A regular meeting of the Idaho State Board of Education was held at Boise State University February 27 – 28, 2024. Board President Dr. Linda Clark presided and called the meeting to order at 10:30 a.m. (MT).

Present
Dr. Linda Clark, President
Dr. David Hill
William G. Gilbert, Jr. Vice-President
Cally Roach
Superintendent Critchfield, Secretary
Cindy Siddoway
Kurt Liebich

Absent
Shawn Keough

Tuesday, February 27, 2024 – 10:30 a.m. (Mountain Time)

BOARDWORK
1. Agenda Review and Approval – Action Item

Mr. Gilbert asked for approval to move the agenda items for the Idaho Department of Education to the top of the agenda. The request was seconded by Dr. Hill.

BOARD ACTION
M/S (Gilbert / Hill) I move to approve the agenda as amended. A roll call vote was taken, and the motion carried 7-0. Shawn Keough was absent from voting.

2. Minutes Review and Approval – Action Item

BOARD ACTION
M/S (Gilbert / Critchfield) I move to approve the minutes for the December 13, 2023, Regular Board meeting, the December 14, 2023, Special Board meeting, the
December 21, 2023, Special Board meeting and the January 9, 2024, Special Board meeting. A roll call vote was taken, and the motion carried 7-0. Shawn Keough was absent from voting.

3. Rolling Calendar – Action Item

BOARD ACTION
M/S (Gilbert / Siddoway) I move to set February 19-20, 2025, as the date and Boise State University as the location for the February 2025 regularly scheduled Board meeting. A roll call vote was taken, and the motion carried 7-0. Shawn Keough was absent from voting.

CONSENT
BAHR
1. Boise State University – Strength of Youth Housing and Facility Contract for Summer Youth Campus 2024-2026 – Action Item

BOARD ACTION
M/S (Gilbert / Hill) I move to approve the request by Boise State University to enter into a 3-year agreement with the For the Strength of Youth program as outlined herein. A roll call vote was taken, and the motion carried 7-0. Shawn Keough was absent from voting.

2. Boise State University – Eight (8) Undergraduate Certificates and One (1) Graduate Certificate Online Program Fees – Action Item

BOARD ACTION
M/S (Gilbert / Hill) I move to approve the request by Boise State University to charge an online program fee of $375 per credit for eight (8) undergraduate certificates in Esports, Nonprofit Management, Health and Human Behavior, Foundations of Public Health, Evidence-Based Public Health, and Community-Driven Health Solutions, Applied Emotional Intelligence and Well-being, and Design Thinking for Professional Purpose and Personal Fulfillment, and $560 per credit for the graduate certificate in Organizational Development. A roll call vote was taken, and the motion carried 7-0. Shawn Keough was absent from voting.

3. Idaho State University – Ground Lease Extension with Idaho Division of Veteran’s Services – Action Item

BOARD ACTION
M/S (Gilbert / Hill) I move to approve the request by Idaho State University to execute a 25-year long term lease with the Division of Veterans Services for the property located at 1957 Alvin Ricken Drive in Pocatello at a rate of $4,000 per month with a 5% increase at each 5-year increment of the lease period. A roll call vote was taken, and the motion carried 7-0. Shawn Keough was absent from voting.
4. University of Idaho – Amendments to Constitution of the University Faculty, FSH 1520 – Action Item

**BOARD ACTION**
M/S (Gilbert / Hill) I move to approve the request by University of Idaho to execute the revisions to Faculty Staff Handbook 1520 Constitution of the University Faculty as noted in the documents attached to this motion. A roll call vote was taken, and the motion carried 7-0. Shawn Keough was absent from voting.

5. University of Idaho – Amendments to University Policy - Academic Ranks and Responsibilities, FSH 1565 – Action Item

**BOARD ACTION**
M/S (Gilbert / Hill) I move to approve the request by the University of Idaho to execute the revisions to Faculty Staff Handbook 1565 Academic Ranks and Responsibilities as noted in the documents attached to this motion. A roll call vote was taken, and the motion carried 7-0. Shawn Keough was absent from voting.

6. University of Idaho - Amendment to Ground Lease between University of Idaho and Palouse Mall LLC – Action Item

**BOARD ACTION**
M/S (Gilbert / Hill) I move to approve the Third Amendment to the Master Ground Lease between the University of Idaho and Palouse Mall LLC in substantial conformance to the form submitted to the Board in Attachment 1 and to authorize the University’s Associate Vice President for Budget and Planning to execute the lease amendment. A roll call vote was taken, and the motion carried 7-0. Shawn Keough was absent from voting.

7. Lewis-Clark State College – Construction Cost Authorization – Clearwater Hall – Action Item

**BOARD ACTION**
M/S (Gilbert / Hill) I move to authorize the construction of the first floor of Clearwater Hall by Lewis Clark State College for a cost not to exceed $2.4M, and to further authorize the President or designee to execute such documents and agreements relating thereto. A roll call vote was taken, and the motion carried 7-0. Shawn Keough was absent from voting.

IDE

8. Emergency Provisional Certificates – Action Item

**BOARD ACTION**
M/S (Gilbert / Hill) I move to authorize the Idaho Department of Education to issue emergency provisional standard instructional certificates for candidates 1-26 as
presented above, effective for the 2023-2024 school year only, and pending a cleared background check. A roll call vote was taken, and the motion carried 7-0. Shawn Keough was absent from voting.

9. Adoption of Education Testing Service Paraprofessional Assessment Qualifying Score – Action Item

BOARD ACTION
M/S (Gilbert / Hill) I move to approve the request by the Professional Standards Commission to reduce the qualifying score of the Educational Testing Service ParaPro Assessment from 460 to 457. A roll call vote was taken, and the motion carried 7-0. Shawn Keough was absent from voting.

BOARD ACTION
M/S (Gilbert / Hill) I move to approve the consent agenda. A roll call vote was taken, and the motion carried 7-0. Shawn Keough was absent from voting.

IDAHO STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

1. Superintendent’s Update

Idaho Career Ready Students (ICRS) Update. The Superintendent shared the following:

- This was a request to the Legislature as a way to support the growing Career Technical Education programs in the state that were outside of federal and state revenue streams.
- There are currently 72,000 students currently enrolled in CTE programs in Idaho.
- Last year Idaho received $45 million in onetime funding via grants to school districts to support students in grades 7-12 who seek CTE programs.
- Programs funded were as diverse as a new meat packing processing class; aquaponics with fish hatcheries; forestry programs.

Board President Dr. Linda Clark said one of the motivators in this program was that a significant number of school districts could not qualify for the federal money because they didn’t have the full pathway programs. It is now anticipated that some of these programs could be incubators for those districts to expand their offerings or are they just too small. Superintendent Critchfield said it was hoped that with the help of Dr. Clay Long, Administrator, Division of Career Technical Education, and his team they would be able to tap into other federal and state dollars to grow these programs.

Mr. Liebich expressed his hope that IDE will take the success stories that will come from the students participating in these programs and use that data to inform the U.S. Department of Education in the hopes of adjusting federal programs to support more of these types of programs.

Graduation Requirements Update. The Superintendent shared that the working group is working to ensure that school districts have local control over what graduation requirements they will be using. This is in addition to the state’s obligation which is to provide the minimum graduation standards for all students regardless of where they live.
in the state. Some of the avenues being considered would be in updating the senior project requirement to adapt that into a college and career readiness project. The working group hopes to have something in place to bring before the Legislature early in the 2025 Legislative session.

Board President Dr. Clark asked if any consideration was being made as it regards the high school dropout rate which is high. Is any consideration being given to developing a non-traditional pathway towards graduation. Superintendent Critchfield said the short answer was yes.

Mrs. Roach said in the past Idaho has been forced into a box because of the US Department of Education’s requirements for graduation and wondered if getting them involved in the discussion would be worthwhile instead of doing all this work only to be told that what is proposed will not be allowed. Superintendent Critchfield said that during the recent visit by US Secretary Cardona of the US Department of Education here in Idaho she was able to sit with him for a bit and talk about various issues affecting Idaho and when she mentioned the graduation requirements working group he told her to keep doing what she was doing and he even pointed her to some waivers that are available for states to be able to make some of these changes.

Board President Clark asked if any other states had been successful in embracing a pathways approach to graduation. Superintendent Critchfield said North Dakota has used this path and the most recent state to use a pathways approach is Montana.

SDE Legislative and Budget Update. Superintendent Critchfield said SDE didn’t bring big legislative items forward this year because their focus has been on modernizing the budget in a way that aligns with the priorities as set forth by the schools in the state.

Assessment Alignment Update. Ryan Cantrell, Deputy Superintendent, Idaho Department of Education said that after discussions with Board member Kurt Liebich he created an infographic to try and outline the six significant items that IDE are currently working on.

