



STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION MEETING

December 15, 2021

Idaho State Board of Education

Clearwater Conference Room

650 West State Street, Suite 349

Boise, ID 83720

A regular meeting of the Idaho State Board of Education was held via Zoom teleconference December 15, 2021, with the call originating from the Office of the State Board of Education in Boise. Board President Kurt Liebich called the meeting to order at 8:00 a.m. (MT).

Present

Kurt Liebich, President

Dr. Dave Hill, Vice-President

Dr. Linda Clark, Secretary

Shawn Keough

Bill Gilbert

Cally J. Roach

Cindy Siddoway

Superintendent Sherri Ybarra

Absent

None

Wednesday, December 15, 2021, 8:00 a.m. (Mountain Time)

OPEN FORUM

Representative John Gannon addressed the Board. He said, *"Idaho university and community college students should not be discouraged or prevented from pursuing studies and careers solely because of their gender and it is disappointing and insulting that this has been advocated recently. This is particularly irritating to me because my grandmother was the only woman in her University of California Dental School Class of 1902. She practiced various aspects of dentistry for 30 years, and she was an important mentor to me."*

I recognize the free speech right, but at the same time Idaho students have a right to be as free from bias as possible in pursuing their education. Our students and their families need to be assured that students will not be restricted in career choices solely because of their gender.

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

650 W. State Street • P. O. Box 83720 • Boise, ID 83720-0037

208/334-2270 • FAX: 208/334-2632

[Website of the Idaho State Board of Education](http://www.idaho.gov/education)

Perhaps the State Board can implement policies and guidelines to protect this important right.

Perhaps a task force to develop language and policy would be a helpful way to go.

It is important that a person with authority not be able to discourage or prevent a student from pursuing a career solely upon the basis of gender. A professor who believes a woman

should not participate in the engineering school should not have influence. Someday a person in authority might advocate those men not be admitted to nursing school. A person with clear and convincing evidence of such attitudes could be restricted from:

- 1. Being involved in courses which are a prerequisite for graduation*
- 2. Being involved in courses which are a prerequisite for other courses*
- 3. Participating in decisions relating to tenure, employment, or personnel matters*
- 4. Participating in decisions regarding to the operations of the university or college.*

These are just possible ideas. There are undoubtedly other ideas, but the important thing is to establish policies so that students and families are certain that they will not be denied entry into programs solely because of their gender.

Thank you for considering these concerns."

BOARDWORK

1. Agenda Review / Approval

Dr. TJ Bliss, Chief Academic Affairs Officer, Idaho State Board of Education, asked that under the Work Session portion of the agenda that item B and C be switched.

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Hill / Roach) I move to approve the agenda as modified. A roll call vote was taken, and the motion carried 8-0.

There were no comments or questions from the Board.

2. Minutes Review / Approval

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Hill / Clark) I move to approve the minutes for the October 20-21, 2021, Regular Board Meeting, the November 2, 2021, Special Board Meeting and the November 29, 2021, Special Board Meeting. A roll call vote was taken, and the motion carried 8-0.

There were no comments or question from the Board.

3. Rolling Calendar

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Hill / Roach) I move to set December 21, 2022, as the date for the December 2022 regularly scheduled Board Meeting, to occur via a videoconference originating from the Office of the State Board of Education in Boise. A roll call vote was taken, and the motion carried 8-0.

AND

M/S (Hill / Roach) I move to amend the June 2022 Regular Board meeting date to June 14–15, 2022 for the June 2022 regularly scheduled Board meeting. A roll call vote was taken, and the motion carried 8-0.

Matt Freeman, Executive Director, Idaho State Board of Education said the change to the December meeting date came about because the original meeting date of December 14th would put pressure on the meeting agenda preparation process for institutions and staff. But the 21st is also problematic as it is closer to the holidays. From a staff perspective the 21st would be better.

A brief discussion among the Board members ensued with the consensus being that the 21st would work and the motion was brought forward.

There were no further comments or questions from the Board.

CONSENT

AUDIT

1. Audit Committee Appointment

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Hill / Gilbert) I move to appoint Steve Skaggs as a non-Board member of the Audit Committee for a three (3) year term commencing December 15, 2021. A roll call vote was taken, and the motion carried 8-0.

BAHR

2. Boise State University - Purchase of Aixtron Metal Organic Vapor Phase Epitaxy System

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Hill / Gilbert) I move to approve the request by Boise State University to authorize the purchase of an Aixtron Metal Organic Vapor Phase Epitaxy system as well as associated equipment and infrastructure, for a total of \$1,300,000. The equipment will be purchased with grant funding as part of a partnership with the

NextFlex Office of Secretary of Defense Manufacturing USA Institute. A roll call vote was taken, and the motion carried 8-0.

3. Boise State University - Certificate in Content Production – Online Program Fee

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Hill / Gilbert) I move to approve the request by Boise State University to offer Certificate in Content Production, an existing certificate already offered online utilizing an online program fee model. The certificate program will charge an online program fee of \$350 per credit. A roll call vote was taken, and the motion carried 8-0.

4. Boise State University – Certificate in Creative Influence – Online Program Fee

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Hill / Gilbert) I move to approve the request by Boise State University to offer a Certificate in Creative Influence, an existing certificate already offered online utilizing an online program fee model. The certificate program will charge an online program fee of \$350 per credit. A roll call vote was taken, and the motion carried 8-0.

5. Boise State University – Certificate in Digital Innovation and Design – Online Program Fee

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Hill / Gilbert) I move to approve the request by Boise State University to offer Certificate in Digital Innovation and Design, an existing certificate already offered utilizing an online program fee model. The certificate program will charge an online program fee of \$350 per credit. A roll call vote was taken, and the motion carried 8-0.

6. Boise State University - Certificate in User Experience Design – Online Program Fee

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Hill / Gilbert) I move to approve the request by Boise State University to offer Certificate in User Experience Design, an existing certificate already offered online utilizing an online program fee model. The certificate program will charge

an online program fee of \$350 per credit. A roll call vote was taken, and the motion carried 8-0.

IRSA

7. Higher Education Research Council Appointment

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Hill / Gilbert) I move to appoint Douglas A. Sayer as a non-institutional representative to the Higher Education Research Council, effective immediately and expiring June 30, 2024. A roll call vote was taken, and the motion carried 8-0.

PPGA

8. Data Management Council Appointment

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Hill / Gilbert) I move to approve the appointment of Kevin Chandler to the Data Management Council as a representative of the State Department of Education for a term commencing immediately and ending June 30, 2022. A roll call vote was taken, and the motion carried 8-0.

9. Lewis-Clark State College – Facilities Naming

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Hill / Gilbert) I move to approve Lewis-Clark State College's request to waive the application of Board Policy I.K. and to enter into a naming rights agreement with P1FCU in substantial conformance with Attachment 1 and authorize the Vice President and Chief Financial Officer to execute the agreement. A roll call vote was taken, and the motion carried 8-0.

10. University of Idaho – Facilities Naming

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Hill / Gilbert) I move to approve the request by the University of Idaho to name the WWAMI Medical Education Building the "D.A. Huckabay M.D. Medical Education Building" and authorize the president of the University of Idaho, or the president's designee, to execute the agreement and any related transactional documents. A roll call vote was taken, and the motion carried 8-0.

11. Idaho State University – Facilities Naming

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Hill / Gilbert) I move to approve the request by Idaho State University to name the Rendezvous building the Richard L and Connie S Bowen Rendezvous Center. A roll call vote was taken, and the motion carried 8-0.

SDE

12. Emergency Provision Certificates

BOARD ACTIONS

M/S (Hill / Gilbert) I move to approve the recommendation by the State Department of Education for one-year emergency provisional certificates to be awarded in the endorsement area(s) at the specified school districts as provided herein for the 2021-22 school year for the following individuals: Mason Bilger, Logan Shipley, Tina Wayman, Megan Felter, Freddy Hernandez, Marissa Turner, Glenn Sailors, Sadie Pulliam, Laura Georigiades, Janelle Marie Kristina LaSalle, Gentry Isham, Matthew Campbell, Roman Romero, Guadalupe Sims, Mallory Smith, Riley Jo Johnson, Edward Simmons, Ericka Johnson, Martha McCuisition, Genevive Olivas, Jennifer Vitek, Maxwell Garrett, Wilson Ong, Karen Rohn, Karlene Ashcraft, Margarita Espinoza-Henscheid, Amy Hinojosa, Jasmyn Rogge, Richard Anderson, Chandler Lawrence, Kira Langer, Molley Alles, Emmanuel Candiani, Leah Dow-Sanchez, Mickey Carter, Michael Easterling, Gail Joy, Jared Lemon, Jasmine Victorious, Kelsey Lentz, Tiffany Ford, Kevin Dorrian, Whitney Oliver, Jesus Cervantes, and Drew Turbow. A roll call vote was taken, and the motion carried 8-0.

