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BOISE STATE UNIVERSITY

SUBJECT  
Boise State University Annual Report

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

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

IMPACT  
Boise State University's strategic plan drives the university's planning, programming, budgeting, and assessment cycles and is the basis for the institution's annual budget requests and performance measure reports. Although the timeline for the university's prior strategic plan, Focus on Effectiveness, has lapsed, the goals of that plan continue to guide us as we prepare to begin the strategic planning process anew.

ATTACHMENTS  
Attachment 1 – Boise State University Annual Progress Report

BOARD STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS  
Boise State University’s annual report gives the Board the opportunity to discuss the institution’s progress toward meeting strategic goals, initiatives the institution may be implementing to meet those goals, and progress toward the Board’s student completion initiatives.

BOARD ACTION  
This item is for informational purposes only.
Since providing our last Annual Progress Report to the Board, Boise State University, as all Idaho universities, had to plan, prepare for and operate in the face of a global pandemic. This began less than a year after welcoming Dr. Marlene Tromp as our seventh president. These historic events coincided with the expiration of our strategic plan, Focus on Effectiveness 2012-2020. We seized the opportunity, during this period of adversity, to learn new ways of serving our community and introduced those insights into our new plan with the goal of helping Idaho thrive and our students succeed.
Boise State’s University Foundations (UF) program reimagined general education by providing a connected, multidisciplinary framework of learning from freshman year through senior year. This kind of work represents one of the innovations for which Boise State is nationally known: defying the boundaries between disciplines to help students think critically in new ways and to prepare them for life after graduation.

New innovations include:

- We provide all first-year students greater access to tenured and tenure-track faculty in smaller University Foundations 100 sections, which has proven to enhance retention.
- The General Education Committee, a subcommittee of the Faculty Senate, now exercises significant authority and oversight for the entire program. Department-based general education courses are subject to more stringent standards, resulting in a more cohesive and effective academic experience for students.
- Finishing Foundations, our capstone course for all graduating seniors, now includes a “making sense of college education” reflection assignment. It has proven effective in helping students articulate their knowledge and skills for life after graduation. Before students graduate, they have a guided experience that includes articulating their vision for the future, looking back at the skills and experiences they gained at Boise State, and naming specific next steps for reaching their goals.
One of the three recommendations in the Commission’s 2019 re-accreditation report stated: “Document the assessment of all academic programs, and use the results of its assessments to inform academic and student-learning planning and practices (Standards 4.A.3, 4.B.2).”

Our recent framework and process for assessment of Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs), Program Assessment Review (PAR), was implemented in 2016-17 as a free-standing process utilizing a rigorous peer-review protocol in which academic units receive feedback on their assessments of learning from faculty outside of their program. The university completed its first three-year cycle of assessing all programs in 2018-19, and completed the first year of PAR evaluations of the second three-year cycle in 2019-20 using the newly revised PAR methodology.

The university had initiated a broad review of the PAR process in 2019, given the Commission’s recommendation to continue to enhance assessment. Under the leadership of Institutional Research and working with faculty and staff committees, we made the following PAR revisions:

1. Integrating the PLO assessment with the University Learning Outcomes (ULO) assessment, in particular for General Education courses, to better align university assessment processes and increase efficiency and effectiveness of both PLO and ULO assessments.

2. Reviewing and revising curriculum maps, assessment templates, and rubrics.

3. Reviewing and redesigning resources, training, and support for faculty who participate in PAR.

The new PAR has more significant emphasis on continuous improvement and curriculum maps that include both PLOs and ULOs creating a more holistic view of the curriculum, and keeping the alignment of courses and ULOs at the forefront for departments. Most recent work focuses on creating an overarching set of assessment principles for the university that would encompass PAR and ULO/University Foundations assessment.
Boise State continues to expand its curricular offerings in targeted areas driven by an analysis of student, industry, and community demand, as well as by our research about where we can create new innovations that will enhance student learning, research, and positively impact our state and nation.

These exciting new programs will improve the delivery of K-12 in the state, prepare more students to serve in a rapidly evolving healthcare industry, ready our state and our students for a new tech economy, and increase not only our students’ post-baccalaureate success but also the availability of a highly-trained workforce for Idaho.

Our Triple Discipline bachelor’s degree allows students to combine almost any three undergraduate minors and certificates into a custom multidisciplinary degree that adds up to unique and attractive qualifications in the job market. This past year, the College of Arts and Sciences enhanced the Triple Discipline (3D) program by creating a faculty mentoring committee and launching an introductory 3D course.
Goal #2: Facilitate the timely attainment of educational goals of our diverse student population.

Boise State has invested significant effort and resources toward the achievement of this goal with tangible success, and we have intentionally aligned our efforts with the Complete College America (CCA) Game Changer strategies. The SBOE’s adoption of Complete College America’s “Momentum Pathways Project” has focused our work. In addition, CCA has recently brought considerable focus to the importance of reducing the equity gaps experienced between different student populations.

In addition, Boise State is a member of the Powered by Publics Coalition of the Association of Public and Landgrant Universities (APLU), which has a focus similar to that of CCA: increase the number of college graduates and close equity gaps.

Our coverage of Goal #2 has four sections:

1. **Overall progress** relative to this goal.
2. **The importance of equity in college attainment** — why it’s important, where Boise State stands in terms of equity, and what actions we are taking to achieve equity.
3. **Student Wellness and Mental Health**.
4. **An update on “Game Changer Strategies”** — our status, description of current activities, and plans relative to the six Game Changer Strategies that constitute the Momentum Pathways Project. Embedded within each of the Game Changers is a description of the challenges presented by the COVID pandemic and a description of actions taken to mitigate those challenges.

**OVERALL PROGRESS**

We are very proud to have played a key role in contributing to the college attainment rate for Idaho. The number of baccalaureate graduates from Boise State has increased every year over the past decade, with a stunning overall increase of **66 percent from 2009-10 to 2019-20**. As a result, **Boise State has exceeded the targets put forth by the SBOE in August 2010 as part of the overall strategy of achieving the state’s 60 percent goal.**

The SBOE targets, which spanned 2009-10 through 2019-20, galvanized Boise State’s efforts to increase the number of students we graduate. A new set of targets resulted from Boise State’s proposed contribution to the APLU’s effort to increase the number of graduates nationwide; those targets are depicted in the graph to the right. The graph also shows that to achieve those targets will require a continued increase in the size of our incoming cohort and/or a further increase in our graduation rate; without any increases, Boise State’s annual number of baccalaureate graduates will level off at about 3,800.
Graduate-level programs are also an important aspect of serving Idaho and Idahoans, and Boise State continues to develop a variety of new programs. The number of graduates from those degree and certificate programs has nearly doubled over the last decade.
As a public institution of higher education, a key aspect of the mission of Boise State is its work to increase the attainment of a college education by the people of the state of Idaho.

In Idaho, some groups have a substantially lower likelihood of completing college, especially those who are first generation, Hispanic/Native American, rural, and have a lower family income. Two examples are shown below. Whereas 40% of White Idahoans have an associate’s degree or above, only 13% of Latinx Idahoans have that level of educational attainment.

The percentage of Idahoans with an associate’s degree or higher varies widely from county to county, from less than 20% to over 55%. And in Boise State’s 10 county service area, the percentage varies from 18% in Owyhee County to 48% in Ada County.

Two key impacts of these inequities are as follows:

- Education is key to providing Idahoans the opportunity to develop the talents and skills necessary for employment. Education can have a transformational impact on students (and their families) in terms of employment opportunities and upward economic mobility. Students from all backgrounds must have the same access to and support for pursuing a college education, or they miss out on the opportunity to develop those skills and talents, develop their full potential, and give back to our great state.

- Education is key to increasing the size and competence of the state’s workforce, as is captured in Idaho’s 60% goal. Increasing the rate of college attainment in all groups, especially those populations that are presently underrepresented populations, is the most impactful way to increase the size and competence of the workforce, and achieve our state’s 60% goal.
Boise State’s ability to increase college attainment rates among all the underrepresented groups requires increasing the number of underrepresented students who enroll in college and increasing their success at graduating from college.

Although Boise State has made remarkable strides in improving retention and graduation rates over the past decade, we have not yet significantly reduced the achievement gaps between various groups of students.

As shown in the figures, the gap for six-year graduation rate between Pell-eligible and non-Pell-eligible students is fourteen percentage points and seven percentage points for first time and transfer students, respectively. The gap for underrepresented ethnic minorities is four points and five points, respectively. Finally, the gap in four-year graduation rate of first-generation students is 12 points and five points, respectively. The impact of closing the equity gap on the number of graduates would be substantial. For example, closing just the gap between those who are and are not first-generation in the 4-year graduation rate would graduate 150 additional students each year.
Trends in the numbers of underrepresented students enrolling at Boise State suggest ongoing issues of access to a university education. Data indicates that numbers for first-time, full-time Pell-eligible students, underrepresented minority students, and first-generation students are essentially flat, whereas numbers are increasing substantially over time for students who are not in these categories. For transfer students, the differences are less substantial, but do exist, especially for Pell-eligible students.

Boise State’s work to address equity gaps includes a variety of actions, many of which are listed below:

- **Increased need-based financial aid:** In the last 18 months, the university has received nearly $1.7M in gifts and pledges for need-based scholarships; of that, $1M is for scholarships with an Idaho residency requirement. A key component of our need-based financial aid is our True Blue Promise scholarship, which has the goal of ensuring support for all qualified Idaho college students, eliminating the financial barrier to their success. Scholarships remain our highest fundraising priority.

- **A focus on rural communities:** In fall 2020, we launched the Community Impact Program (CIP). We engaged in dialogue with three communities — McCall, Mountain Home and Payette — to learn their educational needs. In response to those needs and in collaboration with local community and economic leaders, we are delivering a hybrid-format program.
  - Sixteen students of a variety of ages enrolled in the fall 2020 semester. They include students who are overcoming a variety of barriers: mothers of young children, military spouses, returning adults, and students returning after a “gap year.” The goal is to enroll an additional 30 students for fall 2021.
  - Students received a scholarship that cut their per-credit cost in half.
  - There are exciting indications that the program has an impact on students beyond those enrolled: the go-on rate from these three communities increased by between 17 percent and 28 percent, whereas the go-on rate in four “control” communities (communities that are similar but are not part of the program) decreased by as much as 50 percent.
• All students were enrolled in a course focused on entrepreneurship as part of the first year Community Impact certificate. Eight of them extended their learning and utilized mentoring by a faculty member from the College of Business and Economics beyond the end of the course.
  
  All eight students — a stunning 50 percent of those enrolled in the program — started new business ventures.
  
• The Apple Onramp program, designed to provide access to equipment and high-quality instruction using Apple’s Everyone Can Code and Everyone Can Create curriculum, has been expanded to support each of the partnering communities via local libraries and one school district (Payette). Training for librarians and teachers started in summer 2020 and new equipment was deployed in fall 2020.
  
• The CIP program has created considerable interest among local business owners seeking advice from Boise State faculty members and community-based problem-solving from students in the program.
  
• The Hometown Challenge provides scholarship dollars for students to return home and create projects that give back to their local communities.
  
• Recruitment of students from underrepresented groups includes the following activities by the Office of Admissions:
  
  • Visited rural high schools to recruit rural students and provide them information about transitioning to Boise State, resources available to help them succeed, and an overview of on-campus jobs.
  
  • In addition to traditional college fairs and high school visits, actively engaged with community-based organizations whose mission it is to increase the go-on rate in populations that are underrepresented in higher education in our state, including the Diversity Network for Student Success, Refugee Student Support Network, and the Idaho Commission on Hispanic Affairs.
  
  • Collaborated with Idaho Commission on Hispanic Affairs and Boise State’s student organization, Organización de Estudiantes Latino-Americanos, to host hundreds of Latinx students at the Hispanic Youth Leadership Summit and participated in Project: Dream for Tomorrow.
  
  • Hosted a one-day program targeting first-generation students with financial need and those from an underrepresented race or ethnicity designed to help students prepare for college.
  
  • Hosted a monthly Spanish-language radio show heard throughout the Treasure Valley in order to engage Spanish-speaking families and promote higher education and Boise State University.
  
  • Targeted communication to students from a variety of backgrounds to provide key assistance from the point of inquiry to enrollment.
  
  • Collaborated with educational partners like TRIO, AVID and Gear Up by providing special presentations, group visits and key admissions, financial aid and scholarship information that targeted the needs of each specific group. These educational partners also provide insight into individual students’ personal, financial and academic needs, which is then used to personalize the service provided to students.
  
• Faculty Development: The Center for Teaching and Learning has enhanced opportunities for faculty members to become better teachers for the student population we now serve.
  
  • During a semester-long “Designing for Student Success” faculty learning community, faculty explore evidence-based strategies to support first-generation, low-income, and other underrepresented students to be successful. Two cohorts of about 10 faculty, most of whom teach lower-division courses critical for student success, have completed this experience. In the first cohort, nearly all participating faculty were more successful supporting students, as evidenced by smaller (or fully-closed) gaps in passing rates between majority students and those less likely to succeed (e.g. first gen, Pell-eligible, living off campus). Data from cohort 2 is not yet in. A third cohort will begin work in January 2021.
Boise State recently learned that we have been awarded funding from the APLU's Powered by Publics seed-funding competition to support collaborative projects. The project (Faculty as Change Agents for Equity and Student Success, $22,000) will create a summer institute for faculty from across the Western Coalition fashioned after our local efforts and led by staff from Boise State’s Center for Teaching and Learning in collaboration with leaders from the University of Hawaii.

Workshops support faculty in implementing proven strategies, such as “Transparent Assignments” (see The Transparency in Learning and Teaching in Higher Education project: tilthighered.com), or gaining an understanding of the experience of first-generation students.

Efforts by Boise State aimed at strengthening the social support network for vulnerable students include:

- Launching a program in fall 2019 focused on first-generation commuter students. Roughly 900 students live off campus during their first year. Their retention rate is 71% compared to their on-campus peers at 83%. The program includes outreach and communication, peer mentor opportunities, and connection to resources.
- Hiring a full-time student success coordinator to focus solely on our first-generation students, a group that encompasses many of our rural and underrepresented students.
- Launching a student success online portal called “student life essentials.” This resource is tailored to the ways students look for information. We continue to seek new ways to reach this new generation of students electronically and in face-to-face settings.
- Initiating a student design team to explore first-generation student experiences. They partnered with student researchers to administer a study on rural student experiences and engaged a graduate assistant to help analyze the findings and create interventions to better support rural students.
- Expanding the food pantry in partnership with the Idaho Food Bank, Albertsons and University Foundation to improve offerings and access of fresh foods.
- Securing $7M in 5-year renewable Department of Education TRIO grants for veterans and students with disabilities.

**STUDENT WELLNESS AND MENTAL HEALTH**

An important element of the university’s support of student success requires that we attend to the mental health and overall well-being of students, as well as the staff and faculty who support their growth and development. It is well documented that a large percentage of college students struggle with mental health issues, and Boise State students are not immune: activeminds.org/about-mental-health/statistics/.

In Idaho, data shows that white males are at a disproportionately high risk for suicide and we must support them and all students who enter our institution.

For medical providers at Boise State, approximately 40% of appointments are mental health related. In addition, the pandemic has increased stressors for students, staff, and faculty and has increased the need for mental health services.

**Foundational work (Pre-COVID)**

Even before the pandemic, Counseling Services had been working to address increased student needs. Remarkably, these increases in capacity were accomplished with no increases in staff.
• Between FY18-FY20, appointments increased by 40.5%, an increase in 65 appointments per week.
• Wait times for scheduled appointments were decreased from 4-5 weeks to 3 weeks.
• The office created and sustained five new counseling groups.
• Additional efforts were focused on wellness, including BroncoFit’s 8 Dimensions of Wellness.
• Held 120 outreach events, including guest lectures, training, and discussions. Developed partnerships across campus to create educational and preventive initiatives to address mental health and wellness from multiple angles.
• Launched an initiative to become “America's Healthiest Learning Environment” because we know that well-being is paramount to student success and their ability to graduate.
• Coordinated BroncoFit, a student and employee wellness program, utilizing staff liaisons in departments across the university and about 20 student staff. The BroncoFit program reached 9,000 campus community members in FY20, including after the wellness programs were moved to virtual formats.
• Propelled Boise State into prominence as a national thought leader by hosting over 700 participants from across the country in strategic dialogue to support student engagement and wellbeing through the Project Launchpad Summit.

Current efforts (in the midst of COVID challenges)

The pandemic has called upon us to attend to new and unique challenges facing students, staff and faculty. An October 2020 student survey (n=881) revealed that 87.06% of students were experiencing either increased or significantly increased stress levels and 61.68% of students felt lonely or isolated. It is important to note that the impact of the pandemic is related to issues of equity, as the pandemic has had a disproportionately negative impact on those students who already have the fewest resources and are most likely to be marginalized in our educational system.

Our response to these challenges include changes to meet individual needs and efforts to impact the campus culture so that everyone can play a role in supporting student well-being.

• Created COVID educational content; used social media to share messages with students. Student engagement with Health Services’ accounts has increased exponentially.
• Pivoted to offering over 95% of Counseling Services via Telehealth through HIPAA-compliant Zoom sessions.
• Arranged to provide services temporarily across state lines to students throughout the country while a declared state of emergency existed in the student’s state of residence.
• Further increased Counseling Services appointments.
• Implemented both a staff therapeutic counseling group and a faculty therapeutic counseling group, due to increased demands on services by faculty and staff.
• Counseling Services Director has done 47 presentations to campus groups since July on coping with 2020 related stressors.
• Engaged staff from across the university to provide outreach to students in quarantine or isolation (more than 100 calls per week); created and distributed 300 COVID care kits for students in isolation.
• Formed a new Wellness Working Group, in response to a call from the President, with representatives from across campus. The group has distributed recommendations through campus town hall meetings and has made presentations about trauma-informed care to faculty and students.
• Created Midday Mindfulness, a 10-15 mindfulness program offered four times each week for our entire campus community.

Future

Even after the pandemic subsides, challenges around mental health and well-being in Idaho will persist. We intend to leverage lessons learned during the pandemic to build a campus culture focused on wellness, so that students can gain the full benefit of their years as students at Boise State and reach their academic and career goals. To work toward this aspirational vision, we plan to:

• Embed the President’s Wellness Working group into regular structures of the university in order to support a campus culture move toward a public health approach to wellness.
• Increase staffing in Health Services (medical, counseling, and wellness/BroncoFit) to support campus needs. The increased capacity of the past few years is not sustainable without additional resources.
• Ensure fair compensation for current positions in order to retain and recruit high-quality staff.
• Integrate well-being into the curriculum so that every student learns the 8 dimensions of wellness principles (and all staff and faculty know how to support them).

CCA Game Changer #1: “Think 30”

Focus and Expected outcomes:

Students too often take fewer credits per semester (or year) than they could successfully complete, thereby prolonging their time in college and decreasing their likelihood of finishing. Boise State has implemented tactics to increase the number of credits taken per year and decrease the time to completion. We recognize and respect that some students with full-time jobs and families, for example, may be unable to attend school full-time. For these students, “Think 30” may not be appropriate.

Implementation of this strategy should result in more students who are able to attend full-time and graduate on-time (4 years, 120 credits). In addition, part-time students can accrue credits and graduate more quickly than they otherwise would.

Challenges of COVID:

• Higher rates of unemployment have resulted in fewer students being able to afford to attend college; lower-income students are particularly vulnerable. The result is slower progress to degree.
• The transition of many of our classes to remote/online has had two major impacts:
  • Learning remotely or online requires students to draw upon different skills to manage their time and connect with peers and faculty. This means that some students find navigating their classes more challenging.
  • Some students may have been reluctant to enroll because they had an unwarranted assumption that online/remote classes might be of lower quality or they may have known from past experience that they struggled in an online/remote environment.
STRATEGIES TO MITIGATE THE CHALLENGES OF COVID:

- For the fall 2020 and spring 2021 semesters, the university suspended the typical $30 per credit fee assessed on online courses.
- To help faculty to prepare for an uncertain fall 2020 semester, Boise State’s eCampus Center and Center for Teaching and Learning partnered to provide extensive support for instructors preparing to teach online, remote, and hybrid courses. The Flexible Teaching for Student Success (FTSS) Initiative was focused on preparing faculty to teach in a variety of modalities and to be flexible with students facing numerous challenges during the pandemic. It consisted of three tiers, designed to provide faculty different ways of preparing, depending on their needs.
  - Tier 1 - 3-week online institute: 326 participants
  - Tier 2 - workshops: 174 participants
  - Tier 3 - help sessions/resources: 146 participants
- The staff hours utilized to support various aspects of FTSS (including planning, facilitation, and operations) totalled 4,183 hours
  - 44 staff and faculty facilitated sessions across Tiers 1-3
  - eCampus Center staff devoted an additional 1,350 hours of course development time to High Enrollment/High Impact (HE/HI) projects, which resulted in an additional 1,750 students enrolled in high-quality, online courses.
  - Overall satisfaction with different sessions of FTSS was high, ranging from 87% to 97%

600+ faculty participants
over 4000 hours of planning, facilitation and operations of FTSS workshops
Ongoing Activities and Current Status:

- **FINISH-IN-FOUR PROGRAM:** participating students sign a contract stating they will stay on their plan, and Boise State guarantees that necessary courses will be available to enable students to complete in four years. Budget cuts could impact our ability to provide these courses. **About 700 students participate.**

- In summer 2019 and summer 2020, we **discounted undergraduate per-credit cost of attending summer school by 20%** compared with fall and spring semesters. We are also engaging a robust marketing campaign using a “**Think 30: On Time On Track**” message to motivate students to take summer courses as a way of reaching 30 credits for the full year. As a result of the discount and associated marketing campaign, the number of undergraduate credit hours taken in summer sessions increased from 26,932 in 2018 to 29,015 in 2019 to 34,352 in 2020, for an **overall increase of 4,650 credit hours or 15%.**

- Expansion of need-based scholarships (as described above in the equity section) will help — a key reason that students (especially low-income students) take fewer than 15 credits per semester is that they must work.

