

# House Education Committee

Minutes  
2008



## MINUTES

### HOUSE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

**DATE:** January 9, 2008

**TIME:** 9 A.M.

**PLACE:** Room 148

**MEMBERS:** Chairman Nonini, Vice Chairman Shirley, Representatives Trail, Bradford, Block, Nielsen, Wills, Chadderdon, Shepherd (8), Marriott, Mortimer, Patrick, Thayn, Boe, Pence, Chavez, Durst, Shively

**ABSENT/  
EXCUSED:** None

**GUESTS:** See attached list

Chairman Nonini called the meeting to order at 9 A.M. He introduced the committee secretary, Claudia Howell and the committee page, Morgan Ellis. Audience members were also invited to introduce themselves to the committee members. Chairman Nonini asked Representatives Wills and Shively to review the Committee minutes before each meeting. The Representatives agreed to do so.

Vice Chairman Shirley assigned Representatives to subcommittees for the rules review process. The subcommittees will report back to the full committee their recommendations. Representative Nielsen will chair one committee and Representatives Mortimer and Boe will serve with him. This subcommittee will review the rules from the Idaho State Board of Education. Representative Wills will chair the other subcommittee and Representatives Chadderdon and Shively will serve on this committee. This committee will review the rules of the Idaho Department of Education. Chairman Nonini asked that the subcommittees meet in the next few days and report back to the full committee early next week.

Chairman Nonini shared a newspaper article highlighting an outstanding high school senior from Skyview High School in Nampa. He indicated that he would like to invite the student to come to a future committee meeting. He explained that he would look into the matter and report back. He also shared an article from today's Idaho Statesman business section regarding the high tech industry's struggle to find qualified employees. He explained the importance of supporting quality education for high tech jobs in the state to prevent Idaho students from moving out of state.

Chairman Nonini asked for comments from Committee members regarding issues they feel are important to discuss this legislative session.

Rep. Chavez discussed the evolution of the traditional classes that were once taught in the public schools, including home economics and shop. She felt that these classes were important for the students who were not college bound and by eliminating them, avenues have been taken away.

She further explained that she felt that the Legislature did a good job of focusing on students rather than adults last year.

Rep. Nielsen discussed his concern regarding concurrent credits for high school students to earn college credits.

**Luci Willits**, representing the Idaho Department of Education, explained that Superintendent Tom Luna has included in his budget \$3.5 million to expand concurrent credits across the state. She further explained that this request is not included in the Governor's budget.

Rep. Boe explained that Idaho State University currently has a successful concurrent credit program with high schools in the Pocatello area.

Chairman Nonini encouraged committee members to support concurrent credits across the state.

Rep. Block explained that the College of Southern Idaho has a concurrent credit program and high school students in Twin Falls have the opportunity to earn one year of college credit while still in high school.

Rep. Bradford mentioned that he recently spent time at Westside High school in Preston which implements the concurrent credit program. He reported that 60% of high school students there will earn an associate's degree along with their high school diploma.

Rep. Trail stated that the Idaho Opportunity Scholarship program fits well with the concurrent credit program.

Rep. Chadderdon reported that she recently attended a Women in Government conference in Phoenix. Distance education with broadband technology was discussed. It was suggested that Ed Lodge from Qwest be invited to come to the committee to discuss the Utah Education network and it's implications for Idaho.

Rep. Mortimer explained that an issue he would like to see discussed is the expansion of the transferability of credits. He would like to have a report for the Committee on the rule or statute that deals with this issue for technical schools or higher education. **Mark Browning** from the Idaho State Board of Education will follow up on this issue.

**Luci Willits** reminded the Committee members of State Schools Superintendent Tom Luna's open house this afternoon from 3 to 6 P.M. on the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor of the Len B. Jordan building.

Chairman Nonini announced that the full committee will not meet again until early next week.

**ADJOURN:** The meeting adjourned at 9:55 A.M.

---

Representative Bob Nonini  
Chairman

---

Claudia Howell  
Secretary

MINUTES

**HOUSE EDUCATION COMMITTEE  
NIELSEN SUBCOMMITTEE**

**DATE:** January 10th, 2008

**TIME:** 9 A.M.

**PLACE:** Room 225

**MEMBERS:** Chairman Nielsen, Rep. Mortimer, Rep. Boe

**ABSENT/  
EXCUSED:** None

**GUESTS:** See attached sheet.

Chairman Nielsen called the meeting to order at 9:05 A.M. He suggested that all of the subcommittee members must agree on approval of a docket to recommend approval to the full committee. He further suggested that if subcommittee members have objections or questions on particular dockets, that the docket be reviewed by the full committee. The subcommittee members agreed.

**Docket #08-0105-0701** Chairman Nielsen explained that this rule docket is a pending rule repealing an old rule.

**MOTION:** Rep. Boe made a motion to recommend approval of **Docket #08-0105-0701** to the full Committee. Rep. Mortimer seconded the motion. The motion passed on an unanimous voice vote.

**Docket #08-0105-0702:** **Sandra DeKlotz**, from the Idaho State Board of Education, presented this rule. She explained that this rule includes regulations that have been passed in statute regarding Promise A and Promise B scholarships. The rule is designed to clarify language and make it easier to use. **Mark Browning**, from the Idaho State Board of Education further explained that the rule accommodates home schooled students with clarification of the language regarding criteria for the Promise scholarships. **Mr. Browning** explained that the Promise A scholarship is highly academic, has more rigorous criteria, a higher amount is awarded and is awarded to students pursuing a four year degree. The Promise B scholarship is a smaller award and is given to students pursuing a two year degree. Both scholarships are open to home schooled students and are awarded based on ACT scores, Compass scores and GPA.

**MOTION:** Rep. Mortimer made a motion to recommend approval of **Docket #08-0105-0702** to the full Committee. Rep. Boe seconded the motion. The motion passed on an unanimous voice vote.

**Docket #08-0113-0701:**

**Ms. DeKlotz** presented this docket to the subcommittee. This pending rule deals with the Idaho Opportunity Scholarship. Rep. Mortimer questioned how the \$5,000 figure contributed by students was determined by the Board. **Ms. DeKlotz** explained that students applying for this scholarship must first apply for federal financial aid and Pell grants before the \$5,000 is paid. **Mr. Browning** also pointed out that the Board worked closely with the financial offices at the institutions to arrive at this figure. Rep. Mortimer indicated that he would like more clarification.

It was pointed out that there is a typo on page 21 of the docket in the last paragraph. The Legislature appropriated \$10 million last year to be set in a trust account instead of \$5 million as stated in the docket.

**Ms. DeKlotz** explained that this rule has gone through an award period and some changes have been made.

**Mr. Browning** explained that the language in the definition section; 010. subsection a is taken directly from Idaho Code.

Rep. Mortimer voiced his concern that character of a student needs to be taken into consideration when awarding the Opportunity scholarship.

**Lacey**, an intern working with Rep. Mortimer, explained that just because one has been admitted to a certain college, doesn't mean that the student can pay the tuition for that college.

**Ms. DeKlotz** reported that a maximum of \$3,000 can be awarded per year under the Opportunity scholarship and so far 640 to 740 students have received it. She explained that scholarships are still being awarded today.

It was suggested that a discussion of "weighted equalization formula" could be discussed with the full committee as there could be questions from committee members.

There was discussion regarding the language on page 28; subsection iii under section e. Committee members felt that the language regarding students who are not within two semesters of graduation of such major based on normal academic course load not being eligible for the Opportunity scholarship was not necessary. It was explained that the language was meant to weed out professional students.

**MOTION:**

Rep. Boe made a motion to recommend approval of **Docket #08-0113-0701** to the full committee with further discussion needed on the language on page 28; subsection iii under section e. Rep. Mortimer seconded the motion. The voice vote was unanimous.

**Docket #08-0203-0703:**

**Mary Dunne**, superintendent of the Idaho School for the Deaf and Blind and **Aylee Schaefer**, Transition Coordinator for the blind for the State Board of Education presented this docket to the subcommittee. The subcommittee had questions on the standards referenced in the rule docket on page 77. These standards are for infants, toddlers, children and youth who are deaf or hard of hearing and infants, toddlers, children and youth who are blind or visually impaired.

**Ms. Schaefer** explained that these standards were derived from an Office of Performance Evaluations report on the Idaho State School for the Deaf and Blind. The standards bring in line the state with the national standards. They outline what teachers of the deaf or blind should know and what they should be teaching. The standards also address what curriculum should be taught to these students. **Ms. Dunne** explained that the standards are not mandated by the federal government. The standards are meant to protect Idaho children and outline good practice for teachers of children with vision and hearing loss. In response to questions from committee members, **Ms. Schaefer** made it clear that parents have the final decision as to where their child receives their education. The standards are parent led and do not dilute parental rights.

**MOTION:** Rep. Mortimer made a motion to recommend approval of **Docket # 08-0203-0703** to the full committee. Rep. Boe seconded the motion. The motion passed on an unanimous voice vote.

**Docket #08-0204-0701:** Chairman Nielsen explained that this docket dealing with charter schools was discussed informally and the subcommittee members had questions on page 109; subsection 04 of section 205 (Review of Petitions). **Tamara Baysinger**, charter schools program manager for the State Board of Education responded to committee questions. She explained that this section deals with deficiency reports and requires potential charter schools with deficiencies to send a written response to the authorized chartering entity. She further explained that brick and mortar schools go to the local school district for review and the virtual charter school goes directly to the state charter commission for approval. She reported that there was no opposition to this rule when public hearings were held.

**MOTION:** Rep. Boe made a motion to recommend approval of **Docket #08-0203-0704** to the full committee. Rep. Mortimer seconded the motion. The motion passed on an unanimous voice vote.

Chairman Nielsen announced due to time constraints that the remaining docket on the agenda, **Docket #08-0203-0704** will be heard in the subcommittee on Monday, January 14<sup>th</sup>. The subcommittee will also hear the remaining dockets from the State Board regarding the Commission on Libraries on January 14<sup>th</sup>.

**ADJOURNMENT:** Chairman Nielsen adjourned the meeting at 11:00 A.M.

---

Representative Pete Nielsen  
Chairman

---

Claudia Howell  
Secretary

## MINUTES

### HOUSE EDUCATION SUB-COMMITTEE

**DATE:** January 10, 2008

**TIME:** 9:00 a.m.

**PLACE:** Room 148

**MEMBERS:** Chairman Wills, Representatives Chadderdon, Shively

**GUESTS:** Luci Willits, ID State Dept. Of Education; Shannon Page, Director of Coordinated School Health.

See sign-in sheet for other guests.

Chairman Wills called the meeting to order at 9:10 a.m.

**INTRODUCTION:** Luci Willits introduced Shannon Page, Director of Coordinated School Health and related that Director Page is the former Director of Accreditation.  
**Shannon Page,**  
**Director of**  
**Coordinated**  
**School Health**

**DOCKET NO. 08-0202-0707** Luci Willits and Shannon Page informed the sub-committee members that the purpose of the Rule was to reduce redundancy for schools to be accreditation through the State of Idaho and district accreditation through Northwest Association of Accredited Schools (NAAS). It was further explained that NAAS is a membership organization and each school pays a membership fee to join. Jr. High Schools have to be accredited as 9<sup>th</sup> grade counts toward accreditation. It is mandatory to join NAAS for the school to be accredited.

Chairman Wills indicated that protocol for this meeting will be an informal discussion among the committee members and guests regarding the Rules.

Luci Willits added the State of Idaho was trying to do a dual track and this was parallel with "No Child Left Behind." The school districts and superintendents are very pleased to with this recommendation. Chairman Wills and the committee members stated they are comfortable they can answer any questions that come up in general committee regarding this Rule.

**DOCKET NO. 08-0202-0701** Luci Willits explained this will clarify the parameters on requirements for teachers in taking courses. The courses need to have education related credits and the district has the flexibility to determine if the courses taken are academically based and the course has to fulfill any one of the requirements outlined under 02, a, I, ii, or iii.

**DOCKET NO.**

**08-0202-0702**

Luci Willits explained that this addresses out- of- state certificate holders, It was determined to look at what they've done in their prior state and not require them to take an additional test, if they've already done so for their prior state certification.

Rep. Chadderdon asked if there is a time line for this to occur and Luci Willits stated that she will check into it and report her findings to the entire committee.

**DOCKET NO.  
08-0202-0703**

Luci Willits outlined this allows Idaho school districts to hire uncertified school psychologists in an emergency situation, by allowing them to obtain certification within 3 years. Chairman Wills asked what will occur if they are not fully certified in 3 years. Luci Willits explained they will be reviewed annually, but if they are not fully certified in 3 years, they will not be eligible to teach. It was discussed and generally agreed that good school psychologists are hard to find and it is a mutual investment to have the school district support them in their development and keep them. The responsibility for accountability is on the school district.

**DOCKET NO.  
08-0202-0705**

Luci Willits stated that in the past it was a requirement for teachers to take a technology assessment test. They feel that the technology assessment is included in teacher prep programs. The school district will determine whether or not out-of-state applicants need to take the technology assessment test.

**DOCKET NO.  
08-0202-0706**

This is to address and correct a typo by deleting the requirement for an AAS degree.

**DOCKET NO.  
08-0202-0708**

Luci Willits explained this is part of the certification package to remove redundancy and not put extra red tape for individuals who got their teachers degree in a foreign country. These teachers will have a 3 year interim certificate and have to complete and meet the requirements listed in Section 013.

**DOCKET NO.  
08-0203-0607**

It was determined that another Education Sub-committee was addressing this pending rule.

**DOCKET NO.  
08-0203-0701**

This is just clarifying where the information can be found on the web site.

**DOCKET NO.  
08-0203-0702**

This is just changing dates.

**DOCKET NO.  
08-0203-0703**

This is establishing standards for deaf/hard of hearing and blind/visually impaired students. Luci Willits said they are asking that this be extended and then be brought back as a pending rule.

**DOCKET NO.  
08-0202-0801**



**DOCKET NO.  
08-0203-0801**

Luci Willits said this explained this clarifies the wording and terminology, i.e. changing “reading” to “literacy” and clarification on the requirement of a professional registered nurse license instead of “nursing certificate.”

**DOCKET NO.  
08-0202-0704**

Luci Willits stated this changes the time frame of students who are required to pass the science ISAT in order to graduate. The way it is currently, it would require students to take and pass the science ISAT test the very first time they take it.

Luci Willits and the sub-committee members discussed this pending fee rule and the impacts it would have on teachers. It was noted there is some hesitancy as there is a mode of thought that those teaching at a higher level may not adapt to teaching at the high school level. General discussion followed regarding the process involved in getting rules to this level.

Chairman Wills thank Luci Willits for her time and work.

**MOTION:**

A motion was made by Representative Chadderdon that the sub-committee recommends approval to the full committee for the Pending and Temporary Rules covered this morning. The motion was seconded by Representative Shively.

The motion passed by voice vote.

**ADJOURN:**

The meeting adjourned at 9:52 a.m.

---

Representative Richard Wills  
Sub-committee Chairman

---

Darlene Reed  
Secretary

MINUTES

**NIELSEN SUBCOMMITTEE  
HOUSE EDUCATION COMMITTEE**

**DATE:** January 14, 2008

**TIME:** 9 A.M.

**PLACE:** Room 148

**MEMBERS:** Chairman Nielsen, Rep. Mortimer, Rep. Boe

**ABSENT/  
EXCUSED:** None

**GUESTS:** See attached sheet.

Chairman Nielsen called the meeting to order at 9 A.M.

**MOTION:** Rep. Mortimer made a motion to approve the subcommittee minutes of January 10<sup>th</sup>, 2008 as submitted. On a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously.

In response to questions from subcommittee members, **Sandra DeKlotz**, from the Idaho State Board of Education, explained that she would get clarification from her office regarding the \$5,000 student contribution to the Idaho Opportunity Scholarship. This scholarship is referenced in **Docket 08-0113-0701** which was discussed by the subcommittee on January 10<sup>th</sup>.

**Docket #08-  
0203-0704**

**Sandra DeKlotz** presented this rule to the subcommittee. This rule adds updated definitions that reflect current terminology and usage, eliminates redundant and outdated language, and updates the rules to include all assessments in Idaho's state system. Committee members had questions regarding oversight of assessments that was moved from the Department of Education to the State Board of Education in this rule.

**Phil Homer**, representing the School Administrators Association, explained that the State Board had the authority to take back the testing oversight from the State Department of Education after the federal No Child Left Behind legislation was passed.

Rep. Boe expressed her concern regarding this portion of the docket that gives the assessment authority to the State Board of Education.

Chairman Nielsen explained that because of questions regarding this portion of the rule, **Docket 08-0203-0704** would be considered by the full Committee.

**Docket #30-  
0101-0701**

**Richard Wilson**, Associate State Librarian for the Idaho Commission for Libraries presented the docket to the subcommittee as **Ann Joslin**, the State Librarian was out of town.

He explained that this docket is a chapter repeal. He further explained that the Commission on Libraries services have changed substantially since 2003 as reflected in the name change and amendments to the governing statutes in 2006.

**MOTION:** Rep. Mortimer made a motion to recommend approval of **Docket 30-0101-0701** to the full Committee. Rep. Boe seconded the motion. On a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously.

**Docket #30-0101-0702** **Mr. Wilson** presented this docket to the subcommittee. He explained that this is the chapter rewrite of the repealed rules. Most of the changes are clarifications that used to be Idaho State Board of Education policies which are now in rule to the State Library. He further explained that the State Library has reviewed all of their current services and processes with the deputy Attorney General and identified two areas that warrant rules. These include, eligibility for Library services and Technology Act grant applicants and participants, formerly in board policy; and processes for requesting exemption from the criteria for a proposed library district, and for evaluating such a request.

**MOTION:** Rep. Mortimer made a motion to recommend approval of **Docket 30-0101-0702** to the full committee. On a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously.

**Docket #30-0102-0701** **Mr. Wilson** explained that this docket is a repeal of the second half of the rules that are no longer relevant. The rules governing loan of items to individuals and interlibrary loan services.

**MOTION:** Rep. Mortimer made a motion to recommend approval of **Docket 30-0102-0701** to the full committee. On a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously.

Chairman Nielsen announced that because of questions from the subcommittee, **Docket 08-0203-0702**, a pending rule from the State Board of Education governing thoroughness will be heard in the full Committee.

**ADJOURNMENT** Chairman Nielsen adjourned the meeting at 9:40 A.M.

---

Representative Pete Nielsen  
Chairman

---

Claudia Howell  
Secretary

## MINUTES

### HOUSE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

**DATE:** January 15, 2008

**TIME:** 9 A.M.

**PLACE:** Room 148

**MEMBERS:** Chairman Nonini, Vice Chairman Shirley, Representatives Trail, Bradford, Block, Nielsen, Wills, Chadderdon, Shepherd (8), Marriott, Mortimer, Patrick, Thayn, Boe, Pence, Chavez, Durst, Shively

**ABSENT/  
EXCUSED:** None

**GUESTS:** See attached list.

Chairman Nonini called the meeting to order at 9 A.M. He announced that the Committee will be meeting with the Senate Education Committee next week to hear the "We Teach" legislation from the Idaho Education Association regarding teacher pay and the "iSTARS" legislation regarding teacher pay from Superintendent Tom Luna. The meetings will take place January 21<sup>st</sup> through January 24<sup>th</sup> from 3 to 5 P.M. in the East conference room of the Joe R. Williams building. On Monday, January 21<sup>st</sup>, the joint committees will hear a 30 minute presentation by the IEA and 20 minutes from the School Board Association, administrators, and the State Department of Education. Mr. Luna will then present his legislation for 30 minutes with a 20 minute comment period from the IEA, ISBA and administrators. Public testimony on these two bills will start on Tuesday, January 22<sup>nd</sup> and will continue as needed through January 24<sup>th</sup>. After public testimony is taken, the Senate Education committee will vote on the legislation. When the legislation reaches the House, there will be a vote in Committee with no public testimony taken.

He further announced that the Senate Education Committee has approved all of the rule dockets that were before the Committee. He explained that for a rule to be rejected, both the House and the Senate need to agree.

**MOTION:** Rep. Wills made a motion to accept the minutes of the January 9<sup>th</sup>, 2008 meeting as submitted. Rep. Shively seconded the motion. On a voice vote, the motion carried.

Vice Chairman Shirley thanked Rep. Wills and Rep. Nielsen's subcommittee that heard the rule dockets before the Committee and asked them to report on their work.

Rep. Wills reported that his subcommittee heard the rules from the State Department of Education.

**Docket #08-** This docket adds further definition to the requirements for professional

**0202-0701:**

growth. The changes specifically define “educationally related” credits as being tied to content area, pedagogical best practices, school leadership and/or district need as designated by an administrator.

**Sherri Wood**, president of the Idaho Education Association, expressed the Association’s concerns with this docket. The concerns include; more clarity is needed regarding content, there is no appeals process for educators ready to re certify, and there should be a phase in process for recertification.

**Luci Willits**, representing the Department of Education, responded to the concerns raised by the IEA. She explained that when this docket was heard in the Senate Education Committee, Senator Goedde asked that the Department bring more specific language regarding the appeals process to the legislature next session.

**Christina Linder**, Certification Director for the Department of Education responded to questions. She explained that this rule was discussed with various stakeholders. She further explained that in the past, some educators were given credits for unrelated classes. This rule would specify that credits must be specifically tied to content areas and/or an area of other endorsement, or credits must be specific to pedagogical best practices or for administrative/teacher leadership; or credits must be tied to a specific area of need designated by district administration. She stated that there is already an appeals process in place and already has a phase in process as well. She explained that educator’s credits will not be evaluated until 2013.

In response to questions from Committee members, **Ms. Linder** explained that the local districts would have control. She further explained that integrated curriculum credits would be part of pedagogical best practices.

Rep. Wills explained that this rule docket has already been approved by the Senate Education Committee. He further explained that the other rule dockets from the State Department of Education were heard in his subcommittee and there were no concerns.

**MOTION:**

Rep. Durst made a motion to approve **Docket 08-0202-0707**. Rep. Mortimer seconded the motion. On a voice vote, the motion passed.

**MOTION:**

Rep. Mortimer made a motion to approve **Docket 08-0202-0801** and **Docket 08-0203-0801**. Rep. Chavez seconded the motion. On a voice vote, the motion passed.

Rep. Nielsen gave the report from his subcommittee on the rule dockets from the Idaho State Board of Education. He explained that if all of the members of the subcommittee did not agree on approval, the rule will be discussed by the full Committee.

Rep. Durst expressed his concerns with **Docket 08-0113-0701** regarding the Idaho Opportunity Scholarship program. This docket was recommended for approval by the Nielsen subcommittee.

Rep. Durst felt that the 3.0 high school GPA needed to apply for this

scholarship would be difficult for low income students who may have to work and may have lower GPAs.

**Saundra DeKlotz**, from the State Board of Education, responded to concerns raised by Rep. Durst. She explained that the eligibility for the Idaho Opportunity Scholarship is based 70% on need and 30% on academics. She further explained that because so many students apply, that there needs to be some way to rate the applications.

Rep. Mortimer also expressed his concern with the rule. He explained that desire, determination and character should be a part of the eligibility requirements for the Opportunity scholarship in addition to need and academics.

Rep. Trail also expressed his concern with the rule. He explained that this type of scholarship is in place in several other states and the high school GPA that is needed to apply is determined by the universities.

**Ms. DeKlotz** explained that the Opportunity scholarship is a brand new scholarship and some changes have already been made. She stated that the State Board is dedicated to make the scholarship work and will take Committee member's concerns back to her office.

**MOTION:**

Rep. Durst made a motion to reject **Docket 08-0113-0701**. In the discussion on the motion, Rep. Patrick expressed his concern that the scholarship leaves out the trade schools.

**SUBSTITUTE MOTION:**

Rep. Nielsen made a Substitute Motion to approve **Docket 08-0113-0701**. Rep. Shirley seconded the motion. On a voice vote, the Substitute Motion passed with Reps. Patrick, Durst, Chavez and Pence voting NAY.

Rep. Mortimer, Durst and Trail will work with the State Board of Education in resolving concerns with this rule.

**Docket 08-0203-0702 and Docket 08-0203-0704:**

The Committee discussed the two remaining dockets that did not have consensus in the Nielsen subcommittee. These rules deal with assessment authority that changed from the State Department of Education to the State Board of Education.

Rep. Chavez expressed her concern regarding accountability not being listed in measurable terms.

**Ms. DeKlotz** explained that the purpose of these rule dockets is to assign determination of adequate yearly progress (AYP) for schools and districts in the state from the State Department of Education to the State Board of Education. She explained that accountability is addressed elsewhere in the rules. The performance level descriptors are posted on the Board's website under 08.0203.004.05.

Rep. Boe expressed her concern regarding the State Board's responsibility of assessment in light of recent staff problems.

She explained that the Board has had several executive directors and the

current director is also the administrator of the Division of Professional Technical Education. The deputy director, chief fiscal officer, chief academic officer and several administrative assistant positions are currently unfilled.

**Dr. Mike Rush**, interim Executive Director for the State Board of Education, responded to concerns raised by Committee members. He explained that it has been a challenging responsibility to be in his current position. He further explained that the Board has a large scope of responsibility. He feels that the Board exercises their responsibility by developing policy. The Board is currently restructuring their staff and salaries. He stated that the role of the Board should be evaluation of policies and auditing policies is assessment. He further stated that he feels that the Board should turn over the program role to the State Department of Education. He assured the Committee that the Board's budget is under control and the money used for assessments was used appropriately.

Chairman Nonini explained that he attended a Board meeting yesterday and was impressed with the new contract with the assessment contractor. The Board feels that there will be more flexibility with the new contractor. The Board has formed a committee co-chaired by Superintendent Tom Luna and State Board member Richard Westerberg. This committee will look at how assessments are currently being performed. A survey will be sent out to school districts regarding assessments to gather input.

**Ms. Willits** explained that the two rule dockets were requested by the Department of Education. She stated that the Department supports the rule and urged passage by the Committee.