AND

M/S (Hill / Gilbert) I move to approve the request by State Department of Education for one-year emergency provisional certificates in the School Psychology endorsement area at the specified school districts as provided herein for the 2021-22 school year for the following individuals: Tanner Boyer, Savannah Dierks, Megan Taylor, and Toni Shantel Chadez-Farnetti. A roll call vote was taken, and the motion carried 8-0.

13. Idaho State University - New Educator Preparation Program

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Hill / Gilbert) I move to accept the recommendation of the Professional Standards Commission to conditionally approve Idaho State University's Computer Science (6-12) program for certification. A roll call vote was taken, and the motion carried 8-0.

WORK SESSION

PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

A. K-20 Education Strategic Plan

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

Tracie Bent, Chief Policy and Planning Officer, Idaho State Board of Education, said what is presented in the agenda materials before the Board today asks the Board to decide if these are the right goals and objectives, the right performance measures and for any other amendments the Board would like to discuss. Actual approval of the comprehensive strategic plan will be brought back to the Board at the February Board meeting.

Dr. Clark said during the last Policy, Planning and Government Affairs (PPGA) Committee meeting the conversation centered around Complete College Idaho and should we be focused on those elements that were previously embraced. During the committee discussion it was decided that the focus needs to be on getting more Idaho students into Idaho institutions, keeping them there and getting them through to graduation.

Dr. Bliss said a state-wide summit is being planned for the spring that will bring together all Idaho Institutions to highlight what has been done, and what needs to be done, to help Idaho set up the strategies for moving forward to get the outcomes Idaho's higher education institutions are looking for.

Mrs. Roach asked if the benchmarks and goals as currently outlined are achievable and realistic. Ms. Bent said when looking at post-secondary bench marks those goals were set by the PPGA committee after bringing together representatives from Idaho institutions. The benchmarks are updated every year but fully reviewed every five years.

Dr. Clark said the goal that stands out and that is most likely not attainable is the sixty percent rule. Board President Liebich referenced the long discussion on the sixty percent rule at the last meeting. Dr. Clark referenced the data found on Attachment 2,

Tab A, Page 5, of the agenda material, which showed two separate benchmarks. One benchmark is based on projected work force need (FY 2025), and the other is the Institution recommended targets (FY 2027) based on current awards and projected growth in student enrollment, retention, and completion.

Mr. Gilbert said expanding performance measures and benchmarks doesn't seem to work if we don't also remove something and he wanted to discuss what needs to be removed to have a more focused strategic plan.

Ms. Roach said one of the metrics that gets the most negative press is the Go-On-Rate, and she would like to discuss changing how the rate is measured. She suggested breaking it down further. The current goal for high school graduates going onto higher education is 60 percent and that is not achievable or realistic, and perhaps that goal should be set at 50 percent or less. Then for those who are 12 months past graduation the benchmark could be 55 percent and for those three years after graduation it should be 60 percent.

Dr. Hill said we confuse the strategic plan with the performance plan, and it gets in the way of the Board doing its job. The three issues highlighted for K-12 (K-3 literacy, 5-9 math and graduation readiness) should be the Boards focus going forward. The rest of this could be dropped into a performance plan and taken off the Board's focus but still be monitored by the Board. Dr. Clark said because we are required to keep a strategic plan in place for the state there is nothing to stop the Board from having a tactical plan, that focuses on the three main issues for K-12 and then three separate issues for higher education.

Ms. Bent asked to clarify the Boards purpose in this area. She asked if there is an end, or an overarching goal that the Board is trying to accomplish through these three focused areas and then what does the Board want to look at to measure progress toward that goal. Dr. Hill said strategic plans should be broadly stated and not include implementation measures. The three areas of focus, driven by the pandemic, should have measurements in place, leaving the strategic plan in place because of the state requirement, but create an action plan to the side, because these are the issues important to the Board and to the students in the state.

Mr. Gilbert agreed that this now gives the Board a better focus as a K-12 organization. He further said if we don't streamline the document now it will continue to be bloated and the Board loses its focus on what is most important.

Ms. Bent wanted to make sure the Board's intent is clear. How do they want progress reported in future meetings? She agreed, the objective is a good objective, but we don't have the underlying data to directly measure progress.

Dr. Hill said he begins by looking at a one-page strategic plan and asks if it makes sense. Using the large number of metrics provided and the need to meet the state requirement to satisfy that public spending has been spent well, he views it as 1. What we need to do for compliance and 2. To provide an overview if things are not going well and how to raise efforts to get Idaho to the next level.

Mrs. Roach said pulling out certain metrics which pertain to the top three priorities would help the Board focus on what is most important.

Mr. Gilbert said these documents should clearly show where the Board can dive in and work on the issues that are most important. This allows for looking at the growth and cohorts to see what is working and what is not.

Dr. Marlene Tromp, President, Boise State University, said she would be most interested in hearing from the Institutions Provosts to see the larger picture instead of swimming in a sea of data. The pandemic has affected the metrics being used and the long-term effects of the pandemic on student outcomes are still being analyzed.

Ms. Bent said to recap, there is general agreement that these are the three correct focus areas for post-secondary and the Board wants the data on those three focus areas to be highlighted at future meetings. Dr. Hill agreed and said based on the sheer volume of data previously presented it didn't really tell the Board anything.

Dr. Clark said these are the appropriate measures that the Board needs to have a laser like focus on and to communicate that to the institutions, and what the Board will hold the institutions responsible for. A strategic plan also holds the management team responsible for meeting those goals.

Matt Freeman asked, to clarify for Board meetings moving forward, does the Board want a K-12 and a Higher Education focus area that are highlighted only if new data is available? Board President Liebich agreed that was the Board's request. And if the data is only available once a year that is when that review happens. Mrs. Roach agreed that homing in on specific metrics with specific data should be highlighted at each meeting, instead of being inundated with so much data.

Board President Liebich said getting data only once a year makes it hard to assess where we are, so real time data would be more relevant to the Board discussions. Dr. Clark said that real time data is available, and many districts have this data, we just need to ask for that data.

Ms. Bent said the Board's strategic plan doesn't have to be approved until June. However, approving the plan at the February meeting, would assist the institutions. This timeline gives the institutions plenty of time to make changes to their strategic plans. Any changes made by the institutions are then brought back before the Board at the June Board meeting, giving the institutions time to make the reporting deadline with the state.

Dr. Clark said the goals for the institutions need to be attainable and she has confidence in the data coming from the institutions showing reasonable goals that they can attain.

Mr. Gilbert also said the same rules should apply for K-12 as well as for higher education. He believes trajectory and continuous growth are paramount to success. He believes the onus should be placed back on the institutions to achieve those growth rates. Seeing the growth rates for both FY 2025 and FY 2027 shows the institutions understand this trajectory idea.

Ms. Bent said the last piece of her work session is the workforce readiness measurement and how the skills are measured. Feedback from the community colleges is being worked on to develop a definition of workforce certificates.

Superintendent Ybarra said during the tour of the Mastery Based schools planned for the Board members in February, everyone should get to see some of this workforce readiness in action. What these schools were doing during the pandemic was creative and interesting.

Mrs. Roach asked how these workforce readiness skills fit in with our strategic plans.

Board President Liebich asked if any state has found the answer to these questions. Ms. Bent said no state has found that magic bullet, but she has communicated with Career and Technical Education (CTE) who has a workforce readiness assessment in place and asked what would it take to offer this statewide.

Mrs. Roach said looking at the rate of high school graduates that go on she felt we are failing the majority of our students by not focusing on workforce readiness and that is where she wants to focus her attentions. Not every student wants to go on to get a higher education degree.

Superintendent Ybarra agreed that we are not getting the word out about the Board's work with workforce development and the fact that these competencies are in place.

There were no further comments or questions from the Board.

INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH AND STUDENT AFFAIRS

C. Demographic Characteristics of Idaho's Four-Year Postsecondary Students

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

Board President Liebich started by saying in the fall of 2021, at the request of the Board President, the Office of State Board of Education conducted an analysis of key student demographics at Idaho's four-year public postsecondary institutions to explore how well the student populations match the underlying state demographics, as well as regional demographics of the geographic areas served by the institutions. The analysis focused on two different groups: academic degree-seeking students and recent Idaho public school graduates. Race/ethnicity were analyzed for both groups. High school locale (city/suburb, town, or rural) and high school economic status were analyzed for recent Idaho public school graduates.

Dr. Cathleen McHugh, Chief Research Officer, Idaho State Board of Education, presented the following information.

There are several key findings from this analysis:

- Undergraduate Hispanic students are underrepresented for both residents and non-residents from key states across the four institutions as a whole;
- American Indian, Black, and Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander students are equally represented across the four institutions as a whole;
- Multiracial students are overrepresented across the four institutions as a whole;
- Females are overrepresented at Boise State University and Lewis Clark State College; and
- The University of Idaho is equally gender balanced for resident students and Idaho State University is equally gender balanced for non-resident students.

Mr. Freeman asked if, based on the data UI was close to parity in their gender ratio, and Dr. McHugh said that was correct.

Dr. McHugh's entire report, located in Attachment 1, Tab C, Pages 1-12 gives very detailed breakdowns as to the various demographic groups (Whites, Hispanics, Blacks, Asians, etc.) and economic status (economically disadvantaged vs. economically advantaged) of Idaho's graduating seniors.

Some of the data findings are.

- At BSU and ISU, the share of white students reflects the underlying state population.

- At LC State and UI, white students are underrepresented.
- American Indian students are underrepresented at BSU and UI, equally represented at ISU and overrepresented at LC State compared to the statewide population.
- Asian students are overrepresented at all institutions except LC State where they are equally represented.
- Black students are equally represented at all institutions.
- Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander students are equally represented at all institutions.
- Multi-race students are overrepresented at BSU and LC State and equally represented at ISU and UI.
- Hispanic and White females are generally either equally represented at the four-year institutions or overrepresented.
- Hispanic females are equally represented among the four-year institutions and among the group who do not attend any institution, overrepresented among the two-year Idaho institutions, and underrepresented in the other institutions.
- White females who were ever economically disadvantaged in high school and are from town/rural locales are the only group of females that are underrepresented at the four-year institutions and that is only a one percentage point difference.
- White females who were never economically disadvantaged are overrepresented at Idaho's four-year institutions, especially those females from cities/suburbs.
- The only group of white or Hispanic males who are overrepresented at the four-year institutions are those white males who were never economically disadvantaged and come from cities/suburbs.
- Hispanic males are underrepresented at both the four-year institutions and other institutions and overrepresented among those who do not attend any institution. This is also true for white males who were ever economically disadvantaged (regardless of their locale). However, white males from town/rural locales are also underrepresented among Idaho public two-year institutions as well.
- White males who were not ever economically disadvantaged and come from town/rural locales are equally represented at Idaho's four-year institutions although this result is just barely not statistically significant (a p-value of 0.0510 versus 0.05).
- White males who were economically disadvantaged and from town/rural locales are among the most underrepresented groups. While this group makes up 8 percent of all high school graduates, they make up only 4 percent of those who attend an Idaho four-year public institution.
- The corresponding group for females is more representative, also comprising 8 percent of all high school graduates but comprising 7 percent of those who attend an Idaho four-year public institution.
- Hispanic males are also very underrepresented, comprising 8 percent of all high school graduates and only 5 percent of those who attend an Idaho four-year public institution.

- Both of these groups are overrepresented in the “Do not attend any institution.” Therefore, it is not that these males are going on but just not to public four-year institutions. They are disproportionately less likely to go on.
- Hispanic males are equally represented at the Idaho public two-year institutions; economically disadvantaged white males from town/rural locales are underrepresented in those institutions.

Dr. Tromp said many in higher education are aware of these trends and they are working on targeting white males in this age group, and those who are economically disadvantaged in rural areas. The other topic that Institutions are addressing is the high suicide rate of this same demographic and they are working on offering support to them to help them be academically successful.

Mrs. Roach said the number of economically disadvantaged white males attending two-year colleges should also be of note (Attachment 1, Tab C, Page 12).

Mrs. Keough said she wondered what some of the student demographics were looking for when deciding not to seek a 4-year degree. Dr. Hill said, for the workforce minded, the data captures some but not all of what these white males are really looking for. Apprenticeships are not a part of this data, and neither is the number of males entering the military.

Dr. McHugh said the data presented also does not take into account those who were economically disadvantaged and who then drop out of school in the 9th grade. These white males tend to drop out of high school at a higher rate.

There were no further comments or questions from the Board.

At this time the Board recessed for 10 minutes, returning at 10:00 a.m.

B. Postsecondary Student Experience Survey Report

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

Board President Liebich prefaced the discussion by saying that during the 2021 Idaho legislative session, allegations were made that some students at Idaho’s public postsecondary institutions are being treated negatively because of their personal beliefs and viewpoints. To determine if there is merit to these serious allegations, the Office of the State Board of Education conducted a research study in November 2021 that included a survey of the more than 54,000 students at Idaho’s eight public institutions. All questions on the survey were optional, to allow maximum freedom and discretion in providing responses. Eight thousand, nine hundred eighty-nine (8,989) students

completed the survey, for a total overall response rate of 16.4%. College of Southern Idaho had the lowest response rate (8.9%) and Idaho State University had the highest response rate (24%). All responses to the survey were completely anonymized, to protect student privacy. The Board office did not collect data about which students responded or did not respond, nor can the office connect any specific response to any specific student.

Dr. Bliss mentioned that in the Board's agenda packet was a copy of the actual survey questions sent to the students (Attachment 1, Tab B, pages 104).

Board President Liebich asked how the survey questions were developed. Dr. Bliss said the survey was created by Board staff and the institution research officers. The content of the survey was driven by the Board and reviewed by a national Institutional Review Board (IRB) whose job is to protect the rights and welfare of human research subjects recruited to participate in research activities conducted under the auspices of the institution with which it is affiliated.

Mr. Gilbert asked what percentage of the students surveyed are graduate students and what percentage were undergraduate students. Dr. McHugh said 14 percent of the students were graduate students.

Dr. Bliss said preliminary results showed the following:

- A supermajority of students across all institutions and class levels report feeling valued (87%), respected (95%) and a sense of belonging (90%)
- Never or rarely feeling pressured to affirm or accept beliefs they find offensive (67%)
- Never or rarely feeling shamed or bullied for sharing their personal beliefs or viewpoints (78%)
- Feeling safe to express their personal beliefs or viewpoints with others (89%)
- Familiarity with safeguards and policies that protect freedom of expression (76%)
- Agreement that it is important to participate in courses and activities that are designed specifically to enhance understanding of others' beliefs and viewpoints (85%)

Mrs. Keough asked about the percentage of students who answered that they never or rarely feeling pressured to affirm or accept beliefs they find offensive. Why is the percentage so low? Dr. Bliss said there are no statistics here but raw data. More digging into the answer rates will need to happen in the near future.

Dr. Hill asked if the students were asked about the source of the pressure. Dr. Bliss said yes, they were asked but again this is just raw data and further analysis needs to happen before final data is brought back to the Board. Dr. Hill asked if students were asked to say where the pressure was coming from. Dr Bliss said students were

specifically asked if the pressure was coming from school administrators, faculty, other employees, or even other students.

Dr. Tromp agreed that seeing the real survey data will help institutions work on what needs to be addressed when dealing with student concerns.

Mr. Gilbert said he does not believe the Board can have a conversation on this survey until the cohort data is complete. He wants to see all of the statistics by cohort broken down by age, by under grad and graduate, by political affiliation, by gender and by institution. He also said that the raw data needs to be available for the public to review to the extent possible.

Dr. Bliss said the plan moving forward will be to analyze the data and to break it down by cohorts to help see where the issues are, which should then lead to being able to addresses concerns brought up by students.

Dr. Hill asked when the data will be ready for discussion. Dr. McHugh's staff will begin that work and hope to have the data ready for review in the early part of January or February 2022.

There were no further comments or questions from the Board.

AUDIT

1. FY 2021 Financial Statement Audits

Bill Gilbert said the first item on the agenda is to inform the Board that the Idaho State Board of Education (Board) has contracted with CliftonLarsonAllen LLP, an independent certified public accounting firm, to conduct the annual financial audits of Boise State University, Idaho State University, the University of Idaho, and Lewis-Clark State College.