- As can be seen in the graphs below, there has been a modest increase in students completing 30 credits per year and in the average credits per semester.

![Graphs showing percentage of students completing 30 or more credits per year and average # credits attempted by full-time undergraduate students (fall semester)]

**PLANS**

The COVID pandemic resulted in the delay of our development and implementation of a multi-threaded “Think 30” marketing campaign. We will restart our efforts in the near future.

Implement a Customer Relations Management solution that will facilitate identification of students who are not on track to accumulate 30 credits in a given year, providing an opportunity for earlier intervention, which is more likely to help us impact student success.
Focus and Expected Outcomes:

- Optimize the ways that students progress through mathematics requirements, including non-STEM pathways, thereby minimizing the negative impacts of changing major and transferring among institutions.
- Replace remedial math courses with credit-bearing gateway courses that provide supplemental support. Hasten completion of general education math courses to reduce student attrition and time to degree.

Additional Boise State Expected Outcomes:

- Build student self-efficacy for learning mathematics.
- Increase success in subsequent math and STEM coursework in support of students pursuing degrees that rely on Calculus.

Challenges of COVID:

- Boise State’s pre-COVID model for early math typically had one day of class in the computer lab with teaching assistants available to provide immediate help and one day of class spent in groups of four solving problems. However, neither format works well given the requirements of physical distancing. It is particularly challenging to have effective face-to-face interactions in a classroom that holds 40 students in a physically distanced format.
- The building of self-efficacy is much more effective when based on face-to-face interactions. However, physical distancing puts constraints on the ability of instructors to interact face-to-face with their students. Similarly, tutoring is much more effective in a face-to-face format.

STRATEGIES TO MITIGATE THE CHALLENGES OF COVID:

- Classes were redesigned so that (i) students now engage in computer time on their own, with help available via remote conferencing with the instructor. (ii) Each class of 40 was divided in half and each group of 20 works on problems in a whole-class format.
- Tutoring: We maintained a smaller face-to-face component of tutoring, moving many of our tutoring hours to remote to better support students in remote classes and situations.
**Ongoing Activities and Current Status:**

- We currently have **five math pathways** that serve the vast majority of students well. The diagram below shows what courses are appropriate for each of the groups of students identified by revised SBOE policy III.S: Academically prepared, underprepared, and unprepared.

- We have **developed a new credit-bearing course**, MATH 103, that will serve students who had previously taken MATH 025. Those students typically have very little confidence in math and often have not had a math class for several years. They are best served by a course that builds self-confidence and basic math skills. We expect this will be a factor in increasing student success overall, as math is often a barrier course for students.

- We have **created a new course**, MATH 133: Modeling and Functions, to simultaneously serve as a general education math class for students who would typically pursue Math for Liberal Arts and as a stepping-stone for students pursuing STEM or other fields. This course replaces MATH 108, which was not a general education course; therefore, all students are now able to complete a general education math class by their second semester.

**Boise State’s Math Pathways**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Placement Level (per revised SBOE Policy III.S)</th>
<th>STEM/Algebra Pathway</th>
<th>Business Pathway</th>
<th>Elem. Ed Pathway</th>
<th>Statistics Pathway</th>
<th>Liberal Arts Pathway</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academically Prepared</td>
<td>MATH 143 College Algebra (gen ed) &amp; MATH 144</td>
<td>MATH 149 (gen ed) OR MATH 14P if needed</td>
<td>MATH 157 (gen ed)</td>
<td>Or MATH 153P (gen ed)</td>
<td>Or MATH 123P (gen ed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academically Underprepared</td>
<td>MATH 170 CALC I For some: MATH 175/275 Calculus II &amp; III Plus Additional Lower &amp; Upper division Calculus-dependent coursework in Physics, Engineering, etc.</td>
<td>For some: MATH 160 &amp; BUSSTAT 207 &amp; 208</td>
<td>MATH 257</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academically Unprepared</td>
<td>Adaptive placement into MATH 133 for high achievers</td>
<td>Or MATH 153P (gen ed)</td>
<td>MATH 153 (gen ed)</td>
<td>MATH 123 (gen ed)</td>
<td>MATH 133 (gen ed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(often students with no Math for 3+ years)</td>
<td>MATH 108 Elementary (not gen ed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Our Math Learning Center (MLC) employs an adaptive placement model, delivering lower-division math courses through an enhanced “modified emporium” model that has resulted in substantial increases in student success in early math. Fewer repeats (because of higher success) and a better placement strategy have resulted in dramatic decreases in the number of students needing to take early math courses. Greater success in early math and a focus on self-efficacy have resulted in substantial increases in success in subsequent math courses.
Boise State recognizes an important distinction between two sets of pathways: For the STEM, business, and education pathways, success in subsequent math and math-dependent courses is paramount. It is not desirable to rush a student through a course without providing a solid foundation for downstream coursework. Conversely, for the Liberal Arts or Statistics pathways, the primary objective is to provide a general education math course.

To the right is a graph that depicts the increased number of graduates from our Engineering and Computer Science programs, all of which depend heavily on the solid foundation provided by our math courses.

**PLANS**

- Continue to assess the effectiveness of MLC’s operation, including MATH 103 and 133, and adjust as necessary.
- Evaluate the clarity of the connection of math pathways to degree programs to ensure that the pathways assist students in determining what math they should take. Work with advisors to clarify the pathways.
- Compare the effectiveness of two corequisite models for MATH 123. One is the typical model for a corequisite, adding extra support and an extra credit to the MATH 123 class, resulting in MATH 123P. The second is a “pre-P” model in which the student would take MATH 103 the first seven weeks of the semester to provide a solid foundation for taking MATH 123 in the second seven weeks.
- Analyze and assess current funding mechanisms for the MLC. The improvements in student progress described above have had the foreseeable but unintended consequence of reducing the funding base for the center, which threatens to undermine the established successes. A different funding model is required to put the program on firmer budgetary footing and ensure its long-term success.
- Share practices with other state institutions.
Focus and Expected outcomes:
Replace remedial English courses with gateway courses that provide supplemental support in the form of a “P” corequisite studio for students who need it. Hasten completion of general education English courses to reduce student attrition and time to degree; build student self-efficacy in writing.

Challenges of COVID:
• Boise State’s English 101 has a cap of 25 and the “P” corequisite studio has a cap of 9. In both cases, first-year students are able to have substantial valuable interaction with a faculty member in a small class. However, because of COVID, nearly all sections were switched to remote/online, thereby reducing face-to-face interactions.

STRATEGIES TO MITIGATE THE CHALLENGES OF COVID:
• All faculty who had not received earlier EQIP/online pedagogy training completed the Center for Teaching and Learning’s Summer Institute for Flexible Teaching.
• Instructors were encouraged to increase flexibility (in an already flexible program) and to streamline instruction wherever possible.
• While fall 2020 was an incredibly challenging semester, many faculty reported an even higher connection with students.

Ongoing Activities and Current Status:
• Our First Year Writing Program designed a web-based writing placement tool for students called “The Write Class” that has been adopted by colleges and universities around the country.
• We eliminated English 90, our zero-credit remedial course, in 2009 and implemented a pure co-requisite model in English 101-P. “P” stands for “plus,” a one-credit, one-hour per week writing studio where students get hands-on support from trained writing coaches. Success rates for 101-P are virtually identical to those for the traditional 101 class, and success rates in the follow-on class (English 102) are also virtually identical for both populations. For example, of students who initially enrolled in English 101P in fall 2019, 76% have already completed English 102. Of the students who initially enrolled in English 101 in fall 2019, 73% have already completed English 101. While there is some variation from year to year, this overall pattern has been consistent since we transitioned to English 101P.
• The combined success of English 101P and The Write Class have meant that the Boise State First-Year Writing Program is seen as a model of faculty-led curricular revisions that positively affect student success rates. These results have been shared at a number of state-level Complete College America events as well as in several peer-reviewed publications and an edited special issue of Composition Studies on equity and access in corequisite writing courses.
PLANS

• The most pressing need in first-year writing (English 101, 101P, and 102) is for stable, teaching-intensive faculty positions. A reasonably compensated, highly-trained labor force that specializes in first-year writing instruction enhances the strong contributions that first-year writing makes to student retention initiatives. We need to increase the size of that workforce. Therefore we will create a comprehensive funding plan for first-year writing.

• English 101P is now seen as a very positive initial experience for first-year students, one that combines immersion in academic work with additional support. The course is particularly valuable for students in high-risk groups for whom the immersion and support has a disproportionately positive impact. However, the interest in this course exceeds the number of seats we can make available to students, and we have been unable to accommodate those who place into 101 but would prefer the additional support provided in 101P. We will explore the possibility of funding additional lecturer positions to enable an expansion of the availability of English 101P beyond those who typically enroll.

• We also will explore funding additional lecturer positions for English 101 and 102 so as to provide more students with instruction from stable, teaching-intensive faculty.

• Continue to assess the effectiveness of the First-Year Writing program and make adjustments as necessary.

CCA Game Changer #4: Momentum Year

Focus and Expected outcomes:

• Clarity of post-graduate (career) path results in students settling on a major earlier in their academic careers, thereby reducing the impact of switches in major.

• Use of “meta-majors” simplifies navigation, thereby increasing likelihood that students sign up for correct courses in the first place and reducing the loss of progress that may result from changing majors and transferring among different majors and institutions.

• Early progression (30 credits per year and early completion of math and English) to degree increases overall rate of progress.

Additional expected outcomes:

• Promote early academic success: higher pass rates in early coursework (including but not limited to math and English) are an important driver of retention and graduation.

• Increase the ability of students to understand and articulate the value of their degrees and of co-curricular experiences, enabling students to better wield the skills and knowledge gained during their college career.

• Foster deeper engagement of students with their college career as a result of reflection on how coursework and co-curricular experiences affect what they “know, do, and can become.”

• Teach students to articulate the value of degrees that do not have a particular professional outcome, e.g., a liberal arts degree. CCA logic is that only a tie to a career will motivate a student. However, roughly half of the bachelor’s degrees we award do not tie directly to a career, and
those graduates need to recognize the value of skills and the ways of thinking that also are acquired through degrees like history, English and philosophy. It is important to recognize that students are motivated by their passions as well as by career pathways.

• **Help students understand the value of becoming a college graduate, fully prepared to pursue their aspirations with vigor and aware of the competencies they have acquired that can lead them to variety of career pathways.**

**Challenges presented by COVID:**

• New challenges faced by some students at home, at work, and in school, have, in some cases, undermined progress through a college degree to a career.

• Similarly, students who had been anticipating on-campus life with face-to-face classes and activities may have been tempted to delay enrolling in college until the pandemic has ebbed.

• Our **Learning Assistants Program** provides peer-to-peer support in high fail-rate classes. The program works effectively as a face-to-face program, which was not possible in its current configuration during the pandemic.

**STRATEGIES TO MITIGATE THOSE CHALLENGES:**

• We developed the **“Bronco Gap Year”** program to give students a low-cost opportunity to make academic progress and benefit from the guidance of a faculty mentor, even if present circumstances prevent them from being enrolled full time. While developed for students transitioning from high school, nearly 75% of those enrolled in the program in fall 2020 are current Boise State students. These students utilized the opportunity to explore major and career options with significantly reduced costs. The program is serving both as a recruitment and retention tool.

• The Learning Assistants program made a rapid change to a remote modality to keep the program functioning. Training of learning assistants was changed to enable the offering of an entirely web-based academic support program. In fall, all sessions were held on the Zoom platform and, as a secondary outcome, we increased access to the program by doing so.

**Ongoing Activities and Current Status:**

• We have developed six **meta-majors/areas of interest** that largely correspond to current colleges or math pathways. They include Business, STEM, Education, Arts and Humanities, Social Sciences, and Health. We primarily use meta-majors as “undeclared pathways,” which have been implemented in advising of new, incoming undeclared students at the point of orientation and registration.

• To give students a better understanding of careers, we are increasing information flow to students about majors and encouraging students to actively contemplate their futures. In addition, we aim to facilitate reflection about how coursework and co-curricular experiences will affect what the student knows, can do, and will become.

  • **Although the university has a long history of programs and initiatives that address career education, we are implementing a new university-wide strategy to bolster a student’s knowledge, skills and disposition toward “Make a Living and Make a Life” far beyond graduation.**
• **Major Finder** is a web application that helps prospective and current undergraduate students gain information about the degree programs that Boise State offers. It includes information about the careers that can be pursued by a graduate.

• **Career Pathways** dashboard enables exploration of majors to careers based on degree level, major field of study, and career outcomes. Conversely, one can also select a career outcome and see the fields of study that individuals came from.

• We continue to increase early academic success through our **Learning Assistants** program, which provides support in high fail-rate courses with embedded peer-to-peer support that has made asking for help a normalized activity, rather than a rarefied trip to a tutoring center. In addition, our **Math Learning Center** and **First Year Writing program** put particular emphasis on the success of students.

• **DUAL ENROLLMENT** programs are one way to gain early momentum toward a degree. Boise State’s numbers have increased substantially over time, as shown to the right.

• **Finishing Foundations**: Every student at Boise State takes a Finishing Foundations course in their senior year, and every one of those courses now requires that students engage in a culminating reflection assignment. Therefore, before students graduate, they will have a guided experience that includes articulating their vision for the future, looking back at the skills and experiences they gained at Boise State, and naming specific next steps for reaching their goals.

• **A Student Leadership Team** focused on developing resources aligned with the Beyond the Major reflective framework: purpose, opportunity, and narrative. They identified three key factors that are necessary for students to engage in meaningful reflective work: peer mentorship; feedback; and articulation and translation. They produced a “Campus Field Guide to Reflection” to serve as a resource.

• **The Storyboard** project is grounded in the belief that students experience their education with a stronger sense of purpose and ownership if they are actively building their story throughout their time at Boise State. In addition, students who can articulate the value of their degree are better positioned for success in the job market. A team of faculty and staff collaborated on research, data collection, and programmatic innovation, and they developed and tested strategies for integrating reflective practices and storywork across disciplines.

  • The Storyboard team created a Resource Guide for faculty that synthesizes theory and best practices in five core areas: Inclusivity, Narrative Thinking, Reflective Practice, Integrative Learning, and Articulation. [guides.boisestate.edu/storyboard](http://guides.boisestate.edu/storyboard)

  • Each Storyboard team member developed an area-specific project that integrates reflection and articulation across programs and experiences. Project descriptions and materials will be showcased on the Storyboard website beginning spring 2021: [boisestate.edu/beyonddthemajor/storyboard/](http://boisestate.edu/beyonddthemajor/storyboard/)

  • The Storyboard Mobile App will be launched in spring 2021. It creates a digital space where Boise State students can capture and compile their experiences and work on reflective practice through guided prompts.
PLANS

- Explore ways to integrate reflective practices throughout the curriculum to augment what is now done in Finishing Foundations.
- Consider distinct milestone courses, in addition to Finishing Foundations, where reflection is baked into the student experience.
- Consider integrating reflection into the Program Assessment Report curriculum mapping process so that faculty members can better take a holistic approach to embedding reflection in the curriculum.
- Consider an integrative approach to General Education that would bundle courses into clusters, pathways, or minors.
- Give students, advising staff, faculty, and academic leaders better access to high-quality and highly usable career data for purposes of curriculum development and enhancement (by faculty and academic leaders) and building data-informed, career-oriented academic plans (by students and advisors).

CCA Game Changer #5: Academic Maps and Proactive Advising

Focus and Expected Outcomes:

- Offer full-program academic maps to provide a clear and relevant path to graduation, including default sequence of courses, identification of milestone courses, and alignment to math pathways and career interests.
- Provide proactive advising to create and enhance mechanisms to help students remain on track with their academic maps.
- As a result, there should be increased rate of degree progression, fewer wasted credits, and lower attrition.

Additional Boise State Expected Outcomes:

- Increased progress to degree will result from streamlined curricula — less complexity and removal of unneeded requirements.

Activities and Status:

- Academic maps have been developed for all majors which list courses critical to each program’s curriculum. Virtually all of these plans feature required English, Math and University Foundations courses to be taken in the first year.
- Those degree plans are available to students and their advisor in the software package “Degree Tracker.” Several colleges make use of Degree Tracker.
- Proactive Advising:
  - All new students must, during their first year, receive advisor approval for their course schedules.
  - In the College of Business and Economics, students must receive approval to register throughout their college careers to help ensure timely graduation.
  - Changing to high-intervention majors requires consultation with an advisor.
PLANS

• In early 2021, hire a staff member with the responsibility of ensuring that the academic maps in Degree Tracker and Major Finder are updated and accurate. As a result:
  • Advisors can query Degree Tracker for lists of students who are off-track, giving them the information necessary to intervene.
  • Engaging in the critical work of ensuring accuracy will enable us to create a strong expectation on the part of students, advisors, and advising faculty to utilize Degree Tracker. Our goal is universal use by advisors and students.
  • Develop ways to forecast the future schedule for the offering of courses, thereby providing greater predictability to students about required courses.

CCA Game Changer #6: A Better Deal for Returning Adults

Focus and Expected Outcomes:

Facilitate college attendance/completion for adult learners by leveraging modalities and schedules that accommodate life responsibilities; award more credit for prior learning; market to those with some college but no degree (often called “completers”).

More adult completers at reduced financial and opportunity costs.

CHALLENGES OF COVID AND MITIGATION STRATEGIES:

• Boise State was well situated to support Adult Students through the pandemic via high-quality online programs, purposely built for them. The well developed, fully online courses and programs offered by Boise State allowed seamless adjustment to the pandemic. Marketing, recruitment, and communication strategies were already in place, and no notable impact was experienced for these students. In fact, enrollment grew throughout the year.

Ongoing Activities and Current Status:

• For several years we have offered two degree-completion programs in both face-to-face and online formats that are specifically designed to the needs of returning adult learners: Bachelor of Applied Sciences (BAS) and BA in Multidisciplinary Studies (MDS).
  • Both BAS and MDS include a one-credit Prior Learning Assessment (PLA) preparation course designed to help students convert their prior experience into relevant college credits.
  • Both BAS and MDS are highly flexible and customizable to meet the specific needs of individual students.
  • Both BAS and MDS offer “concierge level” holistic student support services, from intake to program design to academic coaching within courses.
  • Enrollments and graduates have climbed steadily for both programs.
We have developed several additional online degree-completion programs to meet the needs of adult learners. One set of programs targets health care professionals who possess an associates degree: Bachelor of Science in Imaging Sciences, Bachelor of Science in Nursing, and Bachelor of Science in Respiratory Care. The other set targets a broader audience: BBA in Management, Bachelor of Arts in Public Relations, and Bachelor of Arts in Public Health. Enrollments in all are increasing (see graphs).

We offer the **Online Degree Pathway** that enables adult degree-completion students to finish general education and prerequisite coursework before entering one of our online degree-completion programs. As the graph shows, enrollment has increased substantially.

Boise State has been accepted as a partner for the Air Force General Education Mobile initiative, which will facilitate acceptance of military experience and technical credits into the BAS program.

Our **Military Tuition Assistance Promise** program buys down the gap between traditional online tuition/fees and standard, Federally Approved Tuition Assistance. This “gap coverage” allows active duty, guard, and reserve members to maximize their tuition benefit without additional out-of-pocket expenses.

**BroncoReconnect** is an ongoing effort to re-engage and re-enroll students who have stopped out of Boise State. The program provides these students with a guided pathway back into the institution using the same high-touch concierge-level support provided in the MDS and BAS programs.

We have hired a full-time Clinical Experiential Learning Faculty member beginning FY20 who teaches the one-credit Prior Learning Assessment preparation course described above and facilitates other PLA support for students in all majors. **In fall 2020, 44 students used their prior experience in place of 136 classes.**

**PLANS**

Our Community Impact Program, which was discussed in more detail above in the Equity section, serves adults by targeting coursework and programming to the specific needs of Idaho communities. It began in fall 2020, and in the future will be expanded to additional communities.

We are developing an “Experiential Learning Framework” (ELF) that will integrate a significant amount of Experiential Learning credits into the curriculum and thereby reduce the cost to students because the learning is taking place outside of the classroom. ELF is being integrated into a new Bachelor of Science in Cyber Operations and Resilience program that is in the program review pipeline.

Continue to monitor existing programs and develop additional ways to support returning adults. There are many adults in Idaho who can benefit from achieving a college education.
Goal #3: Gain distinction as a doctoral research university.

