his concern with the model and asks if part of the decision to allow for degrees to be stackable was due to in part to recordkeeping. Dr. Howell responds in the affirmative, adding the technical committee also felt if the overall goal is student completion, then the model should incentivize progression as students move through their education and are awarded degrees.

President of Idaho State University (ISU), Mr. Kevin Satterlee, then shared with the Board he fully supports an Outcomes Based Funding model and feels it is a move in the right direction as a system, however, there are concerns with the current model as presented, specifically how the proposed OBF model weighs an Associate's Degree and a Doctorate Degree equally. Mr. Satterlee then comments it would never be his goal or that of ISU to award a certificate or Associate's degree based strictly on a financial incentive, however, there are students who begin their postsecondary education and then realize the value of higher education and make the decision to continue on. In this situation, it is appropriate for the colleges and institutions to receive an allocation and if an institution is awarding a certificate or degree for any other reason it would be inappropriate and this is something that he would not allow at ISU. Dr. Clark then shares with Board members the concern by some members of the public that an OBF type of model leads to institution's becoming degree producing factories and it is important for the Board as well as the colleges and institutions to keep their focus on educating students.

Board member Critchfield then asked if General Education Matriculation (GEM) Certificates are included in the OBF Model. Dr. Howell responds there are institutions, primarily the community colleges, who do award GEM certificates as a way of recognizing a student's completion of their general education and also as a messaging tool to students that they should continue their education. After discussions with the community colleges, two issues regarding GEM certificates were discovered; should GEM certificates be included in the OBF model and the auto awarding of GEM certificates. These two items were discussed with the Business Affairs and Human Resources (BAHR) Committee who directed the technical committee to exclude GEM certificates and the model today reflects this. Mr. Westerberg then shares the intent of the BAHR Committee is for the OBF model to be a resource allocation model and must be consistent from institution to institution the decision by the BAHR committee was an attempt to make this consistent. Dr. Hill then asks if completing the general education requirement in the state of Idaho means something to a student and in his opinion it does and he would prefer the awarding of a GEM certificate be included in the OBF model. Ms. Atchley then comments the decision to exclude GEM certificates from the model had more to do with the automatic awarding of GEM certificates without review and that currently only one institution practices this. Dr. Hill then comments he does not support the automatic awarding of GEM certificates without review, however, the awarding of stackable certificates and credentials is becoming more common and as certificates become more of a currency the Board should recognize this trend and anticipate it. Ms. Atchley responds she cannot support allocating funds for stackable credentials, adding this is counter to the Board's goal of more students graduating with a Bachelor's degree. Board members then heard from representatives from the community colleges who shared their institutions utilize GEM certificates as a

record of achievement and to reinforce that students are on a pathway towards an Associate's degree or Bachelor's degree. Additionally, the community college representatives shared with Board members there has been an increasing trend of students "jobbing out" before completing an Associate's degree and if the model does not allow for an allocation for the awarding of GEM certificates, the institutions would have spent time educating and preparing students without any financial recognition. Dr. Howell responds the model recognizes this by equally weighting student completion of 30 credits or more and the transferring the same as completion of a 1-year certificate.

Dr. Hill then asked how the technical committee arrived at the value placed on higher degrees awarded by the 4-year institutions to which Dr. Howell responds the technical committee designed the model based upon completion rather than cost and with the largest gaps being Associates degrees and Bachelor's degrees, the committee put forth a model to incentivize institutions to fill these gaps. Board member Westerberg then reminds Board members the OBF model can be adaptable and can be modified to meet the needs of the Board and the state's workforce.

Finally, Dr. Howell shares with Board members the implementation plan for the proposed OBF model. The At Risk Amount of 5% was at the recommendation of the consultant from HCM Strategies who shared with the technical committee there has been success with other states running 5% of at risk funding through their model. For the community colleges, the amount is lower due to the data being for the last two years when the state had three community colleges. Now that a fourth community college, the College of Eastern Idaho (CEI), has been added, the Board will need to reevaluate this amount at the end of two years to include data from CEI. The implementation plan over the next three years would be approximately \$30 million and at the same time the At Risk Amount would grow to \$17.9 million. Mr. Freeman then comments after year three, the request for funding from the Legislature could remain constant if production were to increase. Mr. Westerberg comments the converse could also be true to which Dr. Howell responds in the affirmative, adding if production were to decrease, there could also be a decrease in state funding.

Mr. Westerberg then requested unanimous consent to change the weights in the College and University model for the High Impact Multiplier, At-Risk Multiplier and On-Time Graduation Multiplier to 0.33. There was no dissent from the Board and the request was ordered.

At this time the Board recessed for ten minutes, returning at 4:10pm PST.

STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (SDE)

1. Developments in K-12 Education

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

Superintendent of Public Instruction, Ms. Sherri Ybarra, introduced the item and then updated Board members on the 2019 Teacher of the Year Recipient, 2019 State

Presidential Math and Science Winners, National Blue Ribbon School Recipients, new Idaho Reading Indicator (IRI) roll-out, and finally, sharing with Board members SDE will provide their legislative update at the December regular Board meeting.

There were no questions or comments from the Board.

2. FY2020 Public School Budget Request

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

Superintendent of Public Instruction, Ms. Sherri Ybarra, introduced the item and then invited the Senior Financial Management Analyst for the State Department of Education (SDE), Ms. Julie Oberle, to provide a breakdown of the FY2020 Public School Budget request.

Ms. Oberle begins by sharing with the Board the total change in funds requested for the 2019-2020 General Fund Appropriation is an increase of \$122,488,900 or 6.8% and includes \$19,110,000 for the Keep Idaho Students Safe (KISS) Initiative. Ms. Oberle then provided an itemized breakdown of the FY2020 General Fund requested increase of \$122,488,900.

Board member Critchfield asked how the SDE arrived at the dollar amount for the Master Teacher Premium (Section 5.b.) and how funds will be dispersed if the number of qualifying teachers exceeds this number. Superintendent Ybarra responded the amount listed is an average and if funded, by law, whoever qualifies must be paid. Ms. Oberle adds the public education stabilization fund can be used to cover the cost of any payments exceeding the funded amount.