There were some findings for the institutions, but all received an unmodified opinion on the financial statements. The results of the single audit are postponed due to a delay by the federal government in issuing the guidelines for auditing funds related to COVID-19. Pending that audit, there could be further items related to internal controls for federal expenditures addressed.

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Roach / Hill) I move to accept from the Audit Committee the FY2021 financial audit reports for Boise State University, Idaho State University, University of Idaho, and Lewis-Clark State College, as submitted by CliftonLarsonAllen LLP in Attachment 1. A roll call vote was taken, and the motion carried 8-0.

There were no comments or questions from the Board.

2. FY 2021 Financial Ratios - Information Item

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

Todd Kilburn, Chief Financial Officer, Idaho State Board of Education, said these financial ratios and analyses are provided for the Board to review the financial health and year-to-year trends at the institutions. The ratios reflect a financial snapshot as of fiscal year end. The Audit Committee reviews key financial performance factors on a quarterly basis.

The ratios presented measure the financial health of each institution and include a “Composite Financial Index” based on four key ratios. The ratios are designed as management tools to measure financial activity and key trends within an institution over time. They typically do not lend themselves to comparative analysis between institutions because of the varying missions and structures of the institutions and current strategic initiatives underway at a given institution at a given time.

Mr. Gilbert said the Audit Committee had no concerns with the information as presented.

There were no comments or questions from the Board.

3. FY 2021 Net Position Reports - Information Item

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

Mr. Kilburn shared the following. The volatility of state funding as well as fluctuations in enrollment and tuition revenue necessitates that institutions maintain fund balances sufficient to stabilize their operating budgets. As such, Board Policy V.B. sets a minimum target reserve of 5%, as measured by “Unrestricted Available” funds divided by annual operating expenses.

Idaho State University and Lewis-Clark State College met the Board’s 5% reserve target in FY20. Boise State University’s unrestricted net position increased by \$23.4 million during the fiscal year despite Covid-19 continuing to disrupt operations. Commitments against these reserves increased by \$18 million. As a result, the unrestricted funds available increased from \$2.5 million as of June 30, 2020 to \$7.9 million as of June 30, 2021. The ratio of unrestricted funds available to operating expenses is 1.86% which, although improved from the prior year, is short of the 5% target.

University of Idaho has reported a negative \$15.0 million for its “Unrestricted – Available” net position, which results in a negative ratio of 3.9% unrestricted available net position to FY21 operating expenses, an improvement of \$15.0 million over FY20. The University ended FY21 with a positive change in aggregate net position of \$22.8

million due to disciplined permanent base budget reductions. Growth in unrestricted net position of \$7.8 million was limited due to significant debt defeasance which added \$23.6 million to net position invested in capital assets, net of related debt.

There were no comments or questions from the Board.

BUSINESS AFFAIRS AND HUMAN RESOURCES

1. Amendment to Board Policy V.R. – Establishment Of Fees - First Reading

Dr. Hill said this topic came about after concerns were raised during the last Legislative session concerning the transparency of student fees. The Legislature wanted to see what fees could be optional and which needed to be compulsory.

Mr. Kilburn led a working group comprised of representatives from all four of the colleges and universities who worked together to develop the categories that were approved by the Board in October of 2021.

This policy amendment is to codify the decision made by the Board at the October 2021 Regular Board meeting, which includes one overall Consolidated Mandatory fee broken down into four categories:

Student Enrollment, Engagement, and Success

The student enrollment, engagement and success fees provide funding to support the multitude of activities and services available to students, both on and off campus. Included in these fees are scholarships, student employment opportunities, funding to support student success initiatives, and enrollment (recruitment and retention) activities. Institutional

Operations, Services, and Support

These fees support the departmental and infrastructure needs of the college and universities, including construction and maintenance of facilities; instructional and computing resources; student involvement services and participation with athletic, arts, and cultural events.

Student Health and Wellness

The student health and wellness fee support students physical and mental health and well-being. Students' fees also allow for access to the health and counseling centers throughout the year as well as utilize well-being and fitness programs and facilities for overall improvement of the student experience. Also included are the facilities, maintenance, and programs available through the recreation and intramural programs.

Student Government

This fee is to support the student government officers elected by students and support them, their initiatives, and their overall experience. Students are provided the means to engage in discussions, events, and opportunities that interest them, are new to them, and challenge them. A subset of this fee would be student activities, clubs, and organizations, and students would be allowed to opt-out of that fee.

Approval of the policy amendment will support the move to a simplified fee system that is consistent across all institutions and require institutions to list these fees in a consistent and easily accessed location on their websites.

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Hill / Keough) I move to approve the first reading of Board policy V.R. to amend the process through which fees are established as set forth in Attachment

1. A roll call vote was taken, and the motion carried 8-0.

There were no comments or questions from the Board.

2. Maintenance of Effort – GEER Funding

Mr. Kilburn said the U.S. Department of Education provided guidance requiring that states receiving funding under the Coronavirus Response and Relief Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2021 (CRRSA Act) must maintain “State support for higher education in FY 2022 at least at the proportional level of the State’s support for higher education relative to the State’s overall spending, averaged over FYs 2017, 2018, and 2019.” This Maintenance of Effort (MOE) must be demonstrated to the US Department of Education. While appropriated funding for higher education increased, the percentage relative to Idaho’s overall spending decreased for several reasons, including Medicaid expansion.

Since the annual percentage has decreased due to an increase in overall state spending, and in alignment with the guidance provided by the US Department of Education, the Board is being asked to approve submission of a waiver which must be submitted no later than December 30, 2021.

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Hill / Roach) I move to approve the Maintenance of Effort Waiver as proposed in Attachment 2 and authorize Board Staff to submit the waiver on or before the December 30, 2021 deadline. A roll call vote was taken, and the motion carried 8-0.

There were no comments or questions from the Board.

3. Idaho State University - Library Project - Construction and Bidding

Dani Dunstan, Vice President for Operations and Chief of Staff, Idaho State University, said Idaho State University (ISU) seeks approval from the Board to proceed with construction and financing for upgrades to ISU's library including upgrading the first-floor common areas to create a more dynamic student space. In addition, the project will allow for the addition of a Starbucks through ISU's partnership with its food service provider Chartwell's. Work for this project will be completed in two phases. The first phase will include the addition of Starbucks and required service to the area including electrical, plumbing, HVAC, and sewer hookups. The second phase will include upgrades to the remainder of the first-floor common areas to create a dynamic student space. Both projects are scheduled to be under construction in 2022, with the Starbucks portion planned to break ground in May.

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Hill / Keough) I move to approve the request by Idaho State University to proceed with construction and financing in two phases for the Library Upgrades: Common Area and Starbucks project for total costs not to exceed \$2.96M. A roll call vote was taken, and the motion carried 8-0.

There were no comments or questions from the Board.

4. Idaho State University – Leonard Hall Project - Construction and Financing

Dani Dunstan, Vice President for Operations and Chief of Staff, Idaho State University said, ISU seeks construction and financing approval for renovations to the College of Pharmacy, Leonard Hall. The renovation plan for Leonard Hall transforms an extremely outdated office, classroom, and laboratory space into state-of-the-art functionality. The renovation is primarily focused on upgrading the 2nd floor laboratories. Laboratories require redesign to update and modernize the spaces to fit current needs. Further, there is not ADA accessibility into lab spaces.

ISU has received gift commitments totaling \$16 million dedicated to the project. Further, ISU has submitted a request to the Permanent Building Fund Advisory Council (PBFAC) for an additional \$3.4 million.

ISU requests that the Board approve the request to proceed with construction for a total project cost not to exceed \$20,200,000. The project should be completed by August of 2025.

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Hill / Clark) I move to approve the request by Idaho State University to proceed with the construction of Leonard Hall renovations for a total project cost not to exceed \$20,200,000. A roll call vote was taken, and the motion carried 8-0.

Board President Liebich asked if based on the current economic situation does ISU have the reserves needed to see this project through to completion. Ms. Dunstan said a careful analysis was made and ISU is confident that they have a healthy contingency in place to see this project through.

There were no further comments or questions from the Board.