- **Report Card RFP** – the current vendor has communicated that the current platform is no longer going to be available in the years to come so IDE is putting together an RFP to switch over the state report card.
- **IRI RFP** – IDE’s contract with iStation is up and every 5-8 years IDE is required to put out to bid for a new vendor. This allows IDE to ask the question, what do they want from the Idaho Reading Indicator Assessment. IDE received almost 2,000 responses from Idahoans who wanted to express their desires for what they wanted from the IRI, and they are using that information to develop the RFP.
- **ISAT RFP** – another significant contract renewal where the main question is what do Idahoans want from their ISAT and how do we measure student learning and student success.
- The other three items are Standards Review, Essential Standards and Graduation Requirements. All six of these work in concert with one another and more information will be forthcoming.
There were no further comments or questions from the Board.

2. SY24-25 Amendment to the Elementary Secondary Education Act (ESEA) as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) Consolidated State Plan

Mr. Cantrell said IDE staff conducted a thorough review of the ESEA Consolidated Plan and identified edits that are necessary to ensure that the plan reflects current operational practices under Superintendent Critchfield’s administration. Board staff have confirmed that the proposed revisions are minor technical corrections that do not require public comment.

BOARD ACTION
M/S (Critchfield / Roach) I move to approve the 2024-2025 Amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) Consolidated State Plan as provided in Attachment 1 and authorize the State Superintendent of Public Instruction to submit the amendment request on behalf of the State Board of Education. A roll call vote was taken, and the motion carried 7-0. Shawn Keough was absent from voting.

There were no comments or questions from the Board.

PLANNING, POLICY, AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
1. Boise State University Annual Report

Dr. Marlene Tromp, President, Boise State University, gave the annual report to the members of the Board. She shared the following.

- BSU serves 32,000 students each year producing graduates in fields such as cyber security, manufacturing and snow and water science.
- BSU serves students from 43 of 44 counties in Idaho.
- BSU has increased scholarships to help Idaho’s brightest students. Scholarships are awarded to Idaho students based on need and merit and is renewable for all four years of their degree.
- BSU has been doing online degree programs for 30 years and online students make up a quarter of all degrees awarded.
- For Health Care Professionals who already possess an associate degree, BSU offers a BS in Advanced Medical Imaging, nursing, respiratory care, public health and public relations.
- BSU offers Veterans the TAP award. This award picks up where the GI bill ends helping veterans cover the full costs of attending college.
- BSU has the highest retention rate among 4-year Idaho public institutions for the last 5 years with over 41,000 students completing their degrees in the last 10 years.
- In just 5 years BSU’s Esports program has earned four national championships, national player of the year, program of the year and coach of the year. This
program may indirectly be critical in recruiting young males to enroll at BSU, where a 2% increase in male student enrollment just this year has been seen.

- Seventy-one percent of BSU undergraduates stay and work in Idaho.
- In 2023 BSU faculty set a record for bringing in research awards to the amount of $91 million dollars. This amount included a $6 million grant from the USDA to bring locally produced foods into school lunchrooms across the country. That is BSU’s largest sponsored project to date.
- BSU has one of the largest faculties who specialize in ‘snow science’ of any University in the country. This is an incredibly important program since winter snowfall is responsible for 71% of Idaho’s water supply.

Mr. Gilbert asked for an update of what could be expected from BSU in the next 5-10 years as BSU focuses on instate students vs. out of state students. Dr. Tromp said several initiatives have been initiated such as program prioritization review eliminating 33 low performing programs. In addition, data shows that students from metro areas continue to enroll in greater numbers. BSU is still focused on growing the student numbers in rural areas, male students, and first-generation students. Further, BSU sees that programs have to evolve to serve professional needs in the state and a focus will be placed on in-demand careers such as STEM field careers in Health Sciences, Natural Sciences and Engineering.

President Clark asked what was the reduction in staff that was necessary to balance BSU’s budget. Alicia Estey, Chief Financial and Operating Officer, Boise State University, said it was 25-30 vacant positions they elected not to fill, and then the program eliminations.

Mr. Liebich asked for a projection of upwards of 5 years for on-time graduation rates; for every student who leaves school without their degree it is a huge lost opportunity for the student and our institutions. Dr. Tromp said many of BSU’s students are working and have families so it would be unrealistic to think that BSU can reach 91% graduation rate especially since many of these students are piecing their degree out over many years, which should still be seen as a success.

Mrs. Roach wondered how BSU differentiates themselves from the other institutions in Idaho as it relates to areas of expertise. Dr. Tromp said one way that BSU is really striking out is through semiconductor development, expanding the material science engineering program. One of BSU’s public health programs, the social work program, has been ranked one of the top in the country. Dr. Tromp offered to create for the Board members a document that would outline some of the areas that show how BSU differs from the other institutions in the state.

Mrs. Roach asked about the agenda item being brought forward today where BSU is seeking permission for a new Ph.D. program in engineering which did not go through the program prioritization process, and she wondered why that was. John Buckwalter, Provost, Boise State University, said the proposal before the Board today did not go through the program prioritization process because that is for existing programs.
However, it did go through a process of evaluation both internally and with external evaluators that looked for demand and interest from workforce partners. Mr. Gilbert asked what BSU saw as the optimal mix of instate and out of state student numbers. Dr. Tromp said that optimum mix is really more about Idaho’s workforce and what their needs are. For instance, even if every man, woman, and child in the US was trained we could still not cover the demand for cyber security jobs. It is also imperative to keep growth gradual and steady so when the plateau does come they will be fiscally responsive to that change in demand.

Dr. Hill asked if BSU had a strategy for closing the gap in graduation rates for Hispanic students and rural students. Dr. Tromp said the provost’s office, the student affairs office and the enrollment management office are all working towards finding a solution as to how to get more Hispanic and more rural students across the finish line. One of the simplest ideas has been to ask the students directly what programs or services will help them be academically successful, which in some cases has allowed the students to redesign higher education that works for them.

There were no further comments or questions from the Board.

At this time the Board took a 15-minute break returning at 12:26 p.m. (MT).

2. BSU’s Educator Preparation Program (EPP) Update

Boise State University’s Educator Preparation Program is a Board-approved educator preparation program for certification purposes. Dr. James Satterfield and Dr. Jennifer Snow, reviewed the College of Education’s EPP program with the Board. They shared the following:

- The College of Education has 5 departments; 31 Educator preparation programs; 19 clinical faculty; 59 faculty members; 214 initial program completers in 2023; 75 advanced program completers in 2023.
- Program Innovation and Continuous Improvement includes Early Childhood Program Administration and Leadership courses; AI in Education and Career Technical Education (CTE) teacher preparation which is the first of its kind in Idaho offering a master’s in teaching in CTE and a Cybersecurity CTE degree-based teacher preparation program.
- Founded in 2014 the College of Education just passed its accreditation visit and earned full renewal of their accreditation with no areas for improvement and no stipulations.

Board President Dr. Clark asked if the teacher preparation programs address teacher preparation in reading and math and classroom management. Dr. Satterfield said yes, the College of Education was allocating resources to helping teachers with all of these areas. Dr. Snow highlighted the Science of Reading that has been a major focus of the College of Education which has been recognized as a state-approved dyslexia professional development provider. They are actively developing a three-credit series on identification, instructional strategies, and assessment in service.
Mr. Liebich made a comment wondering if the Board was striving enough to generate enough teachers that are actually going to meet the educational needs in Idaho, and he wondered how big the gap was between the need and the number of students training to become teachers. His second comment was to discuss the disconnect in terms of the population of Latino teachers that are out there since 13 to 15 percent of our student population identify as Latino and wondered what is being done to train more teachers from the Latino community. Superintendent Critchfield said it’s time to look beyond the Treasure Valley and into our rural areas for teachers. If we look at the districts who sought emergency certifications we find it everywhere even in the largest school districts, so the need for teachers is great. We are still seeing the fallout from the vast number of teachers who retired after covid, or teachers who entered the profession only to leave after three or four years to pursue jobs with higher pay.

Dr. Satterfield added to the discussion by saying that an avenue that BSU is using to recruit teachers through the TRIO program which allow them to encourage and recruit young teachers into the profession. One of the ways they are doing this is in trying to change the narrative around becoming a teacher and showing young people what a difference they can make in a student’s life. TRIO Teacher Prep is a high impact academic support unit designed to enroll, serve, and graduate 125 first-generation students, limited income students, and/or students with a documented disability into the teaching profession.

There were no further comments or questions from the Board.

WORK SESSION
INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH AND STUDENT AFFAIRS

A. Strategic Discussion of Board Policy III.Z. Planning and Delivery of Postsecondary Programs and Courses

Mrs. Roach shared that Board Policy III.Z Planning and Delivery of Postsecondary Programs and Courses was originally adopted by the Board in August 2003, to "ensure Idaho’s public postsecondary institutions meet the educational and workforce needs of the state through academic planning, alignment, collaboration and coordination of programs." The policy aimed to “optimize the delivery of academic programs while allowing the institutions to grow and develop consistent with an appropriate alignment of strengths and sharing of resources.” The policy provided a critical framework to support the Board in meeting its constitutional and statutory oversight responsibilities by requiring appropriate levels of planning and accountability of postsecondary educational programming.