Board member Clark asked for clarification on the line item requests for the Career Ladder Base Allocation (Section 8.a.). Ms. Oberle responds the line item request for \$27,778,700 is for the year five (5) base allocations for the first and last rungs of the career ladder and if funded would increase the first rung, or starting salary, from \$37,000 to \$37,200 and the top rung from \$50,000 to \$52,000. Ms. Oberle then states this is intentional and has been designed to more closely align with the recommendations from the Governor's Task Force on Education for the rungs to range from \$40,000 - \$60,000. Board member Clark then asks if this is year five (5), and fully implements the Career Ladder, are additional funds necessary in order to increase the salary range to more closely align with the Governor's Task Force recommendations. Ms. Oberle responds Section 5.a. increases the first rung or starting salary to \$37,000 and the top rung to \$50,000. The funds requested in Section 8.a. would raise the starting salary by an additional \$200 to \$37,200 and the final rung an additional \$2,000 to \$52,000. Dr. Clark then comments she appreciates the request for additional funds, however, the increase is still below the Governor's Task Force Recommendation of \$40,000 - \$60,000.

Dr. Clark then shares with Board members she has reviewed the Teacher Pipeline Initiatives included in Section 9.g. and feels there are three initiatives included in this line item that will made a difference for the state's rural and remote districts to secure and

retain teachers and that this is a modest amount of money that could have a big impact in rural Idaho.

There were no additional questions or comments from the Board.

3. Schools With Less Than 10 Students – Annual Report

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

Superintendent of Public Instruction, Ms. Sherri Ybarra, introduced the item reminding Board members of the requirement in Idaho Code that any elementary school having less than ten (10) students in average daily attendance must be approved for operation by the Board. Superintendent Ybarra then stated for the 2018-2019 school year a total of nine (9) schools had requested to operate with an average daily attendance of less than ten (10) and that all of the requests have been approved.

There were no questions or comments from the Board.

4. Mastery Education and Earning Credits

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

Superintendent of Public Instruction, Ms. Sherri Ybarra, introduced the item and then invited the Director of Instructional Support for Student-Centered Learning for the State Department of Education (SDE), Ms. Kelly Brady, to provide the update to the Board.

Ms. Brady begins her presentation by sharing with Board members three possible examples of how to award credit within a mastery based system; through a guidance document developed by the state that includes a description of what will be determined to be an acceptable level of student mastery; flexible pathways to graduation that would expand learning opportunities with flexible pathways to college and career readiness; or allowing local education agencies (LEA) to grant credit based on seat time or on defined levels of mastery of standards. Ms. Brady then states the preference of the State Department of Education (SDE) would be for schools and districts to award credit based on a guidance document developed by SDE, however, the Board would need to provide input on how to develop this document.

Superintendent Ybarra then reminds Board members mastery based education was the number one recommendation of the Governor's Taskforce for Improving Education and that Idaho has been recognized nationally for their work with advanced opportunities and mastery based education. Superintendent Ybarra then requests the Planning, Policy and Governmental Affairs (PPGA) Committee or the Instruction Research and Student Affairs (IRSA) Committee work to further develop how to award credits under a mastery based model.

Board member Critchfield then requested clarification on what SDE would like for the Board to develop, noting the mastery model is highly individualized and is it the desire for SDE to develop consistency within the existing system. Dr. Clark asks if the purpose

would be to develop a standard definition of competency based education within which school districts can find their own individualized pathway while still meeting the state defined requirements for demonstrating competency to earn high school credits to which Ms. Brady responds in the affirmative, adding it is the desire of the SDE to continue development of a mastery based model with fidelity and integrity.

Board member Soltman then requests the timeline for development of the guidance document to which Superintendent Ybarra responds there is none. Dr. Clark then asks if additional schools and districts are able to participate to which Superintendent Ybarra responds in the affirmative. Dr. Clark then asks if these schools would start their mastery based programs in the fall to which Superintendent Ybarra responds in the affirmative. Dr. Clark then comments we would want to have the definition of competency clearly defined before approving any new schools for participation.

The item was then referred back to the Planning, Policy and Governmental Affairs (PPGA) Committee for further development.

5. Financial Literacy/Curriculum

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

Superintendent of Public Instruction, Ms. Sherri Ybarra, introduced the item reminding Board members of the discussion with students during the August 2018 Regular Board meeting who voiced concerns regarding their lack of financial literacy upon graduation from high school. During the work session of the August Board meeting the Board discussed financial literacy courses and standards in Idaho and requested the State Department of Education (SDE) work to identify the location of the financial literacy standards and report their findings to the Board. Superintendent Ybarra then invited the Director of Instructional Support for Student-Centered Learning for the State Department of Education (SDE), Ms. Kelly Brady, to provide the update to the Board.

Ms. Brady reports the financial literacy standards are embedded in the Idaho Content Standards for Social Studies and Economics under the personal finance goals and objectives and that moving forward, SDE will address the issue of student financial literacy through future professional development funds to revisit the financial literacy standards in the economics class required for seniors, to investigate ways to integrate financial literacy into math, and to provide professional development to teachers.

Board member Clark comments an economics class appears to be the best fit for students to learn about financial literacy.

Board member Soltman then states his concern for an additional graduation requirement, to which Dr. Clark responds financial literacy is included in the expectations of an economics course and is not an additional requirement, adding, it is more an issue of training.

There were no additional questions or comments from the Board.

6. School Accountability System Update

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

Superintendent of Public Instruction, Ms. Sherri Ybarra, introduced the item reminding Board members the new state accountability system was established through the rulemaking process by the Board in 2016 and accepted by the Legislature in 2017 for the 2017-2018 school year and the state completed the first cycle of identifying schools for comprehensive support and improvement as well as schools identified for targeted support and improvement in August. Schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement will receive a share of \$2,100,000 in federal funds to help implement the school's strategies for improvement, supported by the SDE's State Technical Assistance Team (STAT). Superintendent Ybarra then invited the Director of Assessment and Accountability for the State Department of Education, Ms. Karlynn Laraway, and the Director of Federal Programs for the State Department of Education, Ms. Karen Seay, to provide the update to the Board.