5. University of Idaho – Issuance of 2022 General Revenue Refunding Bonds

Brian Foisy, Vice President for Finance and Administration, University of Idaho said the University of Idaho (UI) requests the Regents of the University of Idaho approval to issue one series of tax-exempt general revenue and revenue refunding bonds (“Series 2022A Bonds”) pursuant to a Supplemental Resolution in an aggregate principal amount not to exceed \$46,110,000 million.

This is a three-part transaction. The proceeds of the Series 2022A Bonds will be used to refund the Series 2013B Bonds, which financed and reimbursed costs for the acquisition of land of the outdoor science center in McCall.

The Series 2014 Bonds were issued as fixed rate bonds with a final maturity of April 1, 2045.

And the total is not to exceed \$46,110,000 million, with the total amount allocated to the 2022 Project not to exceed \$2,000,000. This is primarily a refunding transaction.

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Hill / Clark) I move to approve the request by the University of Idaho to issue one series of tax-exempt general revenue and revenue refunding bonds to refund the Series 2013B and 2014 Bonds; finance various improvements to auxiliary services in an amount not to exceed \$2 million; and to find that this project is necessary for the proper operation of the University of Idaho and is economically feasible. A roll call vote was taken, and the motion carried 8-0.

AND

M/S (Hill / Roach) I move to approve a Supplemental Resolution for the Series 2022A Bonds, the title of which is as follows: A SUPPLEMENTAL RESOLUTION of the Regents of the University of Idaho Authorizing the Issuance and Providing for the Sale of General Revenue and Revenue Refunding Bonds, Series 2022;

Delegating Authority to Approve the Terms and Provisions of the Bonds, and the Aggregate Principal Amount of the Bonds up to \$46,110,000; Authorizing the Execution and Delivery of a Bond Purchase Agreement upon Sale of the Bonds; and Providing for Other Matters Relating to the Authorization, Issuance, Sale and Payment of the Bonds.

Roll call vote is required. A roll call vote was taken, and the motion carried 8-0.

Board President Liebich asked if this was refinancing fixed rate instruments with fixed rate instruments and not extending the maturity. Mr. Foisy said that was correct.

There were no further comments or questions from the Board.

6. University of Idaho - 4+1 Program Fees

7.

Brian Foisy, Vice President for Finance and Administration, University of Idaho, said the University of Idaho (UI) would like to initiate a 4+1 program for resident undergraduate students to continue into a non-thesis master's program in the same or related discipline. Rather than charging the graduate tuition rate when matriculating to the graduate program, successful applicants to the program would be charged the regular undergraduate student rate for full-time attendance during the Master's program.

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Hill / Keough) I move to approve the University of Idaho's request to implement a 4+1 program for resident undergraduate students to continue into a non-thesis Master's program in the same or related discipline at the regular undergraduate tuition structure. A roll call vote was taken, and the motion carried 8-0.

Board President Liebich asked if any of the other Idaho Institutions had a program like this in place. Dr. Jerry McMurtry, Dean, College of Graduate Studies, Professor, University of Idaho, said in his conversations with the other universities they do not have anything like this in place.

Dr. Bliss asked what the plans are for communicating this opportunity to the students. Dr. McMurtry said the graduate council has been informed who then informed the faculty who is being tasked with spreading the word, and the interest in this program is high.

There were no further comments or questions from the Board.

8. Lewis-Clark State College - College Place Residence Hall - Property Purchase and Funding

Dr. Julie Crea, Vice President for Finance and Administration, Lewis-Clark State College, said Lewis-Clark State College (LCSC) requests approval to purchase and finance a student housing building located at 814 4th street in Lewiston, adjacent to LCSC's campus and within LCSC's designated area of impact. The 28,976 square foot, 22-unit and 88-bedroom, student housing development is located on six contiguous tax parcels totaling 0.98 acres.

LCSC seeks approval to purchase the property for \$5,000,000 plus closing costs for a total cost not to exceed \$5.2 million.

LCSC has conducted due diligence relating to the property and has received a full appraisal and building inspection. The appraised value is \$4,640,000. Through negotiations with the sellers, LCSC requests to exceed the appraised value by 7.8% for a purchase price of \$5,000,000 of which is lower than the requested purchase price.

The property is of strategic value to LCSC with its location in direct proximity to the main campus.

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Hill / Clark) I move to approve the request by Lewis-Clark State College to purchase the property located at 814 4th Street in Lewiston, for an amount not exceed \$5.2 million, subject to bond financing approval; to authorize the Vice President and Chief Financial Officer to execute all necessary documents to complete the purchase as outlined herein, and to find that this project is necessary for the proper operation of LCSC and is economically feasible. A roll call vote was taken, and the motion carried 8-0.

AND

M/S (Hill / Roach) I move to approve Lewis-Clark State College's request for authorization of variable rate debt in amount greater than 20% of LCSC's total outstanding indebtedness. A roll call vote was taken, and the motion carried 8-0.

AND

M/S (Hill / Keough) I move to approve the Master Resolution for the Series 2021 Bonds as set forth in Attachment 2, the title of which is as follows: A resolution of the Board of Trustees of Lewis-Clark State College, authorizing the issuance and sale of General Revenue Bonds, Series 2021, in the principal amount of

\$4,000,000; providing for the acquisition, construction, reconstruction or repair of certain facilities; establishing certain funds and accounts; authorizing the execution and delivery of a bond purchase agreement; providing for the issuance of additional bonds for future Projects; and providing for other matters relating to the authorization, issuance, sale, and payment of bonds.

Roll call vote is required. A roll call vote was taken, and the motion carried 8-0.

Board President Liebich asked if the fees being charged to students will cover debt service costs. Dr. Crea said that correct. The estimated bond payment is \$245,000 and that leaves 25% of the revenue being brought in to pay for improvements, and maintenance and repairs.

Board President Liebich asked if an inspection was done to see what types of improvements or maintenance issues might arise. Dr. Crea said a complete inspection was done and major repairs and upgrades have already been taken care of and LCSC does not expect any large maintenance issues in the near future.

There were no further comments or questions from the Board.

At this time the Board recessed for 10 minutes, returning at 11:25 a.m.

INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH AND STUDENT AFFAIRS

1. Board Policy III.B. Academic Freedom and Responsibility and Policy III.P. Students – First Reading

Dr. Bliss said Board staff identified Board Policy III.B. as being in need of updating in early 2020, in connection with the amendments made to other Board policies at that time. In May 2021, Board staff formed a working group of faculty and administrators from all eight public postsecondary institutions. This working group met several times throughout the summer, resulting in the proposed amendments as attached. The committee and Board staff also sought input from nationally recognized experts and resources on academic freedom and freedom of expression, including the American Association of University Professors, the Foundation for Individual Rights in Education, and the Report on the Committee on Freedom of Expression at the University of Chicago.

The policy amendments represent a significant structural change to the policy.

The current version of Board Policy III.B. applies only to faculty, does not define key terms, and lacks limitations. Language related to the academic freedom of students currently found in Board Policy III.P has been proposed for deletion, as student

academic freedom and responsibility is now covered in the proposed amendments to Board Policy III.B.

The policy amendments represent a significant structural change to the policy. Specifically, the proposed policy is restructured to include the following major sections:

- Definitions of Key Terms
- Academic Freedom and Academic Responsibility of Students
- Academic Freedom and Academic Responsibility of Faculty
- Academic Freedom and Academic Responsibility of Institutions
- Limitations

Dr. Jonathan Lashley, Associate Chief Academic Affairs Officer, Idaho State Board of Education, said academic freedom is what allows for excellence on our campuses. With this freedom also comes the responsibility to know how to protect other's freedoms as well. Academic freedom will exist on Idaho campuses without this legislation, but this is a real opportunity for the Board to lead on what is academic freedom and what is possible in education.

Dr. Bliss mentioned that this policy does not affect Idaho's two-year institutions. He also mentioned that in the second Board Action concerning III.P. the line concerning vaccines is being modified since the CDC has changed the classification of vaccines, so they removed the Category A and B reference from this policy (Attachment 2, Tab 1, Page 8).

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Hill / Keough) I move to approve the first reading of proposed amendments to Board Policy III.B. Academic Freedom and Responsibility, as submitted in Attachment 1. A roll call vote was taken, and the motion carried 8-0.

AND

M/S (Hill / Keough) I move to approve the first reading of proposed amendments to Board Policy III.P. Students, as submitted in Attachment 2. A roll call vote was taken, and the motion carried 8-0.