At the core of Boise State’s critical service to the community, state and region has been the creation of successful and impactful doctoral programs. **Over the past decade, Boise State has created nine new doctoral programs:** Ph.D.s in Materials Science and Engineering; Biomolecular Sciences; Public Policy and Administration; Ecology, Evolution and Behavior; Computing; and Biomedical Engineering; Counselor Education and Supervision; an Ed.D. in Educational Technology; and a Doctor of Nursing Practice.

The following figure shows the growth in the number of doctoral programs and growth in the number of students enrolled in those programs. The number of doctoral graduates has increased more than four-fold from 2012-13 to 2019-20.
Boise State has fostered a steady increase in proposal submissions and in the number of globally competitive research awards — an increase of almost 50 percent — over the past 15 years. Even more remarkable is the dramatic increase in research funding dollars awarded to the university. From FY05 to FY19, total Research and Development Expenditures have increased four-fold, from $9 million to $39.8 million.

Despite the challenges presented by COVID-19 to the campus research community, Boise State University’s research awards have continued to grow. To date, fiscal year awards for 2021 are up $4.6 million from fiscal year 2020 and up $10.8 million from fiscal year 2019 for the July through November time periods.

Awards support Boise State’s path-breaking research across colleges and schools to impact a wide array of ongoing challenges. Currently funded research ranges from election cybersecurity, to evaluating farmland conversion impacts in the Treasure Valley, to better understanding the earthquake that shook the region in March, and to revolutionizing aerospace manufacturing.

These awards not only support faculty in conducting research, but ensure that Boise State’s students gain first-hand educational experiences and opportunities to prepare them for professional success and workforce placement, and permits our students to engage in the critical work of knowledge creation — experiences that will impact their ability to innovate and lead in the world beyond their graduation.

Creating research-intensive graduate programs, especially doctoral programs, and recruiting active research faculty to the university has helped advance not only our students, but Boise, the state of Idaho, and, more broadly, the world by fostering discovery and innovation.
Goal #4: Align university programs and activities with community needs.

President Tromp brings with her an ethic of “caring for our community” to Boise State. This ethic has strong roots on our campus, and we embrace the opportunity to imagine and implement new ways in which we can better serve the various communities within our sphere of activity.

In 2006, Boise State was one of only 76 universities in the nation initially selected by the Carnegie Foundation as a Community Engaged Institution. That classification was renewed in 2015 in recognition of the myriad ways that Boise State actively works to align with the cares, interests, and activities of our local and state community. This commitment to service has been, and continues to be, a defining feature of the university.

Located in the School of Public Service, Idaho Policy Institute’s students, faculty, and staff partner with governmental and non-governmental organizations across Idaho to conduct research on matters of public interest. Examples of recent research efforts include:

- Working in conjunction with the State Board of Education and Department of Education to report on the third annual external evaluation of the state’s Literacy Intervention Program considering: (a) program design, (b) use of funds, and (c) program effectiveness.
- An ongoing evaluation of Idaho Department of Health and Welfare’s (IDHW) Treatment and Transitions (TNT) Program, which serves individuals with severe mental illness and/or a co-occurring disorder who are experiencing homelessness or housing instability.
- The annual Idaho Public Policy Survey, which seeks to understand Idaho residents’ opinions regarding priorities and issues facing the state, including education, COVID-19, budget and taxes, and criminal justice.
- Partnering with Idaho Commission on the Arts to examine implementation of a creative district in the West Central Mountains in order to expand economic development opportunities in the region.

We are proud that Boise State has had a longstanding commitment to develop academic programs at every level that can be completed fully online — a profound way to support our rural communities. Today, Boise State offers 62 degrees and certificates in a fully-online format at the undergraduate and graduate levels.

THOUSANDS OF IDAHOANS HAVE ENGAGED WITH THESE PROGRAMS.

Nearly two-thirds of fully online students reside within Idaho's borders, and many online students residing outside of Idaho are residents of the state who are geographically displaced due to military service or other commitments. We also see the return on serving Idahoans and out-of-state students in their potential to build and maintain lifelong connections to Idaho that help the state thrive.
In fall 2020, we launched the **Community Impact Program** (CIP), which initially involves a partnership with three communities (McCall, Mountain Home, and Payette) and collaboration with community and economic leaders to identify the greatest educational needs and deliver a hybrid-format program to serve each community. Sixteen students of a variety of ages enrolled in the Fall semester, and the goal is to enroll an additional 30 students for fall 2021.

All students enrolled in a course focused on entrepreneurship as part of the first year Community Impact certificate. Eight of them extended their learning and were mentored by a faculty member from the College of Business and Economics beyond the end of the course, which resulted in new business ventures that are in various stages of start-up.

Boise State is also responding to the contemporary healthcare needs of rural and urban communities by offering a 21-week **Value-Based Healthcare certificate** (non-credit bearing) for practicing professionals, delivered in a mostly online format that includes one day of in-person work. The College of Health Sciences’ workforce development program in value-based health care welcomed its first cohort in January 2020. In the same year, the program received a Workforce Development Training Fund Industry Sector Grant from the Idaho Workforce Development Council to fund scholarships.

While the entire country is adopting value-based payment models, each state is implementing laws, policies and processes on its own. Unfortunately, Idaho lags behind the nation in adopting value-based payment models; Idaho has a 29 percent rate for value-based payments while the national rate for value-based payments is 50 percent. It remains much more challenging for rural providers, hospitals and clinics to implement value-based payment models, and 35 of Idaho’s 44 counties are rural.

Grant scholarships are awarded to rural healthcare provider organizations and individuals to complete Boise State’s Value-Based Healthcare Certificate program. The program educates students about the adapting methodology and regulatory environments in healthcare.
This past spring, Steve LaForte, director of strategic operations and general counsel for Cascadia Healthcare, participated in the first cohort of the certificate program with several colleagues from Cascadia’s executive team. They completed the program in August 2020. As he noted,

“It has absolutely prepared us to engage change in a more meaningful way ... the Boise State program has strengthened my grasp of the issues and challenges, and how we best adapt to create meaningful change in these areas.”

The popularity of the certificate has increased with each cohort. The spring 2021 cohort is currently full, including 30 scholarships, and there is a waitlist for the fall 2021 cohort, which will start in August.

Boise State has been innovative — helping businesses, health-care providers and many more — and committed to serving our communities during the COVID crisis.

Boise State builds certified COVID clinical lab on campus

Unlike many universities across the country, Boise State was able to remain open for in-person classes throughout the fall semester. Part of this success is due to a new and growing clinical lab on campus that allows the university to test students, faculty and staff, and student-athletes, and more recently, first responders, teachers and other community members — and typically provide same- or next-day results. Not only is the Clinical Laboratory Improvement Amendments (CLIA)-certified lab helping to keep campus open, but it is also adding much needed lab capacity to southwest Idaho.
Goal #5: Transform our operations to serve the contemporary mission of the university.

Our ongoing efforts include institutionalizing Program Prioritization through the implementation of a Responsibility-Centered Management (RCM)-style budget model (“BroncoBudget 2.0”), and our development of Department Analytics Reports (DAR) provide extensive, actionable data to department chairs, deans, and other academic decision makers.

Program Prioritization, a formal process required of all four-year institutions in Idaho by the State Board of Education on a five-year basis, is currently underway on Boise State’s campus. This structured process is designed to increase alignment of resources with mission and the strategic plan and priorities of an institution, and help the university make informed decisions through conducting a careful evaluation of programs and services.

Objectives of Program Prioritization at Boise State include:

1. Introduce a process that will help:
   a. Result in meaningful changes at the university.
   b. Enable academic leaders to make informed decisions.
   c. Satisfy the SBOE’s requirements for Program Prioritization (Policy III.F - October 2019).
2. Use a process that is consistent, fair, transparent and well-communicated; and builds on existing practices as applicable and relevant.
3. Pay attention to the context of the university and the external environment.
4. Look beyond individual programs and identify university priorities holistically.
5. Pay attention to initiatives already underway.
6. Continue to refine our continuous improvement processes and efforts.
A small coordinating committee with representatives from Academic Affairs and administrative and support units facilitates the Program Prioritization process. This coordinating committee is charged with providing consistency and connection across the university; communication to campus; developing and reviewing methodology for all programs (including determining criteria and weights; and developing metrics and survey intake forms to gather qualitative information). The coordinating committee is currently gathering quantitative and qualitative information for each instructional and non-instructional program relative to four selected criteria — relevance, quality, productivity, and efficiency — to inform planning and foster continuous improvement.

Four criteria used to evaluate programs during Program Prioritization are as follows:

- **Relevance**: Alignment with university mission and strategic priorities, our “North Star;” demand for the program or service; alignment with needs (e.g., alignment with professional, industry, societal needs).
- **Quality**: Evidence of success in achieving goals; evidence of assessment and improvement; distinctiveness and reputational impact.
- **Productivity**: Output or production per investment of time or resources.
- **Efficiency**: The operational effectiveness of the program. For example, for an instructional program, a key component of efficiency is the ability of students to progress in a timely manner.

In addition to the four criteria of assessment, each program is asked to respond to the following question of opportunity analysis: What changes, if any, could be made to this program to increase its impact? The Program Prioritization process will be finalized in spring 2021 with a final report due to the State Board of Education on June 30, 2021.
### INSTITUTIONAL DATA

#### Employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employees (Nov 2020 snapshot for IPEDS report)</th>
<th>Full-time</th>
<th>Part-time</th>
<th>FTE</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Faculty</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>979</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Staff</td>
<td>1,274</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1,293</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified Staff</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,529</strong></td>
<td><strong>668</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,752</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* FTE calculation for IPEDS is full-time plus one-third part-time.

#### Revenue and Expenditures for FY2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operating Revenue</th>
<th>FY2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Tuition and Fees (Gross)</td>
<td>198,262,256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship Discounts and Allowances</td>
<td>(27,777,200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Grants and Contracts</td>
<td>40,464,905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State and Local Grants and Contracts</td>
<td>6,512,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Grants and Contracts</td>
<td>2,991,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and Services of Educational Activities</td>
<td>7,778,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and Services of Auxiliary Enterprises</td>
<td>56,868,054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1,395,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating Revenues</strong></td>
<td><strong>286,496,966</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operating Expenses</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>139,307,732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>37,304,459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service</td>
<td>21,034,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>5,924,454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>20,933,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation &amp; Maintenance of plant</td>
<td>27,359,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Support</td>
<td>34,074,154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Support</td>
<td>32,434,522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary Enterprises</td>
<td>74,189,656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships and Fellowships</td>
<td>18,384,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation</td>
<td>26,623,055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating Expenses</strong></td>
<td><strong>437,570,168</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Income/(Loss)</strong></td>
<td>(151,073,202)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Non-operating revenues/(expenses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Appropriation - General</td>
<td>105,337,986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Appropriation - Maintenance</td>
<td>2,674,539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pell Grants</td>
<td>22,185,765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts</td>
<td>35,465,134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Investment Income</td>
<td>3,521,477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Fair Value of Investments</td>
<td>1,182,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>(6,881,404)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain/Loss on Retirement of Assets</td>
<td>(305,978)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARES Act revenue</td>
<td>7,344,2560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Non-operating Revenue/(Expense)</td>
<td>66,653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Non-operating Revenues/(Expense)</strong></td>
<td><strong>170,590,756</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Revenue and Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Appropriations</td>
<td>5,707,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Gifts and Grants</td>
<td>7,351,466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Other Revenues and Expenses</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,059,421</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Increase in Net Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increase in Net Position</strong></td>
<td><strong>32,576,975</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Position - Beginning of Year</strong></td>
<td>$463,395,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Position - End of Year</strong></td>
<td>$495,972,179</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Headcount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Degree-seeking</td>
<td>16,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Degree-seeking</td>
<td>2,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early College/Dual-credit</td>
<td>3,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Non-degree Seeking (Undergraduate and Graduate Combined) and Audit Only</td>
<td>543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>24,103</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2019-2020 Graduates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree and Graduate Certificate Graduates</th>
<th>Distinct Number of Graduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate Degree (Academic)</td>
<td>3,526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Certificate</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Degree</td>
<td>954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Specialist Degree</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Degree</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,741</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Research and Economic Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY2016</th>
<th>FY2017</th>
<th>FY2018</th>
<th>FY2019</th>
<th>FY2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Office of Technology Transfer</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invention Disclosures</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patent Applications Filed</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patents Issued</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licenses/Options/Letters of Intent</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>License Revenue</td>
<td>$53,847</td>
<td>$39,231</td>
<td>$24,820</td>
<td>$57,136</td>
<td>$15,996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Startups</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTEs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Number of protocols reviewed by:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY2016</th>
<th>FY2017</th>
<th>FY2018</th>
<th>FY2019</th>
<th>FY2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Office of Research Compliance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Biosafety Committee</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Behavioral Institutional Review Board</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Institutional Review Board</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Startups</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY2016</th>
<th>FY2017</th>
<th>FY2018</th>
<th>FY2019</th>
<th>FY2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Office of Sponsored Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # of Proposals Submitted</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # of Awards</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sponsored Projects Funding</td>
<td>$41.3M</td>
<td>$50.1M</td>
<td>$56M</td>
<td>$53.5M</td>
<td>$58.2M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Research and Development Expenditures as reported to NSF</td>
<td>$32M</td>
<td>$34.9M</td>
<td>$41.4M</td>
<td>$39.8M</td>
<td>not available at this time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Externally Funded Research Expenditures</td>
<td>$19.4M</td>
<td>$21.1M</td>
<td>$27.7M</td>
<td>$27M</td>
<td>$29.8M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OUR TRAJECTORY

Significant attention and effort was invested in fall 2019 and spring 2020 to put structures and processes in place to facilitate the successful development of a strategic plan. These include the reconstitution of our Executive Enrollment Committee, enlisting the expertise of the Society of College and University Planning, and a college-to-college listening tour by our Provost and Vice President of Research to better understand the vision of the community.

Last year’s annual progress report announced that a strategic planning effort would begin in late spring-summer 2020. It outlined the expectation of a planning process that would include the campus community and external stakeholders while building on the existing strengths of the university through Dr. Tromp’s leadership.

In a letter to the campus community in May 2020, Dr. Tromp formally announced the launch of a strategic planning effort. Shortly after the distribution of Dr. Tromp’s letter, formal preparations for strategic planning began. On May 11 and 12, 40 university colleagues participated in a day-long training through the Society for College and University Planning (SCUP). From there, Dr. Tromp charged a Strategic Planning Steering Committee to facilitate a collaborative process to engage the campus in the development of a new university strategic plan.

On September 9, 2020, the Strategic Planning Steering Committee released the following working mission, vision and strategic goals to the campus. In addition to President Tromp’s goalposts, the three overarching themes that inspired work on the strategic plan are: Thrive Idaho, Foster Student Success, Innovation and Global Impact. Mission, vision and goals are currently under review and may be revised owing to feedback and input through our process. Once finalized, they will guide the next chapter of Boise State University’s evolution.

**Mission:**
Boise State is a transformative public university that educates people and prepares communities for success in a changing world. Integrating teaching, research, creativity, and service, the university provides an innovative and inclusive learning environment to advance academic, social, economic, and cultural vitality in Idaho and across the globe.

**Vision:**
Accelerating Boise State’s rise as a transformative university preparing people for a changing world

**Strategic Plan Goals:**
Pursue Innovation
Create a Thriving Community
Advance Research and Creative Activity
Trailblaze new connections
Serve All of Idaho

Following the release of the goals to the campus, the Strategic Planning Steering Committee’s highest priority was ensuring campus participation and gathering campus feedback and strategy ideas regarding them. The response to this call for participation has been tremendous, with strong engagement by faculty, staff, students and external stakeholders throughout September, October, and November. In all, nearly 2400 total students, faculty, staff, and friends of the university participated in information and feedback sessions as well as a strategic plan survey. More details about the strategic planning framework and process is available at the university strategic planning website, boisestate.edu/strategicplan.

The strategic planning steering committee is continuing to process and analyze the feedback through December 2020. Once the assessment is complete, the steering committee will deliver a report that finalizes the goal language and objectives of the plan by January 15, 2021. Between the months of January and March tactics and metrics will be identified and added to the plan. The complete plan will be submitted to the State Board of Education for approval in March 2021.
PURSUE INNOVATION

Expand and implement leading-edge innovations and entrepreneurial ideas to provide access to integrated high-quality teaching, service, research, and creative activities.

Boise State is building on our culture of innovation – developing research that positively impacts lives, structures that transcend disciplines so researchers and students can collaborate on big problems, and spaces and programs specifically devoted to innovation.

“Innovation is in our DNA. It’s just what we do at Boise State.”
— DR. MARLENE TROMP, PRESIDENT
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CREATE A THRIVING COMMUNITY

Create a fair, inclusive, and accessible environment to enable all members of the campus community to make a living, make a life, and make a difference.
Advance the research and creative mission of the university community by using transformational approaches to solve grand challenges.
TRAILBLAZE NEW CONNECTIONS

Enhance and foster pathbreaking interdisciplinary programs and activities that transcend traditional fields of study.
SERVE ALL OF IDAHO

Attend to the needs of all of Idaho’s citizens, from those who have been traditionally served in the Treasure Valley to those who have been underserved, including traditional student populations, adult completers and rural students.
University programs received $18 million; almost $800,000 was allocated to faculty and staff support and $8.5 million was designated for student financial aid. More than 14,000 students received some level of financial aid. In addition, donors contributed $6.9 million to key facilities projects.

Our new Vice President of Advancement, Matthew Ewing, arrived just before the start of the COVID-19 pandemic. Soon after his arrival, Vice President Ewing and his team pivoted to focus efforts on the following broad university fundraising priorities:

- Dean of Student’s Emergency Fund, ASBSU
- Campus Food Pantry, the True Blue Promise scholarship, and the Elevate the Blue student-athlete campaign.

Under the new vice president’s leadership, the advancement team is restructured aligning technology, talent, and strategy to improve efficiency and productivity. The new vision and strategic framework that guides the work of Advancement are:

**UNIVERSITY ADVANCEMENT VISION:** Create the best culture of philanthropy and alumni engagement of any public university in the country.

**Strategic framework:** Secure funds for philanthropic priorities; Ensure mutually beneficial relationships with alumni and friends of Boise State; Enhance the alumni and donor experience; Create an integrated, university-wide, advancement system; Prepare to launch the university’s next comprehensive campaign; Develop a culture of high-performing teams.

$34.2 MILLION
raised in total support during FY2020
COLLABORATIONS AND COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIPS

Perhaps the most noteworthy and exciting development is the unprecedented collaboration between the presidents and executive leadership of Idaho’s eight public colleges and universities. All are deeply engaged with one another in shared projects. Their communication, cooperation, and alignment will produce better outcomes for Idaho.

Select examples to illustrate academic collaborations include:

- **Statewide 3MT**, 3-minute thesis presentations and competition, partnering with Idaho State University and University of Idaho.
- **GradWell**, an initiative developed by Boise State, providing resources focusing on graduate student mental health and wellbeing was shared with Idaho State University and University of Idaho. The Graduate College’s GradWell program received national attention in December at the Council for Graduate Schools annual conference.
- **Bridges to Baccalaureate**: Boise State and the College of Western Idaho implemented an NIH-funded program for underserved students in biomedical fields.
- The College of Health Sciences (COHS) is partnering with Idaho State University at the undergraduate and master levels in public health and is making progress toward the ultimate goal of creating a school of public health, which will make Center for Disease Control and Prevention funding available.
- Boise State collaborated with graduate deans at Idaho State University and University of Idaho to create a shared statewide website providing professional development opportunities for graduate students.
- Collaborating with community colleges in finding pathways for associate degree students to complete a bachelor degree in cyber-related fields with Boise State.
- Collaborating with WMDTech (a veterans run Idaho company), Boise State Faculty and Researchers have developed a low-cost gunshot detection system that will enable users to locate the source soundwave produced by the shot or explosion. The technology utilizes acoustic goniometers and multiple angles to detect the arrival of a soundwave. This technology is patented and soon to be licensed to our partner WMDTech.

Other significant collaborations have leveraged the value of our proximity to the Idaho National Lab (INL).

- We developed a statewide cybersecurity partnership with all public Idaho institutions of higher education to make Idaho a national leader in the field.
- Boise State launched the Institute for Pervasive Cybersecurity to lead innovative cybersecurity research and advancement in Idaho and the region.
We have cooperated on research and development and shared resource arrangements (facilities, instrumentation, joint appointments).

- **Boise State University, Idaho Power and INL** established a new collaborative partnership to advance high-performance computing, statewide weather modeling, and workforce development for the state of Idaho in the new **Collaborative Computing Center (C3)**.

**We also partner with local and global businesses, government and non-profit partners to advance our research, our students, and the state.**

- We have conducted research on **Idaho Election Cybersecurity** in collaboration with Idaho Secretary of State and faculty in computer science and political science.

- Our faculty have cybersecurity collaborations with **Suez, Idaho Power, DC Water, EPA, and Armanino, LLP**, one of the top 25 largest independent accounting and business-consulting firms in the U.S. that provides services to many of the biggest cryptocurrencies.

- In **partnership with Apple**, COED and the College of Innovation and Design (COID) delivered coding experiences to 425 students in 5 Idaho school districts (40% female students, 32% URM).