In Fall 2023, the Board President established a Working Group comprised of four Board members to closely examine Board Policy III.Z. and determine if further amendments should be made to the policy, particularly related to Designated Service Regions and Statewide Program Responsibilities.
Five institutions proposed maintaining statewide responsibilities as currently established in Board Policy III.Z. and recommended the Board do more to ensure institutions are actively meeting their statewide responsibilities, including conducting the bi-annual review as required by the policy. Six institutions recommended maintaining designated service regions as they currently exist or with some minor modifications to account for population growth. Two institutions proposed the Board establish a time-limited, first right of refusal process for program proposals outside an institution’s designated service region to allow for a speedy response to workforce demand without creating high-cost inefficiencies and undermining systemness. Seven institutions expressed opposition to the idea that institutions be given the ability to offer General Education courses anywhere in the state.

Based on feedback from the institutions and input from Board staff, the Working Group drafted a set of potential recommendations related to Board Policy III.Z. and determined to bring these draft recommendations to the full Board for a Work Session discussion at the February 2024 Board meeting.

Dr. Hill added that in front of the Board members was a paper, which he emphasized was meant to provoke discussion. As the Board’s responsibility is to the people of Idaho via oversight over the four-year college and four junior colleges and also K-12 this review needs to be seen as a system level discussion, not an individual institution discussion.

Dr. Hill said, “the Board has the oft-stated goal of access and affordability for all Idahoans irrespective of where in the state they might choose to live.” So based on the discussions held with the various institutions Dr. Hill said Policy III.Z. should be a mechanism for managed competition that steers the course between two extremes, the extreme of open competition and the extreme of over managed. The Board’s fundamental functional problem is to build a system with enough rules that people know how to behave broadly but has enough flexibility that the Board and the institutions can use judgement to make sure we don’t collapse innovation.

Further, the role of community colleges needs to be considered in this context. Community Colleges are inherently local institutions, supported by local taxation and overseen by locally elected Boards. In that sense their service region should be identical to their taxing district. They should not encroach on the service areas of other Community Colleges, even with online delivery. Community Colleges are occasionally asked or desire to deliver applied baccalaureate degrees in their region, as allowed by state law. The justification for these degrees is most often expressed in terms of high demand or high need (workforce need) and thus should be specifically addressed in this policy.

Mr. Gilbert said Policy III.Z. states that specific degrees are to be reviewed every two years but that has not been done consistently. When an institution brings forward a program that is similar to another institution’s program these programs need to be reviewed every two years.
Mr. Liebich said he did not feel Idaho was a big enough state to have redundancy across the system in certain areas. Far better to be mission focused as it relates to degree programs. However, if a local business wants to partner with a local institution they should be able to do that, and we shouldn’t be creating natural barriers to that.

Dr. TJ Bliss, Chief Academic Affairs Officer, Idaho State Board of Education, made a couple of clarifying comments. Via Board Policy III.I. the Board approves the missions of the institutions, and those missions are in the Board’s strategic plan which is reviewed every year.

Dr. Bliss said the final paragraph of Board Policy III.Z. says if an institution is approached by a company and wants to enter a contract with them to offer professional development particularly in someone else’s region they just have to notify that institution. The policy encourages them to cooperate, but it does not require them to.

Superintendent Critchfield expressed a concern that perhaps the policy as written years ago is no longer a good fit. She expressed support for the notion that whichever institution is approached by a community business partner to develop particular training courses they will work together to do what is best for the community and the students of Idaho. This collaboration should go a long way in meeting the workforce needs of our state.

Mr. Liebich echoed his agreement with a managed coordinated competition approach especially in areas where we need more students obtaining degrees such as in nursing, and teacher preparation.

Dr. Hill then proposed that the Board members review the tentative proposal as recommended by the working group and bring back any questions they might have tomorrow when the Board meeting continues. They were:

- In each case, designate one institution as the coordinator for statewide programs. (Note: not leader, controller or other supervisory description).
- Create a coordinating committee with co-chairs, Board Member, and the appropriate Dean from the coordinating institution.
- The committee would be charged with developing a statewide multiyear plan for adoption by the Board.
- The Board would then seek legislative approval and attempt to fund the plan.
- The committee would be staffed (minutes, organizational meetings etc.) by the coordinating institution.

The Board recessed for the day at 2:00 p.m. (MT).

Wednesday, February 28, 2024 - 10:25 a.m. (Mountain Time)

Board President Dr. Linda Clark reconvened the meeting at 10:25 a.m. (MT)
EXECUTIVE SESSION – (Closed to the Public) - Action Item to go into Executive Session - No action taken in Executive Session.

M/S (Gilbert / Hill) I move the Board
1. Go into Executive Session pursuant to Idaho Code § 74-206(1)(f) To communicate with legal counsel for the public agency to discuss the legal ramifications of and legal options for pending litigation, or controversies not yet being litigated but imminently likely to be litigated. The mere presence of legal counsel at an executive session does not satisfy this requirement. A roll call vote was taken, and the motion carried 7-0. Shawn Keough was absent from voting.

The Board moved to Executive Session at 10:26 a.m. (MT).

BOARD ACTION
M/S (Gilbert / Roach) I move to go out of Executive Session. A roll call vote was taken, and the motion carried 7-0. Shawn Keough was absent from voting.

The Board returned from Executive Session at 10:44 a.m. (MT).

Board President Dr. Linda Clark stated that the Board concluded its discussion and took no action on the matter discussed.

Wednesday, February 28, 2024 – 10:44 a.m. (Mountain Time)

PLANNING, POLICY, AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
3. Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities (APLU) greeting

Dr. Mark Becker, President, Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities (APLU) addressed the Board. He shared the following:

- The APLU traces its roots in higher education back 1862 with the Morrill land grant act.
- While the nation was at Civil War President Lincoln signed into law a bill which ceded Federal lands to the states and territories, for the purposes of public higher education and particularly public higher education for the education of the common man in Agricultural and Mechanical Arts.
- In 1862 Senator Justin Morrill proposed to the United States Congress that the President create Universities across the country for the purpose of supporting the economies and well fare of our national wellbeing.
- In 1871 twenty-nine of the land grant universities met for the first time in Chicago and started to work together for the common good.
- In 1889 the University of Idaho became Idaho’s land grant institution through the Morrill act. Idaho became a state in 1890.
- The APLU was created in 1896 and was known then as the National Association of State Universities.
There are now 250 member Universities in the system. While BSU is not a land-grant university it does have designation as a research university carrying the Carnegie classification which identifies those institutions that are either research one or two schools. To be eligible for membership into the APLU you must be a research one or two school. The APLU governs schools in the United States, Canada and Mexico and represents 5.3 million undergraduate students, 1.4 million graduate students, 1.3 million faculty and staff and members award over 1.4 million degrees per year. As a collective members conduct 61 billion in externally sponsored research in a year. The APLU is an advocacy organization representing the interest of members in Washington, DC working with the US Congress, US Department of Education, the Department of Agriculture, National Science Foundation, National Institutes of Health, and many others. At its national meeting, held this past November, the APLU recognized Boise State with their degree completion award. In 2013 the APLU created this award for those universities who made tangible real progress towards increasing graduation rates and reducing the number of students who are unnecessarily leaving college without their degree.

Mr. Liebich said it seemed that across the country higher education’s reputation has been damaged and what was the APLU doing to address this narrative. Dr. Becker said he is aware of the mainstream media’s spin on this topic, unfortunately their reporting is not based on facts. In the recent edition of the Chronicle of Higher Education, results of fieldwork and surveys show that the vast majority of Americans actually believe there are some things our universities do quite well such as research. Recently, in Utah, the public higher education institutions came together and presented their case to the citizens of Utah about the value they bring to the state both in terms of economic benefits as well as to the graduates.

There were no further comments or questions from the Board.

OPEN FORUM

Mr. Dunkley, of Dunkley Music addressed the Board. “I am Mark Dunkley of Dunkley music here in Meridian and all of Southern Idaho. Thank you board for letting me speak to you today. We have served the community for 74 years. My concern is not just my concern but the concern of other companies in Idaho that have contacted me.

My concern is about the Odyssey program. The old Odyssey program was working well for us and for our students and parents that we have helped with musical education. When they switched, just at the beginning of this year, to a new platform no advanced notice was given to us and chaos and hardship for both vendors and consumers occurred and let me explain. The new platform requires every item to be shipped. This causes additional cost. We want to see the customers in our store so we can help them,
train them, give them the education on the product and create the correct product for them to use. This also causes the product to be inflated in price that gives the parents the idea that we are inflating our prices and are not competitive because we have to add on freight to somebody that lives a mile away that could come in our store they could pick it up and sometimes that freight charge can be $100. That is our tax money that is being wasted. It discriminates against the local dealers who can perform personal service and personal education instruction to the customers.