Rep. Chavez expressed her concern about the time used for assessments, especially in rural Idaho where there is a lack of computer availability.

Rep. Durst expressed his concern about accountability by the State Board. He felt that the Superintendent should want the responsibility of assessments.

**Ms. Willits** responded that Superintendent Luna is a member of the State Board and also serves as a partner. She explained that the Department does not have the staff to handle assessments.

**MOTION:** Rep. Nielsen made a motion to approve **Docket 08-0203-0702** and **Docket 08-0203-0704**. Rep. Mortimer seconded the motion. On a voice vote, the motion passed with Reps. Durst and Boe voting NAY.

**MOTION:** Rep. Nielsen made a motion to approve the remaining dockets from the State Board of Education. The docket numbers include: **08-0105-0701, 08-0105-0702, 08-0203-703, 08-0202-0702, 08-0202-0703, 08-0202-0704, 08-0202-0705, 08-0202-0706, 08-0203-0607, 08-0203-0701, 08-0204-0701, 30-0101-0701, 30-0101-0702, and 30-0102-0701**. Rep. Mortimer seconded the motion. On a voice vote, the motion passed.

Vice-Chairman Shirley thanked the members of the Nielsen and Wills subcommittees for their hard work regarding the rules. The Committee has concluded the review of the rules.

**ADJOURNMENT** Chairman Nonini adjourned the meeting at 11:05 A.M.

---

Representative Bob Nonini  
Chairman

---

Claudia Howell  
Secretary



## MINUTES

### HOUSE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

**DATE:** January 16, 2008

**TIME:** 9 A.M.

**PLACE:** Room 148

**MEMBERS:** Chairman Nonini, Vice Chairman Shirley, Representatives Trail, Bradford, Block, Nielsen, Wills, Chadderdon, Shepherd (8), Marriott, Mortimer, Patrick, Thayn, Boe, Pence, Chavez, Durst, Shively

**ABSENT/  
EXCUSED:** None

**GUESTS:** See attached list.

Chairman Nonini called the meeting to order at 9 A.M. He explained that the Committee failed to take action on **Docket #08-0202-0701** regarding credits for professional growth that was discussed in yesterday's meeting.

**MOTION:** Rep. Marriott made a motion to approve **Docket #08-0202-0701**. Rep. Bradford seconded the motion. On a voice vote, the motion carried.

**MOTION:** Rep. Shively made a motion to approve the minutes of the January 15<sup>th</sup> meeting as submitted. Rep. Mortimer seconded the motion. On a voice vote, the motion carried.

Rep. Boe introduced **Dr. Arthur Vailus**, president of Idaho State University to the Committee. She explained that he is a child of immigrants and that English is his second language. He graduated from college in New Hampshire and completed post graduate studies in California and Wisconsin. He came to ISU from the University of Houston.

**Dr. Vailus** reported that Idaho does a good job supporting higher education. He explained that ISU's academic plan has the primary emphasis on health professions, related biological and physical sciences, and teacher preparation. He further explained that ISU serves not only those students in Pocatello, but the entire state. ISU works to form partnerships with the state and other foundations. In 2007, ISU researchers received national and international awards. ISU has programs in more than 30 health professions and disciplines. The university offers medical residencies in family medicine, dentistry and pharmacy. **Dr. Vailus** explained that the university is an advocate of the early college program which allows high school students to receive college credits. This program builds students' self-confidence, prepares them for college level course work, eases the transition to college, shortens the time to degree, reduces the cost of higher education and prepares students for life and learning after high school.

ISU integrates with district teachers as adjunct faculty in their academic

departments through department-specific orientation and training, mentors and liaisons during the school year and professional development. He explained that there has been a 26% increase in enrollment in the early college program.

In response to questions from Committee members, **Dr. Vailus** discussed the following points. In response to a question regarding responsibilities of the State Board, he responded that an in depth discussion is needed regarding the structural issue in the state with the State Board overseeing K through 12 and higher education, there is a need to create an integrated ladder of opportunity. In response to a question about establishing a medical school in the state he explained that now is a good time for Idaho to pay attention to this. He further explained that a medical school is dependent on the economy of the state. The fastest way to get doctors is to have a residency program, which has already been established at ISU. In response to a question regarding teacher workshops for the early college program, **Dr. Vailus** explained that teacher training workshops are valuable but time and cost are factors. He further explained that Idaho is far behind other states in the technology infrastructure needed for distance education. He stated that the university has been successful in obtaining federal grants to help establish these programs, but need funding from the state to sustain them.

Rep. Trail introduced **Dr. Tim White**, president of the University of Idaho. **Dr. White** is in his fourth year at the university and was the first member of his family to attend college.

**Dr. White** reported that the University of Idaho is currently in excellent financial condition. The university is listed as Kiplinger's 100 best values and has a 16 to 1 student to teacher ratio. The university is a model in their employee health insurance program and the law school has just completed 100 years of operation. He further reported that when accreditation was done in 2004, there were 16 recommendations. Accreditation was just recently completed and there were no recommendations and now three commendations. The university offers M.S and Ph. D degrees in water resources. They also offer a fire ecology program and has one of two burning laboratories in the nation. The university has a 36 year partnership with the University of Washington and has 436 Idaho-sponsored WWAMI graduates with 306 of them practicing in Idaho. The university also has an "Operation Education" program serving veterans who have been seriously wounded since 9/11. **Dr. White** further reported that over 1/3 of the students are first generation college students. The university has a 54.4% graduation rate compared to the Idaho average of 24.3%. 79% of the university students are full time students. For the past eight years, the University of Idaho enrolled 85% of the state's 95 National Merit Scholars. The university has more physical assets than any other agency which include over 253 buildings. **Dr. White** also reported that the university was recently awarded the National Medal of Arts for the Lionel Hampton International Jazz festival. The university is the only public institution receiving this award in history of the award.

In response to questions from Committee members, **Dr. White** discussed the

following points. The university has property in Sandpoint and is planning to build an extension campus there. The university is lowering energy costs which has resulted in a cost savings of \$1.2 to \$1.3 million per year and has been recognized nationally. In response to a question regarding the high graduation rate compared to other colleges in the state; **Dr. White** explained it is due to a combination of doing a good job of recruiting students and making sure that they receive the support they need during the critical first year of school. Many of the classes are small in size and if a student is in trouble, a team from the university intervenes. In response to a question regarding the average ACT scores of incoming freshman, **Dr. White** responded that he would get that information to the Committee at a later time. In response to questions about offering more classes for a law degree in Boise, **Dr. White** explained that there will be a proposal to the board of regents this spring which will look at a law degree program in Boise with a differentiated curriculum. In response to a question regarding the feasibility of offering second year classes at the university for medical students, **Dr. White** responded that it would be hard to duplicate the classes in Moscow because of the excellent resources in Seattle at the University of Washington. In response to a question regarding concurrent enrollment, **Dr. White** explained that the university is doing concurrent enrollment statewide on a limited basis.

Rep. Chavez introduced **Dr. Dene Thomas**, president of Lewis-Clark State College to the Committee. **Dr. Thomas** was a single mother of three when she started her college career.

**Dr. Thomas** reported that the mission of LCSC is collaboration, teamwork and respect. The college has grown 34% since she became president. The faculty is an important part of the community and is involved in many service organizations. The college doesn't compete with other colleges in the state, but collaborates with them. The primary emphasis areas include; business, criminal justice, nursing, professional technical education, social work and teacher education. The college has high professional exam first time pass rates; 94% for registered nurses, 100% for practical nurses, 100% for radiology technicians, and 91% for teachers. LCSC outreach centers provide 12,500 hours of service per year. Workforce training provides customized training for over 4,000 people each years. LCSC also collaborates with the Department of Correction offering GED classes, parenting classes and welding classes. LCSC has done concurrent enrollment for a long time. The number of students participating have doubled. Memorandums of understanding have been developed with school districts. LCSC offers professional development for current teachers and is training a new generation of elementary and secondary education teachers. LCSC works closely with the Nez Perce tribe and has dramatically increased diversity in their enrollment. The college is currently at the end of the design phase for the new nursing/health sciences building and will break ground in March. The building is expected to open in the fall of 2009. **Dr. Thomas** reported that the college has a tight control over all budgets and a lean senior administration.

Chairman Nonini thanked the presidents that presented to the Committee.

He announced that the Committee will meet tomorrow and will hear from North Idaho College president Dr. Priscilla Bell and the College of Southern Idaho president, Dr. Jerry Beck. He further announced that the medical education study to be presented to the Committee by the State Board of Education scheduled for next week will be rescheduled due to the joint meetings with the Senate Education Committee. **Mark Browning**, from the State Board of Education, will make copies of the summary of the medical education study for Committee members.

## ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Nonini adjourned the meeting at 11:25 A.M.

---

Representative Bob Nonini  
Chairman

---

Claudia Howell  
Secretary

## MINUTES

### HOUSE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

**DATE:** January 17, 2008

**TIME:** 9 A.M.

**PLACE:** Room 148

**MEMBERS:** Chairman Nonini, Vice Chairman Shirley, Representatives Block, Nielsen, Wills, Chadderdon, Shepherd (8), Marriott, Mortimer, Patrick, Thayn, Boe, Pence, Chavez, Durst, Shively

**ABSENT/  
EXCUSED:** Representatives Trail and Bradford

**GUESTS:** See attached list.

Rep. Chadderdon introduced **Dr. Priscilla Bell**, President of North Idaho Community College to the Committee. She explained that **Dr. Bell** came to Idaho from the Tacoma Community College and has been involved with community colleges for over 30 years. She received her PhD from Texas.

**Dr. Bell** explained that NIC is located on the shores of Lake Coeur d'Alene. The college delivers courses to outreach centers in Bonners Ferry, Ponderay, and the Silver Valley, as well as to various sites throughout the five northern counties of Idaho. She reported that NIC is currently engaged in a strategic planning process. They have external and internal focus groups collecting data and sending out surveys. They expect to be finished in May and release the report in June. She further reported that the college has an all time high population. The population has increased 33% in the last decade. There has been a 956% increase in the last decade in distance learning. She explained that there has been an increase of jobs in northern Idaho which has increased the college's workforce development program.

**Dr. Bell** then discussed North Idaho College Legislative Agenda for 2008. The first item discussed was increased funding for student financial aid. NIC has seen an increase in the last six years in the number of graduates with student loans. Over 60% of NIC students receive some form of financial assistance. NIC supports need-based aid as a priority over merit-based aid. The second item discussed was funding to assist high school students with concurrent enrollment. She explained that additional funds are being requested of the Legislature to help qualified high school students defray tuition costs for concurrent enrollment credits at local colleges. The program is call "Win by Getting a Good Start" (WINGS) at NIC. The third item discussed was the remodel of Seiter Hall. She explained that last summer, the Department of Public Works provided funds to update six former lab rooms to general use classrooms. After 33 years of heavy use, Seiter Hall needs a complete remodel.

Another item discussed was the liquor tax funding increase. NIC supports an

initiative to increase the amount of State Liquor Tax funding that goes directly to community colleges. Presently, \$300,000 is provided to support NIC and the CSI (\$150,000 to each). With the establishment of the College of Western Idaho, an increase in Liquor Tax support is needed. NIC requests support to increase the amount per institution from \$150,000 to \$200,000 annually. She then discussed the increased support for Professional-Technical education. NIC support initiatives that enhance employment opportunities funded through increased state allocations for PTE across Idaho. **Dr. Bell** discussed the growing concern regarding employee compensation. The ability of NIC to attract and retain quality faculty and staff faces substantial challenge if compensation continues to lag. Another issue discussed was NIC recommends revising Idaho statute to cap tuition at \$2,500 annually, while maintaining that part of state law limiting annual increases to no more than 10 percent. She also discussed the issue of NIC requesting additional funds for a position and operating costs to facilitate joint program development with Community Colleges of Spokane. The last issue discussed was a request from NIC for additional funding to enhance instructional technology in all NIC classrooms. This two year project would equip all NIC classrooms with standardized technological resources to enhance instruction.

In response to questions from Committee members, **Dr. Bell** discussed the following. NIC has established an agreement with Kootenai Medical Center to enhance the nursing program. Concurrent enrollment does affect the budget of the college, especially when offering expensive professional technical classes. NIC has re-integrated the workforce training program and the PTE program. Tuition costs will not increase if the tuition cap is raised. Tuition costs are offset with scholarships and the need-based scholarships need to be increased. NIC is trying to grow the alumni association. NIC participates in a regional Head Start program. **Dr. Bell** explained that Head Start is important throughout northern Idaho and feels that better prepared preschool students go on to higher education. In response to a question regarding cross state arrangements on tuition, **Dr. Bell** explained that NIC has reduced tuition for neighboring states. She further explained that the state of Washington waives out of state tuition for any Idaho student to attend Washington community colleges. The majority of NIC students feed into the University of Idaho. Out of 870 students enrolled in the GED program at NIC; approximately 600 students enrolled at the college. The largest group of students are from Coeur d'Alene and there is a need to find a way to expand the program in the Silver Valley area. The workforce training program gets some financial support from employers; but NIC does not have extensive relationships with business and industry. In response to Committee questions, **Dr. Bell** explained that she will provide more information to the Committee regarding the Idaho Opportunity scholarship and how it is working at NIC.

Rep. Block introduced **Dr. Jerry Beck**, president of the College of Southern Idaho. A native Idahoan, **Dr. Beck** received his doctorate degree from the University of Idaho. He came to CSI in 1975 and became president of the college in 2005.

**Dr. Beck** explained that CSI is located on 240 acres and also owns an

additional 140 acres of land where a new building will soon be built. 300 students are currently enrolled in the nursing program, and 180 will graduate this spring. **Dr. Beck** discussed CSI's legislative proposals with the Committee. He first discussed raising the community college tuition cap to \$2,500. He explained that CSI is not doubling tuition costs. He further explained that there is a direct correlation between the cost of college and attending college. When foundation scholarship money decreases, enrollment decreases. CSI is supporting an increase to the annual liquor fund distribution. He explained that this fund has not increased since 1982. CSI is also requesting an enhancement to develop a rural math/science dual credit and college preparatory pilot program for eight rural schools. The goal is to develop qualified, highly-trained staff to teach both on-site and Internet-based math and science courses to these high schools. This is a \$276,700 request. CSI is also requesting an enhancement to help expand online offerings as well as to develop a program of quality control and continuous improvement for online courses. The request is for \$226,300. **Dr. Beck** explained that the fringe benefit package that is offered by CSI is a key incentive for existing and potential employees. CSI supports Governor Otter's proposed 5% increase for salary increases. Chairman Nonini explained that he supports the Governor's position in having state employees participate more in health benefits. **Dr. Beck** explained that it is hard to compete with neighboring states in salary and benefits and it is especially difficult for those in lower paid positions. **Dr. Beck** reported that CSI is the center for arts in the Magic Valley and the arts are an important part of the institution.

In response to questions from Committee members regarding concurrent credits, **Dr. Beck** explained that CSI is trying to change the notion from "if" I go to college to "when" I go to college. CSI is working with students as young as 6<sup>th</sup> grade to encourage students to plan for college. In response to a question regarding support of an alumni association, **Dr. Beck** explained that if a community college is successful, there won't be any alumni because graduating students will go on to other universities and become alumni of that institution. Regarding concurrent enrollment, **Dr. Beck** explained that CSI is working with school districts to get high school teachers enrolled in masters degree programs so college courses in the high schools can be taught by teachers with the appropriate credentials. In response to questions regarding the Idaho Opportunity scholarship, **Dr. Beck** explained that he would get specific numbers and additional information for Committee members.

**ADJOURN:** Chairman Nonini adjourned the meeting at 10:45 A.M.

---

Representative Bob Nonini  
Chairman

---

Claudia Howell  
Secretary

## MINUTES

### HOUSE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

**DATE:** January 21, 2008

**TIME:** 9 A.M.

**PLACE:** Room 148

**MEMBERS:** Chairman Nonini, Vice Chairman Shirley, Representatives Trail, Bradford, Nielsen, Wills, Chadderdon, Shepherd (8), Marriott, Mortimer, Patrick, Thayn, Boe, Pence, Chavez, Durst, Shively

**ABSENT/  
EXCUSED:** Rep. Block

**GUESTS:** See attached list

**MOTION:** Rep. Shively made a motion to approve minutes of January 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> meeting as submitted. Rep Mortimer seconded. Motion passed.

Chairman Nonini announced that the Committee will hold print hearings on Rs's starting tomorrow. He explained that most of the Rs's are from the State Board and they are not controversial. The Committee will meet Tuesday and Wednesday morning to print Rss.

Ed Lodge introduced **Mike Peterson**, executive director of Utah Education Network. **Mr Peterson** explained that UEN is a statewide consortium of Public and Higher Education, libraries, state government and business that uses technology to deliver educational services to and from schools, colleges, universities and leading national and international education material providers. UEN was developed 30 years ago. The first responsibility was to develop a video conferencing network to allow universities to teach students from across the state. UEN still provides that service. He explained that when videoconferencing was built, it was fully interactive and connects to classrooms in every school in Utah. There are over 400 video conference classrooms. He further explained that full credit regular college courses are able to be taken with video conferencing. Currently about 30% of Utah State enrollment is off campus. With UEN, Utah State University can offer 30 different bachelors degrees, 15 or 20 master's degrees, and a couple of PhD available on online. **Mr. Peterson** stated that he is currently teaching a video conferencing class to students from across the state. He explained that he sees no difference in the level of interactivity and effectiveness of the class than in face to face classes. He further explained that the fundamental thing that UEN does is provide network infrastructure for public and higher education for state of Utah. Internet connectivity provided. He reported that growth of traffic on the state's education network is staggering. Over the last five years the volume of Internet traffic has doubled every 18 months to two years. UEN has had to be aggressive to accommodate that growth. The network has been involved in two key projects. These include, increasing the capacity of backbone, also making fiber connections to secondary schools and colleges and universities in state. He reported that every school 7<sup>th</sup> grade and up have fiber connections. He explained that fiber is the route to take.



Half of connections on backbone will need to increase about 10 times next year. UEN is involved with local telecommunications providers to participate in the competitive bid process. The network leases circuits from providers and negotiates multi year contracts. UEN functions as anchor tenant.

In response to questions from Committee members, **Mr. Peterson** made the following points. UEN leases Internet connectively through providers. The issue of parental access is controlled through the individual schools. The schools can build portals into their own databases. UEN pays for the circuit connections and individual school districts pay for own local area connections. The school districts do their own programming and support their own software and allow teachers to build own webpages. The districts also have their own staffing and own servers. Rural areas have been more aggressive moving into fiber optics than urban. Training for teachers to teach video conference classes was discussed. **Mr. Peterson** explained that it does require training. There are two levels of training, staff members do technical training. Also, UEN has professional development staff to focus on way to teach. Technology allows students to have equivalent experiences to face to face. He further explained that there is no delay in video conference classes on UEN network. The main customers of UEN are higher education, but UEN also provides connectivity for state government and for public libraries. The network is also exploring a role in health care. In response to a question regarding connecting to rural communities, Mr. Peterson explained that the initial backbone connections were radio. He further explained that it has taken 12 or 14 years to make progress to fiber optics. In response to a question regarding students that need extra help in video conference classes, **Mr. Peterson** explained that the student and the teacher can use video conferencing for one to one instruction, they also can use a web cam connection and can also share applications and look at documents simultaneously. He further explain that the network tapes the classes so students can review the lecture again if needed. UEN also provides a course management system with online access to tools. He explained that the State appropriation for UEN started with \$4 or \$5 million dollars. He further explained that the network piece is about \$13 million. He reported that UEN has provided great savings to the state of Utah. The contacts with telecommunication providers have better savings if done statewide. In response to a question regarding the difference between the Idaho digital academy and UEN, **Mr. Peterson** responded that Idaho has more online classes and Utah has more interactive classes with videoconferencing. **Mark Browning** from the Office of the State Board of Education responded to questions regarding the Idaho Digital Academy. He explained that they can have online courses, can do class over internet, but can't do videoconferencing to do interactivity. **Ed Lodge**, representing Qwest explained there are wires in ground to rural areas. In response to a questions where Idaho would start to develop a network such as the Utah Education Network, **Mr. Lodge** responded that there would have to be a collaboration between Idaho and telecommunication providers. Responding to a questions regarding funding, **Mr. Peterson** explained that the UEN has own line item appropriation and goes through the higher education subcommittee. The network is housed at the University of Utah. Funding for services come directly to UEN.

He explained that students need to go to a learning center for videoconferencing. There are about 400 centers in the state. He further explained that some colleges do provide services outside the state. The network tries to minimize staff involvement because they see themselves as Utah providers. He explained that it is not necessary to have fiber optic cable and could connect with wireless instead. UEN hosts over 300 events a day, including full credit college courses and also classes for the concurrent enrollment program.

Rep. Bradford introduced **Melvin Beutler**, superintendent of Westside School district. **Mr. Beutler** explained that his school district participates in the UEN. He further explained that the reason the district became involved in the UEN was because there are larger schools around their district had better curriculum available. The district wanted better curriculum and got connected with Utah State University. They first connected with USU's satellite system, and first charged \$15/credit. **Mr. Beutler** talked to SBOE and presidents of universities. He explained that the Presidents of universities liked the idea but the heads of departments didn't like the idea. He explained that last year the satellite done away with so now have radio tower and using wireless. He further explained that by offering online and video classes, a high school campus can turn into a community college campus. Distance learning is important, can now offer better curriculum than any other surrounding high schools. He reported that the district spends about \$600 dollars per month for Internet connectivity. In response to Committee questions; **Mr. Beutler** explained that he feels that the students who take college classes will go on to college. He further explained that students have to be on the school campus to have interactive connectivity. Also in response to Committee question, **Mr. Beutler** explained that it costs the district about \$25,000 for the link and \$14,000 for screen. By participating in the UEN, the students now can have any college teacher to draw from the cost is \$30/credit.

**Mr. Beutler** introduced **Melissa Waddoups**, Curriculum director for West Side School District. She discussed the demographics of school district. The district is small, consisting of approximately 570 students. 65% of the students are at the poverty level. 85% of the juniors and 91% of the seniors are taking college credits. The district has a full time concurrent enrollment facilitator on staff. They offer courses through adjunct professors, Internet, independent study and UEN. They receive the courses through Utah Universities, Idaho State University and the College of Southern Idaho. She discussed the needs for concurrent enrollment. These needs include connectivity, programming, school infrastructure, and credit funding. She also discussed benefits of concurrent enrollment. Some of these benefits include, rigor, keeping college students in Idaho, curriculum, retention, recruiting, mini community college, cost savings, and levels the playing field. She explained that if students are able to get 20 college credits while in high school, research has shown they are virtually guaranteed to graduate from college within 5 years of high school graduation. She suggested that money should be put into concurrent enrollment versus scholarship programs. She explained that the district has an endowment fund for concurrent enrollment to help the students who cannot afford to pay for the college credit classes. Last week endowment reached over \$1 million dollars.

She explained that the district can provide an associate's degree for any student in school district who wants one. She further explained that the district has applied for the state's Gear up program, bringing in guest speakers to students and also career fairs. She reported that students have risen to the occasion and there has been no discipline problems. If courses are from adjunct professors, district buy books, if not, the students pay for their own books. She explained that the Endowment pays for credits, not books. Students are required to have 3.0 GPA to take college courses. The concurrent enrollment program has opened up more opportunities, and lets the district offer smaller class sizes. **Mr. Buetler** responded to questions regarding the funding formula. He explained that there is a need to get away from use it or lose it funding.

Chairman Nonini thanked the presenters for a worthwhile presentation.

**ADJOURN:**

Chairman Nonini adjourned the meeting at 11:05 A.M. He announced that the Committee will reconvene at 3 P.M. today for a joint meeting with the Senate Education Committee to hear teacher compensation legislation.

---

Representative Bob Nonini  
Chairman

---

Claudia Howell  
Secretary

## MINUTES

### JOINT HOUSE AND SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

**DATE:** January 21, 2008

**TIME:** 3 P.M.

**PLACE:** East Conference room, JR Williams Building

**MEMBERS:** Co-Chairman Nonini, Vice Chairman Shirley, Representatives Trail, Bradford, Block, Nielsen, Wills, Chadderdon, Shepherd (8), Marriott, Mortimer, Patrick, Thayn, Boe, Pence, Chavez, Durst, Shively

Co-Chairman Goedde, Senators Fulcher, Schroeder, Gannon, Pearce, Jorgenson, Bastian, Burkett, Sagness

**ABSENT/  
EXCUSED:** Rep. Wills and Senator Jorgenson

**GUESTS:** See attached list

Senator Goedde called the meeting to order at 3:05 P.M. He explained the ground rules for those wishing to testify at the joint meeting. These rules include; no clapping or booing, no personal attacks, keep to the issue at hand, don't repeat what prior testimony. Those who testify need to state their name and address for the record. Senator Goedde explained that the joint committee will try to honor out of town speakers. He further explained that the joint committee will dissolve after public testimony is taken. He explained that the IEA will present **SB 1290** followed by a response from the School Board Association and the School Administrators Association. Presenters will be allowed 30 minutes for their presentation and 20 minutes will be allowed for the response.

**SB 1290:** **Sherri Wood**, president of the Idaho Education Association, deferred to Senator Burkett who explained the bill for the joint committee. He explained that there is a need for local plan, a need to retain good teachers and encourage good teachers. He explained that this legislation was developed by teachers, compensation for teachers would be through a foundation. He further explained that compensation needs to be through foundation level.

**Sherri Wood** introduced bill. (See attachment #1) She explained that the average teacher's salary ranks 38<sup>th</sup> in the nation. She further explained that how we pay teachers is as important as how much we pay them. She explained that the work on SB 1290 began shortly after the adjournment of the 2007 legislative session. Those involved included the IEA Task Force, including teachers from throughout the state. The first question for the task force was what principles and goals should drive the development of any pay plan? The goals of the we Teach legislation include; improve student learning, promote professional competence, create collaborative teaching and learning environments, attract and retain high quality teachers, increase public support for education increase the financial opportunities for teachers throughout their careers, be supported by IEA members throughout the state, and be credible with legislators.