Dr. Clark shared her concern with the possibility that under the current model a school could be recognized as both excellent and needing improvement and that under this model alternative schools are set-up to fail and that schools with large populations of handicapped or disabled students are fighting an uphill battle.

There were no additional questions or comments from the Board.

7. Parent and Teacher Engagement and Satisfaction Surveys

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

Superintendent of Public Instruction, Ms. Sherri Ybarra, introduced the item reminding Board members the new state accountability system includes engagement surveys for students in grades 3 through 12 and engagement and satisfaction surveys for parents and teachers beginning in the 2018-2019 school year. Superintendent Ybarra then invited the Director of Assessment and Accountability for the State Department of Education, Ms. Karlynn Laraway, to provide an update to the Board.

Ms. Laraway begins her update by sharing with Board members the State Department of Education (SDE) formed a committee representing stakeholder groups that included teachers, administrators, school board members and parents to develop the parent and teacher survey items. The committee will collect feedback on the surveys through the end of October and then reconvene to review and finalize the survey questions on October 30, 2018. The SDE will then present the survey items for the Board to review and approve during the December 2018 Regular Board meeting.

There were no questions or comments from the Board.

8. Keeping Idaho Students Safe (KISS) Initiative

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

Superintendent of Public Instruction, Ms. Sherri Ybarra, introduced the item and then invited the Director of Student Engagement for the State Department of Education, Mr. Matt McCarter, to provide an update to the Board.

At the end of the update, General Counsel for the University of Idaho, Mr. Kent Nelson, shared with Board members how the University of Idaho has worked to develop threat assessments in response to the death of University of Idaho student, Katie Benoit. Mr. Nelson shares that one of the challenges when conducting a threat assessment is that as a public institution, information collected as part of a threat assessment is subject to public records requests and that the Board must seriously consider legislation that would protect this information. Dr. Clark then requested Mr. Nelson work with Mr. McCarter and Board staff to draft legislation to address this issue.

At the end of the presentation, Superintendent Ybarra requested the Board's support of this initiative as it moves through the legislative process.

There were no additional questions or comments from the Board.

9. Advanced Opportunities Report

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

Superintendent of Public Instruction, Ms. Sherri Ybarra, introduced the item and then invited the Director of Student Engagement for the State Department of Education, Mr. Matt McCarter, to provide an update to the Board.

Mr. McCarter begins his presentation by reminding Board members Advanced Opportunities allocates \$4,125 to every public school student in grades 7-12 to use towards the cost of overload courses, dual credits, and examinations and that in FY18 32,124 students took advantage of the advanced opportunities program, a 5% increase from the previous year. Mr. McCarter then shared with the Board an in-depth breakdown of how the funds were used.

Board member Clark then asks if students who do not exhaust their entire allocation should be allowed to use the money to advance their educational goals after high school. Board member Soltman then comments using the funds towards a Bridge Program would be a logical starting point for this discussion.

There were no additional questions or comments from the Board.

10. Pending Rule Docket Number 08-0203-1801, Special Education Manual

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Ybarra/Critchfield): To approve the revised Idaho Special Education Manual as submitted in Attachment 2. The motion carried 7-0. Mr. Scoggin was absent from voting.

AND

M/S (Ybarra/Critchfield): To approve pending rule docket number 08-0203-1801 as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried 7-0. Mr. Scoggin was absent from voting.

Superintendent of Public Instruction, Ms. Sherri Ybarra, introduced the item sharing with Board members approval of the revisions would bring the Idaho Special Education Manual into alignment with the Idaho Administrative Procedures Act (IDAPA), Idaho Code, Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), and recent court decisions and will also provide clear and consistent guidance for school personnel.

There were no questions or comments from the Board.

11. Pending Rule Docket Number 08-0203-1805, Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAO)

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Ybarra/Atchley): To approve pending rule docket number 08-0203-1805, as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried 7-0. Mr. Scoggin was absent from voting.

Superintendent of Public Instruction, Ms. Sherri Ybarra, introduced the item sharing with Board members approval would bring the Idaho Administrative Procedures Act (IDAPA) into compliance with the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

There were no questions or comments from the Board.

At this time, the Board recessed for the evening at 5:58pm PST.

Thursday, October 18, 2018 8:00 a.m., Lewis-Clark State College, Williams Conference Center, Lewiston, Idaho.

Board President Dr. Linda Clark called the meeting to order at 8:00am (PST) for regularly scheduled business.

OPEN FORUM

There was one participant for Open Forum. Mrs. Joann Trail addressed the Board to request Board members reconsider naming the entire University of Idaho Arboretum, and not just the Asian Grove, after Dr. Richard Naskali.

There were no questions or comments from the Board.

CONSENT AGENDA

BOARD ACTION

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

Business Affairs & Human Resources – Section II Business Affairs

1. Idaho State University – Chief Executive Officer Contract Amendment

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Hill): By unanimous consent to approve the amended employment agreement for Kevin Satterlee as President of Idaho State University as provided in Attachment 1. The motion carried 7-0. Mr. Scoggin was absent from voting.

2. University of Idaho – Retiree Death Benefits Trust Proposal

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Hill): By unanimous consent to approve the request by the University of Idaho to enter into the proposed trust agreement in substantial conformance to the terms set out in Attachment 1 to the materials provided to the Board. The motion carried 7-0. Mr. Scoggin was absent from voting.

3. Boise State University – Lease Renewal at 960 S. Broadway Avenue

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Hill): By unanimous consent to approve the request by Boise State University to renew the lease for space in the building located at 960 S. Broadway Avenue in Boise for a cost not to exceed \$1,138,258 for a term of five (5) years beginning November 1, 2018 as described in Attachment 1. The motion carried 7-0. Mr. Scoggin was absent from voting.

4. University of Idaho – Easement Request on University of Idaho (UI) Experimental Forest in Valley County

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Hill): By unanimous consent to approve the request by the University of Idaho to establish an easement on the UI Experimental Forest in

Valley County as provided in Attachment 1, and to authorize the Vice President for Finance and Administration for the University of Idaho to execute all necessary transaction documents for conveying the subject property rights. The motion carried 7-0. Mr. Scoggin was absent from voting.