Mrs. Roach asked if the universities need to have this type of policy in their accreditation plan. President Tromp said yes, academic freedom is one part of the accreditation standards, and if an accrediting team sees equity gaps, they ask the university to close those gaps.

Board President Liebich reminded everyone that this is a first reading of these changes and this will now be open to public comment. Any comments received will then be brought back to the Board at a future meeting.

There were no further comments or questions from the Board.

2. Board Policy III.G. Postsecondary Program Approval and Discontinuance – First Reading

Dr. Bliss said in August 2021, the Board approved a major revision to Board Policy III.G. Postsecondary Program Approval and Discontinuance. This revision restructured the policy to include three levels of review, based on the nature of requested programmatic changes: full proposal, short proposal, and letter of notification.

After the second reading was approved, Board staff identified an unintended conflict in the policy that cannot be handled as a minor technical correction. Specifically, there is an error in the recently adopted revision of Board Policy III.G that duplicates language in two places:

- Under 3.b.xi, Actions Requiring a Short Proposal Establishment of a dual degree from existing programs with a financial impact of less than \$250,000 per fiscal year.
- Under 3.c.iv, Actions Requiring a Letter of Notification Establishment of a dual degree from existing undergraduate or graduate programs with a financial impact of less than \$250,000 per fiscal year.

The original intent was to have this type of action under the Short Proposal process, not the Letter of Notification process. Other amendments include clarifying procedures for the discontinuation of undergraduate and graduate certificates and clarifying roles for the State Administrator and Executive Director for approval of career technical programs in accordance with Section 33-2202 and 33-2205, Idaho Code.

Amendments will correct the erroneous conflict and duplicative language in the policy, removing confusion about what level of review is required for establishment of dual degrees from existing programs. Amendments will also provide institutions with the necessary procedures for discontinuing certificates and will align roles for program approval for the State Administrator and Executive Director in compliance with Idaho code.

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Hill / Clark) I move to approve the first reading of proposed amendments to Board Policy III.G, Postsecondary Program Approval and Discontinuance, as submitted in Attachment 1. A roll call vote was taken, and the motion carried 8-0.

There were no comments or questions from the Board.

At this time the Board recessed for 45 minutes, returning at 12:33 p.m.

3. Online Idaho Update and Demonstration

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

Board President Liebich began by saying that Online Idaho has transitioned from a Board-led initiative to an interinstitutional collaboration toward radical affordability, reliable access, and educational agency for online learners. The consortia model endorsed by the Board in June 2020 endures because it celebrates the unique strengths of Idaho's higher education community: the already robust portfolio of fully online courses and programs collectively available across Idaho's eight public colleges and universities continues to grow; radically affordable learning pathways are emerging between colleges and universities; administrative processes are becoming less onerous as institutions consolidate efforts and understanding; and a sustainable understanding of "systemness" is emerging as Idaho institutions endeavor to reach every adult Idahoan with meaningful postsecondary opportunities.

Dr. Jonathan Lashley, Associate Chief Academic Affairs Officer, Idaho State Board of Education gave an update on Online Idaho's first year in operation.

The Core Goals of Online Idaho

1. Increase access, affordability, and agency and
2. Map the future of online learning in Idaho.

The Vision of Online Idaho

Online Idaho is a digital learning consortium that is collaboratively driven by public institutions to increase access to postsecondary learning opportunities, accommodate all learners regardless of their circumstances, advocate for the recognition of effective online educators, promote exceptional online learning practices, and pioneer improved advising pathways toward lifelong learning.

Working Goals:

Access

1. Online learning becomes a meaningful option for every postsecondary student in Idaho
2. Support the general public and public/private decision makers in becoming effective champions of online, open, blended, and accessible teaching and learning in Idaho

Affordability

1. Joint degree pathways, consolidated infrastructure, system-like purchasing power, and resource sharing result in radically affordable postsecondary learning experiences

2. Public institutions develop lifelong learning relationships with Idahoans through consolidated marketing, communication, analytics, reporting, and advising efforts

Agency

1. Transparent, stackable pathways toward credentials emerge within and between institutions
2. Through regular statewide meetings, the academic community shares expertise that informs and continuously improves common standards for effective design and delivery of online courses

For the 2021-2022 Academic Year this will be the roadmap moving forward.

FALL 2021

- Complete exchange implementation and soft launch registration
- Design and deliver training for advising staff at each institution
- Launch interinstitutional cybersecurity pathways

SPRING 2022

- Statewide marketing push to support summer/fall registration
- Define system-wide expectations for course exchange participation

SUMMER 2022

- Formalize long-term sustainability model for Online Idaho

To ensure success the following course exchange walkthroughs will happen.

- Student Experience and course-level information
- Administrative portal and reports
- Cyber Security degrees, certificates, and pathways

First Year Outcomes

Engagement

- Institution-led steering committee
- Weekly open “office hours”
- Strategic planning and promotion

Administration

- New consortium agreements
- New joint programs and degrees
- New distributed support models

Interoperable Technology

- Common LMS adoption and support
- Interoperable technology pilots and adoption

Professional Development

- Statewide OEN membership
- Statewide OLC membership + workshop passes

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

650 W. State Street • P. O. Box 83720 • Boise, ID 83720-0037
208/334-2270 • FAX: 208/334-2632

- Board staff development with OLC and UPCEA
- Exploring open resources in online education

The Future of Online Idaho

- More multi-institution collaborations on programs and stackable, fully online pathways to credentials (academic and nonacademic)
- Fortified statewide conversations about continuing education partnerships between Idaho employers and public institutions
- New and/or updated Board and institution policies for online education that reflect consortial infrastructure and practices
- Experimentation with exchange pricing and consortial purchasing
- Leadership in interstate course sharing networks in Cybersecurity, Agriculture, and more

After his report Dr. Lashley did a demonstration of how Online Idaho works (<https://online.idaho.edu/>).

Dr. Lashley ended by saying that the Board will most likely need to have policies concerning online learning to help formalize the foundation that will keep online learning moving forward in Idaho.

Superintendent Ybarra asked for clarification on the transferability mentioned during the demonstration. Does this mean that if a student tries to get into a class at their institution and the class is full, will Online Idaho be an option for students to still be able to take the class from anywhere and stay on track at their institution. Dr. Lashley said yes, this is what other states have found.

Dr. Hill said the institution registrars also came together to fix the Financial Aid issue. Students do not need to apply at each institution for financial aid in order to take any of these classes; financial aid assistance will stay within their enrolled school.

Dr. Lashley said the institutions decide what courses get put into Online Idaho, which leads to a shared infrastructure.

Superintendent Ybarra asked when this will be ready. Dr. Lashley said Quotly is building this shared infrastructure and should have it ready by the Spring – Fall 2022 semesters.

Dr. Clark asked if the GEM courses will be the bulk of the course offerings. Dr. Lashley said yes, that was the case. There are currently 11,000 courses available right now.

Mrs. Roach asked about scholarship students and their financial aid. Dr. Lashley said scholarship students are not part of the scope at this time but expanding the program is possible in the future.

Dr. Hill asked about the quality of classes being offered. Dr. Lashley said every institution has a mechanism in place to ensure that the courses being offered are quality offerings. However, this would be the perfect time for the Board to develop additional policies to state what the baseline quality for these courses should be.

Dr. Hill asked about dual credit students. Dr. Lashley said as part of the plan, it would leverage the same infrastructure so dual credit students could be a part of this program someday.

Mr. Gilbert asked if Quotly provided information about their business growth since they are new and small. Dr. Lashley said Quotly is growing quickly, and the Committee felt comfortable in allowing them to develop the framework for Online Idaho.

President Tromp said nationally the largest population who have benefited from using online learning are women in their 30's with small children. This education opportunity is invaluable in getting more people educated.

Dr. Bliss added that Idaho tuition is very low compared to other states which may benefit our institutions as students from other states can access these courses.

There were no further comments or questions from the Board.

4. North Idaho College – Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities' Investigation of Complaints

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

Ms. Keough led a discussion about the continuing conversations and concerns that have arisen about North Idaho College.

Board President Liebich stated that teachers and students should not worry that accreditation would be withdrawn quickly. A thorough investigation will be conducted by the accreditation team when they visit NIC on January 18, 2022, and recommendations would be made then. No loss of accreditation is imminent.

Dr. Clark asked if there were any members of the Legislature who were concerned enough about this issue to want to draft new legislation. Mrs. Keough said yes, she has been in touch with a couple of Legislators who would like to get together after the first of the year to talk about drafting new legislation concerning this issue that would be part of statute.