She explained that a comprehensive system attracts and retains highly qualified educators. The plan is fully funded, open to all employees and doesn't limit employees. The IEA is opposed to a system that encourages favoritism, is clear and is subject to objective measurements. Professional development in schools is inconsistent. She further explained that the goal of weTEACH is to recognize educators for improved performance. She explained that there are three tiers of compensation in SB 1290. Tier 1 is the foundation pay, this includes the current salary system subject to annual increases provided by the Legislature. Tier 2 is knowledge and skills based, this tier recognizes and rewards teachers who build content knowledge and pedagogy throughout their careers. There are three levels under this tier. These levels are novice, professional and master. The last tier of compensation is the group-based performance awards. This includes awards given to groups of education employees, and is based on achieving pre-determined goals established by the local school district and goals must be focused on student success.

**PRO SB 1290:**

**Jim Shackelford**, executive director of IEA, explained the content of the bill for the joint committee. He discussed specific language included in the bill. Language in the bill includes that the state will make available a framework and funding for local school districts to use in developing their plans, funding will be provided for the three tiers of compensation, the State Department of Education will develop and distribute guidelines, and the Department will approve or deny local plans. He explained the funding formula, the knowledge and skills-based pay framework, the requirement for supervision and evaluation of teachers, the voluntary participation of teachers and the three levels through which teachers may advance during their careers.

**Mr. Shackelford** responded to questions from the joint committee. In response to a question regarding what if individual teacher wants to grow professionally, but school doesn't want to. He explained that the district would come up with plan to work with the teacher. In response to a question regarding the novice plan using the term "few" years. He explained that the term provides for teachers who move from out of state who has years of experience but would not start at novice level. He explained what would be included in a teacher's portfolio. It would include all of the years of research, student work, classes they've taken or taught. When questioned about the fiscal impact and mechanism to fund the program, **Mr. Shackelford** responded that it would be factored on the certain amount per district based on number of students. It would be ongoing funding. It would be a Legislative decision, an amount of money would be identified for salaries, base salary then amount of money to this compensation. He explained that test scores could be a part of factoring professional growth, but it would be done by school districts. He further explained that on page 7, lines 35 of the bill, it addresses the IEA definition of a group based performance. He further explained that the bill was locally developed, with a set of criteria and goals that they want to reach. The comprehensive plan should be approved by SDE. He stated that there could be some disagreements between SDE and local school districts. In response to a question from the committee, **Mr. Shackelford** explained that elementary schools don't have to have a Continuing Improvement Plan, but most do. The hope is that every school would have CIP in place.

When asked about guidelines for a CIP, he explained that under accreditation rules, middle school and high schools have to have a CIP, elementary schools don't. He explained that the high level of competence is achieved through the determination of local professional development groups, flexible based on local school districts. Sen. Gannon mentioned that he sees a lot of red tape with the development of CIPs. In response to a question regarding the estimated amount of infrastructure that will be required for each teacher, **Mr. Shackelford** responded that each school district would create its own infrastructure. He further explained that to pay teachers differently does require time, study and creativity to implement plan. A simple plan would not be as successful. He explained that plans could be written on consensus process and needs input from local educators. There is also a need for sophisticated evaluation steps. In response to a question regarding who will evaluate, he responded that each local district would put together what they would categorize driving student success and local professional development . It would be voluntary for teachers or districts to move to the next level of professional development. Teachers could move back to regular compensation plan if they want. He explained that Group based performance awards would be a one year bonus. The plan only would affect employees other than teachers when it is a group based performance. IEA believes every employee in the school contributes to the learning of a child. When asked about the role of principals, **Mr. Shackelford** responded that they invited administrators to be part of the plan. He explained that the amount of performance awards would differ depending on school district. A school district would receive a lump sum, but would decide whether or not to put money in knowledge and skills area or in group based performances. Under the plan, knowledge and skills-based award is all about individual teachers.

Struggling teachers would get help to get better, if they continue to struggle, then they would be asked to leave. Local school districts would determine what would be put in plan, could use test scores or other measuring tools. He also explained that the state framework could include an array of items, school districts would determine the framework. When questioned about the fiscal impact, he responded that it would be decided by JFAC not by the Education committees.

**CON SB 1290:** **Dr. Clifford Green**, representing the Idaho School Boards Association, spoke in opposition to **SB 1290**. He commended the IEA for putting together a good plan. He further explained the professional development component is admirable. He stated that the ISBA was not asked to the table to develop this plan. He explained that there is a need to bring stakeholders to table. He further explained that the ISBA developed a resolution to support alternative compensation plan for teachers. He discussed the three components of the plan. He explained that the data emphasizes performance of students, but there is no accountability and no specific academic requirement. It is optional for teachers, has a student identifier system, and there are provisions for professional development and mentoring in bill. In **SB1290** the professional development board is not defined. He explained the role of school boards is diminished in bill. He further explained that salary increases should be part of the board's role. In response to a question regarding how the total amount of state funding determined, he responded that it is a process problem in regard to JFAC funding. **SB 1290** funding is not predictable or uniform.

Both plans have components to award all levels. It was mentioned that early in the session, legislators were given a handout endorsing iSTARS, attributed to the president of ISBA, but when contacted by a legislator, she responded that she did not write it. **Dr. Green** responded that he did write it the handout and sent to president to correct which she did and sent it back to **Dr. Green**. The letter was supposed to be sent out with president's name not **Dr. Green's** name. He further explained that there has been some misunderstanding regarding the handout. It was pointed out that the pertinence of this issue has to do with credibility.

**CON SB 1290:** **Jim Lewis**, president of Schools Administrator's Association and Superintendent of Blaine County school district spoke in opposition to **SB 1290**. He first complimented the IEA for **SB 1290**. He mentioned that he has been a member of IEA for 20 years. He further mentioned that the public has been asking for performance based plan. He explained that input from all sides should have been obtained. He further explained that if the state doesn't do something about teacher compensation, teachers will leave. The Association was asked to work on iSTARS. He asked if weTEACH was an honorable proposal or just to muddy the water between it and iSTARS. He responded that there is a need for annual pay increases. He explained that the biggest concern is that local implementation means negotiations. He further explained that continued options for local teachers also means negotiations. He discussed the compensation steps in the bill; he mentioned that the novice level is solid and in place, master's level has some concerns with the professional portfolio and the master's in content area is already in place. He mentioned that there are no specific plans, or how it is going to be budgeted. He stated that he believes that plan has pieces that could be blended or used. He further mentioned that now is the time for courageous leadership. We are slowly getting behind as a state, we currently award time and service, need new ways to reward, reward ability leadership and performance not time and service. There is a need to extend contracts and to recruit the top one third. In response to questions, **Mr. Lewis** explained performance could be beefed up in iSTARS but enough funding is needed.

**SB 1310:** Superintendent **Tom Luna** presented this bill to the Committee. (See attachment #2) He explained that while campaigning for his current position, he pledged to make teacher pay one of his priorities. There is a need to retain the best and brightest teachers. He explained that currently teachers can't receive bonuses. He stated that teachers deserve bonuses like other state employees. He also stated that the steps of iSTARS is not subject to negotiation. The plan gives every teacher five opportunities to get bonuses. The foundation is the current pay system we have today. The first step focuses on student achievement. He explained that 75% of money represents growth and 25% focuses on grade level proficiency. The State provides the funding, but local school districts decide what are hard to fill positions. It is not a new concept. He explained that every teacher that takes category 4 contract is not an at will teacher. He further explained that teachers have steps of due process. The teacher has 6 steps in the due process; these steps include fair and valid evaluations, teachers receive an official letter and a teacher performance evaluation. He explained that there is a considerable amount of protection.

He further explained that too many good teachers leave classroom to make more money. Under the iSTARS plan, it would give teachers choice to make more money. He explained that teachers can be grandfathered into system to attain additional endorsements. Teachers can take a proficiency exam and if they pass, they don't need to take additional courses. He explained that changes have been made to iSTARS since it was presented across the state. There has been a change in the amount of money. It has been estimated that about 25% of teachers will participate this plan. The other change is that the award for steps have been reduced from \$2400 to \$2200. The plan would include all certified staff not just teachers. The cost of the plan is now \$46 million. There has been a change in career opportunity, teacher that has taught 3 or more years can have 3 year contract. Certified staff are eligible to receive bonus if 85% of the students score proficient or higher. The plan provides benefits to rural schools and would help with funding and flexibility to fill hard to fill positions and encourages teacher to gain multiple endorsements. He explained that when iSTARS was developed, he met with all stakeholders including IEA. Support for the plan is necessary to become law.

In response to questions, **Mr. Luna** explained first year teachers can make up to \$37,000 per year. When asked how critical the category 4 plan is to the proposal, **Mr. Luna** responded that there is a need to have support to address student achievement. There is a need for the whole package. When asked if teacher chooses iSTARS and a recession happens, is a teacher protected, **Mr. Luna** responded that the teacher would be protected. He explained that if iSTARS goes away, the teachers can go back to original contract. When asked what happens to representation in local union if teacher decides to participate in iSTARS, **Mr. Luna** explained they would not give it up. He further explained that membership in an association is never asked, and is not a part of qualifying.

When asked about what other assessment tools were considered, **Mr. Luna** explained that no teacher's pay is dependent on one test, only the student achievement piece. He further explained that the ISAT is the one uniform test statewide, it can be improved. It is the measuring stick we use. All other bonuses aren't predicated on ISAT.

He explained that once a teacher chooses category 4 pay, he or she will stay with that while teaching in the state. In response to questions, **Mr. Luna** explained that if districts want to use iSTARS funds has to meet the terms of law in iSTARS bill. When asked about the difference between teacher knowledge and teacher effectiveness **Mr. Luna** responded the iSTARS is a way to provide for teacher incentives. The school district would determine leadership. When asked about the Category 4 contract, he explained that iSTARS would provide funding for keeping teachers we have and attracting new teachers to the state. He further explained that the way to keep teachers in Idaho is to provide a way to pay more for teachers. Each year a teacher teaches, they become more valuable. He stated that iSTARS focuses on areas the current system does not address. When asked if category 4 is essential to this process, **Mr. Luna** responded that it is important because it is needed to gain support necessary to fund this and move policy forward. It is a realistic approach. Under this legislation, teachers would be given a considerable amount of protection that they don't already have.



He explained that vision, resources, skills and incentives are all needed for a successful compensation plan. He further explained that those who are not comfortable with the plan will not choose the plan, but let those that want to choose it. **Mr. Luna** explained that there are a lot of misconceptions out there among teachers.

He explained that if at any point, a third year isn't added back on to a teacher's contract the teacher would have two years to resolve the problem. He further explained that if we stay with what ifs, nothing will change. When asked how much across the state would it cost to get rid of a poor teacher, **Mr. Luna** responded that he did not have the figures and would provide them at a later time. He further explained that iSTARS isn't about getting rid of poor teachers, it is about retaining and attracting good teachers. When asked what would happen if 50% of teachers choose iSTARS, **Mr. Luna**, estimated number of teachers that will participate is 25%. He explained that about 10 items in the budget are estimates, and this is an estimate also. He explained if more teachers choose to participate in the plan, the State has the opportunity to tap into the stabilization fund to make it go. If fewer teachers participate, then the money would go into stabilization fund. He further explained that there are more protections for teachers in category 4 if caught in a reduction in force because the school district has to buy out teacher's contracts. **Mr. Luna** explained that iSTARS is not a plan to bust the union. In response to questions regarding including the deans and faculty of higher education, **Mr. Luna** responded that he did have some discussions with them and have discussed elements of this plan, but they were not involved in development of this plan. He further explained that he went to Boise State University and Lewis-Clark college and presented plan and got input at that time.

**ADJOURN:** Senator Goedde adjourned the meeting at 6:15 P.M.

---

Co-Chairman Nonini  
Chairman House Education

---

Claudia Howell  
Secretary, House Education

---

Co-Chairman Goedde  
Chairman Senate Education

## MINUTES

### HOUSE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

- DATE:** January 22, 2008
- TIME:** 9 A.M.
- PLACE:** Room 148
- MEMBERS:** Vice Chairman Shirley, Representatives, Bradford, Nielsen, Chadderdon, Shepherd (8), Marriott, Mortimer, Patrick, Thayn, Boe, Pence, Chavez, Durst, Shively
- ABSENT/  
EXCUSED:** Chairman Nonini, Rep. Trail, Rep. Block, Rep. Wills
- GUESTS:** See attached sheet.
- Due to the absence of Chairman Nonini, Vice-Chairman Shirley conducted the meeting. He called the meeting to order at 9 A.M. He announced that the Committee has 11 Rs's in committee. Because yesterday was a state holiday and the secretary could not contact state agency personnel to present their RS, only two will be heard today, and the balance will be heard tomorrow.
- RS 17450:** **Rep. Bill Killen** introduced this RS to the Committee. This legislation says thank you to members of our National Guard for their service to Idaho. This proposed legislation extends to non-resident members of the Idaho National Guard the opportunity to attend the state's universities and colleges at resident rates. The Idaho Guard includes 217 non-residents out of a total of 4,627 as of June 2007. Washington, Utah, and Oregon account for 192. Each of these states provides like benefits to Idaho residents in their units.
- MOTION:** Rep. Boe made a motion to print RS 17450, Rep. Mortimer seconded the motion. On a voice vote, the motion carried.
- RS 17364:** **Marty Peterson**, special assistant to the president of the University of Idaho, presented the RS to the Committee. He explained that this legislation is in response to the increasing competition for the limited amount of state funds available to support capital construction projects. He further explained that nearly all capital construction funding in recent years has come from general fund surplus, rather than the Permanent Building Fund dedicated revenue sources. PBF revenues generate approximately \$50 million per year. The DPW operating budget, bond payments, alterations and repairs take about \$35 million. This leaves only \$16 million to meet all new construction and remodeling of state owned facilities. He explained that with the likelihood of large budget surpluses diminishing in the future, there is a need to get the maximum bang for the buck from the dedicated revenues that flow into the Permanent Building Fund. He explained that this bill would establish a matching program for higher education facilities to encourage higher education institutions to look for non-state sources of funding to assist with construction projects.

The program would require a non-state match equal to 50% of the project cost. Funds available for the program would be subject to whatever amount of funding the Legislature appropriates into the fund. Priorities for making awards out of the fund would be determined by the Permanent Building Fund Advisory Council.

**MOTION:**

Rep. Chavez made a motion to print RS 17364, Rep. Mortimer seconded the motion. In the discussion on the motion, **Mr. Peterson** explained that this legislation would not include additional tax incentives. This bill would encourage the institution to raise dollars to match funds from the state. The discretion for the monies in the Permanent Building Fund would remain. On a voice vote, the motion carried.

Rep. Boe mentioned that she attended the National Federation of the Blind dinner last night. She explained that she learned that there is a struggle for education for the blind in the state. It is an issue that the committee needs to look into so all children in the state can have equal education. Rep. Boe will contact the organization to have someone come and speak to the committee.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Vice Chairman Shirley adjourned the meeting at 9:15 A.M.

---

Vice Chairman Shirley  
Chairman

---

Claudia Howell  
Secretary

MINUTES

JOINT MEETING

SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE  
HOUSE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

**DATE:** January 22, 2008

**TIME:** 3:00 p.m.

**PLACE:** East Conference Room, J. R. Williams Building  
700 West State Street, Boise, Idaho

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** (SENATE) Chairman Goedde, Vice Chairman Fulcher, Senators Schroeder, Gannon, Pearce, Jorgenson, Bastian, Burkett, and Sagness (HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES) Chairman Nonini, Vice Chairman Shirley, Representatives Trail, Bradford, Block, Nielsen, Wills, Chadderdon, Shepherd (8), Marriott, Mortimer, Patrick, Thayn, Boe, Pence, Chavez, Durst, and Shively

**MEMBERS ABSENT/ EXCUSED:**

**MINUTES:** **Chairman Nonini** called the meeting to order at 3:10pm. He requested the secretaries take a silent roll call. He welcomed committee members and guests.

**Chairman Nonini** recognized Idaho State Department of Education **Superintendent Tom Luna** and opened the floor for questions.

**Representative Marriott** asked **Superintendent Luna** if teachers accept Category 4, how do they get paid? Does that money go to the district, into the general fund, or do they get paid directly by the State? **Mr. Luna** stated there are two steps with ISTARs. Both the career opportunity and expertise become a permanent part of a teachers pay and they will see it as part of their monthly check they receive from the school district. The other three; student achievement, local control and leadership are annual bonuses, so teachers will see that in a one-time check on an annual basis. The money goes to the district and it is very specific in the law that the money goes to the teachers as outlined in the law.

**Representative Marriott** asked when the annual check would be cut? **Mr. Luna** said the bonuses will be distributed to the teacher no later than December.

**Senator Goedde** asked what percentage a third-year teacher would receive, what amount of raise? **Mr. Luna** stated that currently a third-year teacher makes \$31,000. If a third-year teacher qualifies for every step of ISTARs, it would be an \$11,000.00 increase in their pay for that year which equates to approximately a 35% increase.

**Representative Durst** asked where in the bill does it state that if the program lost funding, the teacher could return back to their Category 3 contract?

**Mr. Luna** stated he would have to refer to **Jason Hancock** and would get that answer for **Representative Durst**. **Mr. Luna** stated if the funding goes away, the bill is no longer in force and the teachers would fall back (into Category 3), it would be as though ISTARS had never been law. He said the reason the money for ISTARS is put into statutory spending is because that is the most secure form of education funding in the State of Idaho. It has never gone down.

**Representative Chavez** stated her concern about the release process. She asked if a teacher that is participating in the program could be released for no constitutional reason? **Mr. Luna** stated the rolling contract provides the teacher with time and the ability to respond to those kind of situations. Any teacher that has three or more years can have a three-year contract. **Mr. Luna** explained the protection the teachers would have is no teacher will ever get to the end of their contract to find out their services were no longer wanted in the district.

**Representative Chavez** asked when the process would take place? **Mr. Luna** stated they would have a two year warning because when the district chose not to add the third year that's when they would know there was an issue that needed to be resolved and they would have two years to resolve it.

**Representative Chavez** asked if every year everyone who chooses this path would have to negotiate their own contract with the superintendent and the board? **Mr. Luna** explained the negotiation between the teacher and the administration happens before the teacher chooses to take the Category 4 contract and if they are satisfied with the negotiation, they would sign the Category 4 contract which would be for the time the teacher is willing to work under.

**Representative Trail** asked if we cannot fund either program, what would **Mr. Luna's** steps be between sessions in preparing for the next session assuming good economic times were ahead. **Mr. Luna** stated Idaho has never had a year where the amount of pay allocated for teachers was reduced. They are making ISTARS funding part of statutory spending. It is secure.

**Representative Patrick** asked when we provide bonuses on the basis of student achievement, does that create the scenario where teachers would not want students who struggle in their classroom? **Mr. Luna** answered no. ISTARS focuses on those students who have the greatest need, and those are the students who are currently scoring at the lowest levels on the ISAT. Under ISTARS we focus on what we think is the greatest value

and that is how much academic growth the student had when he was in the school.

**Chairman Nonini** stated **Jason Hancock** from the State Department of Education had arrived and asked **Representative Durst** to repeat his earlier question. **Representative Durst** asked where in the bill did it state that if this program was passed now and funded, then later not funded that any teacher who had chosen to go to a Category 4 contract would be automatically changed back to a Category 3 contract?

**Jason Hancock** stated the signing of the Category 4 contract is contingent on the teacher receiving this money. If they do not receive this money, it's not a valid contract. **Representative Durst** asked if **Mr. Hancock** would, when he has the opportunity, let the committee know the specific line that indicates that. **Mr. Hancock** answered he would.

**Chairman Nonini** recognized **Superintendent Luna** for further questions.

**Senator Burkett:** Is it intended that the Category 4 contract will allow individual teachers to negotiate for pay levels based on their teaching performance or their relationship with the administrator? **Mr. Luna** stated the ISTARS money is specific as to where the money can go and how much can go to a teacher. He stated the teacher does assume responsibility to negotiate the length of the contract.

**Senator Sagness:** stated he had a statement from **Dr. Paul Rowland** he would like to read. That was continued to a time when **Dr. Rowland** could be present to answer questions.

**Representative Shively** asked if a teacher teaching in a low achieving school would receive the same salary as one teaching in a high achieving school? **Mr. Luna** stated they would receive the same salary, \$31,000.00 per year, because that is related to the foundation pay. However, it is possible one would be paid more than the other depending on whether they were hired to teach in a hard to fill position, the number of endorsements the teacher has, and the willingness of the teacher to mentor new teachers.

**Representative Shirley** asked if under ISTARS, would teachers qualify for an additional endorsement or subject matter area of expertise because of the National Board Certification or would it end at the time the current program discontinues payment.

**Mr. Luna** stated they have an incentive for National Board Certification. He stated ISTARS focuses on areas where they presently do not have incentives.

**Representative Boe** asked if it would be a morale problem among the teachers if a district had to transfer teachers from a high performing school to a low performing school. **Mr. Luna** stated he did not believe it was an issue for a teacher who, rather than being Riffed, was reassigned to another school as the bonuses are based on the whole school working together to improve the school for the betterment of their students.

In answer to a question from **Representative Durst** regarding scores on ISATs and how they relate to the mobility of the population, **Mr. Luna** stated they deal with that situation today. When they give students the ISAT, they take into account that same mobility.

**Senator Burkett** asked for clarification regarding the bill stating a school district would have to include the term (one, two or three years) in the Category 4 contract, but there was nothing in the bill that would limit the school districts to only that provision. **Mr. Luna** deferred to **Jason Hancock** who stated the language in Category 4 in that regard is not any different from the language found in other contracts.

**Chairman Nononi** recognized **Sherri Wood**, president of the Idaho Education Association, who stated changing the way teachers are paid is complex work. The goal for any change should be to increase student success by enhancing the ability of Idaho school districts to recruit and retain the best teachers. She stated the members of IEA do not believe ISTARS will accomplish that goal.

**Ms. Wood** stated the teachers object to relinquishing due process, using ISAT scores to decide bonuses, and limiting the number of individuals who can receive bonuses. **Ms. Wood** asked the committee to carefully consider the implications of any change in the compensation system for Idaho teachers and to only make changes that improve the knowledge and skills teachers possess so they can increase student success.

**Senator Jorgenson** asked what percentage of IEA teachers responded to the survey? **Ms. Wood** stated that several thousand IEA members responded with a plus or minus error factor of 2%. **Senator Jorgenson** asked what percentage of the teachers in Idaho? **Ms. Wood** stated over 2,000 responded. **Senator Jorgenson** pointed out that 2,000 was less than 20% and wanted to establish that it is not the entire IEA enrollment or all Idaho teachers. **Ms. Wood** stated it was statistically reliable.

**Senator Jorgenson** asked if anyone could respond to the survey.

**Ms. Wood** stated respondents had to go into a "members only" website.

**Senator Goedde** asked **Ms. Wood** for a copy of the questions asked on the survey.

**Representative Marriott** asked for clarification - that none of the non-IEA members were eligible to participate in the survey. **Ms. Wood** stated that was correct.

**Representative Mortimer** asked if ISTARS passed, how the union would incorporate and treat a member that elected to participate in the ISTARS program? **Ms. Wood** stated they would be treated fairly.

**Representative Mortimer** asked **Ms. Wood** if the IEA would support the ISTARS program if the Superintendent took the Category 4 contract out of the program? **Ms. Wood** answered no. **Ms. Wood** stated she could ask

them again but there were three very distinct issues their members have: continuing contracts, the quotas that are placed on how many teachers can take part in this and using a single test to provide bonuses.

**Chairman Nonini** introduced **Superintendent Chuck Shackett** from Bonneville School District in Idaho Falls and current President of the ISSA. **Mr. Shackett** spoke in support of ISTARS stating it was his belief ISTARS incorporated the best components from all efforts focused in the area of alternate teacher pay systems.

**Mr. Shackett** stated there were five ways a teacher could financially benefit from its implementation, two of which are leadership bonuses and performance bonuses tied to testing, and it is his belief ISTARS will bring a school together in an effort to increase student achievement.

In conclusion, **Mr. Shackett** read the Idaho School Superintendents' Association Resolution in Support of ISTARS as ratified on January 8, 2008.

**Representative Boe** asked how the Resolution was voted on, how it passed, and what percentage of the superintendents endorsed it?

**Mr. Shackett** stated they sent out the Resolution and information on ISTARS to each of the six regions in their superintendents' group and asked the presidents of each of the six regions to interact with their superintendents and get a feel for the position their superintendents took on ISTARS. It resulted in a 6 to 0 vote in favor of ISTARS.

**Representative Chavez** asked **Mr. Shackett** when he was talking about his three year rolling contract, if he had worked harder and performed better, because he was scared, and not because he loved what he was doing. **Mr. Shackett** answered no. However, having a contract that is not on-going causes one to reflect on the decisions one makes.

**Representative Durst** asked how many students were actually being impacted. **Mr. Shackett** stated he couldn't tell how many students the superintendents have in their school districts. They just polled the Superintendents irregardless of the number of students they have.

**Senator Schroder** asked if the number of his membership is 115?

**Mr. Shackett** stated there are 115 in the state, only a few of which are not members.

**Senator Gannon** asked if any of the superintendents were influenced by the possibility this would allow them to houseclean a little easier?

**Mr. Shackett** answered absolutely not.

**Representative Trail** asked how the superintendents and the administration would handle the challenge of unhappy teachers if ISTARS were passed. **Mr. Shackett** stated he does not believe the majority is against it. The teachers he talked to supported it.



**Representative Mortimer** asked for a comparison of each of the programs as far as ease of implementation of the programs is concerned. **Mr. Shackett** stated he couldn't compare the two because he had not studied "We Teach".

**Representative Mortimer** asked how important is an incentive or merit system to get the education results we need for our students? **Mr. Shackett** answered it is critical. There is needed some component of merit and achievement.