Instruction, Research and Student Affairs (IRSA)

5. Higher Education Research Council (HERC) Committee Appointments

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Hill): By unanimous consent to appoint Dr. Todd E. Combs to the Higher Education Research Council as the INL representative effective immediately. The motion carried 7-0. Mr. Scoggin was absent from voting.

AND

M/S (Critchfield/Hill): By unanimous consent to re-appoint Dr. Haven Baker and Ms. Robin Woods as non-institutional representatives, effective immediately and expiring June 30, 2020. The motion carried 7-0. Mr. Scoggin was absent from voting.

6. Idaho Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (EPSCoR) Committee Appointments

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Hill): By unanimous consent to appoint Dr. Harold Blackman to the Experimental Program to Stimulate Research – Idaho Committee to serve in the position for the Vice President of Research for Boise State University, effective immediately. The motion carried 7-0. Mr. Scoggin was absent from voting.

AND

M/S (Critchfield/Hill): By unanimous consent to appoint Dr. Todd Combs to the Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research – Idaho Committee to serve as the representative for the Idaho National Laboratory, effective immediately and expiring June 30, 2021. The motion carried 7-0. Mr. Scoggin was absent from voting.

Planning, Policy and Governmental Affairs (PPGA)

7. Institution President Approved Alcohol Permits
This item was provided in the agenda materials as an information item.
8. University of Idaho – Facilities Naming – UI Arboretum – Asian Grove

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Hill): By unanimous consent to approve the request by the University of Idaho to designate the Asian Grove in the UI Arboretum as the “Dr. Richard Naskali Asian Grove.” The motion carried 7-0. Mr. Scoggin was absent from voting.

9. Boise State University – Facilities Naming – Nile and Christy Latta Football Plaza

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Hill): By unanimous consent to approve the request by Boise State University to name the plaza in front of the Bleymaier Football Complex the “Nile and Christy Latta Football Plaza.” The motion carried 7-0. Mr. Scoggin was absent from voting.

10. Accountability Oversight Committee Appointment

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Hill): By unanimous consent to approve the appointment of Anne Ritter to the Accountability Oversight Committee effective immediately and ending on June 30, 2020. The motion carried 7-0. Mr. Scoggin was absent from voting.

State Department of Education (SDE)

11. 2017-2018 Accreditation Report

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Hill): By unanimous consent to accept the 2017-2018 Accreditation Summary Report of Idaho Schools as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried 7-0. Mr. Scoggin was absent from voting.

12.2018 Curricular Materials Review and Adoption

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Hill): By unanimous consent to approve the recommendation of the Curricular Materials Selection Committee to adopt curricular materials and related instructional materials for K-12 English Language Arts and Literacy, K-6 Handwriting, K-12 English Learner, K-12 Computer Applications, K-12 Computer Science, and 9-12 Mathematics Open Educational Resources, as submitted in Attachment 1. The motion carried 7-0. Mr. Scoggin was absent from voting.

13. Professional Standards Commission – Emergency Provisional Certificate

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Hill): By unanimous consent to approve the request by the Professional Standards Commission for approval of a one-year emergency provisional certificate for James Broyles to teach Spanish grades six (6) through twelve (12), Music grades six (6) through twelve (12) and Orientation Health Occupations grades six (6) through twelve (12) in the St. Maries Joint School District #041 for the 2018-19 school year. The motion carried 7-0. Mr. Scoggin was absent from voting.

INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH & STUDENT AFFAIRS (IRSA)

1. Standing Committee Report – Higher Education Task Force Update

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

Instruction, Research and Student Affairs (IRSA) Committee Chair, Ms. Debbie Critchfield, introduced the item by sharing with Board members the IRSA Committee continues to work on common course numbering with the intent of submitting the final list for Board approval at the December regularly scheduled Board meeting. Additionally, the IRSA Committee continues to research and develop a crosswalk for Advanced Placement (AP) and College Level Examination Program (CLEP) within the common course list and general education requirements; explore possible strategies and solutions to increase access and affordability of textbooks; submit various grant proposals supporting college access for adult learners as well as develop strategies and goals to ensure first-time, full-time students complete 30 hours each academic calendar year.

Board President, Dr. Linda Clark, then shares with Board members a recent topic of discussion during the October Student Advisory Council meeting focused on the issue of reducing the cost of textbooks and other materials and that students are very interested in being a part of this activity on campus. Dr. Clark then reminds Board members this initiative is not a mandate of the Board, but a recommendation from the Governor's Higher Education Task Force that is being led by the institutions.

The Board's Chief Academic Officer, Dr. Randall Brumfield, states there are a number of different ways textbook affordability can be achieved and all are being considered as part of this work. Finally, Dr. Brumfield states he would be remised if he did not share with Board members there is some ambiguity with the definition of affordability and what the institutions should be working towards in regards to affordable textbooks.

There were no additional questions or comments from the Board.

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

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

Board Secretary, Dr. David Hill introduced the item, sharing with Board members the Established Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (EPSCoR) is a federal program designed to enhance the science and engineering research, education, and technology capabilities of states that have traditionally received smaller amounts of federal research and development funds and that while it is not a demerit, the goal is to not be an EPSCoR state. Dr. Hill then invited Mr. Doyle Jacklin, Vice Chair of the Idaho EPSCoR Committee, to present the annual report to the Board.