There were no further comments or questions from the Board.

STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

1. Development in K-12 Education

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

Superintendent Ybarra gave an update on K-12 education specifically talking about the following three activities.

School Operational Status Portal

US Department of Education had asked for what schools were open for in person learning, and which were operating as hybrid. SDE staff have been working on the reporting for this. The full report can be seen at <https://www.sde.idaho.gov/re-opening/index.html>.

Student Advisory Council

The team met most recently on December 6, 2021. A topic of most importance to them is helping fellow students who have dyslexia.

The students are very interested in having both Governor Little and Board President Liebich come and speak to them at a future Student Advisory Council meeting.

Report on Recent Conferences

At a recent conference of chief state school officers' discussions centered around the following topics; learning loss, relief funds expenditures, staffing shortages, accountability and assessment, the mental health and wellbeing of Idaho students.

There were no comments or questions from the Board.

2. ARP Act ESSER State Plan Amendment

3.

Karen Seay, Director, Federal Programs, State Department of Education, spoke on the State Plan Amendment. She said today's review deals with the changes made to C1. Attachment 2, Tab 2, pages 18-19 specifically detail how ARP ESSER funding will help children in the foster care system and those in the juvenile justice system. Foster Care Stakeholders meet quarterly and is comprised of LEA liaisons, health and welfare regional supervisors and local community organizations.

This working group feels the following are the most critical use of ARP ESSER funds.

1. Reduce chronic absenteeism and improve re-engagement strategies
2. Meet unfinished learning needs and gaps
3. Support credit recovery options
4. Meet the social emotional needs of students
5. Engage students' career technical education programs

6. Offer community based after school programs
7. Provide summer enrichment programs

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Ybarra / Clark) I move to approve the amendments to the Idaho ARP ESSER SEA State Plan as provided in Attachment 2 and authorize the Board President to sign the ARP ESSER SEA State Plan as the representative of the State Education Agency. A roll call vote was taken, and the motion carried 8-0.

Dr. Clark asked if the State Board staff participated in these meetings. Ms. Seay said no, they did not.

There were no further comments or questions from the Board.

4. Elementary Secondary Education Act – Consolidated State Plan Amendment
This item was provided in the agenda materials as an information item.

Superintendent Ybarra said this agenda item will provide the Board with an update on proposed changes to Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) Consolidated State Plan. Proposed updates will take effect during the current 2021-2022 school year (exit criteria) and for the 2022-2023 school year (identification criteria). Idaho may not implement these changes until the amendment has been approved by USED.

Karen Seay, Federal Programs Director, State Board of Education asked the Board to reference the slide presentation found at Attachment 1, Tab 3, page 1 – 14. Ms. Seay highlighted the following in her presentation.

Proposed changes are needed to address state accountability changes, small technical corrections, and gather feedback on improving metrics and identification methods. The goal is to finalize potential changes for stakeholder review and Board approval for submission to USED by February 2022. The last plan amendment was June of 2019. Areas of change for consideration:

1. Revise the current Exit Criteria for Comprehensive Support and Improvement, Underperforming schools reflecting the school is no longer identified in the bottom 5% and is above the 10th percentile (currently 20th percentile) in proficiency for both ELA and Math. This exit criterion was originally set without sufficient data and the 20th percentile is too high.
2. The current growth model is trajectory towards proficiency three years in the future. This model does not adequately reward growth.
3. For targeted support and improvement (TSI), schools can be identified in any (Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) metric and student group

based on gap of 35 percentage points or more for three consecutive years. Overidentification is a concern.

4. More rigorous interventions are required under ESSA for schools that do not exit CSI and therefore are re-identified. The first time this will occur is summer of 2022, after spring 2022 ISAT results are analyzed.

The original goal was to reduce the percentage of students not proficient/not making progress/not graduating by one-third over six years. Idaho has not come close to meeting these goals since original goals were set without meaningful data.

Discussion ensued about the lack of data surrounding the issues raised during this presentation. Having access to better data could assist in developing a plan to bring Idaho closer to goals.

There were no further comments or questions from the Board.

At this time the Board took a 10-minute break, returning at 2:55 p.m.

5. English Language Learner Assessment – Update

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

Superintendent Ybarra said this agenda item will provide the Board with an update on the English Learners program, including student proficiency data. She then referenced Attachment 1, Tab 4, pages 1-4, and Attachment 2, Tab 4, pages 1-4.

Listed Recommendations for Program Progress are:

1. Increase professional development opportunities for general education teachers who work with EL students.
2. Continue to collaborate with certification department to promote EL endorsements and teachers of color.
3. Provide curricular support and professional development for learning loss during COVID-19.

Board President Liebich said, based on the data presented in Attachment 2, Tab 4, page 2, it clearly shows the pandemic had a real impact on ELA students' progress.

Mr. Freeman asked if the recommendations listed at the end of the slide presentation go to the Board or to the Legislature. Superintendent Ybarra said they should be addressed by the Department in working with the school districts.

There were no further comments or questions from the Board.

6. Statewide Reading Assessment –Update

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

Kevin Chandler, Director, Assessment and Accountability, State Department of Education, gave an update on student Idaho Reading Indicator (IRI) results. He reported the following.

The Fall 2021 IRI test was given in person with a remote option being available for those students who wanted it. Overall 90,094 valid tests were received.

The results showed the following data concerning Idaho students.

- Fifty one percent of all students were reading at grade level in Fall 2021.
- Between Fall 2020 and Fall 2021 there was a small rise in the number of students who were reading at grade level. The numbers rose from 49.6 percent (Fall 2020) to 51 percent (Fall 2021).
- When reviewing the data per grade, those in 1st, 2nd and 3rd grade showed a slight increase in reading scores. The only decline was in kindergarten students who went from 43.4 percent (Fall 2020) to 40.8 percent (Fall 2021).
- Overall IRI performance across all four grades recovered nearly 1.5 percentage points in Fall 2021 over the prior year's decline of more than 5 percentage points.
- A similar pattern of recovery in Fall 2021 following the decline in Fall 2020 appeared for all Grades 1 through 3, with the strongest recovery appearing among 1st graders.
- Kindergarten students manifested an opposite trend where the proportion reading at grade level rose by about 1 percentage point in Fall 2020 only to decline by about 2.5 points in Fall 2021.

Mr. Chandler imparted that as SDE reviews the results, there are a few key considerations to keep in mind.

- Although they compared Fall 2020 with Fall 2021 results, the two results come from different student cohorts.
- The fall 2021 to spring 2022 comparison for students will be critical to help understand actual growth and end-of-year reading proficiency among the 2021 cohort of K-3 students.
- Preliminary findings indicate some learning loss in 2020 because of the COVID-19 disruptions and continued monitoring will tell whether, and by how much students' reading skills are recovering.

Board President Liebich said this data highlights why this issue is one of the Board's top three priorities. Dr. Clark said of special note to her is the 60 percent of kindergartens who came into this school year and were not at grade level. Those students will play catch up all their academic life.

There were no further comments or questions from the Board.

7. Professional Standards Commission (PSC) – Annual Report

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

Dr. Bethani Studebaker, Director, Certification and Professional Standards, State Department of Education, spoke about the scope of the PSC. The commission is made up of 18 members appointed by the State Board of Education. Membership is made up of individuals representing the teaching profession in Idaho, including a staff person from the Department of Education and the Division of Career Technical Education. No less than seven members must be certificated classroom teachers, of which at least one must be a teacher of exceptional children and one must serve in pupil personnel services. The purpose of the Professional Standards Commission is to make recommendations regarding professional codes and standards of ethics to the State Board of Education and is authorized to investigate complaints regarding the violation of such standards and makes recommendations to the Board in areas of educator certification and educator preparation standards.

Dr. Studebaker further shared the following.

- There were 851 teacher authorizations made by the committee during the 2020-2021 school year.
- There were 20,673 total certificated educators employed statewide during the 2020-2021 school year.
- The percentage of educators working with an alternative authorization was 4.12 percent.
- During 2020-2021, the PSC received 39 written complaints of alleged educator ethical misconduct, out of which 24 cases were opened.
- There were 36 cases closed during 2020-2021.
- Twenty-five cases – probable cause found with disciplinary action taken
- Eleven cases – no probable cause found.
- Ten of the 36 cases were for educators employed as an administrator.