Odyssey should consider allowing well established vendors with approved items to offer a will call or pickup option. The new program has also made it very difficult to add products onto the website and made it very difficult for parents to navigate. Dunkley music also has not received payment for things that have been approved by Odyssey that were billed in 2024. One thing that could help out the vendor, the dashboard could have a help option, there could be a chat function and an FAQ section as well. We have not signed up for the current platform because it has caused our reputation with our customers to be tarnished and that's just not worth it to me. We have customers and vendors frustrated. The program we would like to be a willing participant in helping to solve the problem we would love to be a vendor representative to help whoever we need to.

We’re here to help with the musical education of the of the people in Idaho and we’ve done that for 74 years and we want to continue. We want local people to be able to help local people and not have to have outside vendors coming in and shipping things to people that they’re not aware of for instance if a person wanted a violin what size of violin do they need. They need to be fitted personally and if an outside vendor if they require a four violin or full-size violin that might be the wrong size so there are many things that can happen with an individual music store or with local vendors helping out to the musical department. Thank you.”

BOARD OF TRUSTEES – BOISE STATE UNIVERSITY

1. Boise State University Students address the Board

The following students addressed the Board. They were Cheyon Sheen, ASBSU President, Jason Holman, ASBSU Vice President, Calvin Doerr, Alejandra (Ally) Almaraz, Nicolette Missbrenner, and Zackery Tallman.

Dr. Hill asked if any of the students had used the math learning center here that just received an award from the APLU, and if so how did it help them. One student said he has used the math learning centers and tutoring services since he transferred into BSU and he felt they were extremely helpful in getting him to develop the basic foundational understanding of math that he needed for his engineering degree. Jason Holman said he always struggled with math, but the math center helped him go from barely passing pre-algebra to passing calculus this past semester.

Mr. Liebich said one of the things the Board was concerned about is the mental health of the student population as we are still coming out of the covid pandemic. He asked...
if the students felt they had the support they needed to deal with any mental health issues. The students felt that BSU does a great job of informing students of the programs in place to help them if they need services. There are posters scattered across campus, regular emails sent to students telling them about the services available. In addition, there are mental health rooms available for students to practice yoga and deep breathing. It was shared that it can take upwards of 4 weeks or more to get an appointment with a counselor so providing more counselors would be helpful.

Superintendent Critchfield asked what kind of advice would they give to incoming freshman. The students said to get more involved in the things that interest you immediately. They agreed that getting involved and being willing to try new opportunities opened avenues for their futures they did not think possible. Joining in is also a great way to meet new people and make new friends. And above all else enjoy your college experience; get more involved in campus activities and clubs.

Board President Dr. Clark asked if any of the students had taken advantage of dual credit courses while in high school and if so how many units did they begin college with. The answers ranged from one credit to 20 credits. Some of the students said that in some of their schools they did not get much information on higher education and what dual credit courses could do for them.

Mrs. Roach asked the students why they chose Boise State, and she asked if any of them received scholarships or financial aid. One student mentioned that they received the Presidential Scholarship which covered most of their tuition, other scholarships happened along the way and they also had financial aid which allowed them to go to BSU for free and they will graduate with no student debt. Another mentioned it was the connections between the faculty members and members of the business community that helped them make the decision to attend BSU. One student shared that they have now had two NASA ISGC internships, higher education research fellowships and been involved in research on the campus for the past two and a half years. Another shared that being a Boise native they were well aware of how much BSU does for the local community and state.

Dr. Hill asked the students about the financial burden they will be graduating with and how do they reconcile that burden with their career path. A nursing student said she felt that her education would eventually pay for itself, and she intended to stay in Idaho after graduation. Jason said the connections he’s been able to make through the College of Business will absolutely make his college debt worth it. He felt privileged to receive two internships just because of those connections and he has a third internship coming soon all because of his professors.

There were no further comments or questions from the Board.

2. Boise State University Employees address the Board

The following BSU employees address the Board. They were:
Mrs. Roach asked for some data concerning the online students who attend BSU. Are they local students or does BSU serve students from across the country. Mr. Wheeler said a little over 40 percent of the students are from Idaho and the rest come from all over the country including some students who are active military and stationed all over the world. Mrs. Roach asked if the 40 percent of Idaho students were in more remote locations where they didn’t have easy access to the campus. Mr. Wheeler said for the most part the students are spread evenly through the state. There are many students who are local who need the flexibility that online courses give them since they work full time and do not have the time to come to the campus.

Mrs. Roach asked for a glimpse of how many dual credit students there might be. Mr. Wheeler said there are currently 7,000 dual credit students enrolled each year most of whom are remote learning. Data does show that those high school students who take dual credit courses through BSU tend to succeed at BSU and graduate on time.

Mr. Gilbert asked Dr. Perrenoud if there was a particular pathway that’s been created across the state between the 2- and 4-year institutions where they work together to help the students transition from school to school especially as it relates to the trades. Mr. Perrenoud said he has been working with North Idaho College and College of Southern Idaho who have recently had an associate degree in construction management be approved which will give more students the opportunity to get construction education in their regions that will then funnel into BSU. Dr. Perrenoud is currently working with the national electrical contractor’s association on a research project on how mega projects impact labor markets. There is a large mega project going on here in the valley and labor is going to attract electricians within the industry which is a huge part of the construction management program. BSU is not a trade school but many people in the trades come to BSU to gain the project management skills necessary to be leaders within their industries.

Dr. Lamborn said the field of semiconductor manufacturing is really complex. There are layers were expertise needs to be utilized in the manufacturing process that includes
people who had their Ph.D.’s, their master’s and their bachelor’s in science and engineering or even in finance business management, supply chain management, factory technicians, etc. It is interesting to note that looking at graduate data over half of the graduates each year started as a transfer student.

There were no further comments or questions from the Board.

BUSINESS AFFAIRS AND HUMAN RESOURCES

1. Amendment to Board Policy – Section V.T. Fee Waivers – 2nd Reading

Mr. Gilbert said this was a second reading of Board Policy V.T. After the December 2023 Board meeting and after close consultation with veteran coordinators from covered institutions, staff confirmed this policy modification would assist the veteran coordinators in working with veterans and their dependent students to continue their education through degree completion. There were no changes between the first and second readings of this policy.

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Gilbert / Roach) I move to approve the second reading of proposed amendments to Board Policy V.T. Fee Waivers, as presented. A roll call vote was taken, and the motion carried 7-0. Shawn Keough was absent from voting.

There were no comments or questions from the Board.

2. University of Idaho – IPv4 Litigation

The Board met in executive session to discuss resolution of litigation between University of Idaho and a private entity. State Board policy V.W.2. requires prior approval and authorization of the Board for an institution to initiate legal action with respect to any matter in which the amount in controversy exceeds $200,000.00.

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Liebich / Siddoway) I move to approve the initiation of legal action and to authorize the President of the University of Idaho, or the President’s designee, to initiate the legal action under the advice and guidance of the University’s legal counsel and in substantial conformance with the terms presented to the Board, along with such other documents necessary to carry out the terms of the legal action. A roll call vote was taken, and the motion carried 7-0. Shawn Keough was absent from voting.

PLANNING, POLICY, AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

4. Consideration of BYU-I - New EPP Literacy Endorsement Program

Kathleen Shoup, Teacher Education Preparation Coordinator, Idaho State Board of Education, shared that in academic year 2022-23, a work group was formed to create
the Idaho Standards for Educator Preparation Providers and the Educator Preparation Program Approval Guide. These two documents were approved by the State Board in 2023. Brigham Young University – Idaho (BYU-I) is the first Educator Preparation Provider to submit a new program application for review and consideration by the State Board. A review team was assembled and reviewed BYU-I’s K-12 literacy program application on January 11, 2024. Board staff facilitated the review. The review team concluded the review on January 11, 2024, and recommended BYU-I’s K-12 literacy program application be approved.

The approval of the new program application would allow BYU-I to offer a K-12 literacy endorsement as a 20-credit endorsement option. The disapproval of the new program application would not allow BYU-I to offer a K-12 literacy endorsement as a 20-credit endorsement option.

BOARD ACTION
M/S (Liebich / Siddoway) I move to approve the request by the Office of the State Board of Education’s review team to approve Brigham Young University - Idaho’s twenty (20) credit K-12 Literacy Program. A roll call vote was taken, and the motion carried 7-0. Shawn Keough was absent from voting.

There were no comments or questions from the Board.