- Faculty have also collaborated with **Idaho Power** to provide support in hydrological modeling, cloud seeding and computational infrastructure high performance computing; with **Micron** to conduct basic research in nucleic acid memory, memristive devices and materials science; and with **Boeing Company** to model and research performance of mechanical properties of materials. Other active collaborations include partnerships with **St. Luke’s Health System** and **Idaho Shakespeare Festival**.

- CAES Technical Assistance Program (CTAP) in the Office of Research and Economic Development has **served almost 100 Idaho companies** from large to small over the past 5 years. Idaho Policy Institute of School of Public Service has provided policy related research to the **City of Boise, Blue Cross Foundation, Idaho Departments of Health and Welfare, Agriculture and Insurance**.

- The **Business Partnership Hub** is launched to make Boise State the premier university for partnerships. It provides a central place for the university community to **explore innovations in research, teaching and programming** that meet the unique expectation of business and industry. In turn, the Hub offers the business community a central doorway to engage and navigate the university and value all we have to offer. By engaging the university’s leadership, it is able to help set transformational strategies for business partnerships that will attract resources and draw them to our student talent. By engaging faculty and enlisting unit leaders from across campus, it assists with improved communication, increased effectiveness that business and industry will appreciate.

We are eager to grow our network of partners and have reached out to many others. Prospective industry, government, and community partners/collaborators can easily engage with Boise State by way of our website: [boisestate.edu/partnerships](http://boisestate.edu/partnerships)
Other College Highlights

- **College of Business and Economics** faculty member Michail Fragkias was identified as a “Highly Cited Researcher for 2019” by the Web of Science Group. In 2019, 0.1% of the world’s researchers, across 21 research fields, earned this distinction.

- **The College of Engineering and Extended Studies** collaborated to create the Idaho workforce certificate program for cybersecurity.

- **College of Education** graduated a record 19 doctoral students in 2019-2020, including its first Ph.D. in Counselor Education and Supervision.

- **Graduate College** drove a 6% year-over-year growth in Ph.D. program enrollments in AY19-20, with a strong focus on multi-college, transdisciplinary programs.

- **College of Health Sciences** expanded the undergraduate nursing prelicensure program by 33% (from 60 to 80 cohorts size) to meet Idaho’s nursing shortages.

- **Honors College** exceeded its $500,000-$1 million fundraising goal by securing ~$1.25 million, including a $1 million planned gift.

- **College of Health Sciences** continues to expand its online MSW program (~450 students currently) as part of its efforts to become a premier program in the Western United States.

- **Honors College** welcomed its largest incoming class of first-year students, at 332 (prior record was 320 in 2019).

- **College of Innovation and Design** continues to lead the Apple Partnership with CWI, IDLA, and area K-12 districts to upskill Idaho public teachers working in historically underserved communities.

- **College of Education’s Center for Multicultural and Educational Opportunities** secured $7.1 million in grants to fund academic tutoring, advising, and counseling.

- **College of Arts and Sciences, College of Education, and College of Innovation and Design**, launched Bronco Gap Year, demonstrating Boise State’s ability to respond swiftly and meaningfully in challenging environments.
The new $50 million Micron Center for Materials Research opened this fall on the Boise State University campus. It is a campus and community innovation hub for materials research and serves as the home of the recently named Micron School of Materials Science and Engineering.

The 97,000-square-foot building provides research laboratories and spaces, state-of-the-art learning environments, a 250-seat lecture hall, two large classrooms, offices and work spaces for faculty members, staff and graduate students advancing materials teaching and research at Boise State.

“We are grateful for the contributions of Micron to materials research on our campus,” said College of Engineering Dean JoAnn Slama Lighty, also noting Micron’s investment in the Ph.D. program in Electrical and Computer Engineering, the establishment of the Micron School of Materials Science and Engineering, and the Ph.D. program in Materials Science and Engineering.

“All changed the research and graduate education trajectory for the College of Engineering and campus,” she said. “The building is a state-of-the-art research facility with labs and spaces specifically designed for materials characterization and scholarship. In addition, the west end of the building houses some of the best teaching space on campus, and some 800 students will eventually pass through the building every class change — when we can.”

The Micron Technology Foundation Inc. gave $25 million — the largest single gift in Boise State history — for the Micron Center for Materials Research.

Micron has been an incredible partner to Boise State since the company, and later the foundation, were formed. To date, their support of Boise State has exceeded $75 million. In 2012, the Micron Foundation helped the university open the Micron College of Business and Economics Building, in 2019, the Fine Arts Building and, this fall, the Micron Center for Materials Research. Together, they are shaping the future of Idaho.
Center for Visual Arts
This new building, opened in 2019, is intended to stimulate new creative work for all of our students and faculty, efforts that have been demonstrated to make a positive impact on growing metro areas and on business innovation; foster increased student and faculty interaction; and meet the growing demand in a variety of academic areas. Praised as one of the finest facilities in the nation by the Director of the National Endowment of the Arts, this gem of a facility will support the growth of talent and innovation in Boise and the state of Idaho.

The American Architecture Award for 2020 was recently bestowed on the Center for the Visual Arts (CVA) from The Chicago Athenaeum: Museum of Architecture and Design, and The European Center for Architecture Art Design and Urban Studies. This tremendous national and international award confirms the Center for the Visual Arts project achieved two vital goals. The creation of a world class art research, teaching and learning facility, and simultaneously a brilliant work of architecture and design. The CVA mirrors Boise State’s commitment to the arts and significantly impacts the regional landscape with remarkable and dazzling contemporary architecture.

This landmark facility brings together all of the Department of Art, Design, and Visual Studies programs — history of art and visual culture, art metals, art education, ceramics, drawing and painting, graphic design, illustration, photography, printmaking, and sculpture — in five-stories and nearly 90,000 gross square feet. Close to 4,000 students take courses through the department, which was previously spread among several facilities throughout campus with aging technologies. This state-of-the-art, donor-supported facility will foster the kind of interdisciplinary excellence that will help Boise State blaze new trails in higher education.
Blue Galleries

In their inaugural year, the Blue Galleries organized and hosted twelve exhibitions of work by national artists, alumni, and students and welcomed thousands of visitors to new exhibition spaces. Tours of the exhibitions were given to prospective and current students, classes from across disciplines, civic groups, arts leaders, and community members. In programming, faculty from Arts, Geosciences and GIMM partnered and presented several exhibitions this year focusing on the relationship between the arts and sciences. New dedicated student gallery space highlighted the work of undergraduate and graduate students with solo exhibitions by MFA and BFA students and group BFA Exhibitions for graduates from the BFA Visual Art, Illustration, and Art Education programs. Some highlights of the exhibitions include:

- **Shane Darwent: Plaza Park**, visual artist Shane Darwent was a visiting artist and brought an exhibition to highlight our fantastic new gallery space for the CVA Grand Opening in October 2019. Shane Darwent’s sculptures, photographic works and installations mine the roadways of suburban American landscapes as unlikely sites for poetic discovery. The exhibition, Plaza Park, reinterprets the built forms of the commercial thoroughfares of contemporary suburbia into a playfully surreal sculpture garden. (Hardy/Kaslo Gallery October-December 2019)

- **Edge and Mirror: Landscape in the Anthropocene**, curated by Gallery Director Kirsten Furlong featured the work of six visual artists and collaboratives defining landscape and the environment in our time through the media of painting, photography, printmaking, video, and installations. Artists: Arctic Arts Project, Andrea Sparrow, Cynthia Camlin, Crystal McBrayer, Levi Robb, and Susan Murrell. (Hardy Kaslo Gallery -August-September 2019)

The Keith and Catherine Stein Luminary, located in the CVA atrium, features the latest in emerging large-format, high-density digital technologies. Three walls of touch-activated screens provide visitors an immersive visual experience and interactive access to arts and exhibitions from around the world. The Stein Luminary opens in January 2021.
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The Public Charter School Commission (PCSC) is Idaho’s statewide charter school authorizer. The PCSC is tasked with risk-management and oversight of approximately 80% of Idaho’s public charter schools.

The PCSC considers whether to approve or deny petitions for new charter schools and whether to renew or non-renew each school’s operating term every five years.

In between those decision points, the PCSC staff conducts the day to day work of school oversight, including compiling data, conducting site visits, and monitoring legal compliance.

Annually, performance reports are published both for the sake of public transparency and to help inform PCSC renewal decisions.

The PCSC maintains standing committees focused on continuous improvement in evaluating new petitions and renewal applications.

MISSION STATEMENT

The Public Charter School Commission's mission is to ensure PCSC-authorized public charter schools’ compliance with Idaho statute, protecting student and public interests by balancing high standards of accountability with respect for the autonomy of public charter schools and implementing best authorizing practices to ensure the excellence of public charter school options available to Idaho families.
**CHARTER SECTOR GROWTH**

The PCSC has grown from authorizing 37 schools in 2017 to authorizing 56 schools today. Five of the schools we authorize are currently pre-operational, and intend to open in 2021 or 2022. In addition, three new charter school petitions, are currently under evaluation.

While the PCSC provides operational and financial oversight for 56 schools, we provide academic oversight for 63 programs. This is because several schools run multiple programs, such as a Montessori elementary and an alternative high school.

During the 2019-20 school year, PCSC schools served approximately 20,500 students, or 6% of the publically educated students in Idaho. This represents a 1% increase over the previous school year, in which PCSC schools served approximately 19,000 students.

**CHARTER SCHOOLS DURING THE PANDEMIC**

**Strengths: Local Control**

By design, charter schools are governed at the building level. Each school has its own governing board of volunteers, subject to Idaho Open Meeting Law and the Idaho Non-Profit Corporation Act. Charter school governing boards establish and maintain school policies and directly evaluate the performance of their school administrator each year.

Because of this structure, charter schools experience greater local control than traditional district schools where the distance between the board and the school is greater and decisions require more consensus building before implementation. This autonomy is one of the primary draws of professional educators to the charter sector.

As the pandemic hit last spring, charter schools were uniquely poised to quickly adapt policies and practices at a local level. While navigating this year has been incredibly difficult for everyone, the nimbleness of charter school structure has proven to be a positive and useful feature.

**Challenges: Enrollment**

Many Idaho public schools (charter and traditional) have experienced lower enrollment than expected this year. However, while traditional districts have funding protections in place at the state level, charter schools are exempt from this benefit (I.C. § 33-1003). Low enrollment causes a direct decrease in revenue. This can be a significant challenge particularly for charters and other small schools.

While 75% of the PCSC's schools were able to maintain at least 90% of their enrollment projections through the fall of 2020, a few have struggled with significantly decreased revenue streams. These schools have implemented creative solutions to compensate for the shortfall.

Schools that have not faced low enrollment, have still faced significant challenges caused by student turn-over and constant transitions between in-person, hybrid, and remote instructional models. The academic and social-emotional impact of this instability is not yet fully known.
SCHOOL OUTCOMES FY20

The PCSC’s framework includes academic, financial, and operational measures. Each school is evaluated against these measures annually and is informed of its status by a performance report. At the end of a school’s operating term, the PCSC determines whether a school’s charter will be renewed, conditionally renewed, or non-renewed based largely on the school’s performance outcomes with respect to these established standards.

In October of 2019, the PCSC began the process of revising its framework and the measures (particularly the academic measures) by which schools are evaluated. The revisions were adopted in October of 2020.

As statewide assessments were canceled in the spring of 2020 due to COVID-19 related closures, the PCSC was not able to evaluate the academic performance in 2020. However, with a revised framework that allows for greater consideration of context, we are confident that new baselines can be established and achievable goals set based on 2021 data.

For the 2019-2020 school year, the only academic data pertinent to the PCSC’s framework is graduation rate. Operational and Financial measures were fully evaluated.

ACADEMIC OUTCOMES

4-Year Graduation Rate

The PCSC authorizes 13 “brick and mortar” schools that offer diplomas. Overall, these schools achieved an average 4-year graduation rate of 92%. Eight have graduation rates above 95%.

The PCSC also authorizes 6 non-alternative virtual schools. The average graduation rate of this group is low (50%) and continues to be an area of focus for both the schools and the PCSC. Encouragingly, improvements are happening: Idaho Virtual Academy achieved a graduation rate of 79% and Idaho Technical Career Academy increased its graduation rate by more than 10% over the previous year.

5-Year Graduation Rate

The PCSC also authorizes 5 alternative schools that had a graduating class in FY20. The PCSC only considers the 5-year graduation rate for alternative schools. In the past, the PCSC framework has compared alternative school outcomes to the statewide average of all schools (83%). Because the comparison was between unlike cohorts, establishing achievable goals was difficult.

The revised framework allows alternative schools to be compared to other alternative schools. While PCSC schools did not hit that mark (52%), a more data-driven target will help establish more relevant goals and better inform future evaluations.
FINANCIAL OUTCOMES

The PCSC evaluates every school against eight financial measures. The first four speak to a school’s ability to remain financially stable in the next year. These include the current ratio of assets to liabilities, the number of days cash on hand, whether the school is in default, and ability to meet and maintain its enrollment projections.

The final four measures speak to a school’s ability to remain financially viable over time. These measures include total margin in the current year and across multiple years, cash flow in the current year and across multiple years, debt service coverage ratio, and total debt to asset ratio.

The calculations and the evaluation rubrics are published in the PCSC’s Performance Framework available on our website.

At the end of the 2020 fiscal year, PCSC schools were performing well on most financial measures. However, this data highlights a few areas of focus:

First, three schools currently operate under a notification of fiscal concern. This effectively adjusts the percentage of payment released at each distribution date to protect taxpayer dollars in the event of a mid-year closure. This status is evaluated each June. While all three showed improvement over the previous year, they did score below a meets standard level on several measures.

Second, a few schools have high facility costs which places their debt service coverage ratio at less than ideal levels. This issue, once it exists, is a difficult one to course correct.

Third, two schools made significant, but planned investments in their facility this year. While this has a temporary impact on cash flow and total margin measures, it is not necessarily a cause for concern.

Finally, the enrollment variance measure was moved from the operational section of the framework, where it was easily lost among other data points, to the financial section, where it takes a more prominent position. The four near-term measures should tell a similar story, but the enrollment variance measure does not align. This anomaly led the PCSC to further investigate the effectiveness of the measure.

As an initial step, additional education was provided to schools this summer, prior to collecting a next data point. As a result, the percentage of schools meeting this standard for FY21 has increased to 75%.

Additional education has helped to provide more accurate data with respect to this specific measure. However, the PCSC is continuing to investigate whether further revision is necessary. Ultimately, this measure will be revised to align with statewide decisions on enrollment reporting as the path forward for all schools becomes clear.
OPERATIONAL OUTCOMES

Board Stewardship

The Board Stewardship measures are intended to help identify whether a charter school’s governing board is providing effective governance.

The governance structure measure considers whether the board is operating in compliance with Open Meeting Law, the Non-Profit Corporation Act, and the board’s own bylaws.

The governance oversight measure considers whether the board is sufficiently engaged in reviewing financial and academic data and whether the board is providing a sufficient evaluation of the school leader. Finally, the governance compliance measure considers whether any significant issues or investigations are attributable to governance practices. A governing board that understands the balance between governance and management is key to a successful charter school.

At the end of FY20, 98% of the PCSC’s schools were implementing effective governance practices.

Leadership and Management

Leadership and management measures consider the effectiveness of a charter school’s day-to-day operations.

The student services measure considers whether a charter school’s special education, English language learner, and college and career readiness programs are in good standing.

The transparency measure considers how well a school is managing public records and website compliance.

The facility measures consider issues of occupancy and safety as well as the quality of transportation and meal service programs. Finally, the operational compliance measure considers the accuracy and timeliness of submitted reports, the compliance of the school’s enrollment process, and how the school addressed any corrective action plans if applicable.

At the end of FY20, more than 90% of the PCSC’s school meet all standards in this category.
GROWTH BRINGS CHANGE

As the PCSC’s portfolio of schools has grown adapting practices and procedures to work at scale has become a primary focus. Below are a few of the significant changes made this year:

New Staff — The PCSC has welcomed two new Program Managers this year, each managing a caseload of schools. Charter schools are unique by nature, and this shift in structure is designed to refocus our work on knowing schools well, so that we may better support and advocate for their needs within the scope of our work as authorizers.

PCSC Policy— In August of 2020, the PCSC adopted significant revisions to its policies. These revisions realign existing policy with statute, provide clarity on timelines and oversight, and include new sections that specifically address amendments, transfers, and reporting. These changes are helping us provide a more consistent experience for schools.

Framework— In October of 2020, the PCSC wrapped up a year-long revision process of its Performance Framework. In addition to strengthening individual measures (as noted on previous pages), these revisions remove unnecessary layers of scoring, refocus the annual report on outcomes, and provide opportunity to consider context (such as unique demographics or pandemic conditions) when considering a school’s renewal application.

Site Visits— One of the major policy revisions this year was to disaggregate the single large-scale site visit that was previously part of the renewal process. Rather than a school hosting a team of evaluators for multiple days, the PCSC staff will make more efficient use of available data (such as accreditation reports) and conduct smaller, purpose-driven site visits (such as observing a board meeting or an enrollment lottery) aimed at collecting necessary data not otherwise available. This change is intended to better facilitate the work of authorizing while decreasing the reporting and hosting burden on our schools at the same time.

Looking Forward

2020 has been a year of unprecedented challenges in education. Enrollment is more variable than ever. Educational professionals are stretched to the limit, and then stretched a little more. Amidst these challenges, the need for choice in the charter sector and for quality schools continues to grow.

As assessments resume and the reality of the 2020 learning gap becomes clearer, we hope to work with our schools to help them establish new baselines and develop targeted goals from where they stand today. We are optimistic that the flexibility in our revised framework will help us compile a more holistic data-story for our schools that will better serve both schools and taxpayers.

The role of charter authorizers is shifting. In the past, authorizing was primarily a punitive system of rules and consequences. The future of authorizing is more multi-faceted, and seeks a better balance between oversight and service. The IPCSC will continue to evolve in this way, though hopefully at a slower pace than we’ve experienced this year.
IDAHO BUREAU OF EDUCATIONAL SERVICES FOR THE DEAF AND THE BLIND

SUBJECT
Idaho Bureau of Educational Services for the Deaf and the Blind (IESDB) Annual Report

REFERENCE
February 2017  IESDB provided the Board with a report updating the Board with current progress of the Bureau
February 2018  IESDB provided the Board with a report updating the Board with current progress of the Bureau
February 2019  IESDB provided the Board with a report updating the Board with current progress of the Bureau

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY
Sections 33-3405(4) and 33-3411, Idaho Code

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION
Pursuant to Section 33-3405(4), Idaho Code, the administrator of IESDB shall make an annual report of the bureau's activities to the State Board of Education at a time and in a format designated by the Board. While IESDB was moved out from the Board’s direct governance in 2009, the Board retains rulemaking authority for education services for students who are deaf or hard of hearing and/or blind or visually impaired, as well as property rights for the School for the Deaf and Blind. IESDB is governed by a board of directors, which is chaired by the state superintendent of public instruction.

ATTACHMENTS
Attachment 1 – IESDB Annual Report

IMPACT
This annual update will provide the Board with an update on the scope of IESDB’s efforts to serve Idaho’s children and provide the Board with the opportunity to ask questions about their work with school districts around Idaho.

BOARD STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
The Idaho Bureau of Educational Services for the Deaf and Blind, originally the Idaho School for the Deaf and Blind has been providing services to Idaho’s children since 1906. Their programs consist of statewide outreach programs and the Idaho School for the Deaf and the Blind, located in Gooding Idaho. They provide supplemental education services, early intervention and education, consultation, and transition support to families and local school districts throughout Idaho. Title to the School property in Gooding is held by the State Board of Education and leased back to IESDB for their use.
BOARD ACTION

This item is for informational purposes only.
IDAHO EDUCATIONAL SERVICES FOR THE DEAF AND THE BLIND
OUTREACH
(BY GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION)

Region 1
Coeur d'Alene

Region 2
Lewiston

Region 3
Caldwell

Region 4
Meridian

Region 5
Gooding

Region 6
Pocatello

Region 7
Idaho Falls
EXPANDED CORE

- Compensatory or functional academic skills, including communication modes
- Orientation and mobility
- Social interaction skills
- Independent living skills
- Recreation and leisure skills
- Career education
- Use of assistive technology
- Sensory efficiency skills
- Self-determination
CAMPUS
USING TECHNOLOGY TO ACCESS THE WORLD
COLLABORATION IS THE KEY TO SUCCESS
COVID-19 RESPONSE
FACILITY DEVELOPMENT
~ THANK YOU ~
SUBJECT
Accountability Oversight Committee High School Assessment Recommendations

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

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

August 2016  Board removed ISAT proficiency graduation requirement. The Board maintained the administration of the ISAT assessment in ELA and Math in grade 10. The Board also maintained the participation in a college entrance exam in grade 11 as a graduation requirement.

December 2018  Board received the fiscal year 2019 report from the Accountability Oversight Committee, including student achievement data and an analysis on the first year of implementation of the state’s new K-12 school accountability system.

August 2017  Board approved Idaho’s ESSA Plan, including a new state and federal accountability system that utilizes multiple measures to identify schools for recognition and support.