Mr. Jacklin reports Idaho EPSCoR continues to search for a new Program Director and the role of Interim Program Director will now be filled by Dr. Carolyn Bohach. Mr. Jacklin then shares the Idaho EPSCoR Committee is a 16 member committee comprised of business members, legislators, community members and scientists and is recommending the appointment of Dr. Todd Combs as the Idaho National Laboratory (INL) representative, replacing Kelly Beierschmitt and Dr. Harold Blackman, the Interim President for Research at Boise State University, replacing Dr. Mark Rudin. Finally, Mr. Jacklin reports in September 2018, it was announced that Idaho EPSCoR was awarded a new Track-1 grant from the National Science Foundation (NSF)-EPSCoR for the "Linking Genome to Phenome to Predict Adaptive Response of Organisms to Changing Landscapes" proposal. The five-year award amount from NSF-EPSCoR is \$20 million with \$800,000 annually being provided as matching funds through the Board's Higher Education Research Council (HERC). Mr. Jacklin then invited the Assistant Project Director and Project Administrator for Idaho EPSCoR, Mr. Rick Schumaker, to present an overview of Idaho EPSCoR's current projects. At the end of his project update, Mr. Schumaker reports Idaho EPSCoR has made great progress in becoming more competitive in receiving research funding and since joining the program has tripled the amount of National Science Foundation (NSF) funding received.

Dr. Hill then asks if there are any other organizations at the federal level, other than NSF, for Idaho to extend to different federal agencies, specifically the Department of Defense (DOD) and Department of Energy (DOE). Mr. Schumaker responds the Idaho EPSCoR governing role and involvement in the other federal agencies is dictated by those agencies guidelines and that Idaho EPSCoR does endorse proposal to the DOE-EPSCoR program but has not had an award in recent years. Mr. Schumaker continues he has received word there will be new opportunities for Idaho EPSCoR to apply for DOE-

EPSCoR programs and the lead for this will be the Vice President for Idaho State University (ISU). Dr. Hill then states the importance for Idaho to take full advantage of all of the EPSCoR programs available.

There were no additional questions or comments from the Board.

3. Graduate Medical Education – Committee Appointments

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Westerberg): To approve the nominations of the Graduate Medical Education committee members provided in Attachment 1 for a two (2) year term, effective immediately and expiring on June 30, 2020. The motion carried 7-0. Mr. Scoggin was absent from voting.

AND

M/S (Critchfield/Hill): To approve the nominations of the Graduate Medical Education committee members provided in Attachment 2 for a four (4) year term, effective immediately and expiring on June 30, 2022. The motion carried 7-0. Mr. Scoggin was absent from voting.

Instruction, Research and Student Affairs (IRSA) Committee Chair, Ms. Debbie Critchfield, introduced the item reminding Board members the Graduate Medical Education (GME) Committee is a newly formed committee reporting to IRSA to provide recommendations to the Board on ways to enhance graduate education in the state of Idaho and the development, implementation, and monitoring of the Board's graduate medical education short and long-term plans.

Board member Soltman then asked if Graduate Medical Education will continue to present to the Joint Finance and Appropriations Committee (JFAC) to which the Board's Executive Director, Mr. Matt Freeman responds in the affirmative, adding each of the Graduate Medical Education programs are now separately budgeted programs under Health Education Programs with the exception of Family Medicine Residency.

There were no additional questions or comments from the Board.

4. Board Policy III.T. Student Athletes – First Reading

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Atchley): To approve the first reading of amendments to Board Policy III.T.6, as presented in Attachment 1. The motion carried 7-0. Mr. Scoggin was absent from voting.

Instruction, Research and Student Affairs (IRSA) Committee Chair, Ms. Debbie Critchfield, introduced the item sharing with Board members the proposed amendments

would clarify the types of incidents that student athletes must report to their head coach and to the athletic director.

There were no questions or comments from the Board.

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

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Hill): To approve the second reading of Board Policy III.N, General Education as presented in Attachment 1. The motion carried 7-0. Mr. Scoggin was absent from voting.

Instruction, Research and Student Affairs (IRSA) Committee Chair, Ms. Debbie Critchfield, introduced the item reminding Board members this is a second reading of the proposed policy amendments. Board member Hill then asked if there were any changes from the first reading, to which the Board's Chief Academic Officer, Dr. Randall Brumfield, responded there were none.

There were no additional questions or comments from the Board.

6. College Level Exam Program/Advanced Placement Course Equivalency Development

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

Instruction, Research and Student Affairs (IRSA) Committee Chair, Ms. Debbie Critchfield, introduced the item sharing with Board members Board staff will continue working with institutions in the coming months to align and adopt a common crosswalk for Advanced Placement (AP) and College Level Exam Program (CLEP) exams as well as other forms of Prior Learning Assessment (PLA) such as those related to military training and instruction and work-based learning.

The Board's Chief Academic Officer, Dr. Randall Brumfield, this work will provide a clear, transparent and consistent crosswalk from AP exams and CLEP exams to specific courses on the proposed common course index list the Board will review in December and for those exams where there would not be a course equivalent, Board staff will explore the possibility of those exams meeting one of the six general education requirements.

There were no additional questions or comments from the Board.

PLANNING, POLICY & GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

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, Mr. Don Soltman, 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. Mr. Soltman 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% non-federal match requirement whose mission is to prepare individuals with disabilities for employment and community enrichment.

Ms. Donnellan then states in 2014 the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and its amendments was reauthorized by the Workforce Innovations and Opportunities Act (WIOA) and is a significant shift in the current law and now looks not only at individuals with disabilities, but at business as customers as well. In response to this shift, IDVR developed a new mission and vision statement to align with WIOA as well the national initiative 2020.

Ms. Donnellan then shares with Board members that in FY2018 there were a total of 1,281 successful outcomes, a 351% increase in customer wages after receiving IDVR services, and that 76% 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 FY2018 was \$12.84; which equates to 63.2% of the average Idaho wage of \$20.00 per hour.

Ms. Donnellan continues with an update on IDVR's efforts to partner with education through pre-employment transition services, paid summer work experience and post-secondary education options. Ms. Donnellan then shares IDVR's efforts to grow their business outreach and engagement includes a new business engagement team comprised of representatives from all eight (8) of IDVR's regions. Finally, Ms. Donnellan shares with members of the Board IDVR's budget request for FY2020 is a single line item for \$8,000 to support the Council for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing (CDHH) to provide training opportunities for licensed interpreters to meet continuing education hours.

There were no questions or comments from the Board.