**Senator Bastain** asked how signing a Category 4 contract makes that teacher a better teacher? **Mr. Shackett** having a one, two, or three year contract, you always weigh every decision you make trying to determine if it is in the best interest of the children and the best interest of the public.

**Senator Bastain** asked if it would be better to deal with the issue separately and simply restructure Idaho Law so we don't have continuing contracts in Idaho. **Mr. Shackett** said the beauty of ISTARS is that it gives teachers a choice.

**Senator Bastain** asked if Idaho could afford the \$123 million on-going funding necessary each year to fund the program? **Mr. Shackett** stated there is an education stabilization fund, a reserve account that would be the fund to cover if there was an overage. **Senator Bastain** inquired if teachers would be better by having a limited contract? **Mr. Shackett** stated he did believe having a limited term contract causes one to be more productive.

**Senator Sagness** asked **Mr. Shackett** why superintendents would want to support something that would cause uneasiness and upset their teachers. **Mr. Shackett** stated that teachers are worried, but after they were told what is truly in ISTARS, the teachers agree it has some merit. He asked if the teachers feel they are a part of the process. **Mr. Shackett** answered everyone had a part in it.

**Chairman Nonini** introduced **Dr. Cliff Green** of the Idaho School Board Association who spoke in support of ISTARS. He stated the board had met and passed a resolution which was what the Board would like to see in an alternative compensation system. The points of that plan are as follows:

- 1) A vehicle to measure achievement gains,
- 2) Data that emphasizes student's performance,
- 3) Academic achievement and accountability through growth measure,
- 4) Performance measure,
- 5) Optional for teachers,
- 6) Student identifier system,
- 7) Collaboration of teachers,
- 8) Evaluations that are fair, equitable, and valid,
- 9) Recognizes the role and authority of the school board and the school board trustees.

In answer to a question by **Senator Burkett**, **Dr. Green** stated there has been no resolution by the ISBA calling for the elimination of category contracts.

**Dr. Green** when asked by **Senator Sagness** who he was speaking for here today stated he was speaking for the Idaho School Board Association, and they had not taken a vote on either ISTARS or "We Teach".

**Chairman Nonini** open the hearing for Public Testimony:

**Wendy Horman**, Bonneville Trustee for the Idaho School Board Association spoke in favor of ISTARS. **Ms. Horman** stated that all the principles were approved by their membership, before they were aware of the existence of ISTARS, align with the ISTARS program.

**Senator Goedde** asked **Ms. Horman** what she personally thought of the ISTARS program? **Ms. Horman** stated it is a step in the right direction, a step that we must take.

**Senator Burkett** asked **Ms. Horman** what elements of ISTARS she would change? **Ms. Horman** said she would support a stronger growth measure and a task force to look at the evaluation of teachers.

**Sherilyn Paris**, teacher at Franklin Elementary School, spoke in opposition of ISTARS. **Ms. Paris** stated teacher's compensation and due process rights should not be linked together but deserved to be treated separately. Also, that ISAT is not sufficient as the only measure for student performance.

**Senator Bastain** asked **Ms. Paris** if she believed in rewarding excellence with merit pay? **Ms. Paris** stated she had some concerns about merit pay and how workable it is.

**Terry Donicht** Superintendent of Schools in the McCall-Donnelly School District as well as Superintendent of Schools in the Meadows Valley School District. **Mr. Donicht** stated he was here to speak on behalf of the ISTARS legislation. That although he had some concern about certain aspects of the bill, overall he was in favor of the bill in its entirety. The weakest of the five components is that which deals with student achievement. However, the limitations of the ISAT could be overcome in the future by developing a test of higher integrity and implementing it in more grade levels.

**Senator Sagness** asked what the relationship was between a continuing contract and improved student performance in the school. **Mr. Donicht** stated he was not sure there was a relationship.

**Senator Sagness** asked Mr. Donicht if he thought the kind of security that exists in a continuing contract is important to them. **Mr. Donicht** stated the importance of security is directly related to ones' confidence in one's

ability.

**Chairman Nonini** recognized **Marianne Donnelly**, Chair person of Pocatello Chubbuck School District Number 25. **Ms. Donnelly** stated any merit pay proposals for teachers must be carefully constructed so it addresses specific educational goals. It must be designed so it really improves the child's learning in the classroom. **Ms. Donnelly** stated, in her view, Superintendent **Luna's** plan falls short of doing this.

**Senator Goedde** stated that it appeared from her testimony she would not support the "We Teach" plan either. **Ms. Donnelly** stated she had not looked at it.

**Vern Newby**, Trustee from District 271, spoke in favor of ISTARs stating ISTARs had given them a milepost to better determine their progress. He spoke of the necessity to retain good teachers.

**Representative Shively** asked **Mr. Newby** if \$8,000.00 more for his math and chemistry teachers would keep them in Idaho? **Mr. Newby** stated he could only speculate.

**Carol Harms** from Lewiston, teaching in Orofino, Idaho stated she wished to speak against the ISTARs proposal. She stated her main objections to the plan after which **Chairman Nonini** asked if she agreed that the "We Teach" plan was the plan. **Ms. Harms** stated she liked it better.

**Wayne Freedman**, School Board Representative from Council, Idaho stated that one of the components of any system that really helps his district is multiple endorsements. He stated his district would benefit from being able to identify those teachers who are much needed to fill out his staff and if he could offer a \$2,100 compensation package that would be helpful.

**Representative Durst** asked **Mr. Freedman** if he thought it was a rational decision for a teacher to make to take a Category 4 contract where he could be making less and lose his due process rights or move to a state nearby and get more money with his contract rights still in place. **Mr. Freedman** stated that teachers choose to teach for reasons other than pay.

**Lori Maxwell**, first grade teacher in Moscow, Idaho stated the ISTARs plan would be a sad development for teachers in the state. She said she was concerned about how the implementation of ISTARs would negatively impact teacher collaboration and collegiality. **Ms. Maxwell** stated Idaho students would certainly lose if teachers felt forced to compete with one another rather than work collaboratively to earn a fair wage. Responding to a question from **Representative Trail** as to whether the ISTARs program would be an incentive or a disincentive for education graduates coming out of our Universities, **Ms. Maxwell** stated it would be a disincentive.

**Brian Duncan** from Heyburn, Idaho, President elect of the Idaho School Board Association as well as the Chairman of the Minidoka District stated that his trustees voted to strongly endorse the ISTAR program. The question his trustees often ask, does adequate funding translate to adequate education and if that is the translation, what would excellent funding for education in Idaho translate to? Would that also translate to excellent education? It is their belief that the ISTAR program is a step in the direction of excellent funding for education in Idaho.

**LaVon Dresen** from Emmett stated poor teachers can be gotten rid of through administrative work. She also spoke against using ISAT tests as a measurement for bonuses.

**Tim Rosandick**, Superintendent of the Homedale School District, spoke in favor of ISTAR in terms of many of its components. He stated it is the boldest innovation ever proposed to enhance teacher's salaries in a very significant way. He also stated the IEA has demonstrated an interest as much as his interest has been to have quality faculty working in school. That when he has had to take action that could be viewed as adverse on an employee, the IEA has been there to make sure that person's due process rights were protected. They have also assisted in making sure he had quality teachers in the classroom.

**Mike Warwick** from Caldwell who teaches in Middleton stated he opposed ISTAR. He stated he opposes ISTAR at a more fundamental level. That in the name of student progress we want to reward the best teachers, but how does stripping teachers of their rights accomplish that? **Senator Goedde** stated it is the choice of the teacher, nothing is required.

**Vickie Simmons** from Boise, a recently retired school administrator, stated she does not endorse either of the plans. **Ms. Simmons** said the major problems are with the ISTAR program. She said she had many concerns but would focus only on the financial ones. First, there is no money for the foundation program which remains the way all teachers in Idaho receive the major portion of their salary. All the money requested is in bonuses. She asked how would districts meet contractual obligations with no increase to the base for the foundation program.

**Ms. Simmons** stated she did not believe Idaho could afford to fund both ISTAR and the foundation long term. Even if only the ISTAR program is funded this year, it was questionable whether Idaho could afford to

keep this program going year after year while the foundation program stagnates.

**Joanne Davis**, a high school teacher from Emmett High, stated she objects to the ISTAR plan. She stated she thinks the plan is disingenuous and that it is trying to accomplish other things. She stated she didn't have a problem with merit pay or incentives that will help out rural districts, but asked for honesty in dealing with them.

**Chuck Alexander**, a high school teacher from Emmett, objects to the ISTARS plan stating he does not believe short contracts make better teachers. He stated he would not be willing to sign away his continuing contract rights as a matter of principle.

**Mr. Alexander** stated he felt “WE Teach” is a better plan but does not think either should be put into play.

**Janie Ward-Engelking**, a teacher from Boise, stated she agreed teachers need to be paid more in order to attract and retain the best and the brightest. However, education is a complex problem and a complex job and when we look at the elements that are important for any kind of pay for performance we have to look at several things. One being that there has to be a strong professional component. That component is in the “We Teach” plan but is lacking in the ISTARS plan. Another element is the mentoring program. **Ms. Ward-Engelking** said neither a teacher’s nor a student’s value can be reduced to a single ISAT score. It is unfair to have that the most important thing they do. She asked the legislators to take another look at the “We Teach” plan.

**Veronica Zaleha**, a teacher/librarian from Boise, spoke in opposition to the ISTARS plan. She stated that creating a pay plan that rewards only a small percentage of select teachers would create a competitive divisive climate no longer conducive to the nurturing that is the hallmark of a strong learning community.

**Laurie McCurdy**, a teacher from Boise and President of the Boise Education Association which represents approximately 1700 teachers in Boise, stated that nothing is more offensive to her than the allegation that unions protect bad teachers. They do not protect bad teachers, they protect due process rights. She opposes STARS stating she feels the plan would cause a mass exodus of teachers transferring to higher performance schools where teachers will have a chance to be more successful.

**Representative Boe** asked **Ms. McCurdy** how her association helped the district redirect a teacher that is not doing well. **Ms. McCurdy** stated they make sure the teacher is working with a peer assistant, they work with the teacher in telling them the areas in which they need to improve, they work with the district to make sure the teacher has a professional development plan set up to improve, and they work with the district to try

to allow that teacher to have enough time to make the improvement they need to make.

**Representative Boe** asked if they can help the teacher who is ready to retire and is just tired. **Ms. McCurdy** answered they have a plan that helps teachers recharge and reconnect with their profession and each other.

**Betty Reimann**, second grade teacher from Pierce Park Elementary School, spoke in support of the IEA and stated is a strong supporting

organization. She described IEA's children's fund, a fund supported by teachers and community contributions for children in need. **Ms. Reimann** thanked **Sherri Wood** and **Jim** for the work they've done for the IEA.

**Amy Adams**, a teacher from Mountain View Elementary, opposes ISTARS. **Ms. Adams'** concern is about the focus ISTARS puts on the ISAT scores. She feels those scores should be used only as a tool. Ms. Adams stated it would be great to have a plan that all teachers can participate in, but she will not give up her continuing contract as a matter of principle.

**Mark Cembalisty**, a Boise teacher, stated he opposed ISTARS. Speaking to the effects ISTARS would have on the children of Idaho, **Mr. Cembalisty** stated ISAT measures the lower levels of understanding very well, but cannot assess higher order thinking skills. Skills our children will need for the future. Therefore, a basic ISAT education, i.e., where ISAT becomes the curricula, will not do for our future.

**Kris Williams-King**, Counselor in the Boise School District, opposes ISTARS stating the plan is not something that is attainable or assessable by all teachers. **Ms. Williams-King** said she felt the ISTARS plan was more political than it is caring about education.

**Bob Olson** retired from Boise School District, stated he was attending this hearing in defense of education. He stated he felt the legislators should pay more attention to the teachers who are opposed to ISTARS than to the organizational managers.

The meeting adjourned at 7:05pm.

---

**Co-Chairman Senator Goedde**  
**Chairman Senate Education**

---

**Co-Chairman Representative Nonini**  
**Chairman House Education**

---

**Carol Vaughn, Secretary Senate Education**

## MINUTES

### HOUSE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

**DATE:** January 23, 2008

**TIME:** 9 A.M.

**PLACE:** Room 148

**MEMBERS:** Chairman Nonini, Vice Chairman Shirley, Representatives Trail, Bradford, Nielsen, Wills, Chadderdon, Shepherd (8), Marriott, Mortimer, Thayn, Boe, Pence, Chavez, Shively

**ABSENT/  
EXCUSED:** Rep. Block, Rep. Patrick, and Rep. Durst

**GUESTS:** See attached list

Chairman Nonini called the meeting to order at 9 A.M. He thanked the Committee for their hard work in the joint committee meeting held yesterday. He announced that **RS 17413C1** and **RS 17438** on today's agenda would be heard at a later time due to changes made by the sponsors.

**RS 17585:** Rep. Bolz presented this RS to the Committee. He explained that this RS was brought to him by a board member from a charter school that is located in two different districts. He explained that the purpose of this legislation is to allow for Charter Schools chartered by the Public Charter School Commission which has a primary attendance zone within more than one school district to be able to relocate to another school district within the primary attendance zone as established in the charter.

**MOTION:** Rep. Nielsen made a motion to introduce **RS 17585** to print, Rep. Bradford seconded the motion. On a voice vote, motion passed.

**RS 17367:** **Aylee Schaefer**, Transition Coordinator for the visually impaired and the deaf and hard of hearing from the State Board of Education presented the RS to the Committee. She explained that this legislation would provide consistent vision screening opportunities for students. She further explained that currently vision screening differs between school districts. This legislation will provide for vision screening for all students grade 1,2,4,6, and 8. Not all children are screened and not all children are screened and not all children are screened by qualified screeners. The legislation will implement a structure to offer training to the screeners, screen children at consistent intervals, and screen children across the state of Idaho.

In response to questions from Committee members, **Ms. Schaefer** explained that this legislation would require an additional general fund appropriation. She further explained that all students in the selected grades would be screened. Students would be screened in distance vision and near vision, using an eye chart. They would also be screened in color vision and screened to make sure both eyes work together. When asked about the \$300,000 cost, **Ms. Schaefer** explained that some districts would need training and equipment. She further explained that some districts employ school nurses or contract with nurses or use volunteers.

In response to a question regarding how the grade levels were determined that are screened, she explained that it was based on critical stages in vision development and points are when certain types of conditions are likely to show up.

**MOTION:** Rep. Chadderdon made a motion to introduce **RS 17367** to print. Rep. Mortimer seconded the motion. In the discussion of the motion, **Ms. Shaefer** responded to Committee questions regarding where the \$300,000 would go. She explained that the State Board will work with the Department of Health and Welfare and the School Board Association to grant the money based on need to school districts. She further explained that she has not discussed this legislation with the optometrists and but felt it would not interfere with their work. On a voice vote, the motion carried.

**RS 17402:** **Tamara Baysinger**, staff for the Public Charter School Commission, presented this RS to the committee. She explained that Idaho Code cites "failure to meet generally accepted accounting standards of fiscal management" as one condition obligating an authorized chartering entity to issue a notice of defect to a public charter school. The generality of this phrase has led to repeated confusion with regard to the Public Charter School Commission's oversight responsibilities as an authorized chartering entity. Specifically, the Commission and other authorized chartering entities would benefit from clarity regarding whether an authorized chartering entity shall issue a notice of defect based on a school's detrimental financial decisions leading to possible financial default, or only in situations in which the school has violated an accounting principle such as would be reported in a fiscal audit. In response to Committee questions regarding why some virtual charter schools did not submit financial records with an authorizer, **Ms. Baysinger** explained that it is currently in code, and this legislation is not designed to address that part of the code in particular. **Amy Lorenzo** from Office of Performance Evaluations responded to Committee questions regarding if the legislation addresses fiscal responsibility. She explained that this legislation has little to do with what was found in OPE's report. She further explained that there is a need for this legislation.

**MOTION:** Rep. Mortimer made the motion to introduce **RS 17402** to print, Rep. Shively seconded the motion. On a voice vote, the motion carried.

**RS 17404:** **Dr. Michael Graham**, Administrator of the Idaho Division of Vocational Rehabilitation presented the RS to the Committee. He explained that VR currently provides service for about 200 clients with end stage renal disease. He further explained that the program was started prior to Medicare. The statute does not allow services which IDVR has been providing for years, including travel and paying for insurance premiums costs. He explained that VR pays for about 1% of costs. The agency does not pay any medical expenses beyond Medicare. In response to questions, **Dr. Graham** explained that the agency pays for some of the costs pertaining to dialysis and pharmaceutical costs. In response to Committee questions, he explained that IDVR is under the State Board of Education, that is why they come to Education committee. It was suggested that this bill would be better heard in the Health and Welfare committee.



- MOTION:** Rep. Marriott made a motion to introduce **RS 17404** to print. Rep. Mortimer seconded the motion. On a voice vote the motion carried.
- RS 17412:** **Mike Mason**, Financial Vice President of the College of Southern Idaho presented this RS to the Committee. He explained that currently Idaho Code limits the annual amount that community colleges can charge for tuition to \$1,250. The College of Southern Idaho and North Idaho College are approaching the annual limit with tuition and will have to freeze tuition if this limit is not increased. This current restriction will also prevent the College of Western Idaho from setting tuition charges above \$625 per semester. He further explained that this legislation does not directly increase tuition and fees. It maintains the authority of locally elected community college boards of trustees to set tuition and fees as described throughout Idaho Code. The tuition cap would be raised to \$2,500 dollars. He further explained tuition can not be raised more than 10% per year.
- MOTION:** Rep. Boe made a motion to introduce **RS 17412** to print. Rep. Shively seconded the motion. It mentioned that Committee members have already heard about this idea. The last time the tuition ceiling was raised was in 1994. This would take them into the significant future and allow the College of Western Idaho to charge what they need for tuition costs. On a voice vote, the motion carried.
- RS 17403:** **Mike Mason** also presented RS to the Committee. He explained that Idaho Code allows for \$300,000 to be transferred annually from the State Liquor Fund to the community college account. Over the past 25 years, the College of Southern Idaho and North Idaho College have each received \$150,000 from this account. With the addition of the College of Western Idaho, the fund will now be split equally between three community colleges rather than two. This legislation will increase the amount to \$600,000. He explained that this is the first increase since 1982 and the Governor has put this in his budget. In response to Committee questions regarding where the money comes out of, **Matt Freeman**, from the Legislative Services Office responded that the money does come out of the state's share of money and not from cities and counties. It was mentioned that there is a need to check on the distribution of money to clarify this issue.
- MOTION:** Rep. Marriott Made a motion to introduce **RS 17403** to print. Rep. Mortimer seconded the motion. On a voice vote the motion carried. Rep. Boe requested that **Mr. Mason** provide a chart to show how liquor funds are distributed.
- RS 17414:** **Dana Kelly**, the Student Affairs program manager for State Board presented this RS to the Committee. She explained that this legislation clarifies and strengthens requirements for obtaining residency in Idaho for the purpose of qualifying for resident fees at the state's institutions of higher education. She further explained that the proposed legislation is similar to legislation proposed during the 2007 legislative session, House Bill 219. Changes were made to address the concerns from last session. In response to questions regarding a previous RS regarding offering National Guard members resident fees; **Ms. Kelly** explained that this legislation does not address that issue. She further explained that this legislation does address some of the issues raised in a report by OPE.

It was discussed that the proposed National Guard legislation would be an exception to this and would not have to follow what this legislation does. It would not be in conflict. It was further suggested that some editorial corrections could be made on line 45 on page 3, to add Wyoming.

**MOTION:**

Rep. Mortimer made a motion to introduce **RS 17414** to print. Rep. Shively seconded the motion. It was suggested that **Dana Kelly** contact **Rep. Kileen** regarding the National Guard legislation. On a voice vote, the motion carried. **Ms. Kelly** will provide additional information to the Committee about how many people the proposed legislation would affect.

Chairman Nonini announced that the Committee would not meet Thursday or Friday morning, but would meet at 3 P.M. with the Senate Committee today and tomorrow.

**ADJOURN:**

Chairman Nonini adjourned the meeting at 9:50 A.M.

---

Representative Bob Nonini  
Chairman

---

Claudia Howell  
Secretary

## MINUTES

### JOINT HOUSE AND SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEES

- DATE:** January 23, 2008
- TIME:** 3 P.M.
- PLACE:** East Conference Room of the JR Williams Building
- MEMBERS:** Co-Chairman Nonini, Vice Chairman Shirley, Representatives Trail, Bradford, Block, Nielsen, Wills, Chadderdon, Marriott, Mortimer, Patrick, Thayn, Boe, Pence, Chavez, Durst, Shively
- Co-Chairman Senator Goedde, Senators Goedde, Fulcher, Schroeder, Gannon, Jorgenson, Bastian, Burkett, Sagness
- ABSENT/  
EXCUSED:** Senator Pearce, Rep. Shepherd
- GUESTS:** See attached sheets.
- Senator Goedde called the meeting to order at 3:15 P.M. He welcomed those present. He reviewed rules of the joint committee. He reminded presenters that they would each have 3 minutes, they need to be respectful to legislators and others, there would be no booing, clapping, no personal attacks, and speak only to the bills at hand. He asked that they do not repeat what prior person has said. He also asked that for the record, they state their name and community in which they live. He explained that the committee would alternate testimonies between pro and con. He further explained that he would adjourn the meeting at 5:15 P.M.
- PRO iSTARS:** **Ryan Kerby**, superintendent in the New Plymouth School District spoke in support of iSTARS. (See attachment #1) He explained that there is a need for more teachers to take higher degrees of ownership in the performance of schools, trying to figure out how to improve schools, and he believes iSTARS does that. He further explained that the multiple endorsement piece helps smaller districts fill all teaching positions. If an elementary school has several teachers with these endorsements, and additional teachers earn masters degrees in content areas such as math or science, the school would not only have a more qualified staff, but additional expertise from which the other teachers can draw. He explained that the achievement piece of iSTARS is a first step in merit pay and is in a good direction. Teachers, dependent on each other for performance pay, will increase collaboration. He further explained that the category 4 aspect of the program provides improvement on some issues relative to personnel, which will improve student learning.
- PRO weTEACH:** **Molly Cochell**, a teacher in the Meridian school district in her 20<sup>th</sup> year of teaching, spoke in opposition to iSTARS. She explained that she teaches at a magnet school. She further explained that **SB1290** (weTEACH) moves teachers through skills, determines needs and goals necessary for themselves, and is individualized and not prescribed.

It also allows for collaborative work and professionalism. Groups are encouraged to work together. It is straightforward and improves teaching with clearly outlined steps. It is an understandable way to improve teacher's success. In response to questions from the committee regarding how the classroom is improved by the weTEACH legislation, **Ms. Cochell** explained that in order to be successful teacher, if a teacher is improving, the student is learning.

**PRO iSTARS:** **Mikki Nuckols**, a teacher from Idaho falls who has taught 7<sup>th</sup> grade for 10 years, spoke in support of iSTARS. She explained that iSTARS makes sure teachers work together. All teachers can get raises. She is currently a mentor and literacy team leader. She further explained that more teachers are willing to take on leadership roles. She explained that most of leadership components in iSTARS are already being done in the schools. She further explained that more endorsements are appealing to her and other teachers in her building. She believes that teams of teachers would be pulled together by iSTARS. In response to Committee questions, **Ms. Nuckols** explained that she did not participate in the IEA survey. She further explained that she recently received the Milken award for outstanding teacher (a national award). She commented on category 4 part of iSTARS. She explained that she feels strongly about students, if it is better for the students, she would make the change. In response to a question regarding how does the category 4 contract make students better students, she explained that it would give teachers time to do after school programs to gain more knowledge. Better teachers who are unwilling to do something because of the pay, would benefit from category 4 contract. When asked what is the relationship between giving up continuing contract and better learning, she responded that a contract doesn't make her a better teacher. Regardless of a pay check, she should be doing it because she wants to help kids. She further explained that good teachers shouldn't have to worry about giving up continuing contract. She reported that she works with 36 teachers, and 2 were opposed to iSTARS, the rest support it. When asked if the ISAT test plays a part in grade she gives to students, she explained that it does not.

**CON iSTARS:** **Peggy Hoy**, a teacher in Twin Falls who has taught for 17 years, spoke in opposition to iSTARS. (See attachment #2) She spoke to the committee as a parent. She explained that she has three children in the public school system. Her middle child is on a 504 plan and her oldest has some learning difficulties. She further explained that her children are doing well in school because they have teams of teachers working together. She feels that the iSTARS plan would inhibit best practices and get rid of collaboration. She further explained that if her children's teachers were to be paid based on how well their students did on their ISAT scores, she would have one group of teachers fighting to have her middle child who scores well on the test, while another group of teachers would do all they could to avoid having her oldest child who his inconsistent in his ISAT scores. She further explained that not only would this plan cause many teachers to not want to teach students with learning difficulties, it would also cause the teams of teachers to give up sharing of ideas and collaboration. In response to questions from Committee members, **Ms. Hoy** explained the ISAT is not representative of every child. If a teacher has high ISAT scores, they would only be focused on teaching to that test and not on all aspects of teaching.

She further explained that collaboration within the district would go away with iSTARS. She stated that in weTEACH, teachers could specialize in something they teach. She further stated that she does not think teachers should be paid for measurable student improvement.

**PRO iSTARS:**

**Charles Kinsy**, superintendent of Lakeland School District spoke in support of iSTARS. (See attachment #3) He explained that the Lakeland School District is around the 15<sup>th</sup> largest district in Idaho. He further explained that almost 90% of their students are proficient on the ISAT and their students's performance significantly exceeds state averages on all measures. He reported that their accomplishments are due to the dedicated educators of their district. He explained that as a Board and administrative team, they have been convinced that they need to provide greater compensation to their teaching professionals. The Board of Trustees passed a resolution supporting iSTARS. He explained that he understands the teacher's concerns about giving up continuing contract status, but he believes the competent educator is protected by multi-year contract, defined due process and the opportunity to choose the iSTARS tract. He further explained that if continuing contract status is the false or perceived crutch that has held teachers salaries down, it is time to toss it away. He explained that iSTARS allows for local districts to designate additional pay to positions to which it is hard to attract and retain personnel. He further explained that the iSTARS plan provides an outline that will attract and retain committed professionals, begin compensating them at a more competitive level, and recognize value.