December 2018  Board received the fiscal year 2019 report from the Accountability Oversight Committee, including student achievement data and an analysis on the first year of implementation of the state’s new K-12 school accountability system.

February 2019  Board approved amendments to the ESSA Plan, based on recommendations from the Assessment and Accountability team at the SDE and the Accountability Oversight Committee.

June 2020  Board received the fiscal year 2020 report from the Accountability Oversight Committee with recommendations regarding assessment and accountability, as related to analysis of the data in the SDE’s 2018-2019 Student Achievement Report.
June 2020  Board received an update from the SDE on the high school accountability assessment.

December 2020  Board received an update from the Accountability Oversight Committee on the status of the committee’s review of the state’s high school accountability assessment and school quality measure.

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY
Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies & Procedures, Section I.Q. Section 33-110, Idaho Code
Idaho Administrative Code, IDAPA 08.02.03 – Section 111, Assessment in the Public Schools; IDAPA 08.02.03 – Section 112, Accountability; IDAPA 08.02.02 – Section 114, Failure to Meet Annual Measureable Progress

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION
The Board’s Accountability Oversight Committee (AOC) was established in April 2010 as an ad-hoc committee of the Board. Board policy I.Q. assigns two responsibilities to the committee:

a. Provide recommendations to the Board on the effectiveness of the statewide student achievement system and make recommendations on improvements and/or changes as needed.

b. Develop and review an annual report of student achievement. This report shall be compiled collaboratively by Board and State Department of Education staff and submitted to the committee for review. The committee will forward the report to the Board with recommendations annually.

In June 2020, Board President Critchfield tasked the AOC with additional work to gather and analyze information and make recommendations to the Board regarding two aspects of the state’s K-12 accountability system: the high school assessment for accountability, and the school quality measure. The AOC first focused its work on a review of the high school assessment for accountability, including receiving presentations from assessment vendors, comparing options, and soliciting feedback from the Idaho Technical Advisory Committee. The AOC is actively engaged in the process of considering the school quality measure and will present recommendations regarding that measure to the Board in April 2021.

The AOC’s recommendations regarding the high school assessment for accountability are detailed in Attachment 1. The committee’s recommendations report includes several appendices. Appendix A provides a history of changes and actions related to the academic standards, assessment, and accountability and is intended to provide context and background to the committee’s recommendations. Appendix B demonstrates the potential parallel processes through which both the high school assessment and the academic content standards may undergo changes. Given the interrelatedness of the standards and assessment, the committee felt it important to consider these processes together. Finally, Appendix
C and Appendix D reflect the work the AOC has done to review and compare the primary high school assessments available on the market. The following reflect the summarized version of the AOC’s recommendations related to high school assessment, which the AOC recommends be considered as a package:

- Explore a multi-assessment option for high school;
- Maintain the ISAT by Smarter Balanced as the high school assessment for state and federal accountability;
- Administer the ISAT by Smarter Balanced in grade 11, beginning in 2022-2023;
- Explore incorporation of the ISAT by Smarter Balanced 11th grade assessment into the Direct Admissions program and/or eliminate the college entrance exam graduation requirement; and
- Support efforts to provide financial support for college and career examinations.

IMPACT
Idaho Administrative Code IDAPA 08.02.03, sections 111 through 114, are tied to the state’s comprehensive assessment system and the state’s accountability framework. The AOC recommendations related to the high school assessment would require amendments to these sections of rule. Additionally, if the State Board moves forward with the AOC’s recommendation to shift the high school assessment for accountability from grade 10 to grade 11, the state will need to propose changes to the Idaho Consolidated State Plan used for federal accountability. Any amendments to provisions in the Idaho Consolidated State Plan that are also in IDAPA 08.02.03 would have to be first amended through the negotiated rulemaking process prior to the Board approving the changes in the Idaho Consolidated State Plan.

ATTACHMENTS
Attachment 1 – Accountability Oversight Committee High School Assessment Recommendations Report

BOARD STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
Idaho’s public-school system accountability framework approved by the Board has been effective since March 29, 2017, following acceptance by the Legislature during the 2017 legislative session. The accountability framework codifies requirements for state accountability and provides: “The state accountability framework will be used to meet both state and federal school accountability requirements and will be broken up by school category and include measures of student academic achievement and school quality as determined by the State Board of Education.”

Pursuant to IDAPA 08.02.03.111, the Idaho Standards Achievement Test is administered at the high school level in grade 10 and the college entrance exam
in grade 11. The college entrance exam requirement was added to the high school
graduation requirements established in IDAPA 08.02.03.105 as part of the Board’s
High School Redesign Initiative started in 2003. As part of the initial research, the
college entrance exam was identified as a barrier to students going on to
postsecondary education after high school. Studies showed many high school
students from families where at least one parent had not attended college or
otherwise belonged to an underserved population often did not take a college
entrance exam due to a sense of underachievement and a feeling that they would
not do well on the exam. Students also demonstrated a lack of understanding
around the purpose and benefits of the exams, and a sense that they would not be
able to afford to go-on to some form of postsecondary education regardless of the
exam. Students that did not have family members that had gone on to
postsecondary education often did not even consider going-on themselves. By
requiring the exam to be taken as part of the high school graduation requirements,
students who would not otherwise have considered taking a college entrance exam
were able to see that they could be successful at the postsecondary level or could
identify areas that needed improvement so they could be successful. In addition to
its use as a graduation requirement, student performance on the college entrance
exam is used by the Board as a measure of performance of Idaho’s K-20 education
system. When implemented, the ISAT and the college entrance exam were
established to meet two very different purposes. In considering any changes to
the state comprehensive assessment program, it will be important for the Board to
consider the purpose of the different types of assessments as well as their validity
in being used for those purposes and all federal requirements pertaining to
assessments used in the state accountability system.

BOARD ACTION
I move to adopt the Accountability Oversight Committee recommendations as
submitted in Attachment 1.

Moved by __________ Seconded by __________ Carried Yes _____ No ______
High School Assessment Recommendation
January 12, 2021

The Accountability Oversight Committee (AOC) supports the State Board of Education in its process of continually engaging in efforts to improve student achievement and ensure students are college and career ready. We recognize the relationship between achievement and assessment and the impact that changes in assessment have on Idaho’s educational system. After a thorough review of high school assessment options as referenced in Appendix C, the AOC makes the following recommendations to improve our system.

Recommendation: Explore a Multi-Assessment Option for High School

We recommend the State Board of Education explore the possibility of a shift to a multi-assessment option for high school students that allows individual students to choose and take the assessment that best aligns with their high school course of study and future goals. This exploration should be done through communication with the U.S. Department of Education, either through existing processes available under the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) or through new means.

Reasoning / Evidence:

- While we are confident the ISAT by Smarter Balanced appropriately measures the Idaho Academic Content Standards, we recognize it may not be ideal for all students. High school students are diverse in their post-secondary interests and the pathways they pursue. Thus, we recommend the high school assessment for state and federal accountability measure each student’s preparedness to pursue their preferred post-secondary pathway.

Additional Information:

- It is important to note that a multi-assessment system for high school may not be approved by the U.S. Department of Education, unless there are changes to federal law. Existing flexibility in the ESSA allows for locally selected, nationally recognized assessments, but requires each local education agency (LEA) to administer the same assessment to all students within the district. We are not aware of any state being approved to allow students within a given LEA to choose their assessment. Additionally, if the State Board were to pursue this option, they would need to establish a process for approving the assessments that LEAs may administer. ESSA also includes a process that allows states to apply for Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA); but again, there are specific parameters and requirements, and no states are currently using IADA for individually-chosen assessments.

Recommendation: Maintain the ISAT by Smarter Balanced as the High School Assessment for State and Federal Accountability

Considering the current standards review process, results of prior research of large scale assessments, and feedback from the Idaho Technical Advisory Committee, we recommend continuing to use the ISAT by Smarter Balanced until any substantial changes to the standards are clarified and implementation of adjusted standards has begun.
Reasoning / Evidence:

- The primary purpose of the summative assessment is to measure the effectiveness of our education system and to hold the system accountable for continuous improvement. We achieve this by measuring student achievement relative to our standards. Based on our comparative review of the ISAT by Smarter Balanced, ACT, and SAT; extensive feedback provided by the Idaho Technical Advisory Committee; and peer review results, it is clear the ISAT by Smarter Balanced is the most closely aligned to the current Idaho Academic Content Standards.

- Our comparative review of the ISAT by Smarter Balanced, ACT, and SAT revealed that ISAT by Smarter Balanced also has a more advanced system of addressing the needs of students with disabilities and English language learners, both in regards to accommodations available and administration of accommodations.

- Based on our comparative review, we believe the ISAT by Smarter Balanced is the best examination to administer during the interim period while the Multi-Assessment Option for High School is being explored and developed.

Recommendation: Administer the ISAT by Smarter Balanced in Grade 11, beginning in 2022-2023

We recommend that beginning in the 2022-2023 school year, the ISAT by Smarter Balanced be administered to all students in grade 11, and that grade 11 results be reported for state and federal accountability. We recommend that administration of the ISAT by Smarter Balanced to grade 10 students be made optional.

Reasoning / Evidence:

- It is critical to ensure students have appropriate opportunities to learn content (as aligned to the high school standards) prior to taking the accountability assessment. Idaho has adjusted the ISAT by Smarter Balanced for grade 10 in an effort to reduce test questions that the state anticipates students may not be prepared to answer. However, since districts and schools are given responsibility for determining the order in which content is taught, shifting the test to grade 11 offers more time and opportunities for students to access content before it is assessed. On the other hand, testing in the senior year would be too late for the assessment to be used to inform later instruction or to use the data for direct admissions and/or college placement purposes (see immediately below for a specific recommendation concerning this.).

Recommendation: Explore Incorporation of the ISAT by Smarter Balanced 11th Grade Assessment into the Direct Admissions Program and/or Eliminate the College Entrance Exam Graduation Requirement

Contingent upon agreement with Idaho’s public institutions of higher education, we recommend the Board incorporate the ISAT by Smarter Balanced 11th Grade Assessment within the direct admissions framework and consider completion of the ISAT by Smarter Balanced as meeting the college entrance exam graduation requirement. If the institutions are not in favor of this approach, we recommend the Board eliminate the college entrance examination graduation requirement.

Reasoning / Evidence:

- There is precedent for using the ISAT by Smarter Balanced 11th Grade Assessment for college admissions and placement. A notable example is South Dakota’s use of the Smarter Balanced
Assessment (administered in grade 11) within their proactive admissions program. South Dakota’s program was based on, and is similar to, Idaho’s direct admissions program. Additionally, public universities in California are in the process of considering use of the Smarter Balanced Assessment for admissions purposes, and several other states within the consortium utilize the results for college placement. Thus, Idaho would not be “going it alone” if it decides to employ ISAT 11 for these purposes.

- Although requiring all Idaho high school students to take a college entrance examination as part of their earning a high school diploma was a laudable effort to help more Idaho youth matriculate, it is now time to explore a more inclusive approach to helping youth prepare for their postsecondary pursuits. In reviewing the data, we do not believe that the statewide college entrance exam requirement has resulted in a substantial increase in Idaho’s Go On rate. Additionally, we believe the direct admissions program is a more effective approach to reaching students who may have previously not considered higher education. And finally, we believe students should only be required to take a single statewide assessment in grade 11.

**Recommendation: Support Efforts to Provide Financial Support for College and Career Examinations**

We recommend the State Board of Education support the development of state budgets that maintain financial support to students to complete exams that benefit their chosen college or career path (including SAT, ACT, ASVAB, or career-technical assessments). This, perhaps, could be accomplished through existing Fast Forward funding.

**Reasoning / Evidence:**

- Until a time when a multi-assessment option is possible for state and federal accountability, we believe it is critical to support students in pursuing their individually-chosen pathways. Rather than require a college entrance exam for all, we propose the state provide funding to support students in completing the exam that best suits their needs.
- We recognize that the legislature finalizes both state budgets and statute. However, we recommend that the State Board of Education encourage the executive and legislative bodies to support efforts to ensure students have the financial support to take the exam(s) needed to pursue their chosen postsecondary education or career pathway.

**Recommendation: Consider these Recommendations as a Package**

And finally, we recommend this series of recommendations be considered as a package. Our committee views these recommendations as interdependent. Together, they represent a coherent and streamlined approach to assessment at the high school level that aligns with current standards, honors the efforts of Idaho educators to teach standards-based content and skills, and recognizes and applauds Idaho’s diverse student populations.

**Supporting Documentation**

Appendix A: History of Standards, Assessment, and Accountability  
Appendix B: Possible Parallel Processes for Changes  
Appendix C: High School Assessment Comparison  
Appendix D: Idaho TAC Feedback
AOC High School Assessment Recommendation

APPENDIX A: History of Standards, Assessment, and Accountability

Recent History of Idaho Standards, Assessment, and Accountability System Changes

- Jan 2011: ID legislature approves adoption of substantially updated academic standards
- Aug 2013: Districts and schools fully implement updated academic content standards
- Dec 2015: Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) signed into law
- Apr & June 2016: AOC presents ESSA compliant accountability framework to Board
- Aug 2016: Board removes ISAT proficiency graduation requirement
- Aug 2017: Board approves ESSA Plan, including new state and federal accountability system
- Feb 2019: Board approves ESSA Plan updates
- June-Dec 2020: Standards review committees begin process of reviewing ELA, Math, and Science standards

- Mar-May 2014: ISAT by Smarter Balanced field tested
- Mar-May 2015: ISAT by Smarter Balanced fully implemented
- Oct 2015: AOC recommends changes to the accountability system (in prep for new ESEA waiver)
- Apr 2016: AOC recommends
  a) removing ISAT grad requirement,
  b) removing ACT/SAT grad requirement,
  c) supporting funding for optional entrance exams
- Aug 2018: Initial round of school identifications using new accountability system
- Dec 2018: FY19 AOC Report recommends changes to accountability system
- June 2020: FY 20 AOC Report to Board (recommending ways to adjust system and promote improved student achievement)
- Aug-Dec 2020: AOC reviews HS assessment and school quality measure used for accountability
AOC High School Assessment Recommendation

APPENDIX B: Possible Parallel Processes for Changes

The Accountability Oversight Committee recognizes that potential changes are being considered to Idaho’s high school assessment and academic content standards. As shown below, these processes could continue on similar paths. Given the relationship between the assessment and standards, regular communication will be key to determine if proposed revisions to the standards necessitate pausing consideration of assessment changes.
AOC High School Assessment Recommendation

APPENDIX C: High School Assessment Comparison

Comparison of High School Accountability Assessments
Completed 12/1/2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>SAT</th>
<th>ACT</th>
<th>ISAT by SBAC</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Power test (untimed or generous time limits) vs. Speed test (timed)</td>
<td>Timed</td>
<td>Timed</td>
<td>Power</td>
<td>SAT &amp; ACT have recently added elements that provide greater time flexibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norm referenced vs. Criterion referenced</td>
<td>Norm</td>
<td>Norm</td>
<td>Criterion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment to Idaho Content Standards</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>SAT and ACT both claim alignment, however, other states needed to supplement the products to address standards alignment for peer review. Supplementing may add to cost and/or administration time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal approval for accountability (Peer Review results)</td>
<td>Partial (substantially meets for other states)</td>
<td>Partial (substantially meets for other states)</td>
<td>Full (fully meets for all SBAC states)</td>
<td>It will be at least one more year before SAT &amp; ACT will receive further peer review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Idaho involvement in test development</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Idaho was a founding member of the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium and has since been a leader in the Consortium.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to conduct bias &amp; sensitivity review of item bank</td>
<td>Unknown but unlikely</td>
<td>Unknown but unlikely</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Smarter Balanced provided the entire item bank to Idaho for individual test item bias and sensitivity analysis by a diverse committee of Idaho stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College readiness indicator</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### APPENDIX C: High School Assessment Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Used by higher education for admissions and/or placement</th>
<th>English Language Learner accommodations</th>
<th>Special Needs Student accommodations</th>
<th>Scale compatibility with Idaho’s K-8 assessment</th>
<th>Assessment data that is actionable (e.g., can affect instruction)</th>
<th>Evidence that vendor has that demonstrates that if student performs well on the assessment they will do well in the future (e.g., in higher ed, etc.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not immediate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT and ACT have long histories of being used for college entrance. SBAC is being used for college entrance and/or course placement in some states. Idaho previously developed a framework to use the SBAC 11 as a college course placement indicator, but it was never implemented.</td>
<td>ISAT by SBAC is considered the most robust of the three in this area.</td>
<td>ISAT by SBAC is considered the most robust of the three in this area. SAT and ACT require LEA’s to get prior authorization to use accommodations with individual students, whereas SBAC leaves those decisions to local LEA personnel.</td>
<td>High school ISAT by SBAC utilizes the same scale as K-8 assessments creating a seamless K-12 system.</td>
<td>All platforms claim to have this, but educators are divided on which provides the best and most informative data.</td>
<td>Provided separately by vendors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### APPENDIX C: High School Assessment Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeliness of assessment results</th>
<th>14-17 days for individual student score reports (to schools, districts, state); 2-4 weeks for schools, district, state to get standard electronic score report files, 6-12 weeks for state to get final accountability file</th>
<th>3 to 8 weeks for school, district and state results; 80% of students have scores within 10 business days</th>
<th>Per contract, max is 10 days (but average is 8 days)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any emerging options that address mastery / student-centered learning in an assessment</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate grade level for this assessment and why</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10 or 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External / independent research that demonstrates quality (validity, reliability) of the assessment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External / independent research that demonstrates alignment of the test to Idaho’s current standards</td>
<td>Partial – peer review</td>
<td>Partial – peer review</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to administer test remotely if there are public health issues in the future</td>
<td>No remote administration planned. Instead, building more flexibility into test dates, locations, start times</td>
<td>Anticipate remote proctoring of weekend testing will be available in spring 2021</td>
<td>Likely will be available spring 2021 (Consortium has adopted an optional shortened form that could be used for remote administration and is currently working on adoption of a remote administration policy)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Highest of the three</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>Lowest</th>
<th>Idaho’s current Grade 3-8 and Grade 10 SBAC assessments combined cost less than just the high school SAT assessment.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interim assessment capability</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>A number of districts in Idaho currently use the SBAC interim assessment system.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Definitions**

**Power Test vs. Speed Test:** A power test is used to assess the underlying knowledge and skills a student has accumulated, without being limited by time. A power test focuses on measuring the level that a student has achieved. Speed tests assess student ability within specific time constraints, so a student’s score reflects ability level within the context of time.

**Norm Referenced vs. Criterion Referenced:** Norm referenced tests compare the test taker’s individual performance to the performance of a statistically selected group of students (the norming group) who completed the assessment at an earlier time. Criterion referenced tests measure an individual student’s performance in comparison to a set of previously established criteria, such as academic standards (without comparing the individual student’s performance to other students).
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Review of the Idaho “Comparison of High School Accountability Assessments"

Joseph M. Ryan
Member, Idaho Technical Advisory Committee
December 2020

Introduction

The considerations described in the “Comparison of High School Accountability Assessments” document are critically important and relevant to the process of evaluating the relative merits of the SAT, ACT, and ISAT by SBAC. There are other issues to be considered and certain of the issues mentioned in the current AOC document need some further elaboration as indicated below. The notes below are organized around the attributes in the AOC Comparison chart, but many issues cover numerous topics and are parts of several topics considered.

The major overarching considerations, as with all measurement practices, are fairness and validity. Fairness means that all students, regardless of any background characteristics or special needs, have an equal opportunity to demonstrate what they know and can do with respect to the Idaho state standards. Validity refers to the degree to which there is evidence and theory supports inferences and conclusions about what students know and can do with regard to the standards.

Power test (untimed or generous time limits) vs. Speed test (timed)

Working quickly within a time limit is not specified as an aspect of the Idaho Standards so ‘speededness’ is what is referred to in educational measurement as a ‘construct irrelevant’ factor. Such a factor could inappropriately distort inferences about what students know and can do. While time allowed for assessment might be generous, students might nevertheless feel pressure and the need to hurry through the assessment if time limits have been announced. Special arrangement must always be made in time limits for students with special needs. Both the SAT and ACT allow additional testing time for students with disabilities.

The ISAT by SBAC is administered as a Computerized Adaptive Test (CAT) and so students move through the test at their own pace.

Norm referenced vs. Criterion referenced

It is important to clarify that “norm-referenced” and “criterion-referenced” are attributes of the score interpretation. Traditional norms can be developed for an assessment that is standards-based and tests reported against norms can be standards based. An assessment developed with the intention to support normative interpretation could be reversed engineered by ‘tweaks’ and augmentation to approximate an assessment designed to be standards-referenced. It is useful
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to make this distinction clear as different vendors will make a variety of claims about norm-versus criterion- or standards-referenced assessments.

The SAT and ACT were originally designed to support normative interpretations of students’ test performance. They have been revised with the intention of supporting standard-referenced interpretations and this work is continuing. ISAT by SBAC has been conceived, designed, and developed to support standards-referenced interpretations and numerous reviews, local and peer reviews, confirm the validity of standards-referenced interpretation based on ISAT by SBAC.