3. Division of Career Technical Education – Career Technical Education (CTE) Educator Pathways

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

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

Mr. Johnson begins by sharing with Board members the goal of ICTE is to prepare Idaho's youth and adults for high-skill, in-demand careers and the recruitment and retention of quality Career Technical Education (CTE) teachers is crucial to supporting this goal. Mr. Johnson then updated the Board on ICTE's efforts to recruit and retain highly effective CTE teachers and the various routes individuals may pursue to become a CTE educator.

Board member Critchfield then expressed her support of Career Technical Education and the investment the state has made in recruiting and retaining quality CTE teachers, however, in some school districts this has created tension or friction between CTE teachers and academic teachers. Ms. Critchfield then asks how to support CTE and attract quality teachers without diminishing what the general education teachers are doing in the classroom. Mr. Johnson responds these are significant issues and ones that he does not have an easy answer for, however, there are four factors that contribute to the retention of all teachers; pay, working conditions, preparation, and mentoring and support in the early years of teaching and, while ICTE is working on increasing preparation and support of CTE teachers, there is little they can do when it comes to differential pay based on supply and demand within the teaching profession and this is a challenge the Board must come to terms with. Ms. Critchfield then comments this is a frequent topic of conversation in her region which is experiencing a boom in industry, particularly manufacturing, that has led to an increase to expand technical offerings, however, this is seen as adversarial by other teachers. Mr. Johnson then responds it is the intent of ICTE for career technical education to be viewed as complimentary to rather than in competition with academic education and that CTE programs provide a competitive advantage to every student, regardless of where they are going in their career.

Dr. Clark then comments the elements shared today, specifically mentoring, are very important when the Board considers ways to address the current teacher shortage.

There were no additional questions or comments from the Board.

At this time the Board recessed for 15 minutes, returning at 9:55am PST.

4. Cisco Networking Academy

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

Planning, Policy and Governmental Affairs (PPGA) Committee Chair, Mr. Don Soltman, introduced the item and then invited Ms. Sara Shreve, Program Manager for the Cisco Networking Academy an update to the Board.

Ms. Shreve begins by sharing with Board members the Cisco Networking Academy provides information and communication technology and networking courses to high schools, community colleges and universities by offering a comprehensive teaching and learning program licensed free to not-for-profit organizations. Ms. Shreve then updated the Board on how secondary and postsecondary programs are using the Cisco Networking Academy to meet workforce needs.

Board member Soltman asks what the minimum certificate(s) for an entry level job would be to which Ms. Shreve responds it would depend on the course, and for example, the IT Essentials course, which is a 70 hour course taken in one semester or two, leads to an A+ Certification a high school student could take and at completion could apply for an entry level job,

There were no additional questions or comments from the Board.

5. Idaho Regional Optical Network (IRON) Update

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

Board Secretary and Idaho Regional Optical Network (IRON) Representative, Dr. David Hill, introduced the item and then invited IRON President and CEO Mr. Brent Stacey to present the update to the Board.

Mr. Stacey begins by sharing with Board members IRON is a 501 3© organization focused on serving research and education in Idaho through a dedicated high-performance network for higher education and research institutions to secure access to the nation's two very high speed, fiber optic broadband networks. IRON's fiber routes run from Coeur d'Alene to Salt Lake City, Utah and from Seattle, Washington to Idaho Falls and continues to expand across the state. Mr. Stacey then shared with the Board the collaboration between the Idaho National Laboratory and the state's colleges and universities is ahead of the building schedule at that when complete, the IRON framework will have been installed completely and be poised for education to take full advantage of this new state asset.

Board member Critchfield then asked how the IRON network is installed to which Mr. Stacey responds IRON is a middle mile provider, providing the backbone across the state, with the last mile more of a challenge requiring collaboration between the colleges and universities and local providers.

Board member Soltman then asks as school districts look toward the future and infrastructure, what the focus should be. Mr. Stacey responds fiber optics, especially as the state moves towards more dual-credit and other advanced opportunity courses. Mr. Stacey then adds IRON is available to the school districts to provide insight on how best to grow their networks. Mr. Soltman comments this would be helpful information to share with the schools.

The Board's Executive Director, Mr. Matt Freeman, then asks if IRON works with the Idaho Technology Association (ITA). Mr. Stacey responds some but not as much as they could, adding IRON does not try to advocate their position, but is a resource that is always available.

There were no additional questions or comments from the Board.

6. Board Policy I.Q. Accountability Oversight Committee – Second Reading

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Soltman/Westerberg): To approve the second reading of Board Policy I.Q. Accountability Oversight Committee as provided in Attachment 1. The motion carried 7-0. Mr. Scoggin was absent from voting.

Planning, Policy and Governmental Affairs (PPGA) Committee Chair, Mr. Don Soltman, introduced the item, reminding Board members the expansion of the Accountability Oversight Committee by two positions will allow for broader representation of the committee while remaining a manageable size. Additionally, Mr. Soltman shares there were no comments received between the first and second reading and there have been no changes to the policy.

There were no questions or comments from the Board.

7. Board Policy IV.E. Eastern Idaho Technical College – Second Reading

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Soltman/Westerberg): To approve the second reading of Board Policy IV.E. Eastern Idaho Technical College, repealing the section in its entirety. The motion carried 7-0. Mr. Scoggin was absent from voting.

Planning, Policy and Governmental Affairs (PPGA) Committee Chair, Mr. Don Soltman, introduced the item, reminding Board members once the second reading is approved Section IV.I will be removed from the Board's Governing Policies and Procedures. Additionally, Mr. Soltman shares there were no comments received between the first and second reading and there have been no changes to the policy.

There were no questions or comments from the Board.

BUSINESS AFFAIRS AND HUMAN RESOURCES (BAHR)**Section I – Human Resources**

1. Board Policy II.F. – Policies Regarding Non-Classified Employees – Second Reading

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Atchley/Soltman): To approve the second reading of the proposed amendment to Board Policy Section II.F.2.b.vi. Policies Regarding Non-Classified Employees, Automobile Exclusion and Courtesy Vehicles as provided in Attachment 1. The motion carried 7-0. Mr. Scoggin was absent from voting.