In response to questions from Committee members regarding competing states and that Idaho is not able to hold on to good teachers, **Mr. Kinsy** replied that in their area it is a problem. There are advantages, teachers want to live in Idaho, but at the same time the district loses 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> year teachers who are young professionals, looking at private organizations that pay more and end up looking across the border. The iSTARS plan would address some of that concern. When asked if he had direct conversations with teachers, **Mr. Kinsy** responded that he has been working with a group of teachers for some time on performance or merit pay plans. He reported that the teachers are supportive of iSTARS plan, but he did not have the percentages. In response to a Committee questions regarding Level 4 and if giving up a continuing contract would make better teachers, **Mr. Kinsy** responded that he was not sure it would make better teachers. He explained that the vast majority of teachers will work hard with whatever contract is there. He further explained that the motivation is there and it provides administration a way to address problems. He stated that they are preparing students for a global economy. Under Idaho statute, districts would be able to develop their own district merit program. If their district had enough money, they would develop such a program. In response to a questions regarding the Category 4 program and if it would be disruptive to teachers, he responded that there is a need to compensate teachers that are working hard. When questioned if he viewed legislators as stakeholders, he responded that there is no question, legislators are stakeholders and should have a say where the money goes. He further explained that overall, the determination of a contract increases accountability.

In response to a question regarding that in the private sector there is an early retirement program and in the iSTARS legislation after 3 years are up and the educator is 56 or 57 they may not be offered another contract, **Mr. Kinsy** responded that the primary concern is to put the best people in the classroom, regardless of age. He explained that under iSTARS, there is a need to have confidence in the School Boards.

**PRO weTEACH:** **David Gibson**, Twin Falls Education President, spoke in opposition to iSTARS. (See attachment #4) He explained that the weTEACH plan gives each school district the local control necessary for determining how to not only overcome the unique obstacles and challenges presented to individual school districts, but also gives them the local control to determine what tool is best used to measure the success of students and teachers alike. He further explained that the weTEACH plan includes continued funding and increases in the foundation pay. The plan also encourages and rewards teachers for becoming more capable and valid educators through collaboration and the sharing of best practices. The weTEACH plan supports the idea that educators should focus their efforts in becoming a master teacher in their field of expertise. In response to a Committee question regarding should legislators have a say in how in the money is appropriated or have the districts decide, **Mr. Gibson** responded that the needs of districts are different so it would be better done by the districts. He further explained that the measuring tool in weTEACH legislation does not come from a single test. Measurement needs to be based on overall achievement and local districts would have a better idea on how to assess.

**PRO iSTARS:** **Mike Gwartney**, representing the Idaho Business Coalition for Excellence in Education spoke in support of iSTARS. He expressed the organization's concern in the difficulty of hiring qualified people. He further explained that with all of the factors in education, nothing is as important as a teacher. He commended both plans in proposing a different way to pay teachers. He explained that the organization likes the iSTARS plan and likes the way it uses measuring tools. As a business group, they are looking forward to working to make education better in the state.

**PRO weTEACH:** **Jennifer Hart**, a science teacher in Nampa spoke in opposition to iSTARS and in favor of the weTEACH plan. (See attachment #5) She explained that weTEACH measures student improvement on each local school district's needs. This allows for local control. The ISAT is not the only measure of student achievement and should not be the only measure used to determine student success and teacher pay. She explained that she likes that the professional development level in weTEACH is not linked to endorsements. She further explained that through weTEACH, all teachers who met the criteria under the leadership portion would be rewarded for doing that without having to give up job securities or without having to be one of the 30% selected for extra pay by the district. She explained that she supports weTEACH because it treats teachers as professionals and does not require them to give up their due process rights.

**PRO iSTARS:** **Carol Scholtz**, a teacher at the Idaho Arts Charter schools in Nampa and Idaho Teacher of the Year, 2008, spoke in support of iSTARS. (See attachment #6) She explained that a large number of teachers did not participate in Idaho Education Association's poll. She further explained that out of the 13,000 who did not participate, many are in favor of iSTARS but may be the silent majority. She explained that according to the Northwest Professional Educators, 52% of the members would choose the category 4 contract. Most educators think that Idaho has good educational system and the Legislature supports teachers. She explained that iSTARS presents the best systemic program for change in education across the board. She further explained that iSTARS will reward all certified personnel in a school for their students' achievement and growth. She explained that iSTARS will lead to specific measurable results across the state and provides a fresh approach to the challenges teachers face. iSTARS provides funds which will be distributed in a fair and equitable manner across district boundaries and is not dependant upon negotiation.

**CON iSTARS:** **Jennifer Taylor**, a Reading specialist in Nampa spoke in opposition to iSTARS. (Attachment #7) She explained that she is certified to teach all grades k thru 8. She further explained that she has reached the top of the pay scale in her school district. She currently owes more that \$20,000 for her master's degree which she sought so she could better meet the reading needs for at-risk youth. She explained that if she were to follow the iSTARS plan, she would need to become multi-endorsed to have a chance at earning a higher salary. She questioned what does becoming endorsed in math, science or physical education help her students learn to read? She asked to please not allow the iSTARS plan with its multi-endorsement requirement in the state to create a shallow educational system, where teachers know a wide range of information and are experts in none. In response to questions from Committee members regarding rural school districts, **Ms. Taylor** explained that there are problems with rural districts and her district needs experts in reading and math but it would put larger districts at a disadvantage to require additional endorsements. She further explained that teachers are willing to get additional training in math. She explained that if iSTARS was to be modified to recognize additional areas of expertise, she would not support it because of the issue of giving up due process. She further explained that if teachers are held to ISAT standards, there is a need to have assurances that students are attending. When asked if there are good things in the iSTARS plan, **Ms. Taylor** responded that recognizing teachers as professionals is good and rewarding is good, but more work needs to be done.

**PRO iSTARS:** **Harold Ott**, executive director of the Idaho Rural Schools Association spoke in support of iSTARS. (See attachment #8) He explained that iSTARS addresses the issue of the supply of teachers to the rural remote districts. This is through the local control area. He explained that iSTARS plan includes a growth measure. Another reason he supports iSTARS is the bonus for teachers that provide leadership in key areas to insure student learning. In response to a question regarding how do we compare merit among teachers of different grade levels, **Mr. Ott** responded that it would be a career ladder approach. Great teachers need to be paid for what they do. iSTARS gives more flexibility and availability to pay teachers.

When asked why does it make a difference to give up a continuing contract, he responded that it is true that there is a need to put something in there for different stakeholders to get bill passed. Due process was discussed. He explained that people agree to arbitration all the time. He further explained that he does not believe due process is given up in the iSTARS plan. He stated that he believes change is a fearful thing, when people have had this protection and believe they are going to expose themselves at risk, they are fearful and see it as a loss of security. There is a need to reward good teachers and keep them in Idaho. When asked if there is a problem with superintendents in giving up continuous contract; he responded that he would not change one thing how did his job. Relationships are more important. Revenue stream is important to legislators. When asked if he thought there was enough money to establish merit pay system and base pay plan at the same time, he responded that there is a concern with years to come. He explained that the Governor has \$46 million in budget for this plan and there is a need to reevaluate annually.

**CON iSTARS:** **Joni Leipf**, a teacher in Meridian spoke in opposition to iSTARS. She read the story "Proof is in the Pudding." She explained that students are varied. She further explained that achievement tests are one proof to determine all the students. She started teaching in 1979. She explained that methods change, and there is a need to study to new standards and curriculum. The iSTARS plan using single measure, it is premature to measure to pass judgement on learning. Teachers want to be treated respectfully. She explained that she is not in it for merit pay, a pay increase to the base is good, but she is not looking for merit pay.

**PRO iSTARS:** **Mike Vuittonet**, Chairman of the Meridian School Board, spoke in support of iSTARS. He explained that the Board is in favor of alternative pay system, but they do have concerns. He feels that improvement is needed in all aspects of educational system. The current teacher compensation system no longer fits. There is a need to hire the best and brightest teachers. He explained that it is discouraging for beginning teachers due to the low salary. He believes that the fear is unfounded if the teachers lose due process rights. In response to Committee questions regarding if it is critical in this plan to have part of it be sign up for category 4 to get rewarded. He answered that it is not critical. It encourages teachers to go to a higher level. He explained that the current ISAT test doesn't truly measure growth, but it still can go forward with the proposal. It could be implemented without that measure. He explained that he believes and supports iSTARS, but does have concern with the ISAT. He recommended to do it in phases.

**CON iSTARS:** **Kathleen McCarter**, a computer technology and Medical Office teacher at a small public charter high school in Meridian for 17 years. (See attachment #9) She explained that her colleagues strongly oppose iSTARS. They believe it would damage teaching profession in Idaho. She explained that her school has very high ISAT scores, yet none of them believe that teacher bonuses should be based solely on one test. They know that it takes an entire school working together to achieve success for all of our students. iSTARS could stifle that kind of collaboration in many schools.



She explained that all of the teachers in her school take on extra responsibilities, yet under the leadership component of iSTARS, only 4.8% of their 16 teachers could qualify for bonuses. In response to Committee questions regarding the compensation of charter school teachers, **Ms. McCarter** explained that she works at a public charter school, and they are under contract with Meridian school district. Other charter schools have different compensation packages. Her charter school does take advantage of grants, but does not compensate teachers outside salary schedule. When asked what has changed since the current matrix was proposed, she explained that students coming out of college have difficulty paying back student loans on beginning teacher's salary. The merit pay plan is carefully crafted with the support of Idaho teachers and the legislators.

**PRO iSTARS:** **Alex LeBeau**, representing the Idaho Association of Commerce and Industry, spoke in support of iSTARS. (See attachment #10) He explained that IACI believes the crux of the current problem is in allocation. He further explained that according to the National Education Association rankings of states 2004 and Estimates of School Statistics 2005 analysis reports that Idaho ranks #2 in the percentage increase in the average salaries of public school teachers from 1993 to 2004, Idaho ranks #10 in the percentage of revenue for K-12 schools from state government coffers and Idaho ranks #10 in per capita spending per student. He further explained that the Legislature and taxpayers have consistently increased state support yet Idaho finds itself near the bottom in the effectiveness of those expenditures. IACI does not believe that we should pay highly-qualified and the not so qualified teachers exactly the same. The iSTARS system does not take anything away from our educators. It offers a new path for compensation and there are at least two levels of opportunity available before the controversial idea of refusing tenure in favor of a multi-year contract. The IACI views are supported by a poll of Idaho citizens that shows 61% of Idahoans disagree that lifetime tenure for public school teachers is good for education. The current system inhibits achievement through a lack of incentives.

**CON iSTARS:** **Amy Armstrong**, a teacher at Meridian High School for 7 years, spoke in opposition to iSTARS. She explained that Meridian High School has the highest level of special education students in the state. She explained that she recently worked with student to pass the ISAT exam. He failed the test several times, and finally passed in his senior year. She believes in the weTEACH plan, it doesn't take one score on one day. She wants to be judged on her merit, not on one score, but student's growth. She explained that pay isn't as important as getting students to be thinkers and productive citizens.

**PRO iSTARS:** **Cathy Hensel**, a 3 year teacher in Idaho and 18 year teacher in Montana spoke in support of iSTARS. She was an officer for the Montana Rural Teacher Association. She explained that she has unquestionable support for the iSTARS plan. She further explained that teachers make more of a difference in student achievement. ISTARS would provide districts with money to attract teachers. It promotes educational leadership to those who choose to attain leadership skills. It is a positive political vision and provides accountability, reward, and leadership.

It emphasizes professional and personal choice. It is a positive format and effective learning. In response to Committee questions, she explained that she chose to be in education and education is her passion.

Senator Goedde announced that Senator Bastain and Senator Burkett will be holding a town hall meeting at 6:30 P.M. tonight at Boise High School on this subject.

**ADJOURN:** Senator Goedde adjourned the meeting at 5:30 P.M.

---

Co-Chairman Rep. Nonini  
Chairman House Education

---

Claudia Howell  
Secretary House Education

---

Co-Chairman Sen. Goedde  
Chairman Senate Education

MINUTES

JOINT MEETING

**SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE  
HOUSE EDUCATION COMMITTEE**

**DATE:** January 24, 2008

**TIME:** 3:00 p.m.

**PLACE:** East Conference Room, J. R. Williams Building  
700 West State Street, Boise, Idaho

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** (SENATE) Chairman Goedde, Vice Chairman Fulcher, Senators Schroeder, Jorgenson, Bastian, Burkett and Sagness  
(HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES) Chairman Nonini, Vice Chairman Shirley, Representatives Trail, Bradford, Block, Nielsen, Wills, Chadderdon, Shepherd (8), Marriott, Mortimer, Patrick, Thayn, Boe, Pence, Chavez, Durst, and Shively

**MEMBERS ABSENT/ EXCUSED:** Senators Pearce and Gannon

**MINUTES:** **Chairman Nonini** called the meeting to order at 3:05pm. He requested the secretaries take a silent roll call. He welcomed committee members and guests.

**Chairman Nonini** opened the floor for continuing testimony on S1290 "We TEACH" and S1310 "ISTARS".

**Senator Robert Geddes**, President Pro Tem, testified in support of the ISTARS proposal. **Senator Geddes** stated his experience serving as Chairman of the Teacher's Salary Task Force last summer, was enlightening to him and it is his opinion, based on what he heard during those hearings, **Superintendent Luna's** proposal meets in large degree those ideas and circumstances that were identified to him during the task force process. In a Boise State University Public Survey, merit based pay, reward for experience, and incentive for improvement were significant. Even general opposition to continuing contracts was a key component of that survey.

**Senator Geddes** stated he began his career in 1995, a year after S 1560 became law and feels that bill has lived its useful life and change needs to occur.

**Senator Geddes** stated he has heard the concern that many qualified teachers are leaving the teaching profession to go into private business for many reasons, one of which is to earn more money. In doing so, however, they are giving up their continuing contracts, there is no guarantee in the private sector that long term security will be available to them. He stated one of the concerns he has heard is that many aspects

of the steps and bonus options are somewhat unpredictable, especially with regard to the professional status and the Category 4 contracts. He stated they may have to do a little more crafting to add some certainty where uncertainty exists. He feels confident there are ways this can be accomplished.

**Senator Sagness** asked since there is no known relationship between doing away with the continuing contract and improved teacher performance and student learning in the classroom, why is that such an integral part of the proposal? **Senator Geddes** said he learned from visiting with the administrators in the school districts he represents, the continuing contract can make a difficult decision an administrator has to make very expensive for a school district to follow through.

**Senator Geddes** stated that, although many of the teachers he talked to expressed concern regarding a continuing contract vs. a Category 4 contract, they encouraged him to go forward. He stated he did not think a continuing contract or a Category 4 contract would make any difference to a good teacher. It does, however, help the administrators administer and it helps improve quality. A renewal contract would be an incentive for teachers to continue to work hard, to be on track, and to improve their skills.

**Representative Durst** asked if **Senator Geddes** was in favor of a Category 4 contract as a way of weeding out bad teachers? **Senator Geddes** stated it wasn't the only provision of the proposal but it was a good provision of the proposal.

**Senator Burkett** stated that one of the teachers who attended the meeting last night, **Roger Taylor**, was a strong advocate for differential pay for teachers but on the other issue, he was very incisive in describing how business is run by a profit dynamic and education is in the area which is a political dynamic. He essentially changed his mind and became a strong advocate for the continuing contract. Based on that experience, is there a potential that we could separate the two concepts and go forward with the one that has broad base support and spend more time studying the category 4 contract? **Senator Geddes** stated there is a profit aspect to education which is training our students to be successful in the world and be productive citizens.

**Michelle Miles**, teacher from Blackfoot, spoke in favor of the "We TEACH" plan. **Ms. Miles** stated the "We TEACH" is a program that will greatly benefit the children of the state by producing the highest quality teachers possible. She stated she saw many similarities between the "We TEACH" program and the National Board for Professional Teaching Standard Certification, specifically Step 2, knowledge and skills based pay. Each of the three steps on this level require the teacher to improve. "We TEACH" requires teachers to take part in a continuing education program to increase their knowledge of the subject matter they are teaching. It has a provision that a professional development plan be reflected upon, reviewed and revised on an annual basis, the plan provides many opportunities for a teacher to reflect on her effectiveness

with students, assess the value of current practices and change tactics when warranted. "We TEACH" has many of the elements that are essential for an outstanding, training, and professional program such as the National Board for Professional Standards.

**Senator Goedde** asked **Ms. Miles** if she could show him any place in the "We TEACH" program where there is measurable accountability? **Ms. Miles** stated the proposal was a framework and there was a lot still to be built on it.

**Representative Marriott** asked if **Ms. Miles** had seen any figures that state how much "We TEACH" would cost? **Ms. Miles** stated she had not.

**Maria Nate**, parent from Rexburg, spoke in favor of the ISTAR program. She stated it is a way for quality teachers to finally be paid what they are worth. She stated another reason she appreciated the ISTAR program is because it is a way for the whole school to be recognized for increased performance.

**Representative Shirley** stated he had talked to many of the same teachers **Ms. Nate** had and found concern and some opposition to ISTAR not uncommon. He asked if she felt it would be a benefit to implement a program that seems to have merit and then continue to improve upon it. Or, is it better to sack both programs and stay where we are? **Ms. Nate** stated she did not think the status quo was working. There is a cry for something to change. She stated she believed the ISTAR program was a good program and solves many of the problems.

**Representative Boe** asked what she saw as the difference between the ISTAR and the "We TEACH" program as far as the ability to award outstanding teachers. **Ms. Nate** stated ISTAR had been fully developed and offers many opportunities on many levels for teachers to have their pay significantly increased.

**Senator Burkett** asked **Ms. Nate** if the majority of the teachers in the districts she is involved in supported ISTAR. She stated there was quiet support for the program. She said it was difficult to be vocal against an organization such as the IEA. **Senator Burkett** asked if she knew of any teachers that were not supporting ISTAR? She stated her school is a very strong union school and they may not be vocally supporting the ISTAR program, but there were teachers there that are supportive of the plan.

**Representative Marriott** asked if there was a difference between good teachers and good teaching? **Ms. Nate** stated maybe not. It is a gift that not all of us have.

**Nancy Larsen**, Idaho Teacher Of The Year 2000 from Coeur d'Alene, said change is dire, it is time to change, so change should be the best it can be. She doesn't, however, believe that a continuing contract will make for better teachers. She believes that part weakens the legislation and should be removed.

She submitted the following revisions:

1. Specifically address the removal of poorly performing teachers,
2. Maintain the support of good teachers through a continuing contract,
3. Develop specific criteria that defines inadequate through exemplary teaching,
4. Train teachers and administrators to use each set of criteria, and
5. Design a plan of implementation that recognizes that good quality change takes time.

**Senator Bastian** asked what were the salient qualities of good teaching? **Ms. Larsen** stated teachers must know their students and how to teach them, know the subjects they teach, and work well with parents and other professionals. **Senator Bastian** asked what elements of the ISTARs program identify quality teaching? **Ms. Larsen** stated that quality teaching is defined as a test score in ISTARs.

**Senator Jorgenson** asked **Ms. Larsen** if having a continuing contract made her a better teacher and would giving up tenure make her a worse teacher? **Ms. Larsen** stated she has professional and personal standards that she adheres to, there is nothing that would entice her to lower her standards in teaching.

**Senator Goedde** stated his concern is, if pay for performance does not move forward this year, that it may be many years before it comes up again. What kind of a time frame do you think it will take to get it right. **Ms. Larsen** answered that her research indicates that true change takes seven years. Although she stated that was too long, she also said that implementing it in one legislative session was not enough time. That, if it is passed in the form it is in and she gives up her tenure rights, then in the future she could not regain them.

**Representative Boe** speaking to some people's perception that there is no way to get a poor teacher out of the system, asked **Ms. Larsen** if they were to implement the training for administrators to recognize teachers who perhaps should find a different direction and a process to help them either become better teachers or to direct them another way, if she thought that would take some of the controversy away from insisting on the continuing contract or being willing to give it up? **Ms. Larsen** stated she did believe that would happen.

**Senator Sagness** asked for a copy of her presentation so he might look at it in greater detail. **Ms. Larsen** said she did and could contract through her e-mail address on the presentation. (Attached as attachment 1)

**Representative Chadderdon** asked **Ms. Larsen** what was it in tenure she felt so serious and sincere about that she would not like to give it up.

**Ms. Larson** stated there are different reasons people like a teacher and if she doesn't fulfill that particular role, they are in an authority position to make a decision about her. The system she talked about would remove the subjectivity issue. **Representative Chadderdon** asked if that was a

prevalent thing that happens to teachers with tenure? **Ms. Larsen** stated she has seen instances of that happening.

**Senator Jorgenson** asked how she would feel about the IEA stepping up and doing the policing? **Ms. Larsen** stated her experience as a member of the IEA is that it is already in place.

**Chairman Nonini** asked **Ms. Larsen** if she was aware of the part of the ISTARS bill that calls for the formation of a group or a commission that would look at the evaluation process? **Ms. Larsen** stated she was not.

**Senator Bastian** stated that during his past experience as a teacher and an administrator he had dealt with teachers that were not quality teachers and the IEA had worked with him to resolve those situations. He asked **Ms. Larsen** if that was typical of her experience with the IEA? **Ms. Larsen** stated she had not personally witnessed that circumstance. Only that she had heard that is a process that has been worked through.

**Representative Pence** stated **Superintendent Luna's** plan has an evaluation part they are going to be working on, and asked if teachers would be more comfortable knowing that this part of the plan is in place before they actually gave up their continuing contract rights? **Ms. Larsen** stated teachers can hit targets if they know where they are up front.

**Michelle Faucher-Sharples**, second grade teacher from Post Falls, stated she was uncomfortable giving up her continuing contract. She had personally experienced a situation where she had been slandered and the IEA had given her representation in resolving that issue. She also felt that having a continuing contract helped her be strong in a situation where she had to file a sexual harassment suit. She said a continuing contract helped her focus on her teaching.

**Representative Durst** commented that is why he has such a hard time with the Category 4 contract, regarding the issue of sexual harassment or a powerful person trying to get rid of a teacher without due process.

**Representative Marriott** asked if there was anything in ISTARS that would have prohibited her from being a member of IEA, and wouldn't they have protected her in the same way, whether or not she was on a Category 4 or a continuing contract. **Ms. Faucher-Sharples** stated that one of the things important to her is just cause and though one of the recent changes to the plan was how it defined due process, she prefers her evaluations regarding how she is teaching and what constitutes expertise be related to her job performance. **Representative Marriott** asked if she would have the same protection under either program. **Ms. Faucher-Sharples** stated she did not think so.

**Senator Fulcher** stated ISTARS is optional, not a mandate. He asked a question **Senator Goedde** had asked previously but was not answered, if she would oppose a colleague who wanted to exercise that option. **Ms. Faucher-Sharples** stated that was their right.

**Senator Sagness** stated he did not see why a person should have to make that choice when there was no demonstrated relationship between giving up a continuing contract and improvement in teaching.

**Senator Schroeder** stated an article in the Lewiston Tribune in December quoted one of the House leaders as saying it was the intent to phase out all continuing contracts after a few years.

**Ken Hosier** teacher at St Ambrose High School and Foundations Academy in Boise spoke in favor of ISTARS. Mr. Hosier spoke to the issue of tenure stating the Idaho tax payers deserved the opportunity to hold the state and school districts accountable for how their tax dollars were spent. He stated the program allows educators who feel tenure is important to retain their continuing contract while allowing teachers the opportunity to earn extra income by forgoing it. As a teacher in a private school, the ISTARS program would give him the incentive to enter the public school system, not a deterrent.

**Dana Harris** from Bear Lake High School in Montpelier, stated one of the concerns of the teachers in her district is they feel the distribution of the money from the ISTARS plan does not equitably compensate educators. She stated the only step in ISTARS that is considered salary is the \$2,200.00 career step. As all other compensation is in the form of year to year bonuses, it is not figured into the calculations for PERSI and, therefore, only about 25% of the teachers would receive salary and retirement benefits. Also, the same teachers would be the only ones eligible for bonuses in leadership and expertise. She stated Mr. Luna told them the plan was created to get rid of poor teachers, however, the problem of poor teachers should be addressed specifically and what administrators can do to make that process work. **Representative Shirley** asked for clarification on how she received the information that PERSI did not figure into the benefits from the plan. **Ms. Harris** stated it was because they were bonuses.

**Senator Goedde** asked **Jason Hancock** to respond to the question of PERSI benefits. **Mr. Hancock** stated page 6, section 5 of the bill outlines that distributions made pursuant to Idaho Code which are all the distributions under ISTARS, that the state shall provide the funding for PERSI and Social Security that goes with that. While it is true that there are certain steps on ISTARS that may be there one year and not another year, those contributions do count towards the PERSI and retirement calculations.

**Ron Jensen** from Idaho Falls stated he was speaking on behalf of new teachers and wished to address the ISTARS plan. He stated it is his understanding that the plan is intended to improve the system to not only keep qualified teachers but attract new teachers that are qualified as well. He felt the ISTARS plan did neither. **Mr. Jensen** stated under the ISTARS program the financial security of knowing he would have a consistent paycheck would be gone.

**Representative Shively** asked **Mr. Jensen** if, as a new teacher, he felt



he must give up tenure to receive extra pay for mentoring, for good scores on ISAT, to fulfill a scarcity position, to receive extra pay for several endorsements for national endorsement or certification? **Mr. Jensen** said absolutely not. That the extra pay should come regardless. He did not see how an incentive could be getting something for giving up something. He did not see the connection with the two.

**Senator Fulcher** asked what happens to him and his colleagues if one year, because funding is available they receive an increase in pay, but the following year funding is not available so they do not receive an increase in pay. What does that do as far as morale is concerned? **Mr. Jensen** said it would be very difficult for him, as he must live on a monthly budget which makes consistency very important to him.