Alignment to Idaho Content Standards

Alignment to the Idaho content standards is the single most important characteristic of the assessment. The purpose of the assessment program is to monitor and report students’ status and progress with respect to the Idaho content standards. Alignment must be evaluated as completely as possible for any assessment being considered. This alignment is the key element claiming that the assessment used by Idaho is valid.

As mentioned above, the SAT and ACT were originally designed to support normative interpretations of students’ test performance and have been adapted to match various states’ standards. ISAT by SBAC, by contrast, was designed and constructed to assess specified content standards and the alignment to the Idaho standards has been confirmed.

Federal approval for accountability (Peer Review results)

The peer review process is often seen as simply a statutory compliance issue. However, the peer process gives the state an independent view of the quality of the assessment program, especially the degree to which it achieves it intended purposes in serving all students. A full endorsement indicates that an assessment is doing what it is designed to do.

The full endorsement via federal peer review of all SBAC states includes ISAT by SBAC and thus approves the use of ISAT by SBAC for use in the state’s accountability program.

Direct Idaho involvement in test development

The involvement of state educators and other interested parties in the state is an important consideration often overlooked if psychometric considerations dominate assessment development. In addition to providing input based on local understanding and local experiences, the participation of parents, educators, and state leaders can facilitate and support local ‘buy in’ as a program is implemented.

The history of various in-state reviews with the participation of Idaho educators in various item reviews and other aspects of the ISAT development and approval show substantial Idaho involvement in test development.
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Ability to conduct bias & sensitivity review of item bank

The sense of state ownership is substantially enhanced when local educators can verify external reports of item bias and issues of item sensitivity. Idaho educators were allowed to examine the entire SBAC item bank used to construct ISAT by SBAC. For security reasons, the SAT and ACT do not have an open review policy for items bias and sensitivity but have numerous in-house reviews by experienced expert reviewers who would likely detect any items flagged by Idaho educators during a bias and sensitivity review.

College readiness indicator

This is a useful and important criterion for evaluating assessments for a state assessment programs. Traditionally, tests designed for this purpose were constructed to support normative interpretations and so the students who were highest ranked in math and verbal skills, by definition, outperformed other students. A major factor in developing these tests was the selection of test items from field testing that maximally differentiated students with relatively high and low scores. The differentiation of students is not the major consideration in a standards-based state assessment.

It should further be noted that not all students go to college or plan to go to college so that concerns about college readiness, college admissions and placement, should expand to the broader view of the k-12 educational needs of all students, not just the college-bound. The SAT and ACT have a long and well documented history of successfully indicating students’ likelihood of success in college. This, at least in part, can be attributed to the normative nature of these assessments. ISAT by SBAC does not have this extended history. Emerging evidence supports the value of ISAT by SBAC as one useful indicator of students’ readiness for college. Also, reviews by higher education experts of the content standards on which ISAT by SBAC is based supports the value of ISAT by SBAC as an indicator of students’ readiness for college.

Used by higher education for admissions and/or placement

A number of well-regard college and universities are moderating (and in some cases eliminating) the use of college entrance examinations for admissions considerations and many colleges have developed or have selected assessments for placement.

Further, to repeat from the previous section, not all students go to college, or plan to, so that concerns about college readiness, college admissions and placement, should keep a broader view of the k-12 educational needs of all students, not just the college-bound. In the future, modifications to Grade 10-11 ISAT by SBAC might be considered in order to serve certain higher education needs without adding to the number of tests students must take.

English Language Learner accommodations
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This is a critical area and part of the overall validity consideration: What evidence is there that the assessment is valid for all students, specifically for students learning English? If there is variation in the support that different assessments provide for English Language Learners, then the relative strengths and weakness of the various assessments need to be weighed and evaluated.

The ACT and SAT provide some support in terms of accommodations for English Language Learners and ISAT by SBAC is seen as particularly strong in this regard.

Special Needs Student Accommodations

The peer review process seems to have a history of focusing particular attention on the degree to which an assessment offers depth, breadth, and flexibility in the accommodations provided to students with special needs.

The ACT describes and offers a variety of accommodations for students with disabilities; the SAT reports that accommodations are widely accepted and supported. ISAT by SBAC includes a wide range of accommodations for students with disabilities that yield scores that can be reported as part of the school's assessment results.

Scale compatibility with Idaho’s K-8 assessment

The opportunity to provide a ‘continuous progress’ mapping of students on a common scale across grades is a valuable feature of an assessment program. This can be accomplished in a variety of ways and does not require a common scale. However, claims that assessments use a ‘common scale’ need to be explained in detail. One interpretation of ‘common scale’ is that within each grade, the same scale origin and variability is used. A different interpretation of ‘common scale’ is that there is a single cross-grade scale that has been vertically equated across grades. The later would be a much more useful and powerful scale.

The ISAT by SBAC is delivered as a computer adaptive test using specialized software for that purposes. The CAT program can be applied to most any item banks as long as they meet certain configuration requirements. In the ISAT by SBAC CAT context, it would be possible to extend the item bank for the Grade 10-11 tests toward Grade 9 and the Grade 8 item bank up toward Grade 9. Content specification and test blueprints would need to be honored and there would be cost considerations.

Assessment data that is actionable (e.g., can affect instruction)

The single most commonly and loudly voiced complaint of teachers about assessment is the inability of assessment to provide information that informs instructional practices. When
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teachers cannot use information from an assessment system to plan, design, monitor and modify instruction, then an assessment system has failed that educational purpose. The reference to an ‘assessment system’ is critical because the traditional single end-of-year assessment does not provide useful information for taking instructional actions.

An assessment system should include a variety of assessments, which are linked directly to appropriate instructional resources.

ISAT by SBAC has a number of assessment system components including different types of interim assessments and a collection of resources linked to the assessment results through the content standards. Many other assessments have supplementary materials but their connection to assessment results is somewhat vague.

It is important to mention that vendors should provide evidence that their various score reports and score reporting procedures were field tested and confirmed as communicating assessment results in ways that are actionable by teachers.

Evidence that if a student performs well on the assessment they will do well in the future (e.g., in higher ed, etc.)

This is very similar to the topic “College readiness indicator,” and comments under that heading apply here as well. It is important to emphasize the states obligation to provide an education for all students is a much broader obligation that getting students ready for college.

Timeliness of assessment results

Assessment results cannot be actionable by teachers (see earlier section) unless the results are delivered in a timely fashion. Online presentations of results have facilitated the delivery process. The improvement of reporting systems should be a continuous priority since assessment results serve little instructional purpose until teachers have them.

Any emerging options that address mastery / student-centered learning in an assessment

The chart indicates ‘None’ for all three vendors. However, an assessment that is part of a comprehensive assessment systems with strong links to instructional resources might present options for a variety of learner supports.

Appropriate grade level for this assessment

The concept of a fixed form ‘grade level’ assessment is becoming somewhat outdated, especially in the context of computer adaptive testing (CAT). The CAT software is applied to an item bank and so the issue of ‘grade level’ becomes a question of how wide a range of items does the bank
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contain? The items in a bank can be written for a range of grades, in terms of content and relative difficulty, and scaled via equating to be on a common scale.

In the context of a cross-grade item bank, a test for the completion of high school would be targeted for grade 11 by selecting items designed for the content of that grade. Other carefully designed and developed items could be added to the same bank and could be used to construct tests at other grades.

Currently, ISAT by SBAC is listed as applicable for grade 10 or 11. A comprehensive expanded item bank could be developed so that items appropriate for the range of students and content in Grades 10 and 11 could be scaled onto a common scale. In a similar fashion, items appropriate in content and difficulty for Grade 9 might also be scaled onto the common scale, spanning grades 9-10.

External / independent research that demonstrates quality (validity, reliability) of the assessment

External/independent verification of test quality (reliability, validity) is highly desirable and should be evaluated carefully if it is supplied by a vendor whose product is being evaluated.

External / independent research that demonstrates alignment of the test to Idaho’s current standards

External/independent verification of test alignment to state standards is highly desirable and should be evaluated carefully if it is supplied by a vendor whose product is being evaluated.

Ability to administer test remotely if there are public health issues in the future

Remote testing for public health reasons may be necessary from time to time in the near future and at other times. An assessment system with the capacity to be administered remotely should merit priority consideration for adoption.

The capacity to provide fair and valid assessment is an important feature of remote testing that needs to be evaluated very rigorously and thoroughly. Validity evidence collected from typical intact classroom settings is not necessarily applicable evidence of validity for remote assessment in assessment centers or home settings. Any considerations for adopting a remote assessment proposal should require that the vendor describe a plan for evaluating the validity of the assessment when employed remotely.

Cost

Cost must be a consideration within the framework of state procurement policies.
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Interim assessment capability

It is important to view a state’s assessment efforts as an assessment system, in which different types of formative, interim, and summative assessments are all connected to each other, to the state’s content standards, and to relevant and readily accessible instruction resources. The availability of easily accessible interim assessments supports the previous mentioned issues of test results being actionable and timely. ISAT by SBAC has a strong interim assessment component with focused block assessments and more broadly targeted interim assessments tied to the state standards and to a variety of instructional support resources.

Dr. Ryan received an A.B. in mathematics and M.Ed. in Educational Psychology from Boston College and a Ph.D. in Measurement, Evaluation, and Statistical Analysis from the University of Chicago. He was a professor of educational measurement and research at the University of South Carolina from 1974 to 1995, and at Arizona State University from 1995 until 2006. Dr. Ryan is a Fellow of the American Educational Research Association and a Professor Emeritus at Arizona State University. He has served on the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) for the SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium and also TACs for the states of Alaska, Idaho, Connecticut, the New England Common Assessment Program, Ohio, Rhode Island, and Washington. His areas of technical expertise include score reporting and interpretation, scaling, equating, standard setting, and bias or DIF analyses.
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Review of the Idaho “Comparison of High School Accountability Assessments”

Ed Roeber
Member, Idaho Technical Advisory Committee
December 2020

Kevin Whitman, Director of Assessment for the Idaho State Department of Education, sent the Idaho Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) the document titled “Comparison of High School Accountability Assessments,” dated 12/1/2020, for its review. The chart summarizes the work of the Idaho Accountability Oversight Committee’s (AOC) examination of the three key choices for high school accountability assessments in Idaho.

This review includes three parts:

1. Commentary on some of the listed attributes
2. Suggested additional attributes and comments to be added to the AOC chart.
3. Recommendations

Review of the AOC Chart

The AOC chart lays out a number of useful attributes of the assessments that can be used at the high school level for student guidance, college entrance, and accountability. The following commentary is on both the level of details that might be important to include for some of the attributes listed, as well as suggesting additional attributes might be added to the chart. This is followed by recommendations.

Commentary on Some of the Listed Attributes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Listed Attribute</th>
<th>Additional Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alignment</td>
<td>Both the ACT and SAT are only partially aligned to state content standards, and the alignment differs each year. This is because test forms for both the ACT and SAT are constructed to predict overall performance, not alignment to the content standards in any state. This means the augmentation needed for the ACT and SAT will be different each year, which is an added test development and field test cost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Approval for Accountability</td>
<td>In the past, states were required to work towards obtaining full Peer approval. Under the Trump administration, “Substantially Meets” seems to have become the equivalent – a level “close enough,” not requiring additional action on the part of the state. It is uncertain what the new administration will require.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| Ability to review the item bank for bias & sensitivity | The ACT and SAT columns are accurate in that these organizations will not permit users to examine items in their item banks. However, each organization invests considerable resources in conducting these reviews so it is unlikely that if a state review was permitted, anything substantially negative would be found. |
| Used by higher education for admissions purposes | While the Grade 10 ISAT by SBAC is not used for higher education admission purposes in Idaho, did the AOC consider shifting this assessment to grade 11? Other states do so, and while there is some analytical work needed to make this change (and it does have Peer Review implications), the work is not substantial. It might provide a way for the state to use its current exam in a manner that permits students to apply to ID universities. In considering this change, it might be useful to determine which other SBAC states have agreements with their institutions of higher education for the use of the SBAC tests for higher education admissions, and if so, whether such agreements would permit ID students to use grade 11 test results to apply for admission at those institutions. In other words, would such the universities in those states permit the use of ISAT by SBAC for college admissions at those universities? |
| ELL Accommodations | Both the ACT and SAT offer a limited array of accommodations for ELLs that result in college-reportable scores. This is a real drawback to both tests. Students with disabilities are offered a wide range of accommodations that result in college-reportable scores, such as listening to the reading test being read to them and receiving college-reportable scores. However, the range of accommodations permitted for ELLs that result in college-reportable scores is much more limited. There is no sound educational reason for this difference. |
| Special Needs Student Accommodations | The ACT and the College Board differ substantially on accommodations for students with disabilities are handled. In both cases, an accommodations coordinator has to assemble the evidence for the need for an accommodation and then submit this information to the ACT or College Board. These organizations determine if the accommodations are approved. The College Board does not publish lists of available accommodations nor which ones result in college-reportable scores. Instead, they offer assurances that virtually all requests for accommodations are accepted (with limited proof backing up this claim). The ACT does have a very detailed list of available/approvable accommodations for these student and this list provides guidance on which accommodations will result in college-reportable scores. |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting Scale</th>
<th>One way some states have addressed this issue is to add additional assessments in grades 9 or 10, or changed which assessment is used at grade 8. For example, Michigan uses the SAT at grade 11, and the PSAT at grades 8, 9, and 10. Thus, it has a comparable cross-grade scale. Of course, it costs to add testing in grade 9 and 10, as well as use commercial College Board products in grades 8-11. If the ISAT was shifted to grade 11 (by tweaking the grade 10 test through adding grade 11 standards and items to it), the current grade 10 test could continue to be used, and a grade 9 version of it could be added by tweaking the assessment by adding grade 9 standards and items. This could provide a common grade 9-11 assessment so that students could be given “early” college readiness messages (e.g., ‘on-track for college and career readiness.’), and growth in student achievement could be used as an accountability measure.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Assessment Data is Actionable | Yes, all test data is actionable from each test, but by whom, for what purposes, and to what extent? This is a big deal. Actions potentially include:  
- For use in college admissions;  
- For review and enhancement of the school’s instructional programs in grades 8-11;  
- To help students to see how college and career ready they are;  
- To assist students to improve their readiness for college (i.e., not having to take remedial courses as a freshman);  
- Taking and passing credit-bearing courses in each discipline as a freshman; obtaining a GPA of 2.0 or better as a freshman).  
It is vital to define the intended uses before answering whether each test can meet this attribute.  
One difference in the use of the data is that ISAT tends to hold schools accountable for student performance, while the ACT and SAT are more likely to hold students accountable for their test performance. Which is more important to the AOC for improving student achievement/college readiness now and in the future? |
| Appropriate Grade Level for the Exam | Might the ISAT column be changed to “grades 11 or 12” (see above)? |
| Alignment Data | Each vendor can provide both their own internal data on alignment they have generated, as well as external, independent data that other states have gathered. The key in such independent studies from other states is the extent of alignment between other states’ standards and those used in Idaho. “Partial alignment” is most likely correct status for alignment. |
| Cost | This has been a major difference between a college entrance exam (CEE) and a state assessment used for accountability purposes. Michigan, by competitively bidding the program a few years ago, found that the SAT was less expensive than the ACT due to more intensive competition between ACT and the College Board. Still, prices were four-times higher for use of a CEE over the previous state-developed exam. |
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Additional Attributes and Comments

There are several additional ways on which to compare the SAT, ACT, and ISAT. These are listed below, along with commentary about each attribute.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Attribute</th>
<th>SAT</th>
<th>ACT</th>
<th>ISAT by SBAC</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Accommodation Requests</td>
<td>As noted, formal requests for accommodations must be made to SAT district accommodations coordinators appointed by districts. Documentation of the need for an accommodation must be provided.</td>
<td>As noted, formal requests for accommodations must be made to ACT by district accommodations coordinators appointed by districts. Documentation of the need for an accommodation must be provided.</td>
<td>As noted, Idaho districts make the determination of needed accommodations locally and do not have to apply for them.</td>
<td>Getting ACT or the College Board to approve accommodations requests can a time-consuming, frustrating process for some local educators and parents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Support Materials</td>
<td>The College Board offers no-cost access to the Khan Academy platform. It provides extensive learning resources for students.</td>
<td>ACT offers no-cost access to its learning platform, which is not as extensive as Khan Academy’s platform. It also provides some learning resources for students.</td>
<td>No such resource is available, per se, although SBAC offers Tools for Teachers which does provide some instructional support for teachers who use the Smarter assessments.</td>
<td>The College Board rightfully points out their goal of helping students to be ready for college when the take the CEE (or improving their readiness before re-testing). How might Idaho address this issue if ISAT is used as the CEE?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-Tests</td>
<td>Students who take the state-paid SAT can retest at a later date by signing up for a Saturday CEE administration. Vouchers are available for low-income students.</td>
<td>Students who take the state-paid ACT can retest at a later date by signing up for a Saturday CEE administration. Vouchers are available for low-income students.</td>
<td>SBAC does not currently offer the opportunity for 11th graders to retest in fall grade 12. There is only one time when they currently re-test in 12th grade (spring).</td>
<td>This issue is most pertinent for students who are not satisfied with their CEE score. Would Idaho permit these students to re-test in the fall of 12th grade (thus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Could the ISAT be offered in the fall and spring if used as a CEE for accountability purposes?</th>
<th>Necessitating giving ISAT twice in grade 12?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Recommendations**

It is the opinion of this reviewer that the easiest and best solution for which CEE test to use in Idaho is to change the ISAT by SBAC for use initially in grade 11, with re-testing in grade 12, and administering the ISAT with all eleventh graders. This could lead to the elimination of the use of the SAT (or the adoption of the ACT) for all eleventh graders, thus saving both testing time and costs.

With the savings from not administered the SAT (or the ACT), some thought should be given to retaining the current grade 10 ISAT assessment, and potentially considering the creation of a grade 9 version of ISAT. This would permit schools to monitor what proportion of students who are ‘on track to be college and career ready’ in grades 9 and 10, and then who are college and career ready (in grade 11). This would be valuable accountability information at the school and district levels, as well as important and motivating information for students and their families. Such comprehensive information would be useful in assuring that schools work to improve the college and career readiness of all students.

If the state still wanted to provide a state-paid opportunity for those students who do need a SAT (or ACT) CEE score for admissions to universities that require such a score, the state could offer state-paid vouchers for student use to pay for a regular Saturday administration of either CEE.
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Review of the Idaho “Comparison of High School Accountability Assessments”

Damian Betebenner
Member, Idaho Technical Advisory Committee Member
Senior Association National Center for the Improvement of Educational Assessment
December 2020

Kevin Whitman, director of assessment for the Idaho State Department of Education, sent the Idaho Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) the document titled “Comparison of High School Accountability Assessments,” dated 12/1/2020 for its review. In the document is a chart summarizing the work of the Idaho Accountability Oversight Committee’s (AOC) examination of the three key choices for high school accountability assessments in Idaho: ACT, SAT, ISAT by SBAC.

The chart summarizing the work by the AOC was tasked with the following: “Examine the current options for high school assessments and make a recommendation concerning which high school assessment Idaho high school students should be completing.”

The AOC is asking for the TAC’s input on this comparison document. Points of interest include:

- Are the statements accurate? Vendor presentations may offer a more optimistic view of their own products than you all would provide as impartial experts.
- Are there considerations not currently included in the template that you think merit consideration in the AOC’s decision-making process?
- Is there general feedback/guidance you would offer on how to best approach high school assessments?

Below are the responses to the bulleted items in order that they appear:

Are the statements accurate? Vendor presentations may offer a more optimistic view of their own products than you all would provide as impartial experts.

In general, the statements are broadly accurate but there are missing details in the answers provided that are critical to the decision-making process.

- The answers to “Alignment to Idaho content standards” are generally accurate. However, as a consequence, if full alignment with Idaho standards is required, then Idaho must consider how (and at what cost) to modify the ACT and SAT so that they fully align.
- The answer to “Used by higher education for entrance and/or placement” is likely misleading for ISAT by SBAC. It is not clear how many institutions would accept ISAT by SBAC for entrance and/or placement. This is likely a critical issue as the adoption of a test
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that is not utilized for college entrance decisions by a large number of colleges/universities is not really a college entrance examination.

- The answers addressing accommodations make significant details that must be considered. Accommodations offered by ACT and SAT are often more limited so as not to impact the predictive validity associated with the instrument. Accommodations offered by ISAT by SBAC are more extensive. Detail on ACT and SAT regarding whether certain accommodations lead to score invalidation will be critical in determining whether all students will receive a valid CEE score.

Are there considerations not currently included in the template that you think merit consideration in the AOC’s decision-making process?

- Due to the COVID pandemic, some colleges and universities are altering their entrance criteria to make CEE optional. Whether this is a permanent change is not known but something that the AOC should determine (particularly with regard to the colleges/universities frequently attended by Idaho students --- BSU, UI, ISU, ...). The less essential CEE are, the less important utility for college/university entrance becomes.

- Can the ISAT by SBAC be given in the 11th grade to make it more in line with other CEE? From the table provided it appears as though it can.

- The instructions for our work stated that, “As a graduation requirement, high school students must also participate in a college entrance exam.” Is there a definition of “college entrance exam” provided somewhere? Clearly, the ACT and SAT would be deemed CEEs. It is likely a stretch to call the ISAT by SBAC a CEE. Would that be a problem?