6. Division of Career Technical Education Annual Report

Dr. Clay Long, Administrator, Career Technical Education, reviewed the annual report for the Board and said his presentation today was intended to drive conversation and discussion as he goes through some of the data elements. He shared the following:

- There has been a 35% increase in total programs offered over the last five years.
- There are 145 local education agencies participating, 72% of those in rural areas.
- There are 15 career technical centers with 20,631 student enrolled.
- 71% of all high school students take CTE courses.
- 2,394 CTE diplomas were awarded between 2022 – 2023.
- 94% of CTE concentrators graduated from high school compared to only 80% who did not take any CTE courses.
- 48% of high school CTE concentrators went on to college compared to only 42% of all Idaho high school graduates.
- 1,708 students have been awarded certificates and degrees, a 2% increase in five years.
- 93% of technical college completers found jobs, continued their education, or went into the military.
- 71% obtained employment related to their CTE training.
- 5,100 student enrolled and nearly 3,200 FTE in certificate / degree programs.
- There are 215 active programs in the state.
- 95,675-year end credits have been awarded.
• There was an 11% increase in one year for the number of students going to workforce training centers (WTC).
• That is a five-year average of over 47,000 WTC enrollments.
• For Adult Education 44% of students are ages 25-44
• 85% of GED test takers did not finish high school due to personal or academic reasons.
• Idaho’s GED pass rate is 80% - the national rate is only 69%.
• For many students the highest grade completed is the 10th grade.
• 32,000 unique students earning 115,000 microcredentials.

Dr. Long shared that in April he will be back with a first look at IDCTE’s Strategic Plan. He will also have a revised 4-year plan where CTE will be reviewing all 56 of their programs.

Board President Dr. Clark asked if there was a breakdown for the number of males enrolled versus the number of females enrolled in CTE courses. Dr. Long said he would get that data to the Board.

Mr. Liebich asked if there was something in Board policy or statute that prevents a student from continuing on without having their GED. Dr. Long said Idaho currently uses the GED test but other tests can be utilized. Mr. Liebich said if the state wanted to allow adults to earn a high school diploma by taking CTE courses that would be a totally different approach and pathway. Dr. Long said he would do some more research and find out what the number of students might be and see if the new legislation that came forward this legislative session was for those students who have aged out of the system.

Dr. Hill said he totally sees the vision as Clay outlined it here today, but he wondered who owns the vision and who will drive us to the end game. Mr. Freeman said he has been in discussions with Dr. Long, Dr. Clark and Superintendent Critchfield and they feel that they can be an informal data governance council that would make those decisions around capacity, both human capital capacity and financial capacity, and the needs associated with that, to help frame that vision.

Dr. Long said after his Inspire Ready presentation last October he received questions regarding CTE's teacher certification program and the trend of those pieces. In fact, he made a presentation to JFAC (Joint Finance Appropriations Committee) and they are recommending the positions that CTE requested, three of those being regional teacher educators, that will help deliver course work but also the mentoring piece that is important to the success of new teachers.

Board President Dr. Clark asked for a sense of the struggles in finding CTE teachers or people willing to move into CTE teaching and what will it take to increase those numbers. Dr. Long said they don’t track positions at the district level to see if the jobs are being filled, they look at if a program isn't able to operate.
There were no further comments or questions from the Board.

At this time the Board took a 30-minute break returning at 12:50 p.m. (MT).

5. Workforce Development Council LAUNCH Report

Wendi Secrist, Executive Director of the Workforce Development Council, gave an update on the LAUNCH program to the Board. She shared the following:

- The legislation to create the Idaho Launch Grant Program went into effect on July 1, 2023.
- Launch’s application program was ready by October 2023.
- By November 30th they had received over 11,500 applications from students across Idaho.
- Initial grant awards were made in December of 2023.
- As of February 26, 2024, they have received a little more than 13,000 applications.
- Females applied at a higher rate than male students by 5%. However, this was a smaller gap than is seen in those applying for other scholarships, which suggests that more males have actually applied to this grant award than for other award programs.
- About a thousand students have not completed their application. Work is ongoing to have college and career advisors in local school districts work with these students and to encourage them to finish their application.
- The application deadline is April 15th, 2024.
- Launch is available to public, private, and homeschool students, students in tribal schools, and those getting their GED.
- Of students applying to credit granting institutions: 1,160 or 10% are applying for certificates rather than the traditional degree.
- The largest number of applications received are from students interested in fields such as Health Care Technicians, Nursing, Business Administration, Engineering, Biological Sciences and Teaching.

Board President Dr. Clark expressed surprise that the number of students applying from tribal schools was so low (7 applications). Ms. Secrist said data analysis is ongoing to determine what the factors are for such a low number. For instance, if a student marks Hispanic but they are also a tribal member Hispanic takes precedence over everything, so more analysis is necessary to look at these numbers.

Mr. Gilbert said it was very likely that funding for this program will be oversubscribed and wanted to know what the mechanism is to prioritize who is awarded a grant, knowing that the priority is in demand careers first. Ms. Secrist said statute required Workforce Development to use either job openings or growth rate to determine in demand careers. This equates to careers with 50 or more job openings. This data is coming from the Idaho Department of Labor statistics.
There were no further comments or questions from the Board.

7. Middle Grade Math Work Group Recommendations

Alison Henken, K-12 Accountability and Projects Program Manager, Idaho State Board of Education, led the Board through the recommendations.

The Math Work Group was chaired by Board President Dr. Linda Clark and included twenty (20) other individuals from across Idaho, including representatives from the State Board of Education (Board), State Department of Education (Department), Division of Career Technical Education, STEM Action Center, higher education math experts, and K-12 educators from district and school administrators to math teachers. The work group met six (6) times as a full group and subgroups met three (3) to five (5) additional times to delve more deeply into their specific areas of focus. The subgroups included: Educator Effectiveness, Special Initiatives, What’s Not Working, What’s Working, and Statute. During full group meetings, the Math Work Group reviewed math achievement data and specific data pulled based at their request, discussed success and challenges, and developed actionable recommendations to present to the Board.

The following are highlighted recommendations from the Math Work Group’s Report.

**Educator Effectiveness**

**Priority Recommendation**
- The Board, Department, and Regional Math Centers should work together to develop professional learning pathways for educators to increase their mathematical knowledge for teaching. Consider use of micro-credentialing within the pathways and adjust renewal requirements and/or processes to support implementation and incentive educator preparation.

**Other Highlighted Recommendation**
- Create a Math Educator Preparation Work Group to 1) identify changes needed to ensure educators develop sufficient mathematical knowledge for teaching during preparation, and 2) review the approach currently used to fund the Idaho State Department of Education, and, if applicable, make recommendations for improvement.

**Standards, Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment**

**Priority Recommendation**
- Engage a work group to develop a K-12 Comprehensive Math Plan and set a five-year update cycle.

**Other Highlighted Recommendations**
- Department should adjust the process for review of math curricular materials to provide more specific guidance regarding which materials are most aligned to the Idaho Math Instructional Framework and which should be avoided.
STEM and CTE Integration
Priority Recommendation
• Build a cross-agency collaboration between the Board, Department, CTE, STEM Action Center, Workforce Development Council, and the Regional Math Centers to create and implement a campaign to address math culture in the state.

Other Highlighted Recommendations
• Department should capitalize on existing, successful professional development structures within the STEM Action Center and CTE to provide expanded, integrated math training content.

Idaho Statute
Priority Recommendation
• Update Idaho statute to align to key recommendations in this report. Promote the development of budgets that will support state and LEA efforts to improve math achievement.

Board President Dr. Clark asked if the recommendations brought forward were where the group wanted to be when they began meeting. Ms. Henken said yes, and the group realized they have systemic issues that need to be dealt with and included the establishment of a math educator preparation work group as well as the continued work of this math workgroup in their recommendations.

Mr. Liebich wondered how much of this problem is a curriculum problem on top of an educator confidence problem where teachers just are not comfortable teaching math. Board President Dr. Clark said its true we haven’t identified a strong math curriculum as we did in reading. Superintendent Critchfield said along with a curriculum review there needs to be better teacher preparation in how to teach math, and in being comfortable doing so. A lot of work needs to go into reframing the narrative that, “I’m not a math person”, into “I am a math person.”

There were no further comments or questions from the Board.

For a comprehensive review of the Math Work Group findings please go to //efaidnbmnnibpcajpogclclefindmkaj/https://boardofed.idaho.gov/meetings/board/archive/2024/022724/03%20PPGA.pdf

BOARD ACTION
M/S (Liebich / Siddoway)) I move to adopt the Math Work Group recommendations outlined in Attachment 2. A roll call vote was taken, and the motion carried 7-0. Shawn Keough was absent from voting.