**Jim Norton** teacher and Superintendent of the Parma School District, stated he wrote down neutral because there were things in both plans he liked and did not like. He recommends the following changes.

#### **“We TEACH”**

1. Strengthen the connection between teacher licensure, professional development and compensation, and
2. Illustrate in more detail the connection between student performance and staff responsibilities.

#### **ISTARS**

1. The sections on Market Scarcity and Multiple Endorsements need to be adjusted and language included that would provide additional resources to districts based on size,
2. The current language in ISTARS will not help rural schools, and may actually hurt rural schools,
3. Additional funds for leadership responsibility should not be tied to contract status, and
4. The Category 4 contract is problematic due to declining enrollment which means declining revenues.

**Chairman Nonini** requested a copy of Mr. Norton’s testimony.  
(Attachment 2)

**Senator Schroeder** asked if the provisions of the two bills were supported by research, and asked the Chairman if the people who brought the bills forward could point to the research that supports the provisions in those bills.

**Representative Boe** asked **Mr. Norton** if training for administrators, superintendents, principals, etc. would be helpful in more accurately measuring teacher performance? **Mr. Norton** said that was absolutely essential. He stated there was a need for much more training in regard to teacher evaluation and due process rights.

**Senator Bastian** asked **Mr. Norton** if he was recommending they look more carefully at the research and proceed cautiously. That if it cannot be done this year, they work next year to get it done but to get it done well.

**Mr. Norton** stated that was a fair representation of his presentation.

**Chairman Nonini** stated there would be time for only two more speakers but the sign up sheets would be distributed to all committee members so they may be aware of who was in favor of what. (Attachment 3)

**Adam Collins** a resident of Garden City, teaches at Eagle High School. He stated among his colleagues there seemed to be confusion as to what is considered due process and what is considered just cause. He pointed out the differences; that the current system requires proof be shown of criminal negligence or professional incompetence. He stated that was absent in ISTARS where no proof is required. Also, he did not see the choice of jumping into the ISTARS plan or staying with the current plan as choice but financial coercion.

**Senator Goedde** asked **Mr. Collins** if he was aware that the first two steps in the ISTARS program which provide money for the majority of teachers in this state that have nothing to do with giving up any contract rights. **Mr. Collins** stated he didn't have any problem with that only when the loss of rights is tied to any pay increases.

**Roger Quarles**, Superintendent of the Caldwell School District, supports the ISTARS plan stating that under this plan each of his schools could easily show enough growth to be able to financially reward all teachers in the building for their efforts.

**Mr. Quarles** stated the question of why a teacher should have to move to a new Category 4 contract in order to qualify for additional financial incentives is an easy one for him to answer. He said if we want our state tax payers to fund education at a higher level in order to pay teachers more money, then they must be more accountable for student achievement.

**Representative Durst** asked why he found it necessary for the State of Idaho to be the first state ever to move forward with a plan that requires teachers to give up their due process rights? **Mr. Quarles** stated he didn't see it as giving up their due process rights. He said it was an easy decision for the teachers he talked to in Caldwell to give up their continuing contracts to earn an additional \$10,000.00. He said it is part of a plan to move forward, the right to the next step.

**Senator Burkett** asked **Mr. Quarles** if he thought keeping the continuing contract in districts where the system has broken down, and things aren't working well, would be valuable to those teachers? **Mr. Quarles** stated in that case it might be better for those teachers to have a continuing contract. A critical part of this plan is leadership. The superintendent is governed by a board of directors that is elected to run the school district. That power lies in their hands and they need to understand what a lack of leadership is doing to their district.

**Senator Bastian** asked, with the current economic situation, what would happen if the total dollars for education did not increase? **Mr. Quarles**

stated that continuing to go down the same road would not solve their issues in Caldwell. He wanted them to look at merit and have their leadership work with the State Department and the Association to put more money in teachers' pockets.

**Senator Sagness** asked if the accountability of going to a Category 4 contract was more perception than real. **Mr. Quarles** stated people's perceptions are real to them. To him, accountability is student achievement. **Senator Sagness** stated that although he agreed with **Mr. Quarles** on most of his remarks, he could not see how a Category 4 contract would make a teacher a better teacher, improve the situation in the classroom or increase accountability. **Mr. Quarles** stated he didn't like the way education is funded now or the way teachers are paid and the Category 4 contract may not be the best plan, but for him, he just wants to find a way to get more money for teachers.

**Senator Schroeder** stated that during the 16 years he has been on the committee they have been doing many different things. That when something isn't working, they try something else. He stated he believes the current education and ISAT is failing and now they are just moving in another direction. He suggested that any new plan be based on research.

**Senator Goedde** shared the following numbers for the first two steps of the plan. They are as follows: The first step would affect 13,066 teachers which is \$22.6 million and the next step would affect 1,666 teachers at \$4.3 million or \$26.9 million dollars before you have to look at the continuing contract issue.

**Sherri Wood**, President of the Idaho Education Association gave her closing presentation in support of "We TEACH". (See Attachment 4)

**Superintendent Luna** then presented his closing remarks in support of ISTARS. He stated that the legislators had a choice before them; the choice to either vote to continue with the status quo in the way we pay our teachers or do something that will truly improve student achievement and teacher pay. We can finally give teachers the rewards and recognition they deserve and move forward with a plan the taxpayers in Idaho are demanding.

He stated that although change is difficult and uncomfortable, it is necessary in order to move education forward in Idaho. That the only way we can become comfortable with change is to experience it. The Idaho Education Association on-line poll predicts that only 8% of the teachers will avail themselves of all the bonuses and pay increases that ISTARS has to offer. School administrators across the state believe that 30 to 35% of our teachers will take advantage of these opportunities. We will never get a true understanding or an accurate estimate until we give teachers a chance to participate.

**Mr. Luna** stated that not all teachers are comfortable with the career opportunity steps in ISTARS, but that doesn't mean those opportunities

should be denied all Idaho teachers. He stated there was nothing punitive in the ISTARS plan, that ISTARS is all about giving teachers choices.

**Mr. Luna** remarked on the charter schools, how those teachers work without continuing contracts and they haven't seen any of the fears that have been expressed in the hearings this week played out in reality. Also, there are approximately 3,000 teachers who have taught less than three years working on a one year contract today and should be allowed the choice to stay on a Category 4 type contract. Although a Category 4 contract may not be for everyone, that right should not be denied to another.

**Mr. Luna** discussed **Senator Sagness'** idea about removing the Category 4 contract from the plan in order to find some negotiated balance to the plans. We now know that no matter what we do with the Category 4 contract even removing it entirely from ISTARS, that the IEA would not support it. **Mr. Luna** said the reason was as stated by **Sherri Wood** in her testimony on Monday, all decisions about teacher compensation must be decided through collective bargaining (local negotiations). All \$46 million of ISTARS goes directly to educators. None of the \$46 million ends up on the negotiating table.

**Mr. Luna** stated ISTARS is not a perfect plan but a first step towards progress. Progress to get teacher pay on the right path that rewards performance. A path that commits the legislature to doing something different in the way we pay teachers.

There were closing remarks by **Chairman Nonini** and **Co-Chairman Goedde**. **Chairman Goedde** stated the plans will be taken up in Committee on Wednesday.

**Chairman Nonini** adjourned the meeting at 5:37pm.

---

**Co-Chairman Senator Goedde**  
**Chairman Senate Education**

---

**Co-Chairman Representative Nonini**  
**Chairman House Education**

---

**Carol Vaughn, Secretary Senate Education**

MINUTES

**HOUSE EDUCATION COMMITTEE**

**DATE:** January 25, 2008

**TIME:** 10 A.M.

**PLACE:** Room 148

**MEMBERS:** Chairman Nonini, Vice Chairman Shirley, Representatives Trail, Bradford, Block, Wills, Chadderdon, Shepherd (8), Mortimer, Patrick, Pence, Durst, Shively

**ABSENT/  
EXCUSED:** Rep. Nielsen, Rep. Marriott, Rep. Thayn, Rep. Boe, and Rep. Chavez

**GUESTS:** See attached sheet.

Chairman Nonini called the meeting to order at 10:05 A.M. He thanked the committee members for meeting twice a day this past week.

**RS 17413C1:** **Tamara Baysinger**, from the Office of the State Board presented this RS to the Committee. She explained that the Office of Performance Evaluations recommended that the legislature clarify the definition of a public virtual school as found in Section 33-525A (6), Idaho Code. This new definition will provide more specific information for new virtual schools to include in their petitions and establish a clearer criteria for use in determining which of Idaho's existing schools may be considered public virtual schools. In response to a question from the Committee regarding working with directors of virtual programs in drafting this legislation, **Ms. Baysinger** explained that the Virtual School Association was contacted and input was received. Chairman Nonini explained that if the Committee decides to print this RS; at the bill hearing members of this Association would be able to come and testify. He further explained that at the bill hearing, the Committee can also hear from the Office of Performance Evaluations and the Joint Legislative Oversight Committee regarding this legislation.

**MOTION:** Rep. Wills made a motion to introduce **RS 17413C1** to print. On a voice vote, the motion carried.

**ADJOURN:** Chairman Nonini adjourned the meeting at 10:15 A.M.

---

Representative Bob Nonini  
Chairman

---

Claudia Howell  
Secretary

## MINUTES

### HOUSE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

**DATE:** January 28, 2008

**TIME:** 9 A.M.

**PLACE:** Room 148

**MEMBERS:** Chairman Nonini, Vice Chairman Shirley, Representatives Trail, Bradford, Block, Nielsen, Wills,, Shepherd (8), Marriott, Mortimer, Patrick, Thayn, Boe, Pence, Durst, Shively

**ABSENT/  
EXCUSED:** Rep. Chadderdon, Rep. Chavez

**GUESTS:** See attached list.

Chairman Nonini called the meeting to order at 9 A.M.

**MOTION:** Rep. Mortimer made a motion to approve the minutes of January 25<sup>th</sup> as submitted. The motion carried on a voice vote.

**MOTION:** Rep. Bradford made a motion to approve the minutes of January 22<sup>nd</sup> as submitted. On a voice vote, the motion carried.

**MOTION:** Rep. Patrick made a motion to approve the minutes of January 21<sup>st</sup> as submitted. On a voice vote, the motion carried.

**MOTION:** Rep. Shirley made a motion to approve the minutes of January 23<sup>rd</sup> as submitted. On a voice vote, the motion carried.

**Larry Callicut**, Director of the Idaho Department of Juvenile Corrections addressed the Committee. He introduced **Dr. Glenda Rohrbach**, Education Manager for the Department of Juvenile Corrections. He outlined changes that have started under his tenure for the Committee. He explained that the Governor requested that the Department develop meaningful and measurable objectives. He looked back on his 11 years with Department and tried to identify gaps. Four areas were identified. These areas include, victims, families, reintegration and professionalism. He explained that victims had not been given enough due notice. The Department has focused on more opportunities for offenders to write apology letters to victims and to understand the harm they caused. He explained that the goal of the Department is to involve families and have them participate in the process while juveniles are in the Department's custody. He explained that reintegration has been the weakest link. He further explained that it is important that the Department does something once the juvenile re enters the community. There is a need to make sure there are appropriate wrap around services. The latest achievement by the Department is that they have contracted for Functional Family Therapy and Reintegration Specialist services.

Another goal of the Department is to increase the level of professionalism of the Juvenile Corrections workforce. The objective is to train 100% of the staff with POST curriculum. He then discussed with the Committee juvenile population trends and the percentages of various disorders. Co-occurring disorders jumped from 16% in 2006 to 30% in 2007. In discussing the reason for this jump, **Director Callicut** explained that the Department is collecting their data in a different way. He further explained that the Department did not correctly show data in 2006. In response to questions regarding drug and alcohol disorders, he responded that it is rare to find youth using drugs that haven't used alcohol first. He further explained that the actual increase from 2006 to 2007 is about a 3 to 4% increase. He discussed the recidivism rates with the Committee. He explained that the difference in the percentages in 2005 was that the Department was tracking two years out, they are now tracking one year out. He reported that about 75% of offenses re occur during the first year of release. There was a discussion of the difference in numbers of youth arrested and those with formal petition process. He explained that detention is leveling off, and judges are finding alternative sanctions rather than detention. These sanctions include community based initiatives. He explained that the Department deals with juveniles in the 10 to 17 age group. He further explained that juveniles aged 10 until their 21<sup>st</sup> birthday come under their custody. He reported that 95% of juvenile services are provided at the local level by the county. He further reported that there are great people at the ground level and it is critical for local people to be able to do what they can. In response to Committee questions regarding early intervention of problem children, **Director Callicut** explained that if there were early intervention it would be lot easier to fix problems than when they are older. He introduced **Dr. Glenda Rohrbach** to discuss this issue.

She explained that there is research that shows kids that are high risk at an early age are the same kids that end up in juvenile detention. She further explained that it is best if it can be worked out with families and various communities have tried different attempts to involve families. In response to a Committee question regarding the state helping with this issue, **Dr. Rohrbach** explained that there are issues with some schools and it depends on the student. Some families are able to help and are not given the opportunity. The precursor to success in school depends on how well the parents have prepared the child for school. She discussed with the Committee the student achievement data and ISAT scores. She explained that 58% of the students in Juvenile Corrections showed improvement in reading. She further explained that about 40% of the students were proficient before they took the test. There are fewer students who are proficient in language. Students struggle in math. They often come in below basic and some students improve but still don't score proficient. In response to a Committee questions regarding data showing how much school they missed before coming into detention, **Dr. Rohrbach** explained that the Department does have access to that data. She further explained that the Department has started using computerized data, if a school requests data, it is sent to them. Before juvenile leaves facility, they contact the school. She discussed the GED scores with the Committee. She explained that they a do pre test prior to taking the GED to ensure they are successful. She further explained that research shows the more gains student makes in education, there will be less recidivism.

In discussing the gap with students making good growth while in detention, then going back to school, she explained that she has met with schools and at times the students are not successful. She explained that school is the most difficult place to return to and the success rate not where they want it to be. She explained that a high school diploma has better credibility than a GED. The Department almost always does a high school equivalency test at the same time as the GED. She explained that almost 80% of teachers at the St Anthony facility are ready to retire in the next 5 years. She further explained that teachers make same money in a year what regular teachers make in 10 months. Their teachers make about \$40,000 a year and work longer. Special education only students in are in three facilities, 44% qualify for special education services. There is a need for expanded vocational programs and the Department will talk with Legislature next year on this issue. She explained that the 45 to 55% percentage of juveniles qualifying for special education services should be 90 to 100%. The local school district provides teacher or services, but that may change in the future. In response to questions, **Dr. Rohrbach** explained that most families of the juveniles in detention are dysfunctional. She discussed the family demographics; some of the statistics include 5.3% of the juveniles are under foster care, 7% live with their grandparents, 36.3% live with their mother only, 18.2% with their stepparent, 11.3% with both biological parents, 25.1% reported some type of abuse by a family member, 38.9% reported abuse, and 38% live in poverty. It was further reported that there are 168,109 juveniles living in Idaho that are between the ages 10 to 17. About half are male. Most juvenile offenders are the reflection of environment they come from. In response to a questions regarding shipping offenders out of state, **Director Callicut** responded that only 6 juveniles are currently out of state because the state does not have the services to work with them. These juveniles are developmentally delayed and are sex offenders. He further reported that in 1996 there were 105 juveniles out of state. He explained that it costs about \$165/day for the Idaho youth ranch and \$202/day for juvenile detention. When questioned about if that state has treatment for developmentally delayed juveniles who are sex offenders, he responded that the state did have program, but there was a low number that was in this category, so the state went to a contract provider instead.

He discussed with the Committee "Solutions" which is a new unit being constructed at the Juvenile Corrections facility in Nampa that will serve 12 females and 12 males state custody juveniles with co-occurring disorders. He reported that it will be completed toward the end of May. The juveniles that will be housed there are determined by clinical staff based on risk and needs. The length of the program will vary, but the target is 12 months.

**Dr. Dennis Griffin**, president of the College of Western Idaho was introduced to the Committee by **Mark Dunham**, who is on the Board of Trustees from the College of Western Idaho (one of 5 trustees). **Mr. Dunham** explained that the Treasure Valley was largest population area in the country that did not have community college. Through the great effort of many hard working people, a referendum was passed in May of 2007 creating the Community College district. On July 30<sup>th</sup> the new trustees were installed. The group is currently working on the first steps to get the college up and running. **Dr. Griffin** was the executive director of Canyon county campus for Boise State University and also instructor for a long time.



He was made the interim president of the College of Western Idaho in August of 2007. He is now the president. **Dr. Griffin** explained that starting a community college from scratch has not been done in Idaho in 40 years. He introduced to the Committee **Dr. Victor Watson**, who is the Executive Vice President of Instruction and Student Services, and **Shirl Boyce**, Director of Community Relations and Advancement. **Dr. Griffin** explained that much has been accomplished in 4 months. He explained that CSI and NIC have been enormously helpful. They have visited other community colleges and want to learn best practices. They have found that the quickest route for accreditation is to partner with another institution. They have signed MOU with Boise State University, but that has changed recently and are now working with the College of Southern Idaho. They have also had to establish 70 to 80 policies and procedures. A long and short term strategic plan has also been written. When questioned if they have involved those who were vocal with their support of the Community College, **Mr. Boyce** explained that they are now in the process of working with an advisory committee on focus groups, specifically with those with an interest in community colleges for input into their strategic plan. **Dr. Griffin** explained that they have bought a computer system (ERP). He explained that the goal is by this summer to have all HR, payroll, and all other functions on the computer system. They have developed their '09 budget, and had thought that by this fall they would be able to offer classes, but all policies and procedures needed to be in place before that could happen. They would have also had to pay over \$2 million to BSU for computer services. The goal is to be independent as soon as possible. Based on that decision, he outlined timelines for the Committee. They have started offering non credit classes in January and are under contract with Selland College. He explained that every good community college has a sizable assessment center. They will be offering night classes in Boise and Meridian through the local high schools.

They plan to start with 20 full time and 40 part time instructors. In July of 2009 they plan to transfer the entire Selland College to CWI. He mentioned that they cannot receive property taxes until July 2009. He explained that they are putting their investments in the state investment pool with the Treasurer's office. He further explained that taxpayers in Ada and Canyon counties will be paying .020% of their property taxes for the college. He also explained that the Capital outlay costs went up in the budget due to the purchase of their new computer system. The tuition costs will be \$118/credit (half of what BSU charges), and \$1,180/semester. They will operate on the semester system to be able to work closely with sister colleges in the state. When asked if they were in favor of proposed legislation to raise tuition cap, **Mr. Dunham** explained that they need to look at the bill and they have no pro or con position. He further explained that when bill comes back, they weigh in with CSI and NIC (they both support it). When questioned regarding the long range future and if they were looking at intercollegiate athletics, **Dr. Griffin** explained that they are now concerned with nuts and bolts but have talked about college teams, but that would be way down the line.

Chairman Nonini thanked them for their presentation and wished them luck in the future. He announced that the Committee will hear from Dr. Kustra, President of Boise State University tomorrow. He further announced that the Committee will hear about the Medical Education Study done by the State Board on Thursday, January 31<sup>st</sup>. It was suggested that because of the length of the report, Committee members could get only the last three sections for review.

**ADJOURN:** Chairman Nonini adjourned the meeting at 10:55 A.M.

---

Representative Bob Nonini  
Chairman

---

Claudia Howell  
Secretary

## MINUTES

### HOUSE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

**DATE:** January 29, 2008

**TIME:** 9 A.M.

**PLACE:** Room 148

**MEMBERS:** Vice Chairman Shirley, Representatives Trail, Bradford, Block, Nielsen, Chadderdon, Shepherd (8), Marriott, Mortimer, Patrick, Thayn, Boe, Pence, Chavez, Durst, Shively

**ABSENT/  
EXCUSED:** Chairman Nonini, and Rep. Wills

**GUESTS:** See attached list.

Vice Chairman Shirley chaired the meeting due to the absence of Chairman Nonini who was presenting legislation in another committee. He called the meeting to order at 9 A.M. He welcomed guests and recognized former Speaker of the House, **Bruce Newcomb**, who now works with Boise State University.

**MOTION:** Rep. Shively made a motion to approve the minutes from January 28<sup>th</sup>, 2008 as submitted. On a voice vote, the motion carried.

**Bruce Newcomb** introduced **Dr. Bob Kustra**, President of Boise State University to the Committee. He reported that it has been a pleasure working with Dr. Kustra, whom he feels has a vision for Boise State University to make it a metropolitan university for now and in the future. He further reported that he has great respect for him. **Dr. Kustra** addressed the committee. He mentioned that he is currently in his 5<sup>th</sup> year as President of BSU. He explained that during and before serving in the Legislature in Illinois; he served on the faculty of various institutions in Illinois. He enjoyed working with students. He asked that Committee members go to their computers and first google "Fiesta Bowl", in which they would find on the second page of the search the classic football game with BSU. He then asked that they google "Magnetic shape-memory foams", and explained that they would find information on the first page of the search that shows that this is a new class of materials that has been developed at BSU. He further explained that the lead researcher in developing this foam is on the faculty of BSU. This foam has applications in space and in automobiles. The foam is harder, more solid and light as a feather than the current materials used to make automobiles.

He explained that the principal challenge at BSU is growth. He further explained that the University has received tremendous support from the Legislature and from Micron. He explained that when the University decided to create a Materials Science and Engineering program, they went to Micron for initial funding and Micron gave them the seed money. In discussing the growth in enrollment figures, he explained that there is a dip in enrollment due to the establishment of the College of Western Idaho taking some of

the freshmen and sophomores from BSU.

There is a need for the University to get ready for juniors coming out of CWI. He explained that over the last 5 yrs, the University has experienced 2% annual growth. He further explained that in the fall of 2008, enrollment has gone up 3%. There are currently 19,540 students enrolled at BSU. There has been a 44% increase in growth since 1990. There has been an increase in the strength of the science and engineering programs. He explained that high tech jobs are being created in Idaho, but there is a need to find people to put into these jobs. The challenge is to find computer science people. He reported that Microsoft is looking for 650 computer science graduates to start working tomorrow. BSU has a PhD and graduate program in computer science to prepare people here for jobs in Idaho. BSU has the only executive MBA program in the state. Students attend classes one night a week and on Saturdays and don't have to give up their jobs. Students need to be in Treasure Valley to take the courses. In response to a question regarding the lack of trained engineers and recruitment of people outside of the United States, **Dr. Kustra** explained that we have federally funded research programs to help with this issue. He further explained that it starts in the middle schools to get students up to speed. In response to a question regarding how the impact of CWI on BSU was calculated, **Dr. Kustra** explained that it is not an exact science and it is difficult for CWI to know how many students will enroll. He further explained that BSU will have to do more marketing and PR, but it will not happen overnight. The numbers are based on the transfer of Selland College, which has 1,200 students, from BSU to CWI. He further explained that there may be other students who are in high school that would be attracted by lower cost of CWI. There is a need to assess the enrollment numbers next year. He explained that there has been a 40 to 60% increase in undergraduates for next year. He further explained that he does not think CWI will have a significant impact on BSU. In response to a question regarding the executive MBA program and if students could live elsewhere, **Dr. Kustra** responded that students could live somewhere else and travel to the Treasure Valley to take classes.

**Dr. Kustra** reported that Heather Rae, on the BSU faculty, recently won the Grand Jury Prize for her film at Sundance Film Festival. He is currently working with Heather to create a film studies program at the University. He then discussed the University's growth in discovery and invention. BSU has received \$27 million in FY07 in federal research grants. There is a need to understand the economic impact and also adding jobs to the economy of Idaho. He discussed the Statewide impact of BSU. He explained that there has been a 61% increase in student enrollment from northern Idaho. He reported that BSU is in its 3<sup>rd</sup> year of offering a National Merit Scholarship Program. The National Merit Scholarship students receive a full ride scholarship and stipend. **Dr. Kustra** reported that the University is trying to accommodate more students that want to live on campus. They are working with a large firm to come and help build on campus housing. BSU currently has 2,300 beds on campus for students.

**Dr. Kustra** explained that \$8.4 million dollars of the General Fund appropriation is being used for salary, new faculty, to help ensure student success, research oversight, facilities operations support and technology and data security. He further explained that the University has to be diligent about how they spend federal money and compliance is a major issue.

In response to a question regarding the Governor's proposed reduction in benefits along with the 5% raise and if it would be an issue for BSU, **Dr. Kustra** explained that there is a need to look at Idaho and compare with other states the total compensation package. He further explained that he brought his concerns to a meeting with the Department of Administration and came away from the meeting feeling it was a fair approach. He discussed with the Committee the challenges of BSU. Currently the University enrolls 41.1% of students in the state, but receives 31.5% of the General Fund appropriation. He explained that he does want to make sure this is not a pattern. He explained that where there is enrollment growth, it should be funded. He reported that BSU is asking for funding for the first ever building for research. BSU is in the planning process to build the Center for Environmental Science and Economic Development. It is intended to be a 21<sup>st</sup> century metropolitan research building. There will be 5 stories of research labs. He explained that there is \$10 million in the Governor's budget, but the University still needs \$5 million more. There is a plan in place not officially approved.