Business Affairs and Human Resources (BAHR) Committee Chair, Ms. Emma Atchley, introduced the item, reminding Board members the proposed amendment is the result of discussions with the State Risk Management office and clarifies the insurance requirements when local dealerships provide courtesy vehicles to institution personnel who choose to make personal use of those vehicles. Additionally, Ms. Atchley shares there were no changes from the approved first reading.

There were no questions or comments from the Board.

2. Boise State University – Amendment to Multi-Year Employment Agreement for Bryan Harsin – Head Football Coach

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Atchley/Critchfield): To approve the request by Boise State University to enter into the multi-year agreement with Bryan Harsin, Head Football Coach as proposed in Attachment 1. The motion carried 7-0. Mr. Scoggin was absent from voting.

Business Affairs and Human Resources (BAHR) Committee Chair, Ms. Emma Atchley, introduced the item sharing with Board members the request from Boise State University (BSU) includes significant changes to the existing contract for BSU Head Football Coach Bryan Harsin that require Board approval. Ms. Atchley then requested the Vice President and Chief Financial Officer for Boise State University, Mr. Mark Heil, present the proposed changes to the Board.

Mr. Heil begins by sharing with Board members the proposed contract changes are a result of BSU wanting to show their support for Head Football Coach Bryan Harsin and the football program by offering Mr. Harsin incentives tied to a successful season. Mr. Heil then states the requested changes also include the addition of liquidated damages for termination for convenience by Mr. Harsin, not included in the original agreement. Board member Westerberg then expressed his appreciation for BSU's progress on the liquidated damages, adding the contracts for a highly successful coach need to be competitive, however, it is his opinion the proposed damages are not enough when compared to similar contracts within the Mountain West division.

There were no additional questions or comments from the Board.

Section II – Finance

1. FY 2019 College and Universities Summary of Sources and Uses of Funds
This item was provided in the agenda materials as an information item.

Business Affairs and Human Resources (BAHR) Committee Chair, Ms. Emma Atchley, introduced the item and then asked the Board's Chief Fiscal Officer, Dr. Carson Howell, to provide an overview of the report to the Board.

Dr. Howell shares with Board members the College and Universities receive funding from a variety of sources and the purpose of the report is to provide a summary of the revenue sources.

Board member Westerberg then requested clarification on what is included in the Academic Support category. Responding on behalf of the (4) four 4-year institutions was University of Idaho Vice President for Finance and Administration, Mr. Brian Foisy who responds the nationally recognized definition for the Academic Support category includes expenses incurred to provide support services for the institution's primary missions: instruction, research, and public service and includes academic administration, galleries, audio/visual services, etc.

Board member Atchley then requested clarification on what is included in the Institutional Support category to which Mr. Foisy responds the nationally recognized definition for the Institutional Support category includes expenses for central, executive-level activities concerned with management and long-range planning for the entire institution, such as planning and programming operations and legal services; fiscal operations; and activities concerned with community and alumni relations, including development and fund raising, etc. Ms. Atchley then asks if institutional support is primarily administrative in nature to which Mr. Foisy responds in the affirmative.

There were no additional questions or comments from the Board.

2. Outcomes Based Funding

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Atchley/Hill): To waive Board Policy V.S. Allocation of Lump Sum Appropriation for the Fiscal Year 2020 budget. The motion carried 7-0. Mr. Scoggin was absent from voting.

AND

M/S (Atchley/Westerberg): To approve the College and Universities Outcomes Based Funding model as outlined in Attachment 2, with the adjustment of the weighted distribution weights for the high impact, at-risk and on-time multiplier, and the 3-year implementation plan as follows:

**FY2020: \$11,000,000 of new state funding and \$3,000,000 of existing base funding;
FY2021: \$7,500,000 of new state funding and \$5,500,000 of existing base funding;
FY2022: \$4,000,000 of new state funding and \$5,500,000 of existing base funding.**
The motion carried 7-0. Mr. Scoggin was absent from voting.

AND

M/S (Atchley/Hill): To approve the Community Colleges Outcomes Based Funding model as outlined in Attachment 3, and the 2-year implementation plan as follows:

**FY2020: \$3,000,000 of new state funding and \$491,000 of existing base funding;
FY2021: \$597,875 of new state funding and \$994,000 of existing base funding.**
The motion carried 7-0. Mr. Scoggin was absent from voting.

AND

M/S (Atchley/Westerberg): To approve the Career Technical Education Outcomes Based Funding model as outlined in Attachment 4, and the 3-year implementation plan as follows:

**FY2020: \$2,000,000 of new state funding and \$500,000 of existing base funding;
FY2021: \$1,000,000 of new state funding and \$900,000 of existing base funding;
FY2022: \$612,383 of new state funding and \$1,000,000 of existing base funding.**
The motion carried 7-0. Mr. Scoggin was absent from voting.

Business Affairs and Human Resources (BAHR) Committee Chair, Ms. Emma Atchley, introduced the item reminding Board members of the discussion around Outcomes Based Funding during the October 17, 2018 Work Session and the motions before the Board today reflect that discussion.

Prior to going to motion, Board member Westerberg requested unanimous consent for the BAHR committee to review the issue of stacking of awards for the 4-year institutions under the Outcomes Based Funding (OBF) model. Board member Soltman asks if the intent is for this to be an ongoing review to which Mr. Westerberg responds in the affirmative. There were no objections to the request for unanimous consent.

The Board's Executive Director, Mr. Matt Freeman, then reminds Board members that Board Policy V.S. includes the Enrollment Workload Adjustment (EWA) Formula and the motion before the Board today is to waive the EWA formula in lieu of Outcomes Based Funding.

Board member Clark then asked for clarification on the implementation plan for the community colleges outcomes based funding model and why this model is for two (2) years and not three (3) years like the other models. The Board's Chief Fiscal Officer, Dr. Carson Howell, responds the model was built on historical data and until this year there were only three community colleges in the state. Dr. Howell then states with the addition of the College of Eastern Idaho (CEI), there will be a review after the second year to evaluate the third year implementation.

There were no additional questions or comments from the Board.