IDAHO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
3. Idaho Teacher of the Year
Superintendent Critchfield then introduced Idaho’s Teacher of the Year, Trent Van Leuven. Mr. Van Leuven was selected from over 300 nominations and 70 applicants. He started his teaching career as an agriscience instructor at the West Ada School District in 2009 before moving on to teach career technical education subjects at Mackay Jr./Sr. High School in 2014. He is the President of the Mackay Education Association and Chairman of the State and Federal Lands Committee of the Idaho Farm Bureau. He was the 2014 recipient of the National NAAE Ideas Unlimited Winner award and the 2008 recipient of the Platinum Award for Regional Dairy Challenge Event in California. He was also named National Agriscience Teacher of the Year from Region 1 in 2017. Van Leuven will serve as Idaho’s 2024 Teacher of the Year and will be Idaho’s nominee for National Teacher of the Year.

Mr. Van Leuven then addressed the Board sharing that he felt we are in the golden age of CTE in the state of Idaho which was propelled by initiatives like the Advanced Opportunities, the emphasis placed on comprehensive local needs assessments by Idaho, the Idaho career ready schools’ program, Idaho Launch, the teacher apprenticeship program, career ladder investments and so many other initiatives. This proactive planning sets Idaho apart.

Mr. Van Leuven spent a minute expressing his concern over the challenges of teacher recruitment and retention which he sees especially in small schools. He shared that at his school, Mackay High in the last 10 years they have had, on average, a new science teacher every other year. Some of the factors that contribute to such high turnover is housing, teacher salary, retirements, benefits, additional duties, and conflicts.

Further, the other critical issue facing schools today is administrator retention and recruitment which plays a critical role in teacher recruitment and retention. A stable administrator is essential for strategic planning and enacting significant change. In addition, the number of Superintendent’s was greatly diminished by covid. A potential solution would be for a superintendent apprenticeship program similar to the teacher apprenticeship programs already in place which would foster homegrown leadership.

Mr. Gilbert said he liked the administrator apprenticeship program idea but worried that taking great teachers, such as Mr. Van Leuven, out of the classroom to make them administrators was doing a disservice to the students. Mr. Van Leuven said in many of the small school districts the superintendent is only a part-time job so they could still be in the classroom. The impediment to getting good teachers who want to become administrators is the financial cost of taking courses to become an administrator. Mr. Liebich asked for his understanding of why teacher retention is so low, and what is the root cause of this turnover. Mr. Van Leuven answered with the high cost of housing in some of the rural areas was a deterrent to teachers staying for the long term. In Mackay houses are in the million-dollar range and many teachers commute long distances to teach there. So, when a job opens closer to where they live they move on. The other component is that the spouse of the teacher sometimes cannot find a job in the local area. So, the two problems in teacher retention are high cost of housing and lack of employment for the spouse.
Board President Dr. Clark issued a challenge to the institutions to take some of Mr. Van Leuven’s recommendations in how to combat high turnover in both teacher and superintendent turnover and to see what pathways they could come up with to improve things in our school districts.

There were no further comments or questions from the Board.

**PLANNING, POLICY, AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS**

8. Accountability Oversight Committee Recommendations re. Long Term Goals

In April 2023, the Board approved amendments to the Consolidated State Plan that included an extension of the state’s long-term goals and measurements of interim progress for one additional year, with the acknowledgement that the state would need to set new long-term goals and interim progress targets for the 2024-2025 school year and forward.

In May 2023, the AOC began the work to develop a new approach to creating the state’s long-term goals and measurements of interim progress. The AOC has involved Department staff throughout the process, particularly as draft goals have been developed.

Based on substantial discussions in recent years, the AOC recommends that the state establish goals that will push the state to improve performance while also ensuring that the interim targets are meaningful and achievable for all groups. However, the state’s long-term goals must also be developed in alignment with federal law, which requires them to be ambitious and include a component that will aid in reducing performance gaps between subgroups. Goals are required for all students and for subgroups, and the calculation used to create the goals must be the same for all groups.

The proposed approach for setting the long-term goals for ISAT proficiency in English Language Arts and Math and for graduation rates sets the expectation that all groups will improve their performance by seven (7) percentage points over seven (7) years and will close the gap between their group and the all-students’ group by ten (10) percent over the same period. If a gap does not exist between the group and the all-students’ group, only the seven (7) percentage point increase is expected. After the long-term goals are calculated, the measurements of interim progress are identified by dividing the long-term goal by seven (7) to create annual targets.

On January 12, 2024, the AOC voted to submit the proposed approach for creating new long-term goals to the Board for feedback. The AOC also suggested that the proposal be shared with Idaho’s assessment technical advisory board (TAC), to ensure that the formula behind it is sound. Idaho’s TAC includes experts in psychometrics and standardized assessments, including a nationally recognized growth model expert. On January 22, the AOC Chair, Board staff, and Department staff met with the TAC and provided detailed information regarding the proposed approach. The TAC confirmed that the formula is mathematically and theoretically sound. They also suggested pulling
additional data on schools who are demonstrating success with specific subgroups to ensure that the proposed subgroup goals are appropriate.

Ms. Henken said federal law requires that this update to the strategic plan be put out to the public for comment for 30 days. Therefore, any public comments received will be brought back to the Board’s attention at a future Board meeting.

Mr. Gilbert said it seemed to him that as a Board they could do little to drive the outcomes to these goals. If the Board’s intent is to say that regardless of how it comes about the Board expects continuous improvement every year. That would be the goal. Ms. Henken said AOC struggled with how to find the right balance because of the way federal law is written and the requirements around how we navigate the parameters which we need to work in, in terms of calculation is very challenging.

Superintendent Critchfield said the past strategic plan, as Alison mentioned, did not have achievable goals, such as the 95% graduation rate. This new plan has goals that can be aimed for that we believe can be achieved and is something that we can turn into the federal government and say we believe in this plan.

There were no further comments or questions from the Board.

To review the complete report head to; //efaidnbmnnibpcajpcglclefindmkajhttps://boardofed.idaho.gov/meetings/board/archive/2024/022724/03%20PPGA.pdf

At this time the Board took a 20-minute break returning at 2:44 p.m. (MT).

Superintendent Critchfield left the meeting at 2:25 p.m.

9. Accountability Oversight Committee Recommendation re. Trajectory Growth Model

Ms. Henken led the discussion. The trajectory growth model is used as a part of Idaho’s K-12 school accountability system. Once students’ individual growth targets are identified, the percentage of students who met their targets is calculated for each school. This is used as the growth indicator in the state’s formula to identify schools for comprehensive support and improvement. However, because so many students have not had meaningful targets under the current model, these growth targets are not often used at the school or individual student level. The AOC is hoping to change this by first updating the way that growth targets are identified and then providing support and feedback to Department staff as they revise the ISAT individual student reports.

Over the past ten months, the AOC has reviewed and discussed many potential methods to improve the state’s trajectory growth model by:

- Creating more achievable targets for non-proficient students; and
- Creating more meaningful targets for students who are proficient or advanced.
The proposed model breaks the ISAT performance categories into sub-categories and sets each student’s trajectory growth target based on the expectation that the student will move up one sub-category until they reach the advanced level.

Board President Dr. Clark said this model is really a commitment to growth for all students.

There were no further comments or questions from the Board.

To review the complete report head to; //efaidnbmnlnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/https://boardofed.idaho.gov/meetings/board/archive/2024/022724/03%20PPGA.pdf

10. State Board of Education Strategic Plan Final Approval

Ms. Thompson led the discussion. Idaho Code § 67-2903 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.

In October the Board reviews performance measure outcomes from the K-20 Education Strategic Plan as well as the performance of the agencies and institutions under its governance. The data review and work session discussion help to guide revision efforts on the strategic plan for the next cycle. Board staff then work with stakeholders and the PPGA committee to refine proposed revisions. In December, the Board reviews any proposed revisions to the K-20 strategic plan and provides feedback on the proposal. In February the board finalizes any revisions to the K-20 strategic plan going forward.

Board feedback at that time was incorporated into proposed revisions. Proposed revisions were first considered by the PPGA Committee in November of 2023. After revisions based on Committee feedback, the proposed revisions were brought to the full Board for a work session in December of 2023. During the work session the Board members provided feedback and generally expressed support for finalizing the revision ideas for adoption consideration in February.

Since then, Board staff has worked with representatives from the Idaho Department of Education, the Accountability Oversight Committee, and institutional researchers from the colleges and universities to gather feedback for finalizing the proposed revisions. Board staff has also worked with the OSBE research, college and career, academic affairs, and IT teams to discuss the viability and efficacy of the proposed measures.

The result is a proposal for the Board to adopt 3 goals with 9 objectives and 17 performance measures. As the highest-level strategic plan, these measures aim to serve as a spotlight on key areas of the Board’s work and the efficacy of Board initiatives.
There are three main goals: Educational Readiness, Education Access, and Educational Attainment.

BOARD ACTION
M/S (Liebich / Siddoway) I move to approve the FY 2025-2029 K-20 Education Strategic plan as provided in Attachment 2 with an exception to remove measure two under objective C and goal one. A roll call vote was taken, and the motion carried 6-0. Superintendent Critchfield and Shawn Keough were absent from voting.