It was mentioned that the retention rate should go up for BSU because students who are not quite ready for college could attend CWI, and then go on to BSU. **Dr. Kustra** explained that one of the purposes of a community colleges is to deal with students who have difficulties. In response to a question regarding the money possibly received by BSU for the development of the memory foam product, **Dr. Kustra** explained that BSU has Intellectual Property rights and from the beginning know what the patents are and know what is intellectual property. He further added that BSU has hired a full time lawyer to keep track of Intellectual Property Division. He stated that he did not know the amount money that would be involved in the development of this product. It will vary across departments and colleges. In response to a question regarding the Idaho Opportunity Scholarship and other needs based scholarships, **Dr. Kustra** explained that he is very much concerned about students who come to BSU because the average debt load is \$19,000. It is a problem for students. He explained that the Opportunity Scholarship Program is very important. He further explained that financial need is one of the reasons why too many students in Idaho choose to pass up higher education. He explained that is not the only reason, however. There are cultural issues in Idaho and also access issues. He reported that there was a recent study done that tracked 18 to 24 year olds in the country. It found that in Michigan, 44% of this age group attended higher education, while in Idaho only 26% attended higher education which was the lowest in the nation. He explained that this issue also has to do with what goes on inside homes and the hopes and expectations from parents. He further explained that we should be talking about it and helping people understand the importance of attending college. When asked about the possibility of manufacturing the foam product in the state, **Dr. Kustra** explained that he did not know yet, but likely it would be done outside of Idaho. When asked if it were more expensive to educate a commuter student rather than one who lives on campus, he responded that there is no significant difference. In response to a question regarding the University's ethical oversight of research, he explained that the University does have oversight. He explained that BSU is not yet involved in the research that would raise ethical questions. BSU has an office of Institutional Research. The faculty are aware of what they are doing and the implications their research might have.

In response to a question regarding concurrent enrollment, **Dr. Kustra** explained that BSU has 950 students in 2008 enrolled in concurrent enrollment thanks to the efforts of the State Board of Education. BSU has added a staff member at BSU to help with this issue. BSU has identified a given number of faculty qualified to teach concurrent enrollments classes, but not at the expense of quality. He explained that there should be a way to put a program together that is strong academically. In response to a question regarding a new PhD program being offered at BSU, **Dr. Kustra** explain that they will be offering a PhD in Public Policy in addition to several other new Masters degrees.

Vice Chairman Shirley thanked Dr. Kustra for his presentation and his strong leadership at Boise State University.

**ADJOURN:** Vice Chairman Shirley adjourned the meeting at 10:15 A.M.

---

Vice Chairman Shirley  
Chairman

---

Claudia Howell  
Secretary

## MINUTES

### HOUSE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

**DATE:** January 30, 2008

**TIME:** 9 A.M.

**PLACE:** Room 148

**MEMBERS:** Chairman Nonini, Vice Chairman Shirley, Representatives Bradford, Block, Nielsen, Wills, Chadderdon, Shepherd (8), Marriott, Mortimer, Patrick, Thayn, Boe, Pence, Chavez, Durst, Shively

**ABSENT/  
EXCUSED:** Rep. Trail

**GUESTS:** See attached list.

Chairman Nonini called the meeting to order at 9 A.M.

**MOTION:** Rep. Shively made a motion to approve the minutes from the January 29<sup>th</sup>, 2008 meeting as submitted. On a voice vote, the motion carried.

Chairman Nonini invited **Sherri Wood**, president of IEA to address the Committee. She explained that last week in the joint hearings with the Senate Education Committee, members had asked for the research that the weTEACH legislation was based on. She provided Committee members with a condensed version of that research and the Committee secretary with the entire research should the members want to see it. Chairman Nonini explained that he did not know when the Senate Education Committee will discuss the proposed iSTARS and weTEACH legislation.

Chairman Nonini informed the Committee members that they received a letter from Dr. Beck, president of the College of Southern Idaho, outlining information on the Idaho Opportunity Scholarship. It was mentioned that North Idaho College had no students using the Opportunity Scholarship as of date. Committee members requested a list from each University regarding the amount of students using the Opportunity Scholarship. The Committee secretary will get the list for Committee members.

Chairman Nonini introduced **James Fox** with the Associated Student organization at the University of Idaho to the Committee. **Mr. Fox** explained that currently 109 students from the University of Idaho are on the Opportunity Scholarship. He introduced **Kristen Caldwell**, a senator from the U of I Associated Students and **Amy Huddleston**, Vice President of the Associated Students from the U of I.

**Roy Eiguren** introduced **Eric Anderson**, from the National Chess Foundation to the Committee. He explained that he has worked with **Mr. Anderson** on board of directors of Avista Corporation. He further explained that **Mr. Anderson** has a passion for chess and has started a foundation to put chess into the elementary schools.

**Mr. Anderson** has served as an investment banker and owns his own investment firm. **Mr. Anderson** then addressed the Committee. He explained that the goal and vision of America's Chess Foundation is to put chess in every 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> grade classroom in America. He explained that he is working with businesses and families to bring together a coalition .

Superintendent **Tom Luna** introduced this program to the Committee. He explained that he had talked to **Mr. Anderson** about this program last year, and thought it was a great program and wanted to advance it quickly in Idaho. **Mr. Luna** is supportive of the "First Move" program put together by private individuals. He explained that the focus is on using chess to enhance a number of different curricula including math and critical thinking skills. He explained that it is a very successful curriculum. He offered this program to the first 100 classrooms in the state who voluntarily signed up to participate in this pilot project. He reported that teachers have been using chess to teach about history, math, critical thinking skills, and manners. He further explained that he has visited classrooms in this pilot project and was impressed. The children are very engaged. Discipline is taking place while students play the chess game correctly and they are learning a lot of history.

**Wendi Fisher**, Vice President of the First Move Program presented a powerpoint presentation to the Committee and discussed efforts to expand this program in Idaho. She explained that teachers are using chess as an educational tool in the classroom. The students have fun, increased social skills and teachers also learn. She further explained that the program has high value at low cost, reinforces things like critical thinking, helps to build self esteem, channel energy, develop analytical skills and helps with discipline. Students learn how to slow down and think and analyze rather than react. She explained that the standards are based on curriculum that builds self esteem. The principles of the program provide high quality research and standards based curriculum, focus on student outcomes, continual assess, and reinforces teachers. She reported that most students who received chess instruction scored higher academically. The program is currently being mapped to Idaho state standards. The program holds to rigorous evaluations. She explained that the First Move program is partnering with University of Oregon to evaluate the first year of program. **Ms. Fisher** explained that the First Move program is a complete package. It includes a two year curriculum. It includes chess sets for the class and chess sets for the students to take home. First Move provides support including teacher training and mentoring. It also provides technology which includes an online community and online play (highly restricted, players just know where the students are located). Currently First Move is in 18 states. She explained that 94% of the teachers say First Move is valuable use of classroom time, 100% say it is engaging, and 88% think student's higher thinking skills have improved. Language, ethnic background, size and shape don't matter. Chess is easy to learn, and has smart "brand association". **Ms. Fisher** reported that **Carol Schulz**, Idaho's Teacher of the Year, thinks the program is outstanding. The First Move program is priced \$625 per classroom for year one, \$325 per classroom in year two and \$175 per classroom in year three. There are currently 106 classrooms in Idaho participating in the First Move program and they are already seeing benefits. The goal is to reach all 1,600 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> grade classrooms in Idaho. Idaho would be first state to implement the First Move program on statewide basis.



In response to questions from Committee members, **Ms. Fisher** explained that if schools want to participate in the program after the 3<sup>rd</sup> grade they could continue using chess with cross curricular activities found on websites and host family chess nights. In response to a question regarding if the program would affect interaction on playground, **Ms. Fisher** explained that some have seen children shaking hands before playing chess on playground and in some schools discipline referrals have gone down dramatically. She explained that they have found that the program brings kids together of all ability levels. Kids who least expect to excel do and it is generally a positive thing. In response to a question regarding class time used, **Mr. Fisher** explained that it varies from school to school. Some teachers use it as math time, others use time from other curriculum. In clarifying the cost of the program, she explained that \$625 is direct program costs and that is what school or district pays for. The rest of costs are picked up by national office. She further clarified that the past year the Idaho State Department of Education paid for the First Move program which was implemented in 106 classrooms. **Superintendent Luna** explained that the Department has pledged to pay for the first year, then school or districts would pay for next year. **Ms. Fisher** explained that the \$625 is bare bone costs and there is no profit built in. **Mr. Anderson** explained that those who serve on the National Board for America's Foundation for Chess pay \$25,000 a year to be on the Board. **Ms. Fisher** explained that the child does keep the chessboard. She further explained that if Idaho were to implement this program statewide there would be an ongoing cost of \$281,000 per year. **Luci Willits**, from the State Department of Education, explained that the Department put forth \$60,000 last year for this program. She further explained that the Department will try to give first year free for schools, then the individual schools or districts would have to absorb costs.

Chairman Nonini mentioned that this is worthwhile program. He explained that there is a new magnet school in his district in Coeur d'Alene and he and his wife have made donation of \$625 so the third grade classroom there can have this program. He distributed donor cards to Committee members. Rep. Chadderdon said she would support this program in her district. He suggested that Committee members find from Superintendent's office which classrooms are participating in their districts so they can visit those classrooms. It was mentioned that they would like to have all 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> grade classrooms in each school participate in this program. **Eric Anderson** shared story about NFL Football star Shaun Alexander who is a major donor to the Foundation. Mr. Alexander has identified three programs nationwide that he would support and America's Foundation for Chess is one of them. He donates \$100,000 a year for this program. **Sherri Wood**, with IEA responded to the Committee members about what she has heard from the teachers about this program. She reported that teachers in high poverty schools have found that the First Move program bridges all gaps between the kids. Children who are severely disabled can excel at chess. She has heard many positive things about program.

Chairman Nonini explained that this program is a great collaborative effort, and it is all about the kids. Committee members were asked to encourage businesses in their own communities to participate in donating to this program. It was mentioned that this would be something small businesses could do to contribute to this program.

**Eric Anderson** is working with **Superintendent Luna** on ways to galvanize the state to have this program statewide. It was suggested that may they could bring Shaun Alexander to Idaho. The contact information for Wendi Fisher is [wendi@af4c.org](mailto:wendi@af4c.org)

**Kris Ball**, president of the Meridian Parent Advocates for Gifted Education (PAGE) addressed the Committee. She explained the mission of PAGE is to foster an understanding of all gifted children and their unique needs and to advocate for appropriate education through partnerships with educators, parents, administrators and legislators. She explained that the term “gifted” is in itself a problem for many people, since it seems to carry with it overtones of elitism; however, it is still the most commonly used term in literature and media. She further explained that contrary to what so many believe, a gifted mind is not necessarily able to find its own way. In discussing IQ scores, she explained that three percent of the population falls under 70 in the IQ test and are considered special needs and require full time aides. Three percent of the population falls above 130 in the IQ test and is considered gifted and just different from the norm of 100 as special needs. She brought with her three students in the gifted program. **Colton Grainger** is 13 years old and attends Lowell Scott Middle School. He is dual enrolled at Centennial High School taking a chemistry class. He explained that the GT program has taught him how to be upbeat and never quit. The program has eliminated busy work and repetitive teaching techniques and has made learning much easier. He explained that he wants to be a research scientist someday and he doesn't know where he wants to go to college yet. **Gabe Ball** is 10 years old and in the 4<sup>th</sup> grade at Peregrine Elementary School. He explained that in his gifted class he is motivated to learn, but in his regular class he was bored and got bad grades. When questioned about the difference between his regular class and his GT class, he explained that in his GT class he learns a lot faster, and does not have to do things over again. There are 12 students in his GT self contained classroom. It is a 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> grade combined classroom. **Stone Wilson** is in the 5<sup>th</sup> grade, he asked for a budget for GT program. He explained that the subjects are more challenging in the GT class.

In response to Committee questions, **Ms. Ball** explained that they definitely encourage dual enrollment. Some GT students would have to take college level classes because they have gone beyond the math and science classes offered at the high school. She explained that children can get more self esteem from the gifted program than regular classroom. GT self contained classrooms enable students to find peers. She explained that the Idaho learning academy could be a great tool. She further explained that some students tend to do better in the actual classroom. With the learning academy, her son wanted to take geometry online but was not able to do that because he couldn't go and use school computers during the day. She explained that the federal government spent approximately \$8 billion dollars last year on the students scoring in the lower end of the IQ scale, and only \$800 million was spent on students in the higher end of the scale. She further explained that this money was spent solely on teacher training.

**Julie Grainger**, treasurer of the Meridian PAGE group discussed the economic advantage of supporting gifted education. She explained that Idaho businesses need the best and brightest to compete in a global economy.

She further explained that gifted children need emotional and academic support to reach their full potential. She reported that approximately 1/5 of high school dropouts were from the gifted range. Currently there are no incentives for teachers to get more training to be gifted teachers. These teachers have to be unique and different. There is a need to make accommodations for bright kids.

**Kris Ball** discussed the funding restraints that limit identification and availability of gifted program. There is a need to focus on gifted children. Currently funding comes from discretionary funds. Districts should be funded based on enrollment, not attendance. There is a 6% discrepancy between attendance statistics and enrollment statistics. She reported that approximately 300 gifted students have been identified in elementary schools in Meridian, but the district can only serve 75. Four additional teachers are needed to teach gifted students for the coming year. There is also a concern about the current ISAT tests. She explained that the current vendor provides no growth measure and there are no national norms. In response to a question regarding the NAPE test, **Ms. Ball** explained the NAPE test is only administered in specific schools. She further explained that she will be addressing these concerns with the ISAT test to the State Board of Education. She reported that PAGE does support SCR 122 which directs the Legislature to study the current funding formula. In response to a question regarding testing, she explained that there are private tests for identifying gifted children. In the Meridian school district they are required to meet specific standards. The tests have to be administered through a psychologist or psychiatrist. If a parent chooses to test their child privately it is very costly. It was mentioned that gifted children appear across the socio-economic spectrum, their needs are just as important as the children with special needs. Currently those needs are not being met.

Chairman Nonini expressed his appreciation for the interesting presentation and the parent's passion for children's education.

Rep. Wills, presented the students with Idaho House of Representatives pins for their courage in testifying before the Committee.

**ADJOURN:**

There being no further business before the Committee, Chairman Nonini adjourned meeting at 11:05.

---

Representative Bob Nonini  
Chairman

---

Claudia Howell  
Secretary

## MINUTES

### HOUSE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

**DATE:** January 31, 2008

**TIME:** 9 A.M.

**PLACE:** Room 148

**MEMBERS:** Chairman Nonini, Vice Chairman Shirley, Representatives Trail, Bradford, Block, Nielsen, Wills, Chadderdon, Shepherd (8), Marriott, Mortimer, Patrick, Thayn, Boe, Pence, Chavez, Durst, Shively

**ABSENT/  
EXCUSED:** None

**GUESTS:** See attached list.

Because Chairman Nonini was at a meeting, Vice Chairman Shirley called the meeting to order at 9 A.M. He welcomed the guests present and recognized **Milford Terrell**, President of the State Board of Education, **Laird Stone**, past president of the State Board, and Executive Director of the State Board **Mike Rush** who were present.

**RS 17740:** Rep. Jim Patrick presented this RS to the Committee. He explained that the proposed legislation will amend the existing statute Idaho Code Section 33-130 to clarify the requirements of school contractors to have background checks for employees in direct contact with school children. He explained that he has seen a gap regarding contract school employees and they are currently not required by law to have background checks. Employees of school district contractors are also not currently covered. He further explained that many companies do provide background checks, but wants to make sure it is required by law. The proposed legislation spells out specifically what types of background that would preclude someone working with children. In response to a question regarding if the proposed legislation would include coaches, drill team instructors, cooks, and janitors; he replied that if the person is an employee of the school, they are currently included in the current law. He explained that if the person is a contractor, they would be included in the proposed legislation. He further explained that if the person is a paid contractor, they would be covered in legislation, if they are not paid they would not be covered. There was a concern raised about the issue of volunteers in the schools and the definition of "direct contact", Rep. Patrick responded that the proposed legislation would be defined as any contact with a child. It was suggested by Committee members that Rep. Patrick could obtain comments from the Attorney General's office regarding this issue when the bill is brought back before the Committee. It was further suggested that Rep. Patrick explain to the Committee how agencies such as the State Board of Education and the Administrators feel about the proposed legislation.

**MOTION:** Rep. Marriott made a motion to introduce **RS 17740** to print. On a voice vote, the motion carried.

**Mark Browning**, from the Idaho State Board of Education introduced the Medical Education Study Report to the Committee. Committee members were given a CD with the entire report and a two page summary report. He acknowledged the cooperation of the institutions of higher education with their help with this study. He also mentioned that **Mike Killworth** from the State Board has also worked hard on this study.

**Laird Stone**, immediate Past President of the State Board and Chairman of the Medical Education Study Committee for the State Board, discussed the report with the Committee. He explained that **SB 1210** in that last legislative session appropriated \$300,000 to SBOE for a medical study to determine the need and feasibility of increased medical education opportunities in Idaho. The bill also stipulates that the Board report those findings and make recommendations to the second session of the 59<sup>th</sup> Idaho Legislature. The Board contracted with MGT of America, Inc. to conduct the study. The MGT study report was presented to the State Board at their December 2007 meeting. He explained that the report is a good starting point and did an excellent job of documenting the significant need for more physicians in the state. **Mr. Stone** discussed some of the major findings included in the report. These findings include the following; compared to other states, access by the general population to physicians is extremely limited in Idaho, Idaho ranks high in the number of physicians aged 55 and older, the state's population base is sufficient to support the clinical components of a medical education program, there is a large number of highly qualified Idahoans available and searching for medical education opportunities, Idaho is next to last among the states in the number of graduate medical education seats per capita, and less populated states than Idaho have supported medical schools for years.

**Mr. Stone** reported that the Board will be hosting public hearings in April regarding this issue to receive more input on the type of medical education people would like to see in Idaho. The Board intends to come back in 2009 to the Legislature with specific recommendations. He explained that there is a need for more study on this issue. There is a need for a more comprehensive inventory of medical and science courses that are available at Idaho's institutions of higher education. There is also a need for more information on contracts currently have with Washington and the University of Utah and more information on the residency programs in Idaho. **Mr. Stone** explained that the key components are the lesser and greater economic impact and there is a need for more information on those terms. There is also a need to know how much it is going to cost and how will it benefit state of Idaho.

**Mr. Stone** explained that the Board has looked at a model in South Dakota. He explained that the state does have qualified students that want to go on in medical education, but there are currently not enough seats for them. It was mentioned that the cost of healthcare is an issue that needs to be looked at. **Mr. Stone** explained that the report itself does not say that if Idaho had a medical program; the cost of health care would go down, but it is implied. There may be an economic impact. When questioned about the cost of establishing more medical education in the state, **Mr. Stone** explained that the costs in the report are estimated costs and are just general numbers. He explained that the \$60 million figure may be way too high.

He explained that the increase of medical education in the state will have positive economic impact. He clarified that residency programs do not have to be in one place. He discussed the options for increased medical education. These options include; create a new university-operated medical school, expand contract programs with medical schools in other states, develop a new joint medical school from current medical education resources, and expand graduate medical education programs in the state. He explained that under any of the options there would be cost involved, and merging of existing programs. He further explained that there is a need for accreditation and a need to work with National Liaison Committee for Accreditation. **Mr. Stone** discussed the proposed plan of action of the State Board. Some of the components of this plan include; in early March the first committee meeting of the SBOE Medical Education Study Committee will meet, they will meet again in April to get input from various stakeholders and then also hold public hearings in various parts of the state in April, the committee will meet again in May and review public comments, establish criteria for final recommendation and reach consensus for recommendations for the full SBOE, finally in June the Board will receive the Medical Education Study Committee's recommendations for a final decision by the full Board. The Board will then report to the 2009 Legislature.

In response to Committee questions, **Mr. Stone** explained that a public and private partnership such as the one in South Dakota is good model. He also explained that Wyoming has a loan forgiveness program to attract physicians to the state, and the Board is looking at this program to see if it has been successful. In discussing the various options with the Committee, he explained that the quickest way to increase medical education in the state is to expand residency programs. The limiting factor is the money. He further explained that if we choose one option for a stand alone medical school it could take 10 to 12 years to establish.

Chairman Nonini returned from his meeting and chaired the meeting.

**Mr. Stone** explained that the Board does not know the economic costs yet. He further explained that it would take 10 to 12 years for a brick and mortar medical school. In response to questions, **Mr. Stone** explained that Lewiston has been added as a location for the public hearings scheduled for April. There was a discussion of the problems with getting trained physicians to stay in rural communities that have to pay back huge student loans. He explained that we are looking at providing medical education at a lesser cost to keep physicians in the state. There is a need to look at the numbers to see if there is a cost benefit to the state. It was mentioned that competition is a good thing because consumers have more choices. It was further mentioned that insurance companies need to be involved in this discussion about making health care costs more affordable. **Mr. Stone** explained that insurance companies would be part of the public input meetings. There is a need for a buy in from the legislature and the people of Idaho. It was mentioned that North Idaho has the fastest growing senior population in the state. Senior citizens moving to northern Idaho are having a hard time finding health care. There is a need for specialized doctors. He explained that the major factor in recruiting physicians is the spouse. In response to questions regarding if weight is given in accreditation if the state had it's own medical education facility, **Mr. Stone** explained that there would have to be a physical facility and there has to be a center for the programs.

There is a need to have a core location and it would not be an issue for accreditation. He explained that the Board has already done two inventories of facilities in the state. They have received reports from institutions as to what facilities they have available. When questioned whether the Board has considered how to establish clinical sites, **Mr. Stone** explained that there are benefits of having a clinical site but it takes a big chunk of income from physicians to establish a clinic. He further explained that at this point, SBOE does not know and will be addressing this issue over the next couple of months. It is a valid concern that is not addressed in the report. In response to a question regarding if Tribal members have been included as a partner in discussion, he explained that they can be included and would be invited to the public hearings for input. It was mentioned that 80% of physicians remain in Idaho that go to residencies in the state. All of Idaho's WWAMI physicians come to Idaho. There are loan repayment opportunities for physicians who practice in rural Idaho. It was mentioned that one of things that drive the high cost of medical services is high jury verdicts.

Chairman Nonini applauded the Board for their thoroughness of this report. It was mentioned that SBOE will next meet on February 28<sup>th</sup>, and meet again in April. The Medical Education Committee is trying to coordinate dates for their next meeting.

**Milford Terrell**, president of State Board addressed the Committee. He explained that the Board received the medical education study report only hours before their last meeting in December. He further explained that his recommendation is give at least another year to put together all of the details. He explained that there is a lot of fine detail and the Board is looking at 15 or 20 years down the line. There is a need to bring in consultants to let them know how much it would cost to set out the system and accreditation issues need to be addressed. The Board wants to make sure input is gotten from everyone. He asked Committee members to have patience and let the Board do it the right way. It was mentioned that the Committee will look forward to hearing from the State Board in a year. It was explained that there was no need for legislative approval to extend the time for the State Board to present their findings.

**ADJOURN:**

Chairman Nonini announced that the Committee will not meet tomorrow, Friday, February 1<sup>st</sup>. As there was no further business before the Committee, Chairman Nonini adjourned the meeting at 10:25 A.M.

---

Representative Bob Nonini  
Chairman

---

Claudia Howell  
Secretary

## MINUTES

### HOUSE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

- DATE:** February 4, 2008
- TIME:** 9 A.M.
- PLACE:** Room 148
- MEMBERS:** Chairman Nonini, Vice Chairman Shirley, Representatives Trail, Bradford, Block, Nielsen, Wills, Marriott, Mortimer, Patrick, Thayn, Boe, Pence, Chavez, Durst, Shively
- ABSENT/  
EXCUSED:** Rep. Chadderdon and Rep. Shepherd (8)
- GUESTS:** See attached list.
- Chairman Nonini called the meeting to order at 9 A.M.
- MOTION:** Rep. Shively made a motion to approve the minutes of January 30<sup>th</sup> and January 31<sup>st</sup> as submitted. On a voice vote, the motion carried.
- HB 385:** **Rep. Bill Killen** presented this bill to the Committee. He explained that this legislation says thank you to the members of our National Guard for their service to Idaho. It extends to non-resident members of Idaho's Guard the opportunity to attend the state's universities and colleges at resident rates. He explained that the proposed legislation would extend to both officers and enlisted members of the Idaho National Guard. It was pointed out by Committee members that on page 4, line 14 of the bill it should read "WWAMI" instead of "WAMI" and to also add Wyoming to the list of states included in the medical residency consortium. In response to a question regarding the institutions of higher education's response on the possible loss of revenue, **Rep. Killen** explained that he had talked to universities, and they said they could not comment, but were in support of the proposed legislation. He further explained that he thought fiscal impact would be substantially less and that it was a conservative figure. In response to question regarding educational benefits received by military personnel, **Dave Dahle**, an attorney with Idaho National Guard responded that the Army National Guard and Air National Guard receive federal assistance with tuition. He further explained that the Air National Guard does not receive as much as the Army National Guard in tuition assistance. He explained that federal tuition assistance will not remain for years to come. He also explained that Idaho has lost students to other states because there are more incentives for Idaho students to go to other states, since Idaho currently doesn't provide in state tuition. Rep. Mortimer reported that his son currently receives VA benefits for \$1,500 a month to cover tuition and books, and will receive it for 36 months. It was also mentioned that the University of Idaho has started a scholarship fund for disabled returning military students.
- MOTION:** Rep. Wills made a motion to send **HB 385** to **General Orders with the Committee amendments attached** to change "WAMI" to "WWAMI" and to include Wyoming on page 4, line 14 of the bill. Rep. Block seconded the motion. On a voice vote, the motion passed.