- Were ISAT by SBAC to be selected, would a substantial number of students in Idaho take the ACT and/or SAT anyway? If so, would this be acceptable?

Is there general feedback/guidance you would offer on how to best approach high school assessments?

- Like with many decisions related to student testing and accountability, there are technical considerations and practical considerations.

- In terms of technical considerations, as the chart provided by AOC summarizes, in most categories ISAT by SBAC is a superior choice based upon technical considerations. The test aligns with state standards and is on the same scale as the current ISAT assessments. From cost and technical perspectives, I would recommend ISAT by SBAC.

- In terms of practical considerations (particularly utility for college entrance and placement decisions) SAT and ACT are superior. The ISAT by SBAC is comparable in predictive validity with the SAT and ACT. However, it appears to not be used as widely for that purpose.
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- Even more practically, how would the decision on adopting one of these tests be received by policy makers and parents. This seems like a critical issue and one that should be handled with care.
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Review of the Idaho “Comparison of High School Accountability Assessments”

Patricia Almond
Member, Idaho Technical Advisory Committee
December 2020

Evidence Considered:

• AOC Task: “Examine the current options for high school assessments make a recommendation concerning which high school assessment Idaho high school students should be completing.”
• Presentation evidence from the vendors RE: SAT, ACT, SBAC HS assessment including slide presentations and clarifying documentation.
• Comparison of High School Accountability Assessment, 12/01/2020
• Reviews of the Comparison of High School Accountability Assessments in Idaho submitted by Dr Joe Ryan and Dr Ed Roeber.

This review includes three parts:

1. General observations about the options for high school assessments
2. Queries regarding a “recommendation concerning which high school assessment Idaho high school students should be completing.”
3. Recommendation for the AOC to consider adding the following considerations to their comparison analysis.

NOTE: At the time I completed this review I already had in-hand both Dr Roeber and Dr Ryan’s reviews. I had reviewed the information provided by the vendors, the Comparison document regarding options for high school assessment, and Drs Roeber and Ryan’s reviews, which I believe were each technically sound and thorough. This review raises underlying questions that observed in reviewing this body of information.

General Observations About the Options for High School Assessments

• Several Options: It seems that the options: when administered, which assessment, is a retest and opportunity available, and most importantly what is the purpose for the high school assessment? These options include conditions. If the question “which assessment should Idaho students take?” proposes a single high school test these differences are worthy of considering.
• Purpose: The assessments, SAT, ACT, ISAT by SBAC, each are high school assessments with varying costs, implementation challenges, and validity for the purposes they were
AOC High School Assessment Recommendation
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developed to address. Getting down to a single assessment to meet all purposes: school, district, and state accountability; information to guide instruction and especially readiness for college (which resembles high school graduation in making decisions at the individual student level). In addition, there are questions the validity and reliability of each for the individual purposes.

• Considerations for accessibility and accommodations for English Language Learners and Students with Disabilities were addressed very well by both of my fellow Technical Advisory Members. I have little to add regarding the points made except to note there are substantive differences among the three high school assessments.

Queries Regarding a “Recommendation Concerning Which High School Assessment Idaho High School Students Should Be Completing”:

• Back to Purpose: More may need to be said or investigated about whether any of these assessments will meet validity requirements for an assessment that measures school, district, and state accountability and at the same time provide adequate to make decision about college entrance and placement.

• Cost and Burden: It is understandable that two separate high school assessments schedule one year apart represent a burden to schools, faculty, students, and families. Especially, when as pointed out, not all students are college bound.

Recommendation for the AOC to consider adding the following considerations to their comparison analysis.

• Validity for Testing Purpose
• Fairness for individuals who may be refused college admission on the basis of test scores alone.
• Determine if the task, truly calls for recommending a single high school assessment for all purposes.
SUBJECT

2022-2027 K-20 Education Strategic Plan

REFERENCE

December 2015
Board received update on progress toward 60% educational attainment goal and areas for consideration as policy levers for increasing degree production and approved the updated K-20 Education Strategic Plan including adjustment to level of credential benchmarks.

December 2016
Board reviewed and discussed amendments to the Board’s FY18-FY22 K-20 Education Strategic plan and approved amendments to the Board’s FY18-FY22 Higher Education Research Strategic Plan.

August 2017
Board discussed in detail goal one and possible amendments to the K-20 Education strategic plan and requested the Planning, Policy and Governmental Affairs Committee continue the work and bring back proposed amendments to the Board for consideration.

December 2017
Board discussed and requested additional changes to the Board’s new strategic plan.

February 2018
Board approved new K-20 Education Strategic Plan (FY20-FY24) significantly rewriting the Goals, Objectives, and Performance Measures.

October 2018
Board reviewed the K-20 Educational System performance measures and directed staff to remove a number of performance measures and bring forward annual degree production targets for consideration in the updated K-20 Education Strategic Plan for the December 2018 Board meeting.

December 2018
Board reviewed the draft K-20 Education Strategic Plan and discussed setting institution level credential production goals by level of credential.

February 2019
Board approved updated K-20 Education Strategic Plan and reviewed data on Idaho’s workforce education gap and potential credential production targets. Directed staff to do additional work with the Department of Labor, Department of Commerce, Workforce Development Council, and Governor’s Office on identifying workforce need and production targets.

June 2019
Board approved updated FY20-FY24 Institution, Agency, and Special/Health program strategic plans.

October 2019
Board reviewed K-20 Education System performance during the Work Session and Literacy Growth Targets during the Planning, Policy and Governmental Affairs
February 2020  Board approved amendments to the FY21 K-20 Education Strategic Plan.

May 2020  The Board discussed amendments to the Board’s K-20 Strategic plan as part of a facilitated Board retreat.

June 2020  Board approved the institutions’ and agencies’ strategic plans and delegated approval of the health and special program plans to the Executive Director.

August 2020  Board approved a new mission and vision statement for the K-20 Education Strategic plan.

October 2020  Board reviewed K-20 Education System performance measures.

December 2020  Board discussed possible amendments to the FY 22 K-20 Education Strategic Plan.

**APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY**

Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies & Procedures, Section I.M. Planning and Reporting
Section 67-1903, Idaho Code

**BACKGROUND/ DISCUSSION**

Idaho State Constitution, Article IX, Section 2, provides that the general supervision of the state educational institutions and public school system of the State of Idaho, “shall be vested in a state board of education, the membership, powers and duties of which shall be prescribed by law.” Through obligations set in the State Constitution and Idaho statutes, the State Board of Education (Board) is charged with the general supervision, governance and control of all educational institutions and agencies supported in whole or in part by the state. This includes public schools, colleges and universities, Department of Education, Division of Career Technical Education, Idaho Public Television, and the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation. The Board and its executive agencies are charged with enforcing and implementing the education laws of the state.

Due to these broad responsibilities, the Board serves multiple roles. The Board sits as a policy-making body for all public education in Idaho, provides general oversight and governance for public K-20 education, and has a direct governance role as the Board of Regents for the University of Idaho and the board of trustees for the other public four-year college and universities. The K-20 Education strategic plan must encompass and serve all of these aspects of Idaho’s public education system.

The Board’s strategic plan is a forward-looking roadmap used to guide future actions, define the vision and mission of Idaho’s K-20 educational system, guide growth and development, and to establish priorities for resource distribution. Strategic planning provides a mechanism for continual review to ensure excellence in public education throughout the state. The strategic plan establishes the Board’s
goals and objectives that are consistent with the Board’s governing ideals and communicates those goals and objectives to the agencies and institutions under the Board, to the public and other stakeholder groups. At the October regular Board meeting, the Board reviews performance measures from the K-20 Education Strategic Plan as well as the performance of the agencies and institutions. Unlike the strategic plan work, the performance measure review is a backward look at progress made during the previous four years toward reaching the strategic plan goals and objectives.

Section 67-2903, Idaho Code, sets out minimum planning elements that are required to be in every agency and institution strategic plan as well as the annual review and updating requirement that is the basis for the Board’s strategic planning cycle. The state strategic planning requirements are identified in Attachment 2.

IMPACT
Once the Board has approved the updated strategic plan, the agencies, institutions and special/health programs will update their strategic plans for the Board’s consideration in April 2021 with final approval scheduled for June 2021.

ATTACHMENTS
Attachment 1 – FY 2022–2027 K-20 Education Strategic Plan - Consolidated
Attachment 2 – Strategic Planning Requirements

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
At its October 2020 regular meeting the Board reviewed the performance of Idaho’s K-20 education system based on progress towards the benchmarks and performance targets of the K-20 Education Strategic Plan, which includes the agencies, institutions and special/health programs that makeup Idaho’s education system. The Board took a deep dive into the metrics used to measure progress toward Board Goal 2, Educational Readiness. As part of the conversation, there was interest expressed in having a more in-depth conversation around strategies that are being used to close the gap between where we are at and the benchmarks set in the strategic plan. Board members indicated they would like to focus on K-3 literacy and education readiness. Attachment 3 identifies work that has recently been done or is currently being done in the area of literacy intervention and educational readiness.

Pursuant to Section 33-1615, Idaho Code, students in kindergarten through grade three will have their reading/literacy skills tested on the statewide assessment at least twice a year and the State Department of Education will report the results of the assessment to the Board, the Legislature and Governor and the results will be made available to the public by school and district. Pursuant to Section 33-1616, Idaho Code, the Board is required to promulgate rules implementing the provisions of the chapter and include “student trajectory growth to proficiency benchmarks and a timeline for reaching such benchmarks.” The data from the statewide reading assessment are necessary to set meaningful literacy growth targets. The
Board approved the current literacy growth targets at the August 2016 Regular Board meeting. Those targets are codified in IDAPA 08.02.01.802. The existing targets were set based on the legacy version of the Idaho reading indicator (IRI). At this time, data needed to develop new literacy growth targets are not available. Work on setting new literacy growth targets includes amending the current targets in Administrative Code. The negotiated rulemaking process required for amending these targets is currently scheduled to start spring 2021.

During the December 2020 Regular Board meeting strategic planning work session, the Board discussed its strategic priorities focused on literacy proficiency and student readiness. The K-20 Education Strategic Plan is documentation of the Board’s goals and objectives for education in Idaho and serves as the state’s plan for Idaho’s K-20 education system and must be aligned to Idaho’s constitutional responsibility for a uniform and thorough education system. The proposed amendments identified during the work session and incorporated into the plan in Attachment 1 include:

- Adding an additional performance measure to Goal 2, Objective A, measuring cohort literacy proficiency growth;
- Removal of the performance measure under Goal 2, Objective B, measuring number of students participating in early readiness opportunities. Staff were not able to find a way to measures participation; and
- Change wording on Goal 3, Objective A, from degrees produced to degrees conferred.

Staff recommends approval of the strategic plan as amended in Attachment 1.

BOARD ACTION
I move to approve the FY 2022-2027 K-20 Education Strategic plan as provided in Attachment 1.

Moved by __________ Seconded by __________ Carried Yes _____ No ______
To drive improvement of the K-20 education system for the citizens of Idaho, focusing on quality, results, and accountability.

A student-centered education system that creates opportunities for all Idahoans to improve their quality of life.

**GOAL 1: EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM ALIGNMENT** – Ensure that all components of the educational system are integrated and coordinated to maximize opportunities for all students.

**Objective A: Data Access and Transparency** - Support data-informed decision-making and transparency through analysis and accessibility of our public K-20 educational system.

**Objective B: Alignment and Coordination** – Ensure the articulation and transfer of students throughout the education pipeline (secondary school, technical training, postsecondary, etc.).

**GOAL 2: EDUCATIONAL READINESS** – Provide a rigorous, uniform, and thorough education that empowers students to be lifelong learners and prepares all students to fully participate in their community and postsecondary and workforce opportunities by ensuring they are ready to learn at the next educational level.

**Objective A: Rigorous Education** – Deliver rigorous programs that challenge and prepare students to transition through each level of the educational system.

**Objective B: School Readiness** – Explore opportunities to enhance school readiness.

**GOAL 3: EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT** – Idaho’s public colleges and universities will award enough degrees and certificates to meet the education and forecasted workforce needs of Idaho residents necessary to survive and thrive in the changing economy.

**Objective A: Higher Level of Educational Attainment** – Increase completion of certificates and degrees through Idaho’s educational system.

**Objective B: Timely Degree Completion** – Close the achievement gap, boost graduation rates and increase on-time degree completion through implementation of the Game Changers (structured schedules, math pathways, co-requisite support).

**Objective C: Access** - Increase access to Idaho’s robust educational system for all Idahoans, regardless of socioeconomic status, age, or geographic location.

**GOAL 4: WORKFORCE READINESS** - The educational system will provide an individualized environment that facilitates the creation of practical and theoretical knowledge leading to college and career readiness.

**Objective A: Workforce Alignment** – Prepare students to efficiently and effectively enter and succeed in the workforce.

**Objective B: Medical Education** – Deliver relevant education that meets the health care needs of Idaho and the region.
MISSION STATEMENT
To drive improvement of the K-20 education system for the citizens of Idaho, focusing on quality, results, and accountability.

VISION STATEMENT
A student-centered education system that creates opportunities for all Idahoans to improve their quality of life.

GUIDING VALUES
- Access
- Innovation
- Preparedness
- Resilience

GOAL 1: EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM ALIGNMENT (systemness) – Ensure that all components of the educational system are integrated and coordinated to maximize opportunities for all students.

Objective A: Data Access and Transparency - Support data-informed decision-making and transparency through analysis and accessibility of our public K-20 educational system.

Performance Measures:
I. Development of a single K-20 data dashboard and timeline for implementation.
   Benchmark: Completed by FY2020

Objective B: Alignment and Coordination – Ensure the articulation and transfer of students throughout the education pipeline (secondary school, technical training, postsecondary, etc.).

Performance Measures:
I. Percent of Idaho community college transfers who graduate from four-year institutions.
II. Percent of postsecondary first time freshmen who graduated from an Idaho high school in the previous year requiring remedial education in math and language arts.

Benchmark: 2 year – less than 55%
4 year – less than 20%  

GOAL 2: EDUCATIONAL READINESS (student-centered) – Provide a rigorous, uniform, and thorough education that empowers students to be lifelong learners and prepares all students to fully participate in their community and postsecondary and workforce opportunities by assuring they are ready to learn for the next educational level.

Objective A: Rigorous Education – Deliver rigorous programs that challenge and prepare students to transition through each level of the educational system.

Performance Measures:

I. Percentage Performance of students scoring at grade level or higher on the statewide reading assessment (broken out by grade level, K-3).

Benchmark: TBD (Benchmark will be set after Spring 2020-2021 IRI results received)

II. Growth Fall to Spring of student cohorts scoring at grade level or higher on the statewide reading assessment (broken out by grade level, K-3).

Benchmark: TBD (Benchmark will be set after Spring 2021 IRI results received)

II. Percentage of students meeting proficient or advance on the Idaho Standards Achievement Test (broken out by subject at each transition grade level, 5, 8, high school).

Benchmark:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Idaho Standards Achievement Test</th>
<th>by 2022/ESSA Plan Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Math</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Grade</td>
<td>58.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Grade</td>
<td>57.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>53.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ELA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Grade</td>
<td>68.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Grade</td>
<td>67.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>73.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Science</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Grade</td>
<td>FY21 Baseline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>FY21 Baseline</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. High School Cohort Graduation rate.
   Benchmark: 95%³ or more

IV. Percentage of Idaho high school graduates meeting college placement/entrance exam college readiness benchmarks.
   Benchmark: SAT – 60%¹ or more
               ACT – 60%¹ or more

V. Percent of high school graduates who participated in one or more advanced opportunities.
   Benchmark: 80%¹ or more

VI. Percent of dual credit students who graduate high school with an Associates Degree.
   Benchmark: 3%² or more

VII. Percent of high school graduates who enroll in a postsecondary institution:
    Within 12 months of high school graduation.
    Benchmark: 60%³ or more
    Within 36 months of high school graduation.
    Benchmark: 80%⁴ or more

Objective B: School Readiness – Explore opportunities to enhance school readiness.

Performance Measures:
I. Percentage of students scoring at grade level on the statewide reading assessment during the Fall administration in Kindergarten.
   Benchmark: TBD (Benchmark will be set after Spring 2020 IRI results received)

II. Number of students participating in early readiness opportunities facilitated by the state.
    Benchmark: TBD

GOAL 3: EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT (opportunity) – Ensure Idaho’s public colleges and universities will award enough degrees and certificates to meet the education and forecasted workforce needs of Idaho residents necessary to survive and thrive in the changing economy.

Objective A: Higher Level of Educational Attainment – Increase completion of certificates and degrees through Idaho’s educational system.

Performance Measures:
I. Percent of Idahoans (ages 25-34) who have a college degree or certificate requiring one academic year or more of study.
   Benchmark: 60%⁵ or more
II. **Total number of certificates/degrees produced/conferred, by institution per year:**
   a) Certificates
   b) Associate degrees
   c) Baccalaureate degrees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number of certificates/degrees produced, by institution annually</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Certificates of at least one year</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Eastern Idaho</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Southern Idaho</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Western Idaho</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Idaho College</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boise State University</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho State University</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis-Clark State College</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Idaho</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Associate degrees                                                      | TBD       |
| College of Eastern Idaho                                              | TBD       |
| College of Southern Idaho                                             | TBD       |
| College of Western Idaho                                              | TBD       |
| North Idaho College                                                   | TBD       |
| Boise State University                                                | TBD       |
| Idaho State University                                                | TBD       |
| Lewis-Clark State College                                             | TBD       |
| University of Idaho                                                   | TBD       |

| Baccalaureate degrees                                                 | TBD       |
| Boise State University                                                | TBD       |
| Idaho State University                                                | TBD       |
| Lewis-Clark State College                                             | TBD       |
| University of Idaho                                                   | TBD       |

III. **Percentage of new full-time degree-seeking students who return (or who graduate) for second year in an Idaho postsecondary public institution.**
   (Distinguish between new freshmen and transfers)
   **Benchmark:** (2 year Institutions) 75%³ or more
   (4 year Institutions) 85%³ or more

IV. **Percent of full-time first-time freshman graduating within 150% of time or less (2yr and 4yr).**
   **Benchmark:** 50%³ or more (2yr/4yr)
Objective B: Timely Degree Completion – Close the achievement gap, boost graduation rates and increase on-time degree completion through implementation of the Game Changers (structured schedules, math pathways, co-requisite support).

Performance Measures:
I. Percent of undergraduate, degree-seeking students completing 30 or more credits per academic year at the institution reporting.
   Benchmark: 50% or more

II. Percent of new degree-seeking freshmen completing a gateway math course within two years.
   Benchmark: 60% or more

III. Median number of credits earned at completion of Associate’s or Baccalaureate degree program.
   Benchmark: Transfer Students: 69/138² or less
   Benchmark: non-transfer students: 69/138² or less

Objective C: Access - Increase access to Idaho’s robust educational system for all Idahoans, regardless of socioeconomic status, age, or geographic location.

Performance Measures:
I. Annual number of state-funded scholarships awarded and total dollar amount.
   Benchmark: 3,000⁶ or more, $16M⁷ or more

II. Proportion of postsecondary graduates with student loan debt.
   Benchmark: 50% or less⁸

III. Percent of students who complete the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA).
   Benchmark: 60% or more

IV. Percent cost of attendance (to the student)
   Benchmark: 96%⁴ or less of average cost of peer institutions

V. Average net cost to attend public institution.
   Benchmark: 4-year institutions - 90% or less of peers⁴ (using IPEDS calculation)

VI. Expense per student FTE
   Benchmark: $20,000⁴ or less

VII. Number of degrees produced
    Benchmark: 15,000³ or more
GOAL 4: WORKFORCE READINESS (opportunity) – Ensure the educational system provides an individualized environment that facilitates the creation of practical and theoretical knowledge leading to college and career readiness.

Objective A: Workforce Alignment – Prepare students to efficiently and effectively enter and succeed in the workforce.

Performance Measures:
I. Percentage of students participating in internships.
   Benchmark: 10%\(^4\) or more

II. Percentage of undergraduate students participating in undergraduate research.
    Benchmark: Varies by institution\(^4\)

III. Percent of non-STEM to STEM baccalaureate degrees conferred in STEM fields (CCA/IPEDS Definition of STEM fields).
    Benchmark:

IV. Increase in postsecondary programs tied to workforce needs per year.
    Benchmark: 10\(^9\) or more

Objective B: Medical Education – Deliver relevant education that meets the health care needs of Idaho and the region.