Discussion ensued concerning the motion as written. It was recommended that a substitute motion be made to remove measure two under objective C and goal one.

There were no further comments or questions from the Board.

For a complete review of the data head to: //efaidnbnmnnibpcacjpcgclefindmkaj/https://boardofed.idaho.gov/meetings/board/archive/2024/022724/03%20PPGA.pdf

11. Legislative Session Update

Ms. Thompson reviewed some of the legislation making its way through the Legislature this session. She noted that the Board did approve three bills or three ideas to move forward as legislation this year.

Some of the other legislation the Board wanted to move forward were.

SB 1246 – State Board of Ed, Retirement – printed. This bill will solve a minor recruiting issue for the office of the State Board of Education.
HB 411 – Education Data – did not pass House floor Transfer credit reporting between institutions – did not get legislative support.

There are also six pending rules that have moved forward this year.

House Education – Pending Rules
- Docket No. 08-0112-2301 – Rules Governing the Postsecondary Credit Scholarship
- Docket No. 08-0203-2301 – Rules Governing Thoroughness
- Docket No. 55-0103-2301 – Rules Governing Career Technical Schools
- Docket No. 08-0401-2301 – Rules Governing the Idaho Digital Learning Academy
- Docket No. 08-0113-2302 – Rules Governing the Opportunity Scholarship
The House Education Committee approved all pending rules with the exclusion of proposed revisions to revisions to 08.04.01.112.03.

The Senate Education Committee approved all pending rules as presented.

Other bills that will impact the work in the Board of Education office are:
S 1358 – Empowering Parents which will allow reimbursements for purchased. This will require additional staff.
HB 521 – as written has a short turnaround time for implementation.
S 1261 – state employee telework – no more than 15% of employees working remotely during any given pay period
S 1274 – diversity statements, prohibition
HB 417 – cash transactions
HB 415 – concealed weapons on school property bill
HB 447 – parental school choice
S 1289 – libraries bill which failed recently but HB 635 would allow districts to dissolve its libraries

Mr. Freeman mentioned S 1317 which would create a new special license plate with the revenue going to the State Board office who would be required to administer a grant program for firearm safety. That bill passed the Senate on an 18-15 vote and is now in front of the House for consideration.

BOARD ACTION
The Board took No Action or made any motion on any of the Legislation before the Legislature.

There were no further comments or questions from the Board.

INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH AND STUDENT AFFAIRS
1. Board Policy III.N. Statewide General Education – First Reading

Dr. Heidi Estrem, Associate Chief Academic Officer, Idaho State Board of Education, reviewed the policy with the Board. She said the policy change before the Board is a result of about a year’s worth of work and conversation among the general education committee (GEM) members.

The proposed amendments further clarify two areas related to General Education. First, they provide a unified purpose for the rubrics that have been developed for each Way of Knowing or disciplinary area in General Education. Board staff had, at the request of the General Education Committee, gathered input on the effective use of the rubrics from the faculty representative groups during Spring 2023. The General Education Committee proposed this change at the October 2023 General Education Summit and approved the change in January 2024. While the rubrics may continue to be used for a variety of purposes on campus, including for instruction and assessment, the policy now
more clearly describes their utility as a guide for on-campus decisions about assigning
general education courses to the various Ways of Knowing categories.

Secondly, the Committee worked collaboratively throughout last year to describe roles
and term limits, as reflected in the policy amendments, and to develop Committee
Bylaws to help shape the roles and responsibilities of the Committee.

BOARD ACTION
M/S (Roach / Hill) I move to approve the first reading of proposed amendments to
Board Policy III.N., Statewide General Education, as submitted in Attachment 1. A
roll call vote was taken, and the motion carried 6-0. Superintendent Critchfield and
Shawn Keough were absent from voting.

Board President Dr. Clark asked what the General Education Committee is and who
comprises it and what is its purpose. Dr. Estrem said GEM is made up of the general
education directors from each campus as well as five subject area representatives that
represent different communities that also impact general education. GEM is a
subcommittee of the Board, and they gather several times a year to review courses and
give input on policy related to general education across all eight of Idaho’s institutions.

There were no further comments or questions from the Board.

2. Board Policy III.Q. Admissions Standards – First Reading

Dr. Estrem shared that the proposed changes update and streamline this policy in
several ways. First, the high school course requirements are clarified by removing
specific course limitations that are no longer appropriate. Secondly, changes to Career
Technical Education (CTE) program admissions clarify CTE admission procedures and
remove descriptions of advising processes that are better described elsewhere. Third,
revisions to the provisional (proposed “alternative”) admissions process better reflect
options for admitting and serving students, and in particular, high-achieving students
from high schools without high school accreditation from a Board-recognized accreditor.

BOARD ACTION
M/S (Roach / Hill) I move to approve the first reading of proposed amendments to
Board Policy III.Q, Admission Standards as presented in Attachment 1. A roll call
vote was taken, and the motion carried 6-0. Superintendent Critchfield and Shawn
Keough were absent from voting.

There were no comments or questions from the Board.

Reading
Dr. TJ Bliss, Chief Academic Officer, Idaho State Board of Education said the Board approved the first reading at the December 2023 meeting and no changes were made between first and second reading.

The Division is requesting amendments to Board Policy III.Y. Advanced Opportunities and III.L. Prior Learning. The amendments to Policy III.Y would replace what is now referred to as technical competency credit with microcredentials as established in Board policy III.E. Amendments to Board Policy III.L. would call microcredentials as an allowable methodology for prior learning assessment. The Division's microcredentialing platform referenced in Board Policy III.E. is SkillStack®.

**BOARD ACTION**

M/S (Roach / Gilbert) I move to approve the second reading of amendments to Board policies III.L and III.Y. as provided in attachments 1 and 2. A roll call vote was taken, and the motion carried 6-0. Superintendent Critchfield and Shawn Keough were absent from voting.

There were no comments or questions from the Board.

4. Boise State University – Ph.D., Engineering

Boise State University proposes to offer a Ph.D. program in Engineering. Initially, there will be four tracks: Infrastructure Systems, Water and Environment Systems, Energy Systems, and Mechatronics and Control Systems.

Dr. Bliss said that two years ago BSU notified the Board office that they would be bringing forward this proposal through the regular three-year planning process. The plan was then discussed extensively with the Council on Academic Affairs and Programs (CAAP) and all of the institutions were able to weigh in. The proposal then was submitted to the IRSA committee where another discussion took place before the proposal was brought before the Board for consideration.

John Buckwalter, Provost and Vice President, Academic Affairs, Boise State University, said the vision for the Ph.D. in Engineering program is to create an interdisciplinary doctoral program that integrates engineering research with non-engineering disciplines to improve the research products, economic return, and community impact.

The program has three broad objectives that will support the career advancement of Idaho residents and stimulate economic growth in the State of Idaho.

1. Expand the postdoctoral workforce in the State of Idaho.
2. Create engineering researchers with transdisciplinary technical skills who can work seamlessly across interdisciplinary boundaries.
3. Increase research and creativity in and for Idaho.
BOARD ACTION
M/S (Roach / Hill) I move to approve the request by Boise State University to create a Ph.D. in Engineering, as presented in Attachment 1. A roll call vote was taken, and the motion carried 6-0. Superintendent Critchfield and Shawn Keough were absent from voting.

There were no comments or questions from the Board.

5. Lewis-Clark State College – MSN, Nursing Leadership in Healthcare

Lewis-Clark State College requests approval to offer a new Master of Science Nursing (MSN) degree in Nursing Leadership in Healthcare. This program will offer two tracks:

1) Bachelor of Science Nursing (BSN) – MSN track (30 credits)
2) Registered Nurse (RN) – MSN track (11-17 bridge credits + 30 graduate level credits)

Dr. Bliss shared that this degree proposal went through the same process as the Ph.D. in Engineering Degree from BSU, however this program did generate some conversation as ISU does have statewide responsibility for a master’s in science in nursing, however through those conversations it was determined that this program is different enough where the courses have very little overlap with the program that ISU has responsibility for. ISU and LCSC did work closely on this program and were able to resolve any concerns before bringing this forward to the Board for consideration.

Dr. Krista Harwick, Associate Dean of the School of Professional Studies, Nursing and Health Sciences, Lewis Clark State College shared that the proposed MSN degree is in response to the need expressed by local and regional industry partners for more nurse leaders and managers to support the health care workforce. Nursing (RN) is listed among the top occupations in terms of job growth through 2026.

The fully online MSN program, Nursing Leadership in Healthcare, challenges the BSN-prepared Registered Nurse to develop the evidenced-based knowledge and skills to become a transformative nurse leader effective across a diverse range of healthcare and academic environments. The graduate will develop expertise to practice at an advanced level in financial and human capital management and quality improvement and safety management. Graduates will be equipped with strategies for managing policy and other issues encountered in healthcare and educator leadership roles.