The scope of the PSC is:

- Usually reviews 20 percent of the educator preparation standards and endorsements each year.

- Upon the written request of the House and Senate Education Committees in March 2020, a full review of all educator preparation standards and endorsements was conducted, and the full review was completed April 2021
- An Educator Standards Working Group, which included Standards Committee members and other members of the PSC, was convened to complete the full review and draft proposed revisions.
- The work of the Educator Standards Working Group is anticipated to culminate in a rulemaking action for consideration by the House and Senate Education Committees in 2022.
- Completes educator preparation program reviews. The following program reviews were completed during 2020-2021:
 - o University of Idaho – CAEP & State Team Review
- Completes educator preparation new program proposal desk reviews. The following new programs for certification were reviewed and approved by the State Board of Education during 2020-2021:
 - o Northwest Nazarene University – Exceptional Child, Teacher Leader – Instructional Specialist, Teacher Leader – Special education
 - o University of Idaho – Theater Arts

There were no comments or questions from the Board.

8. Federal Coronavirus Relief Funding Update

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

Karen Seay, Director, Federal Programs, State Board of Education said this agenda item provides the Board with a high-level update on the most recent information on the COVID-19 relief funds. Ms. Seay imparted the following updates on relief funds expenditures.

The percentage of funds expended in the GRA for the flow through amounts, only for the three ESSER grants, as of December 14, 2021 are:

1. 92.7 percent of the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security Act (CARES Act) money have been expended.
2. 31.03 percent of the Coronavirus Response and Relief Supplemental Appropriations Act (CRRSA Act) monies have been expended and
3. 6.36 percent of the American Rescue Plan Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief (ARP ESSER) funds have been expended.

For a more complete review of the Local Education Agency (LEA) ARP ESSER Use of Funds Plan please reference the State Department of Education website at; <https://www.sde.idaho.gov/federal-programs/prf/american-rescue-plan/index.html>

The State Department of Education has outlined a few concerns with the ESSER reporting. The largest of which is the burden statement which indicates each state, and each LEA will need 140 hours to collect and submit the proposed data. Superintendent Ybarra provided feedback with significant concerns relating to this data collection requirement.

Governor Little's substitute grant closed at 5:00 p.m. (MT) on December 15, 2021. As of December 14, 2021, 87 percent of the grant funds have been drawn down. The grant earmarked \$10 million to recruit and retain critical staff and provide supplementary pay for hard-to-fill positions. The SDE tracked positions and staff numbers benefiting from these funds and that data will be coming to the Board at a future meeting.

There were no comments or questions from the Board.

PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

1. STEM Action Center – Annual Report

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

Dr. Kaitlin Maguire, Director, Idaho STEM Action Center gave an update on the center's activity over the past year.

Some of the presentation highlights were:

- Nineteen of the twenty hot jobs in Idaho require STEM skills.
- That number is expected to grow by 16.3 percent by 2029.
- Idaho STEM jobs pay nearly twice the median wage of non-STEM jobs.
- Idaho's Tech Sector is the third fastest growing in the nation at 4.2 percent.
- Within 10 years, ninety percent of jobs will require digital skills.

STEM's Mission

Advance innovative STEM opportunities for educators, students, communities, and industry to build a competitive Idaho workforce and economy.

STEM's Vision

A diverse STEM-literate Idaho workforce to support the long-term economic prosperity of Idaho.

STEM's Goals

- 1: Increase awareness of the importance of STEM+CS throughout Idaho
- 2: Advance equitable access to high-quality STEM+CS opportunities for educators, students, and communities
- 3: Align education and workforce needs throughout Idaho

Schools that wish to be designated as STEM schools can apply for a \$10,000 grant per year up to 5 years. Currently there are 6 designated schools, and 5 schools are scheduled to be reviewed this school year.

Mrs. Roach asked if the state is currently tracking how many students are acquiring STEM diplomas. Dr. Maguire said that data is not currently being tracked.

There were no further comments or questions from the Board.

2. Next Steps Idaho Update

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

Sara Scudder, Outreach Team Senior Program Manager, Idaho State Board of Education began her update by saying the Next Steps website was initially developed to provide resources for students in grades 8 through 12, their parents, and the educators that help to support these students. Ongoing development and expansion of the website to include an adult audience has been done through a systematic approach of researching not only those tools most meaningful to the target groups but also through gathering user feedback. Due to this systematic approach, the website has seen expanded usage.

Next Steps Idaho Vision

Create a college and career planning tool that is easily delivered, highly visible and widely used by Idahoans.

Next Steps Idaho Goals

1. Seamlessly incorporate career development resources on the Next Steps Idaho site.
2. Increase ability to meet and respond to stakeholder needs.
3. Engage students and professionals (counselors, advisors) with Next Steps Idaho.
4. Expand marketing and outreach.
5. Strategically engage business and partner agencies.

Since the relaunch of Next Steps Idaho in September 2020, enhanced navigation, expanded resources for adult users, and new career and college tools have produced substantial usage.

1. Over 230,000 user sessions produced 750,000-page views with an average session duration of 5.5 minutes - very high by industry standards.
2. January 2021 will see the launch of student portfolios.
3. Students from 8th through 12th grade will be able to create a portfolio of career and college activities, interests, and assessments that will follow them from year to year and school to school.
4. Adults will also be able to create portfolios to support their career and education interests.

There were no comments or questions from the Board.

3. Community College Trustee Zones

Tracie Bent, Chief Policy and Planning Officer, Idaho State Board of Education, said pursuant to Section 33-2104A, Idaho Code, a proposal to redefine the boundaries of trustee zones of a community college district shall be initiated by its board of trustees at the first meeting following the report of the decennial census or following the electors' approval of the addition of territory pursuant to section 33-2105, Idaho Code. The board of trustees shall submit the proposal to the state board of education within one hundred twenty (120) days following the decennial census or election. The proposal shall include a legal description of each proposed trustee zone, a map of the district showing how each proposed trustee zone would appear and the approximate population each zone would have should the proposal to change the boundaries of the trustee zones become effective.

At the time of agenda production the College of Southern Idaho's board of trustee zone boundary was ready for submission. The rest of the College trustee zones will be brought forward to the Board at a future meeting.

The College of Southern Idaho's proposal uses the 2020 Census data, has no population variances more than 10 percent from any other trustee zone, the proposal completely accounts for all areas within the district boundary, and a licensed professional has certified their legal descriptions.

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Clark / Hill) I move to approve the College of Southern Idaho's trustee zone boundary rezoning proposals as submitted in Attachment 1. A roll call vote was taken, and the motion carried 8-0.

There were no comments or questions from the Board.

4. Temporary Rule – IDAPA 08.02.01 – Average Daily Attendance

Dr. Clark said approval of the temporary rule, Docket 08-0201-2103, would allow averaging of the FTE student enrollment numbers to be used for calculating average daily attendance for FY 2022.

Ms. Bent said this temporary rule will require the Governor's approval to move forward. Further Ms. Bent said Section 33-1002, Idaho Code, authorizes the Board to set through Administrative Code the methodology for how attendance will be reported for calculating average daily attendance as it applies to public school funding. For the 2020-2021 academic year, in response to the COVID-19 pandemic and the disruption to in person learning, the Board approved a temporary rule allowing the FTE student enrollment methodology established in IDAPA 08.02.01 to be used for reporting attendance for calculating Average Daily Attendance (ADA). On average, statewide, daily school attendance rates run around 95%, meaning on any given day, about 95% of enrolled students are in attendance. Due to the ongoing impacts of the pandemic, schools have reported attendance rates as low as 80%. School districts and charter schools have indicated much higher instances of students being out sick at much higher rates than normal or remaining home due to quarantining. As a result of the lower daily attendance rates and the negative impact this will have on public school funding, several school district administrators and charter schools have asked the Board to consider approving another temporary rule allowing FTE student enrollment to be used for calculating ADA for the 2021-2022 school year.

Matt Freeman reminded the Board that Temporary Rules expire when the Legislature calls Sine Die.

BOARD ACTION

M/S (Clark / Keough) I move to approve the temporary rule Docket 08-0201-2103, allowing average student FTE enrollment to be used for calculating average daily attendance, as submitted in Attachment 1. A roll call vote was taken, and the motion carried 8-0.

There were no comments or questions from the Board.

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

M/S (Hill / Roach) I move to adjourn the meeting at 4:29 p.m. (MT). A roll call vote was taken, and the motion carried 8-0.