Performance Measures:
I. Number of University of Utah Medical School or WWAMI graduates who are residents in one of Idaho’s graduate medical education programs.
   Benchmark: 8\(^10\) graduates at any one time

II. Idaho graduates who participated in one of the state sponsored medical programs who returned to Idaho.
    Benchmark: 60\(^11\) or more

III. Percentage of Family Medicine Residency graduates practicing in Idaho.
    Benchmark: 60\(^11\) or more

IV. Percentage of Psychiatry Residency Program graduates practicing in Idaho.
    Benchmark: 50\(^11\) or more

V. Medical related postsecondary programs (other than nursing).
   Benchmark: 100\(^9\) or more

KEY EXTERNAL FACTORS
Idaho public universities are regionally accredited by the Northwest Commission on
Colleges and Universities (NWCCU). To that end, there are 24 eligibility requirements and five standards, containing 114 subsets for which the institutions must maintain compliance. The five standards for accreditation are statements that articulate the quality and effectiveness expected of accredited institutions, and collectively provide a framework for continuous improvement within the postsecondary institutions. The five standards also serve as indicators by which institutions are evaluated by national peers. The standards are designed to guide institutions in a process of self-reflection that blends analysis and synthesis in a holistic examination of:

- The institution's mission and core themes;
- The translation of the mission's core themes into assessable objectives supported by programs and services;
- The appraisal of the institution's potential to fulfill the Mission;
- The planning and implementation involved in achieving and assessing the desired outcomes of programs and services; and
- An evaluation of the results of the institution's efforts to fulfill the Mission and assess its ability to monitor its environment, adapt, and sustain itself as a viable institution.

EVALUATION PROCESS
The Board convenes representatives from the institutions, agencies, and other interested education stakeholders to review and recommend amendments to the Board’s Planning, Policy and Governmental Affairs Committee regarding the development of the K-20 Education Strategic Plan. Recommendations are then presented to the Board for consideration in December. Additionally, the Board reviews and considers amendments to the strategic plan annually, changes may be brought forward from the Planning, Policy, and Governmental Affairs Committee, Board staff, or other ad hoc input received during the year. This review and re-approval takes into consideration performance measure progress reported to the Board in October.

Performance towards meeting the set benchmarks is reviewed and discussed annually with the State Board of Education in October. The Board may choose at that time to direct staff to change or adjust performance measures or benchmarks contained in the K-20 Education Strategic Plan. Feedback received from the institutions and agencies as well as other education stakeholders is considered at this time.

---

1 Benchmark is set based on the increase needed to meet the state educational attainment goal (60%).
2 Benchmark is set based on analysis of available and projected resources (staff, facilities, and funding).
3 Benchmark is set based on an analysis of historical trends combined with the desired level of achievement and available and projected resources (staff, facilities and funding). Desired level of achievement is based on projected change needed to move the needle on the state's 60% educational attainment goal.
4 Benchmark is set based on an analysis of historical trends combined with the desired level of achievement and available and projected resources (staff, facilities and funding).
5 Benchmark is set based on the Georgetown Study of workforce needs in Idaho in 2020 and beyond.
6 Benchmarks are set based on an analysis of historical trends combined with desired level of achievement.
7 Benchmarks are set based on performance of their WICHE peer institutions and are set to bring them either in alignment with their peer or closer to the performance level of their peer institutions.
8 Benchmarks are set based on analysis of available and projected resources (staff, facilities, and funding) and established best practices and what can realistically be accomplished while still qualifying as a stretch goal and not status quo.
9 New measure.
10 Benchmark is set based on projected and currently available state resources.
11 Benchmark is set based on an analysis of historical trends combined with the desired level of achievement and available and projected resources (staff, facilities and funding). Desired level of achievement is set at a rate greater than similar programs in other states.
Strategic Planning Requirements

Pursuant to sections 67-1901 through 1903, Idaho Code, and Board Policy I.M. the strategic plans for the institutions, agencies and special/health programs under the oversight of the Board are required to submit an updated strategic plan each year. This requirement also applies to the states K-20 Education Strategic Plan developed by the Board. These plans must encompass at a minimum the current year and four years going forward. The separate area specific strategic plans are not required to be reviewed and updated annually; however, they are required to meet the same formatting and component requirements. The Board planning calendar schedules the K-20 Education Strategic Plan to come forward to the Board at the December Board meeting and again for final review, if necessary, at the February Board meeting. The institution and agency strategic plans come forward annually at the April and June Board meetings, allowing for them to be updated based on amendments to the K-20 Education Strategic Plan or Board direction. This timeline allows the Board to review the plans and ask questions in April, and then have them brought back to the regular June Board meeting, with changes if needed, for final approval while still meeting the state requirement that all required plans be submitted to the Division of Financial Management (DFM) by July 1 of each year. Once approved by the Board; the Office of the State Board of Education submits all of the plans to DFM.

Board policy I.M. sets out the minimum components that must be included in the strategic plans and defines each of those components. The Board’s requirements are in alignment with DFM’s guidelines and the requirements set out in Sections 67-1901 through 67-1903, Idaho Code. The Board policy includes two additional provisions. The plans must include a mission and vision statement, where the statutory requirements allow for a mission or vision statement and in the case of the institutions, the definition of mission statement includes the institutions core themes.

Pursuant to State Code and Board Policy, each strategic plan must include:

1. A comprehensive mission and vision statement covering the major programs, functions and activities of the institution or agency. Institution mission statements must articulate a purpose appropriate for a degree granting institution of higher education, with its primary purpose to serve the education interest of its students and its principal programs leading to recognized degrees. In alignment with regional accreditation, the institution must articulate its purpose in a mission statement, and identify core themes that comprise essential elements of that mission.

2. General goals and objectives for the major programs, functions and activities of the organization, including a description of how they are to be achieved.
   i. Institutions (including Career Technical Education) shall address, at a minimum, instructional issues (including accreditation and student issues), infrastructure issues (including personnel, finance, and facilities), advancement (including foundation activities), and the external environment served by the institution.
ii. Agencies shall address, at a minimum, constituent issues and service delivery, infrastructure issues (including personnel, finance, and facilities), and advancement (if applicable).

iii. Each objective must include at a minimum one performance measure with a benchmark.

3. Performance measures must be quantifiable indicators of progress.

4. Benchmarks for each performance measure must be, at a minimum, for the next fiscal year, and include an explanation of how the benchmark level was established.

5. Identification of key factors external to the organization that could significantly affect the achievement of the general goals and objectives.

6. A brief description of the evaluations or processes to be used in establishing or revising general goals and objectives in the future.

7. Institutions and agencies may include strategies at their discretion.

In addition to the required components and the definition of each component, Board policy I.M. requires each plan to be submitted in a consistent format.
SUBJECT
2021 Legislative Update

REFERENCE
June 2020  The Board approved legislative ideas for the 2020 legislative session.
August 2020  The Board approved three pieces of legislation for the 2020 legislative session.

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY
Section 33-107(5)(b), Idaho Code

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION
This item will provide the Board with an update on education-related legislation that has been introduced during the 2021 Legislative Session. This will be the Board’s first opportunity to consider education-related legislation for the current session.

Board Submitted Legislation:
Of the three pieces of legislation approved by the Board at the August 2020 Regular Board meeting, one, the community college tuition cap, was requested to be held by the community college presidents. The remaining two were introduced and printed by the Senate Education Committee. Both pieces of legislation passed the Senate and are pending consideration by the Housed Education Committee.

SB1006 - Idaho literacy achievement and accountability act: amends, repeals, and adds to existing law to enact the Idaho Literacy Achievement and Accountability Act.

SB1007 - salary schedules, professional endorsements: amends existing law to provide that local salary schedules for public school staff salaries shall include certain minimum amounts and to clarify eligibility requirements for professional endorsements and advanced professional endorsements.

Administrative Rules Update:
Five rule dockets were approved by the Board for the legislature to consider during the 2021 Legislative Session. All pending rule dockets have been accepted in whole or in part by the House and Senate Education Committees.

“Normal” Pending Dockets
Docket 08-0202-2001 – Career Technical Certification. Accepted in whole.
Docket 08-0201-2002 – ADA Reporting and FTE Enrollment. Accepted in part. The methodology establishing how school districts and charter schools reported FTE student enrollment for reporting purposes
only was accepted. Additional language removing a statutory conflict regarding counting only in-person students was rejected.

Docket 08-0501-2001 – Seed Certification Chapter Repeal. Accepted in whole.

Docket 47-0101-2001 – IDVR Vocation Rehabilitation Programs. Accepted in whole.

Omnibus Docket
08-0000-1900F (Fee Rule) - Administrative Code Fees in IDAPA 08 Codified as of June 30, 2019. Accepted in whole.

Board staff will be prepared to walk the Board through any of the listed legislation to answer questions regarding the impact that a given piece of legislation may have on the state educational system or explain specific details of the legislation. The Board may choose to support, oppose, or remain neutral/silent on any of the legislation discussed.

IMPACT
This update provides the Board with the status of education-related legislation that has been introduced or the Board has been requested to weigh in on. Any items the Board chooses to support or oppose will provide Board staff with the authorization to share the Board’s position with legislators, including to testify for or against bills based on the Board’s action(s).

ATTACHMENTS
Attachment 1 – Introduced Education Related Legislation

BOARD STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
The attached summary provides a list of education-related legislation and legislation impacting state agencies and institutions, including those under the Board’s governance. The status of each bill, at the time the agenda material was prepared is provided. Staff will provide updates to the Board at the meeting regarding any intervening changes that have occurred. Additional education related legislation that has been introduced prior to the Board meeting, but not included in Attachment 1, may also be discussed.

Board staff will be prepared to provide the Board with an update at the Board meeting on any pieces of legislation that the Board wishes to have additional information on as well as those pieces of legislation opposed by the various education stakeholder organizations.
BOARD ACTION

I move to (oppose/endorse) (house bill #/Senate bill #) ____________________.

Moved by __________ Seconded by __________ Carried Yes _____ No _____
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Last Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H0002</td>
<td>Bond, levy elections, disclosures: Requires any ballot question to authorize a bond after July 1, 2021, to the information and language required by Section 33-439 and 33-439A, Idaho Code, in order to be binding and prohibits the ballot question from including other information or language regarding any other bond, levy, or matter, whether previous, current, or proposed. Creates of penalty of $10,000 fine for failure to comply with the provisions of these sections on the office of the county clerk and nullifies passage of the bond. The secretary of state will levy the fine and deposit it in the general fund of the state of Idaho.</td>
<td>01/15/2021 House - Reported Printed and Referred to State Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H0008</td>
<td>Bond, levy, ballot disclosures: Requires any ballot question to authorize a bond after July 1, 2021, to the information and language required by Section 33-439 and 33-439A, Idaho Code, in order to be binding and prohibits the ballot question from including other information or language regarding any other bond, levy, or matter, whether previous, current, or proposed. Allows a registered elector and resident to challenge the taxing districts failure to comply. Upon a determination by the court that the taxing district failed to comply with the provisions of this section, the court must declare the outcome of the ballot question nullified and, in addition, must order the taxing district to reimburse the court clerk for the election costs associated with the ballot question and award court costs and fees to the complainant. School districts are taxing districts.</td>
<td>02/04/2021 House - Take bill off General Orders; referred to State Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H0022</td>
<td>Public charter schools, funding: Section 33-5208, Idaho Code, caps the number of support units a charter school can grow in a single year to 30. The bill will remove the support unit cap, starting with FY21. Support units are used for calculating the public schools salary-based apportionment and discretionary funding. A support unit average value in FY21 is approximately $103,000.</td>
<td>01/29/2021 Senate - Introduced, read first time; referred to: Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H0023</td>
<td>Endowment land exchange, repeal: This bill seeks to eliminate inactive provisions of law. In 2001, the Idaho Legislature authorized a land exchange between the Land Board, Idaho State University, the University of Idaho and the State Board of Education with the goal of transferring title of certain endowment lands that comprised the Center for Higher Education in Idaho Falls to the universities. Since this land exchange authorized by Idaho Code 58-156 was completed in 2002.</td>
<td>02/05/2021 Senate - Introduced, read first time; referred to: Resources &amp; Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H0053</td>
<td>Electronic notices, govt entities: Allows public notices by governmental entities, including state agencies, institutions, and school districts the option to publish public notices or publications electronically using the government entity's official website.</td>
<td>02/10/2021 House - Failed: Ayes 32 Nays 38 Abs/Excd 0, Filed in Office of Chief Clerk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H0062</td>
<td>Empower parents in education act: Creates a state education savings account reserve fund for the state allocation for public education appropriations then distributes the funds 62% of all public school funds to the student education savings account; 30% to the students home district; 5% for premium payments to LEAs, 3% to the small district stabilization fund. The 62% is then divided between those students who registered with an LEA for</td>
<td>02/01/2021 House - Reported Printed and Referred to Ways &amp; Means</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H0065</td>
<td>Monuments, memorials, protection: adds a new section to Chapter 1, Title 73, Idaho Code, and provides for the protection of certain historic monuments and memorials. No monument or memorial erected on State property may be relocated, removed, disturbed, or altered without approval of the Idaho Legislature by way of a Concurrent Resolution. The legislation also preserves the names of historic figures and historic events memorialized in or dedicated to public schools, streets, bridges, structures, parks, preserves, or other public areas of the State or any of its political subdivisions that were in place prior to July 1, 2021.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H0066</td>
<td>Bond, levy election disclosures: Creates a new section of code notwithstanding any other provision of law except for the provisions of section 63-802, Idaho Code, any taxing district that proposes to submit any question to the electors of the district that would authorize any levy, except for the levies authorized for the purposes provided in sections 63-802 and 33-802(4), Idaho Code, and except for levies relating to bonded indebtedness where section 34-913, Idaho Code, applies, must include in the ballot question, or in a brief official statement on the ballot but separate from the ballot question, a disclosure setting forth in simple, understandable language. prohibits the ballot question from including other information or language regarding any other bond, levy, or matter, whether previous, current, or proposed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H0067</td>
<td>Schools, infectious disease: Amends and adds to existing law to clarify who has the authority to close schools or limit school activities or programs for the purpose of stopping the spread of infectious disease. Removes the authorization for schools to be closed on order of the State Board of Health and Welfare or local health authorities. Creates a new section of code stating only the Governor, State Board of Education or local school board/board of directors to close schools to prevent the spread of infectious disease. Includes emergency clause.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H0068</td>
<td>Higher ed, infectious disease: Adds to existing law to provide for policies regarding the prevention and spread of infectious disease at colleges and universities adopted by the colleges and universities and limits the authority to close the public institutions to the State Board of Education for the institutions under the Boards direct governance to the community college board of trustees for the community colleges. Includes emergency clause.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H0069</td>
<td>Ed, continuous improvement council: Amends existing law to provide for an advisory council on continuous improvement plans and student achievement measures and to revise provisions regarding staff evaluations, removes the requirement for school district and charter school college and career advising plans, and literacy intervention plans to be submitted to the State Board of Education.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H0073</td>
<td>Local gov, uniform accounting: Amends, repeals, and adds to existing law to provide for a uniform system of accounting and financial transparency from local governmental entities and education providers.</td>
<td>02/12/2021 House - U.C. to hold place on third reading calendar until Monday, February 15, 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H0089</td>
<td>Firearms, school property: allows school district employees, with an enhanced concealed weapons license, to carry a concealed weapon on school property with or without permission of the school board.</td>
<td>02/05/2021 House - Reported Printed and Referred to State Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H0090</td>
<td>Monuments, memorials, leg approval: provides for the protection of certain historic monuments and memorials. No monument or memorial erected on State property may be relocated, removed, disturbed, or altered without approval of the Idaho Legislature by way of a Concurrent Resolution. The legislation also preserves the names of historic figures and historic events memorialized in or dedicated to public schools, streets, bridges, structures, parks, preserves, or other public areas of the State or any of its political subdivisions that were in place prior to July 1, 2021.</td>
<td>02/10/2021 Senate - Introduced, read first time; referred to: State Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H0094</td>
<td>Criminal justice data system: Amends existing law to authorize a designee from the State Board of Education to serve on the Data Oversight Council and to provide for a vice chairman.</td>
<td>02/12/2021 House - Reported out of Committee with Do Pass Recommendation, Filed for Second Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H0106</td>
<td>Election date, school districts: Idaho’s election laws provide for four possible election dates each year - March, May, August and November. This legislation would eliminate the August election date.</td>
<td>02/12/2021 House - U.C. to hold place on third reading calendar until Monday, February 15, 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H0111</td>
<td>School employees, category 3: Amends existing law to provide that school employees at category 3 contract status shall not advance beyond such status until they complete certain requirements</td>
<td>02/10/2021 House - Reported Printed and Referred to Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H0116</td>
<td>Higher ed tuition, fees: Amends existing law to provide that tuition and fees at state institutions of higher education shall be the same or lower in the 2021-2022 and 2022-2023 academic years as they were on December 31, 2020, and to provide for rules allowing students to opt in or opt out of paying fees.</td>
<td>02/11/2021 House - Reported Printed and Referred to Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H0121</td>
<td>Voting, college credit: Amends existing law to prohibit the use of college credit to affect a student’s vote.</td>
<td>02/12/2021 House - Reported Printed and Referred to State Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H0122</td>
<td>Firearms, school property: Amends existing law to provide that certain persons shall not be prohibited from possessing weapons on school property.</td>
<td>02/12/2021 House - Reported Printed and Referred to State Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H0136</td>
<td>At-large elections: allows for at-large elections to the governing body of any political subdivision that contains no more than 140 registered voters at the last general election.</td>
<td>02/12/2021 House - Introduced, read first time, referred to JRA for Printing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H0141</td>
<td>Procurement, universities: Adds to and amends existing law to provide that a state agency may not enter into a noncompetitive contract with a state institution of higher education unless authorized by the Administrator of the Division of Purchasing.</td>
<td>02/12/2021 House - Introduced, read first time, referred to JRA for Printing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H0153</td>
<td>Higher ed, separate budget bills: Adds to existing law to provide that separate appropriation bills shall be prepared for each state college and university.</td>
<td>02/12/2021 House - Introduced, read first time, referred to JRA for Printing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1006</td>
<td>Idaho literacy achievement and accountability act: Amends, repeals, and adds to existing law to enact the Idaho Literacy Achievement and Accountability Act.</td>
<td>01/26/2021 Senate Passed 35-0-0 01/27/2021 House - Read First Time, Referred to Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1007</td>
<td>Ed, salary schedules, professional endorsements: Amends existing law to provide that local salary schedules for public school staff salaries shall include certain minimum amounts and to clarify eligibility requirements for professional endorsements and advanced professional endorsements.</td>
<td>01/26/2021 Senate Passed 35-0-0 01/27/2021 House - Read First Time, Referred to Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1008</td>
<td>Approp, edu bd, office, add'l: $166,500 FY21 Supplemental budget for IT and Data Management</td>
<td>01/26/2021 Senate Passed 35-0-0 01/29/2021 House Passed 64-3-3 02/09/2021 Senate - Signed by Governor on 02/09/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1039</td>
<td>Workforce readiness diploma: Adds to existing law to provide for a workforce readiness diploma. Requires students to pass a technical skills assessment, the workplace readiness assessment, and demonstrate competency of career technical education program standards to be issued a workforce readiness diploma by a school district or charter school.</td>
<td>02/09/2021 House - Read First Time, Referred to Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1043</td>
<td>School board hearings, exec session: Amends Idaho Code 33-205 to allow for student hearings in executive session, to preserve the privacy of the student.</td>
<td>02/12/2021 Senate - Referred to 14th Order for amendment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1045</td>
<td>Edu, advanced opp, nonpublic school: Creates a new section to provide advanced opportunities funding for nonpublic school students, subject to appropriation. Limits the per student amount to $750 per student for their four years of high school.</td>
<td>02/11/2021 Senate - Read second time; filed for Third Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1046</td>
<td>Innovation classrooms: Creates a new section to provide for the creation of innovation classrooms in which an alternative curriculum will be taught. Requires school districts to establish innovation classrooms using alternate curriculum when requested by a group representing 24 or more students. Excludes students participating in an innovative classroom from being included in the school accountability results unless wanted by the school district.</td>
<td>02/11/2021 Senate - Reported out of committee; to 14th Order for amendment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1052</td>
<td>Elementary students, flex schedules: Adds to existing law to provide for flexible school schedules for academically advanced elementary school students.</td>
<td>02/04/2021 Senate - Reported Printed; referred to Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1067</td>
<td>Elections, recall petitions: In the event that a school discontinuance election is held, the cost of conducting the election would be borne by the county, rather than the school district.</td>
<td>02/12/2021 Senate - Reported out of Committee with Do Pass Recommendation; Filed for second reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1075</td>
<td>Kindergarten, jump-start program: creates a kindergarten jump-start program and parent training program that would allow a school district to offer a four week kindergarten jump-start program and training program for parents.</td>
<td>02/10/2021 Senate - Reported Printed; referred to Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1091</td>
<td>Approp, edu bd, office, add'l: This bill provides an additional appropriation of $50,000 in onetime trustee and benefit payments from the Miscellaneous Revenue Fund to the Office of the State Board of Education for FY 2021.</td>
<td>02/12/2021 Senate - Reported out of Committee with Do Pass Recommendation; Filed for second reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1105</td>
<td>Bond, levy expiration, tax notice: Amends existing law to revise bond and levy expiration date information.</td>
<td>02/12/2021 Senate - Introduced; read first time; referred to JR for Printing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1109</td>
<td>Idaho promise mentor program: Adds to existing law to establish a volunteer college and career mentoring program in the Office of the State Board of Education.</td>
<td>02/12/2021 Senate - Introduced; read first time; referred to JR for Printing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCR105</td>
<td>Rule rejection, board of ed: States findings of the Legislature and rejects certain subsections of a rule of the State Board of Education relating to Rules Governing Administration.</td>
<td>02/11/2021 Senate - Reported Printed; referred to 10th order; held one legislative day</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>