BOARD ACTION
M/S (Roach / Hill) I move to approve the request by Lewis-Clark State College to offer a Master of Nursing, Nursing Leadership in Healthcare as presented in Attachment 1. A roll call vote was taken, and the motion carried 6-0. Superintendent Critchfield and Shawn Keough were absent from voting.
Mr. Liebich asked how this program differs from the program at ISU. Dr. Harwick said ISU’s master’s degree is specific to nursing education. LSCS has added leadership and healthcare courses into their degree to help nurses understand the economics of health care delivery not just the clinical practice but the business aspect behind it.

Dr. Hill said in his opinion this is the way Board Policy III.Z. should work. We have an institution in one part of the state that wants to deliver a program another school has statewide responsibility for, and they worked together to make sure that the local need was met. In the end Idaho is served.

There were no further comments or questions from the Board.

WORK SESSION
INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH AND STUDENT AFFAIRS
B. Generative AI Workshop

Dr. Estrem said this work session is intended to give the Board a sense of how Generative AI is affecting higher education.

Generative AI has brought transformative changes to higher education, fundamentally altering how teaching, learning, and research are conducted. With generative AI, educational content can potentially be tailored to individual student needs, accommodating different learning styles and paces. This technology enables the creation of dynamic, interactive course materials, making learning more engaging and effective. Additionally, generative AI assists in the development of virtual labs and simulations, providing students with practical, hands-on experience that is particularly beneficial in fields like science, engineering, and medicine.

Generative AI is also revolutionizing research within higher education. It accelerates data analysis, enabling researchers to process vast amounts of information rapidly, which leads to quicker and more innovative discoveries. This capability is particularly impactful in fields such as genomics, climate science, and physics. Moreover, AI-generated models and simulations are opening new frontiers in research, allowing for experimentation and exploration that were previously impossible due to resource constraints.

Dr. Jen Schneider, Associate Dean of the College of Innovation and Design, Boise State University, stated the Generative AI is ubiquitous, powerful and will transform the global workforce and therefore higher education.

- What is generative AI? Technology that enables us to immediately generate text, images, and video just by entering prompts. No coding or technical expertise necessary.
- How does it work? Generative AI is powered by computers that have digested texts and images and learned from those how to interact with human prompts in a seemingly natural manner.
ChatGPT took only 2 months to reach 100 million users. In context it took Netflix 18 years to reach that milestone.

Generative AI is embedded in various programs and most people do not realize they are using it.

Students can prompt ChatGPT to write a college essay for them. The program won’t write the essay, but it will supply a title and a good outline. However, you can go back and forth with ChatGPT to get more details and once the essay is written it can be uploaded and ChatGPT will edit it and do image generation.

There are limitations to AI’s abilities. It hallucinates so it can make up facts about someone.

Data privacy, social and ethical challenges, intellectual property violations is another area where AI is not infallible.

In higher education faculty are concerned about student integrity essentially cheating which is leading to the use of plagiarism detectors which tend to generate false positives.

Half of the fastest growing jobs are related to AI which will impact how institutions teach and how students learn.

50% of students are using generative AI. Only 25% of faculty are. (Inside Higher Ed)

Mr. Liebich said if the data is all coming from the internet and there is a time lag and even years ago things weren’t on the internet the results may not be current. Dr. Schneider that accuracy is a big concern because AI uses patterns when it’s collecting its data it’s not just an internet search engine.

Mr. Liebich said then the real value in the quality of the output of generative AI is dependent on who owns the data set. And with this tool when does it no longer become your work.

Mr. Gilbert said AI will shift the focus to personal interaction. Someone can generate tons of paper on a topic but when you talk with them you will know if they actually understood what they wrote.

Dr. Schneider said some faculty are actually moving to oral exams which creates challenges for students who have accommodations for anxiety.

Dr. Bliss said Dr. Schneider sends out a weekly update, lengthy, exhaustive sometime but delightful and sometimes terrifying on AI as it relates specifically to higher education. If any of the Board members would like to receive this newsletter please let Dr. Bliss know.

Dr. Estrem said the statewide AI Alliance has been meeting and their vision is evolving around transparency and ethics. This group has sponsored and launched a three-part professional development series for higher education professionals. There is also an upcoming webinar on AI and ethics.
Mr. Freeman asked if there was intent for there to be consistency across our institutions on how AI is approached from a pedagogical standpoint. Dr. Schneider said right now the discussion is about exploring where everyone is in using AI. Some institutions have begun at the regulatory phase developing policy for its use. As far as the statewide alliance it is too early for there to be policy at this level because things are so rapidly evolving.

There were no further comments or questions from the Board.

A. Strategic Discussion of Board Policy III.Z. Planning and Delivery of Postsecondary Programs and Courses

This is a continuation of the discussion that began on February 27th.

Ms. Roach and Dr. Hill wrote up some recommendations on how to move forward. The recommendations are:

Direct staff to work with the 8 institutions to revise policy III.Z to meet the following objectives:
- Maintain access and affordability
- Incentive system supporting behavior

The policy should:
- Institutionalize managed competition approach
- Allow for effective implementation
- Be based upon mission areas with coordination responsibility
- Ensure timely response to emergent needs
- Address BAS degrees at CC and AA degrees at 4 years
- Reward Innovation
- Retain designated service regions

Additionally – work on the High Demand Program Advisory Group Development

Mr. Gilbert asked about the retention of the service areas. Dr. Hill said that was still an open question. Mr. Gilbert said everything laid out in the recommendation is very logical, however the details related to the designated service areas and the time in which there’s an opportunity to do something or to have another institution come into the process and into that service area that’s where it feels like we could get stuck. Dr. Hill said it was fairly clear from the Board’s conversation yesterday that the Board doesn’t have the heart for eliminating the service areas but to rather put in place a mechanism by which if a particular thing is not being met there is a time frame for someone else to come in and address the emergent needs. That is why he put in the word ‘timely’ in the recommendation.
Discussion ensued around placing a Board member on CAAP. Dr. Bliss asked for clarification. Was the Board asking for Board policy for first and second reading to add a Board member to CAAP or just to invite Board members to CAAP for the foreseeable future. Dr. Hill said that would require a bit more research to see how Board members are placed on committees. He would like to handle this in the same manner in which we handle the other subcommittees.

Dr. Bliss reminded the Board that neither CAAP nor IRSA were decision-making bodies. The Board could put someone on CAAP, but they cannot make a decision. Anything that needs Board approval is brought before the full Board for consideration. Items for the Board’s attention are funneled from a subcommittee to one of the three germaine committees (BAHR, IRSA, PPGA). No subcommittee has decision making authority.

Mrs. Roach questioned if there were programs or opportunities that were not brought forward by the subcommittees that perhaps the full Board would be interested in hearing. Dr. Bliss said that under his tenure every single issue of concern or controversy has been brought to the Board for consideration. Board Policy III.Z. does not stop the process but facilities a conversation and when those issues can’t be resolved, which has only happened a couple of times, those issues come directly to the Board. Mrs. Roach again stressed that in her opinion there were some issues that CAAP and even IRSA decided did not need to go forward for the Board’s consideration and perhaps the Board members would have wanted to discuss these items, but they never had the chance. Hence the request to put a Board member on CAAP.

Dr. Bliss asked for an elaboration on what those types of issues would have been that didn’t get escalated to the Board’s attention. Dr. Bliss was asked if there had been examples at CAAP where people have brought forward program proposals which after discussion have been modified to make sure that they are adequately different and therefore uniquely different and approvable. He answered yes, that has happened a couple of times.

Mrs. Roach was concerned that perhaps some institutions were feeling frustrated by the process because they could not get their item past CAAP or IRSA to be heard by the full Board. And perhaps Policy III.Z. is stifling conversations and is too restrictive as written. Dr. Hill said more work needs to be done before a proposal is brought back to the Board. The purpose of this work session was to ask where we are and where do we want to be and then to send it back to IRSA. Dr. Hill said the policy does need to be specific enough so that every possible decision does not come before the Board. There has to be a balance point and to find that point is to have the institutions craft the policy using Dr. Bliss as the intermediary.

Dr. Bliss said the soonest a new policy could be brought back to the Board for consideration was June or August. Board President Dr. Clark said the Board would be comfortable in having a look at the proposal in June knowing that this will not be a final decision. Dr. Hill asked for another work session on Policy III.Z. for the April Board
meeting so that the Board can see something concrete in terms of changes before the
draft is brought back in June for consideration.

There were no further comments or questions from the Board.

INFORMATIONAL

IRSA
2. Semi-Annual Report of Approved Program Requests – Information Item

PPGA
3. Idaho School for the Deaf and Blind Annual Report
4. STEM Action Center Annual Report

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

M/S (Hill / Siddoway) I move to adjourn the meeting at 4:29 p.m. (MT). A roll call
vote was taken, and the motion carried 6-0. Superintendent Critchfield and Shawn
Keough were absent from voting.