3. Boise State University – Contract Addendum One to TouchNet Information Systems, Inc.

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Atchley/Hill): To approve the request by Boise State University to amend the TouchNet Third Application Subscription Program Agreement for the purchase and implementation of TouchNet e-Bill Solution Software at an additional cost not to exceed \$290,653.69 as provided in Attachment 1. The motion carried 7-0. Mr. Scoggin was absent from voting.

Business Affairs and Human Resources (BAHR) Committee Chair, Ms. Emma Atchley, introduced the item and shared with Board members the addendum increases the total value of the contract to more than \$1,000,000, thus requiring Board approval.

There were no questions or comments from the Board.

4. Boise State University – Reduction to 2019 Summer Student Fees

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Atchley/Westerberg): To approve the request by Boise State University to set the summer 2019 resident undergraduate fee at \$280.00 per credit, the non-resident undergraduate fee at \$315 per credit, the resident graduate fee at \$355 per credit and the non-resident graduate fee at \$390 per credit. The motion carried 7-0. Mr. Scoggin was absent from voting.

Business Affairs and Human Resources (BAHR) Committee Chair, Ms. Emma Atchley, introduced the item and then invited Boise State University (BSU) Interim Provost, Dr. Tony Roark, and Associate Vice President for Budget and Planning, Mr. Kenneth Kline, to present the proposal to the Board.

Dr. Roark begins the presentation by sharing with Board members BSU served 9,000 students during the last summer session and while this is the highest number of students served by BSU during this term, students are still underutilizing the summer session. Dr. Roark then states BSU would like to implement a discount for the summer session fees of 20% in an attempt to make the cost of college more affordable as well as to help students make progress towards a degree. Finally, Dr. Roark states BSU has the

capacity to support the reduced fee structure and plans to package this as a part of the “Think 30” Program adding, an analysis of student success conducted by BSU has found the D, Fail, Withdraw (DFW) rates to be 3-points lower in the summer than the regular term.

Board member Westerberg then asked how BSU arrived at the 20% decrease and if there is any research to support this number. Mr. Kline responds for students taking 15 credit hours per semester, fall and spring, the cost per credit is 20% less than the regular part time rate contributing to the perception the summer term is more expensive. Additionally, BSU surveyed students who were taking 12 credit hours while working and asked if a tuition discount of 10% would compel them to attend the summer session. A majority of students answered no. When asked if a tuition discount of 20% would compel them to attend, the majority responded in the affirmative.

There were no additional questions or comments from the Board.

5. University of Idaho – Purchase Agreement – Rinker Rock Creek Ranch

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Atchley/Westerberg): To approve the request by the University of Idaho to purchase the Rinker Rock Creek Ranch Property as described in Attachment 3 Exhibit A, for an amount not to exceed \$1,252,388 in substantial conformance with the terms of purchase set out in Attachment 3; and further, to authorize the Vice President of Finance and Administration of the University of Idaho to execute and deliver all necessary transaction documents for closing the purchase. The motion carried 7-0. Mr. Scoggin was absent from voting.

Business Affairs and Human Resources (BAHR) Committee Chair, Ms. Emma Atchley, introduced the item and invited University of Idaho Vice President for Finance and Administration, Mr. Brian Foisy and University Counsel Mr. Kent Nelson to present the proposal to the Board.

Mr. Foisy begins by sharing with Board members the request before the Board today is an opportunity for the University of Idaho (UI) to purchase a 10,400 acre parcel of property for a purchase price significantly below market value. Mr. Foisy continues the purchase price would provide the current owners, the Nature Conservancy and the Wood River Land Trust, with the return of funds used to purchase the property and that the Wood River Land Trust and the Nature Conservancy would have the right to purchase the property back, if UI were to back out, and return the purchase price plus 2% for each year the university owned the property.

Board member Clark asked if the property is a fully working ranch to which Mr. Foisy responds the property is largely undeveloped and has great value as a research facility for rangeland operations including grazing cattle in conjunction with the ranching

operation based at the Nancy M Cummings Research Education and Extension Center in Salmon, Idaho.

Board member Atchley then asks if the property will be a part of UI's educational mission to use the land for experimentation and research in terms of grazing practices to which Mr. Foisy responds in the affirmative.

There were no additional questions or comments from the Board.

6. Lewis-Clark State College – Career Technical Education Building Project – Funding and Construction Authorization

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Atchley/Soltman): To approve the request by Lewis-Clark State College to implement the bidding and construction phases of the capital project to design and construct a proposed Career Technical Education Center, as described in Attachment 1, and to authorize the Vice President for Finance and Administration to execute all necessary and requisite consulting contracts to bid, award, and complete the construction phase of the project for an amount not to exceed \$21,000,000. The motion carried 7-0. Mr. Scoggin was absent from voting.

Business Affairs and Human Resources (BAHR) Committee Chair, Ms. Emma Atchley, introduced the item and invited President of Lewis-Clark State College (LCSC), Dr. Cynthia Pemberton, and Vice President for Finance and Administration, Mr. Todd Kilburn, to present the proposal to the Board.

Dr. Pemberton begins by sharing with Board members the request before the Board today is to approve the implementation of the bidding and construction phases of the new Career Technical Education Center. Dr. Pemberton then states the estimated budget for the project is higher than previous estimates mainly due to uncertainties around the cost of steel. Finally, in the interest of complete transparency, Dr. Pemberton shares with the Board the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) has requested, under separate cover, submittal of the water analysis for the project and that LCSC has responded and does not anticipate any issues.

Mr. Kilburn then shared an update of the project budget and funding sources with the Board.

There were no questions or comments from the Board.

OTHER BUSINESS

Prior to adjournment, Dr. Clark shared with members of the Board and the audience the December Regularly scheduled Board meeting will be hosted by the College of Western Idaho (CWI) on the campus of Boise State University (BSU) and that additional details for this meeting will be made available on the Board's website.

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

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Critchfield/Westerberg): To adjourn the meeting at 10:49 am (PST). The motion carried 7-0.



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

DRAFT

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.

DRAFT MINUTES

November 8, 2018

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

DRAFT MINUTES

November 8, 2018

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.