**Lloyd Knight** from the Division of Financial Management presented the Governor's Public Schools Budget Proposals. He explained that the Governor is recommending a 5% increase in salary for teachers, administrators, and classified staff. He further explained that it is an increase to the base and it equates to approximately \$30 million for teachers. He also explained that the Governor did not recommend funding for **Superintendent Luna's** iSTARS merit based compensation plan. **Mr. Knight** explained that the Governor would like the increase to go through some kind of merit program. There is currently no merit based system in place. He further explained that if the Legislature does not approve a merit based system, the 5% would go in the base. There would be no 5% increase in the minimum teacher's salary. In response to questions regarding the support of concurrent enrollment and the fact that the Governor did not recommend funding for this, **Mr. Knight** responded that there are a number of programs already working in the state and students are already enrolled in courses and benefitting from concurrent enrollment. Because there were a number of requests and existing programs, the Governor did not recommend additional money for concurrent enrollment. He explained that the Public School's line items were considered and the Governor made a decision on his own. It was also mentioned that the Governor did not recommend an additional \$4 million for the Math Initiative. **Mr. Knight** explained that it was felt that the Initiative was too expensive. It was mentioned that the Governor does support and additional \$5 million for remediation and should support the funding for the Math Initiative. **Mr. Knight** explained that it is not a policy recommendation, just dollars and cents decision regarding the math initiative. In response to Committee questions, he explained that the classroom supplies increase was due to an increase in the number of teachers. It was also mentioned that the Craig-Wyden fund was not funded in the budget. In response to a question regarding the non funding of the Longitudinal data system, **Mr. Knight** explained that the item was moved from Public Schools Budget to the Superintendent's Budget and the Governor is recommending \$3.5 million. In response to Committee question regarding dual enrollment **Mr. Knight** explained that the Governor does think that dual enrollment is important, but there are existing programs. He further explained that there has been three different requests from three different budgets regarding this issue. He further explained that part of the Governor's concern is that the state needs to have specifics of the program. In response to a question regarding if the Governor is receptive to increasing the base pay of teachers without a reduction in benefits, **Mr. Knight** explained that each school district handles benefits themselves. The State provides money to them and 18.04% of salary is for benefits. He further explained that it would be a policy discussion. He also explained that the Governor believes strongly in the benefits package reflecting what is currently happening in business world. When questioned regarding the Safe and drug free school money possibly being used for other things, **Luci Willits**, representing the Department of Education, responded that the Coordinator for Safe and Drug free schools would be able to better answer the question at a later time. With regard to the access of some of the money in lottery fund, she explained that **Superintendent Luna** would discuss this issue when he presents his budget to the Committee. In response to a questions regarding the funding for classroom supplies and if it included librarians and other staff other than teachers, **Ms. Willits** explained that it only is for classroom teachers.

It was explained that the Agency did request a 1% increase in discretionary funds, but the Governor did not recommend the increase. It was mentioned that income revenues in low 3%, and the Governor is asking for 5% increase in salaries. It will be difficult when JFAC starts setting budgets. It is a smaller pie than what they thought they had. **Mr. Knight** explained that if line item is not recommended, it does not mean it isn't as important. The reality is that the pie is always limited. There was a concern expressed about no safety net for rural Idaho schools and the increase in transportation costs. He explained that the state is required to reimburse for travel costs. He further explained that in FY 07 the state did get the monies to the districts and there was enough money left over for a deposit to the Public Stabilization Fund. He explained that there was more revenue than disbursements in FY 07. When questioned about the makeup of dedicated funds from endowment revenue, he explained that he would get the specific numbers for the Committee. In response to a question regarding the Bond levy equalization fund, he explained that as districts pass additional bonds in the future, the number will increase. It was mentioned that there should be limits or control over this number. He explained that nearly \$30 million dollars in the Public Schools budget is attributed to growth. In response to a question regarding the Rural schools initiative that was eliminated in Governor's budget, **Mr. Knight** responded that DFM did not have report for rural district task force yet, so there was no recommendation yet. Another area of concern was the amount of money in the Early Retirement fund. It was explained that there was talk about eliminating this fund, but after speaking to IEA's Sherri Wood and Jim Shackelford, it was found that this is a worthwhile program and does save the state some money.

New Executive Director of the Idaho State Historical Society, **Janet Gallimore** addressed the Committee. She explained that the vision of the Idaho State Historical Society is to inspire, enrich and engage all Idahoans by leading the state in preserving and sharing our dynamic cultural heritage. She explained that the Society was established as a state agency in 1907. They serve nearly 100,000 on site visitors annually and have over 700,000 website visits. They are the stewards of and provide public access to 250,000 artifacts, 65,000 cubic feet of manuscript and state archives material, 30,000 rolls of microfilm, including Idaho newspapers dating from 1863 to the present, 500,000 photographic images, an extensive oral history collection, Idaho's inventory of records for archaeological sites and 60 historic buildings throughout the state. The Society serves over 20,000 children through curriculum aligned programming at the museum and Old Pen sites. National History Day engages thousands of Idaho students in history each year. She explained that many of the historic sites have been transformed from their initial use to serve diverse educational needs today. She further explained that the Society's Board recently approved a strategic plan. Some of the new major initiatives include; the Digital Initiatives Program, a pilot project funded by a grant that seeks to explore the emerging role of digital collections and will incorporate digital representations of mining related materials into an online educational exhibit with a searchable database and the renewed Statehouse in which the Society's staff has been responsible for all collections management activities for materials from the Statehouse that had to be relocated and conserved as part of the Statehouse restoration.

She explained that they are planning to expand the state museum. She further explained that she would be happy to take Committee members on a tour of State Penetinary.

**ADJOURN:** As there was no further business to be brought before the Committee, Chairman Nonini adjourned at 10:40 A.M.

---

Representative Bob Nonini  
Chairman

---

Claudia Howell  
Secretary

## MINUTES

### HOUSE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

**DATE:** February 5, 2008

**TIME:** 9 A.M.

**PLACE:** Room 148

**MEMBERS:** Chairman Nonini, Vice Chairman Shirley, Representatives Bradford, Block, Nielsen, Wills, Chadderdon, Shepherd (8), Marriott, Mortimer, Patrick, Thayn, Boe, Pence, Chavez, Durst, Shively

**ABSENT/  
EXCUSED:** Rep. Trail

**GUESTS:** See attached list.

Chairman Nonini called the meeting to order at 9 A.M. He announced that Superintendent Luna will be first on the agenda for tomorrow's meeting. He further announced that copies of Governor's budget will be available at tomorrow's meeting.

**HB 399:** **Mike Mason**, Vice President of Administration for the College of Southern Idaho presented this bill to the Committee. He explained that currently Idaho Code limits the annual amount that community colleges can charge for tuition to \$625 a semester. He further explained that CSI and NIC are approaching the annual limit with tuition and will have to freeze tuition if this limit is not increased. This current restriction will also prevent the College of Western Idaho from setting tuition charges above \$625 per semester. He explained that this legislation does not directly increase tuition and fees. The tuition cap would be raised to \$2,500 dollars. It maintains the authority of locally elected community college Boards of Trustees to set tuition and fees as described throughout Idaho Code. He explained that it is a reasonable increase, and it does not mean tuition costs will be raised. He further explained that there is a 10% increase limit per year. He reported that CSI and NIC's tuition are within \$5 dollars of each other and they expect to work closely with CWI. He explained that there are no statutory limits for tuition at 4 year colleges and universities, just community colleges.

**MOTION:** Rep. Boe made a motion to send HB 399 to the Floor with a **DO PASS recommendation**. In response to Committee questions, **Mr. Mason** explained that students currently contribute about 21% of tuition costs at community colleges. He further explained that there have been increases in insurance and salaries costs. The tuition for community colleges are considerably below 4 year tuition costs. He explained that it would be unlikely that CSI would hit the maximum cap. He further explained that CSI has no intention of going to the 10% limit in raising tuition. It was mentioned that community colleges are the cheapest form of education. He explained that the College of Western Idaho had \$5 million appropriated last year and again this year, also hopefully will have money from liquor tax. The College of Southern Idaho charges \$1,050 per year for tuition and fees.

It was mentioned that it costs about \$5,200 to educate a student at a community college. It was mentioned that Boise State University charges \$4,400 per year for tuition and fees, the University of Idaho charges \$4,100 per year, and Lewis-Clark State College charges \$3,800 per year. He explained that community colleges would have to inform the State Board of Education when raising the tuition and the board of trustees at the college makes that decision.

On a voice vote, the motion carried. Rep. Durst voted NAY. Chairman Nonini, Rep. Block, Rep. Chadderdon, Rep. Mortimer, Rep. Nielsen, Rep. Wills, Rep. Patrick, Rep. Boe, Rep. Pence, Rep. Chavez, and Rep. Shively will sponsor the bill on the Floor.

**Director Brent Reinke** of the Idaho Department of Corrections addressed the Committee. He discussed the Idaho VINE hotline which is a consortium of states that will allow victims of crimes to know where the offender is at any time. He explained that when the offender moves from location to location, the victim receives a phone call. It is a very valuable resource from victim's standpoint. He explained that it pertains to offenders that are in the state of Idaho. He further explained that the victim would have to call Idaho VINE and register and then they would automatically be notified when the offender moves. The Department is currently working with IACI and the Prosecutor's group to let victims know about this service. If the victim moves out of the state, they would still be notified. He explained that one would not have to be a victim, anyone could register to get this information.

He explained that the Criminal Justice Commission is leading the effort to bring Idaho in compliance with the Adam Walsh Act and strengthen Idaho's sex offender laws. Commission actions include; drafting recommended proposals to clarify and strengthen Idaho's sex offender statutes, drafting legislation to enhance Idaho's sex offender registry, and sending draft legislation to the federal government to see if the proposals are in "substantial compliance" with the federal law. **Director Reinke** explained that the Department would be placing current practices into Code. He explained that Rep. Boe currently serves on Idaho Criminal Justice Commission. He further explained that the Criminal Justice Commission members determined more review is needed regarding implementation of Florida's law in Idaho. The Florida law requires a mandatory minimum of 25 years in prison for any crime where the victim is under 12. Initial estimates indicate that if enacted in Idaho, that 25 years after implementation this law would require 2,150 added prison beds.

In response to questions, **Director Reinke** explained the classification of current offenses into a modified tier system, according to the severity of crime. He further explained that the register does give groups information as to who lives around them. It currently does not define levels of risk. It is a risk based approach. He explained that there is a need to remember that sex offenders have lowest recidivism rate, only about 7% re offend sexually.

**Director Reinke** discussed the Department's "Black Hat Crew". He explained that it is about morale and marketing. There is a need to have focus. Since the implementation of the "Black Hat Crew", the Department's employee turnover rate is down to 20% from 34%. The Department will continue to build on this.

He explained that the Department numbers regarding the prison population is about 250 below the projection. They are working closely with field staff to manage this population. The numbers will be monitored over the next 12 to 18 months to see if this is a trend. He also discussed the Department's upcoming projects which include; the building of a secure mental health 300 bed facility and the purchase of eye scan tools to determine when a drug test is required. He explained that the machine is about the size of 6 foot table, requires training, and the cost to lease the equipment is \$2,700 a month. The machine measures the eye in 5 different dimensions and has a success rate of 93%. There would be a hard copy of the results and it is connected to a national registry. The machine tests for drug and alcohol usage. He discussed their five year vision which includes Idaho as a leader in developing in state systems, developing partnerships, enhanced treatment capacity, in state capacity for Idaho inmates and systems approach. There is a need to look for the gaps between the juvenile corrections and adult corrections. There is also a need to get services in the community to keep people out of prison. He explained that 8% of the population in prison cause 84% of offenses. He mentioned that the Office of Drug Policy would play an important role. Current trends are not sustainable. The Department is working on prevention. More dollars and emphasis need to be put in prevention. There is a need for a balanced approach.

**Director Reinke** introduced **Shane Evans**, Deputy Director for the Department of Corrections to the Committee. He discussed the Education and Treatment division of the Department. He discussed a three state recidivism study (Maryland, Minnesota, and Ohio) which demonstrated that participants in education were re-incarcerated at a rate of 10% lower than those who did not participate in education classes. He explained that new initiatives include a comprehensive plan partnership, development of vocational training building, and adding a comprehensive assessment tool. The Department is currently conducting a comprehensive curriculum review and standardizing the entire system. In response to Committee questions, **Mr. Evans** explained that the faculty at IDOC are currently about 20% below average in pay. The Department is taking an incremental approach to be up to level of pay as that of public educators. Teachers are required to have bachelor's degrees and teacher's certificates as they would need in any other setting. Retention and marketing is difficult. He explained that teaching in the prisons is a shaping ground for young educators and teachers teach year round. He further explained that the new tech center is supported by the Governor and will soon be built south of Boise. The Department is working hard to make sure that the education delivered in the institutions are what employers want. They are exploring offering the welding program at the women's prison. The Department is working with Idaho State University in offering a new Office Management program in the prisons. 45 to 50 offenders will complete this program by July of 2008. He explained that the Office management program was not intended to be gender specific. In response to Committee questions, **Mr. Evans** explained that the GED or high school equivalency is a requirement for parole. He further explained that there has been 84 non readers increase their reading level to the 6<sup>th</sup> grade level. Other components to lower recidivism include effective interventions and treatment and supportive housing. Connectivity in the community is critical. An effort is currently being made to teach those in prison how to handle finances.

Chairman Nonini thanked Director Reinke and Mr. Evans for their presentation and told of an example of former offender getting his education while incarcerated.

**Margo Healy**, ISAT manager for SBOE addressed the Committee. She is a 37 year educator in the state of Idaho. She explained that the No Child Left Behind Act created a huge shift. NCLB requires rigorous state standards, test aligned to standards, performance standards, proficiency level descriptors, disaggregated scores for all subgroups, and 100% proficiency for all students by 2013. Schools are now accountable for all children. 15 months ago the state started over in developing testing. In response to Committee questions regarding cut scores and proficiency scores that are not the same nationally, **Ms. Healy** explained that the State Board assembled a group of expert educators from across the state. This group took the test score data and did book marking. They went through item by item, got to the part where they separated proficient scores from advanced scores. They then looked at the difference in scores between basic and proficient. They then discussed, then scored again. The cut scores are based on input from Idaho educators using Idaho standards. She explained that book marking is not the same thing as using the growth model. The state cannot participate in a growth model system until the state has longitudinal data system. The Board is working on this option, but it will take about 2 to 3 years to set this up once the money has been allocated. She explained that the educators stood behind the book marking process. She explained that the standards can be found on SBOE website and are in chart format. Other students moving in to Idaho may have problems because the cut scores from other states may be lower. She discussed the development of the test. The test has to contain Idaho standards, have proficiency level descriptors, then test items are reviewed for form and content and reviewed for bias and sensitivity. She explained that the test blueprint designs the weighting of the test. Teachers reviewed the data, and a third party reviews the item then final test is created and reviewed. Cut scores are reset every 4 to 5 years. She explained that the ISAT 2003-2006 was based on a set of skills and knowledge represented as the Learning Continuum. Norm referenced tests are designed so that half the population is above the mid-point and half are below. Performance can be reported as a scale score, standard score or percentile score. One value of national norms is that they allow broad comparisons of student scores across multiple states.

She explained that the NCLB act says the test has to be done once a year, and fall test that is done in Idaho is not a part of NCLB package. She also explained that starting next week, the Board will be surveying educators to see if they really want to have the extra test in the fall. Concern was expressed about the about the time it takes to do the test. **Ms. Healy** explained that the maximum time allowed is 4 ½ hours to take all 3 tests. She further explained that NCLB act shifted for teachers as well. Changes were made to the standards two years ago to make them more rigorous and deeper. Teachers now have a different approach and validity is important. She explained that the state gave 1.3 million tests last May. In response to questions, she explained that accommodations can be made for students on IEPs to take the test which include additional time and shorter time frames, or students could be tested in a separate room for shorter time intervals. Accommodations are needed for about 10% of kids. She explained that these accommodations are known and utilized better in some places better than others. She further explained that accommodations

just levels the playing field.

Chairman Nonini asked **Ms. Healy** if she could return to the Committee and finish her presentation at a later time due to the lateness of the hour. **Ms. Healy** agreed.

**ADJOURN:**

As there was no further business to come before the Committee, Chairman Nonini adjourned the meeting at 10:55 A.M.

---

Representative Bob Nonini  
Chairman

---

Claudia Howell  
Secretary



## MINUTES

### HOUSE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

**DATE:** February 6, 2008

**TIME:** 9 A.M.

**PLACE:** Room 148

**MEMBERS:** Chairman Nonini, Vice Chairman Shirley, Representatives Trail, Bradford, Block, Nielsen, Wills, Chadderdon, Shepherd (8), Marriott, Mortimer, Patrick, Thayn, Boe, Pence, Chavez, Durst, Shively

**ABSENT/  
EXCUSED:** None

**GUESTS:** See attached list.

Chairman Nonini called the meeting to order at 9:05 A.M.

**SJM 109:** **Senator John Goedde** presented this Joint Memorial to the Committee. He explained that this is a memorial to Congress objecting to a maintenance of effort mandate in the College Opportunity and Affordability Act and urges Congress to remove the provision from the bill. He further explained that this mandate takes away the right of the states to appropriate money for higher education. He provided to Committee members a letter signed by the Executive Director of the National Governors Association, State Higher Education executive officers, and the Executive Director of the National Conference of State Legislatures supporting this memorial. He explained that the memorial is also supported by the universities in Idaho.

**MOTION:** Rep. Wills made a motion to send **SJM 109 to third reading calendar**. On a voice vote, the motion passed. Chairman Nonini will sponsor the memorial on the House Floor. After review, Rep. Wills reported that under rule 30 of House Rules the motion to send SJM 109 to the third reading calendar is not allowed. He withdrew his original motion and made a new motion to send **SJM 109 to the second reading calendar**. On a voice vote, the motion passed.

**Ann Joslin**, the State Librarian addressed the committee. She explained that the Commission for Libraries' mission is to help libraries build their capacity to better serve their clientele and the people of Idaho. She discussed a report that found Americans use their public libraries to find information that helps them solve problems in their everyday lives and it also found that young adults between the ages of 18 to 29 are the most likely library users for any purpose. She explained that Idaho libraries reflect this trend of increased use. The Commission's staff work with libraries to help them increase their visibility in their communities. She also discussed Libraries Linking Idaho services (LiLI). She explained that it is the largest statewide program and it provides information resources for all Idaho libraries. The LiLI databases are one of the most reliable sources of accurate and up to date information. 100% of school districts, public libraries and academic libraries have access to the LiLI databases. The statewide web catalog has almost 5.5 million items owned by Idaho libraries.

She also discussed the Commission's quest to bring the state documents depository program into the 21<sup>st</sup> century. The Commission is introducing legislation, SB 1321, to create a digital repository of state publications. Another focus of the Commission is a two year expansion of the Read to Me program. Their vision is that all parents and care givers nurture their children's early literacy skills and all children develop as independent readers and become lifelong learners. A new focus this year for the Commission is their work with school libraries. This includes three initiatives, collecting and analyzing school library data, focusing on the teacher librarian's role in student success, and they are providing professional development opportunities for teacher librarians. In response to questions from Committee members, **Ms. Joslin** explained that it is a local decision to request materials from the library, whether to have the service online or needing to go in person to the library. She further explained that they are seeing more and more libraries letting their patrons request items online. She also explained that certified librarians are essential to make the Commission's initiatives work. She further explained that the number of certified librarians in elementary schools have dropped. In response to questions, she clarified that it is a local decision if a public library wants to receive federal funds that includes connection to the internet, they are required to filter. It was mentioned that there is a new library building in Coeur d'Alene which is a beautiful facility. There is also a new library in Mountain Home. She clarified the definition of a "Digital Native" which is anyone who was born since technology became so prevalent. The opposite of this term would be a "Digital Immigrant".

**Superintendent Tom Luna** presented his budget to the Committee. He explained that he has already discussed part of his budget, the teacher compensation plan, iSTARS. He further explained that the Department is requesting a flat budget with no money for inflationary increase. He reported that the Department has been spending tax dollars efficiently. His goal is to run the Department as efficiently as possible. For every dollar saved, the money can go into the classrooms. Education happens in the classroom and not in the Department. He explained that they are negotiating contracts that weren't negotiated in the past. They have also shifted to electronic processes from paper as much as possible. The Department has an annual cost savings of \$43,700 in rent alone. They have put all employees on one floor, except IT and returned about 4,600 square feet to the state. He explained that surplus furniture, office supplies and paper were sold to other agencies and donated schools. He explained that the Department sent a truck full of furniture to Lapwai school district. The Department has been able to save money and have been able to fund new positions.

He discussed his 2008 Public Schools budget with the Committee. He discussed the successes in 2007. He explained that more money for classroom supplies and materials were funded for teachers. Each teacher was given \$350 to spend for supplies. In response to questions, he clarified that the classroom supplies are for classroom teachers and other certified employees did not receive the extra funds. He further explained that it is not their plan to expand because it is not yet been implemented for a year. Before any changes are made, the Department wants to go through one full school year. He explained that he is not opposed to looking at changes to this program in the future.

It was mentioned that many teachers are appreciative of the funds but in some school districts, the teachers did not receive the money. **Superintendent Luna** explained that there has been some problems with some teachers not getting access to the full \$350. It has been reported to him that in some districts this money was used as part of negotiation process. He explained that it was not the intent, and will be working to tighten up the intent language. It was mentioned that some teachers have pooled this money to buy big ticket items. **Superintendent Luna** explained that however the money is spent, it is up to the individual teacher and not the district. He further explained that it is not intended to be the total budget for the arts. It is also not the intent for teachers to have less money than they have had in previous years. He explained that the Department will be looking at these kinds of issues and deal with them.

He explained that more money was dedicated to helping students who struggle on the ISAT. \$5 million dollars was funded. He explained that the Department will monitor the remediation cost. He further explained that the by product of this funding is that in the coming years, they should see less students needing remediation. Districts have used this money where they need it the most. The money could be used for expanded kindergarten activity. In response to questions from Committee members, he explained that the state would not allow state dollars to be used for preschool activities.

The Department has also received funds to replace old and worn out textbooks. He explained that they are in the first year of this and another payment is scheduled to go out this year. Data has not yet been collected on these funds.

He explained that the largest budget increase deals with the teacher compensation plan, iSTARS which costs \$46 million. The plan offers teachers 5 different opportunities to earn bonuses beyond their base salary. It is a statewide plan and is not subject to negotiations. He explained that after hearing all of the public testimony, he understands that all may not agree on what a performance pay program would look like, but all teachers deserve one.

He then discussed the Math Initiative with the Committee. He explained that the Department has used \$350,000 as seed money to evaluate current math education in state, look at the latest research, and develop the Idaho math initiative for K-12 grades. He discussed the reasons why the state needs a math initiative. He explained that fewer students are reaching proficiency on the ISAT. 82% of third grade students scored proficient in math, and two years later, only 73% were proficient. Proficiency in math declines as students get older. In response to questions regarding the funding of iSTARS and the math initiative, **Superintendent Luna** responded if iSTARS is funded less than \$46 million, adjustments to merit pay would have to be done. If the math initiative not funded, the Department has wasted \$350,000 dollars.

In response to a question regarding dual enrollment and the math initiative, he explained that does not limit the difficulty of math that can be offered in high school. There is a need to provide opportunities for those who excel in math. He explained that if teacher incentive pay plans do not get out of the Senate Education Committee, he agrees with the Governor that teacher pay needs to be focused on merit. He is hopeful that they get done this year. It is possible that the money would go away. He discussed problem solving. He explained that there are several ways to do problems in math. There is a conventional way, a compensation way, and a decomposing way. He explained that if we want students to be problem solvers and be critical thinkers, there is a need to teach different ways to solve math problems.

**Superintendent Luna** then discussed the longitudinal data system that the Department is asking funding for. He explained that it would cost \$2.6 million in one time funds and \$1.9 million in ongoing funds. It would give Idaho the ability to collect timely and accurate data. He further explained that the critical keys to data success are current data, accurate data, and reliable data. He explained that Idaho is one of only six states in the nation without a longitudinal data system. He then discussed the steps in implementing such a data system. He explained that the Department has already piloted a unique student identifier in five districts. With this type of data system, when a student moves into a new school, the school would know what classes they excel in and what classes they struggle in. Access to student information would be through the unique student identifier and there would be levels of security. PIN numbers would be very restricted and the teacher would have access only to the students they teach. He explained that parents would have access to this system as well. He further explained that because of new technology, districts would not have to replace any software or hardware and a bridge would be built for this new system which would tap into the system they are currently using. The cost would be more if the current system had to be replaced. Teachers could be identified with this system, and the Department could see how many students are going to college right after high school. He explained that technology would allow for data sharing between states, but states are not currently trading this information.

**Superintendent Luna** then discussed the funding for concurrent credit. The Department is asking for \$3.5 million. He explained that last summer, the Colorado State Board passed legislation to allow all high school students to take college courses, if they desire, and the state would pay for it. Concurrent credit opens a door of opportunity and is a financial benefit. In response to a questions regarding if private colleges would be able to participate in concurrent credit, he explained that they would not as it has to do with how the money flows. He further explained that he will get information to Committee members about what individual districts are doing in the state.

He explained that the Department is requesting \$94 million dollars more than they asked for last year. Chairman Nonini explained that the Committee will have the opportunity to discuss the budget and the Committee's recommendations will be taken by the Chairman to JFAC.

It was mentioned that the Governor has seen request on concurrent enrollment come from **Superintendent Luna's** budget and also from other Universities. **Superintendent Luna** responded he was not aware of any other request in any University's budget for the expansion of concurrent enrollment. He explained that there is a need for a statewide plan on concurrent enrollment. In response to Committee questions, **Tim Hill** from the Department defined exceptional contracts. He explained that these contracts cover 6 or 7 statutory provisions which include special education students, and juvenile detention students. Also in response to Committee questions, **Superintendent Luna** explained that there has been discussions on funding for alternative schools at the elementary level. He further explained that there is a need for this. Discussions are taking place and through the middle school task force there may be recommendations for the future. In discussing transportation issues, he explained that the costs are estimates and are based on growth and fuel costs. He further explained that after the budget is set, then if there are overestimated costs, the excess money goes into the states' Stabilization fund, if the costs are underestimated, the Department would tap into this fund.

Chairman Nonini announced that due to the lateness of the hour, Dr. Stoneberg who is on today's agenda to discuss the National Assessment of Educational Progress program would be rescheduled to Monday, Feb. 11<sup>th</sup>. He further announced that the Committee would be meeting on Friday, February 8<sup>th</sup> to hear Rss.

**ADJOURN:**

As there was no further business to be brought before the Committee, Chairman Nonini adjourned the meeting at 10:55 A.M.

---

Representative Bob Nonini  
Chairman

---

Claudia Howell  
Secretary

## MINUTES

### HOUSE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

**DATE:** February 7, 2008

**TIME:** 9 A.M.

**PLACE:** Room 148

**MEMBERS:** Chairman Nonini, Vice Chairman Shirley, Representatives Trail, Bradford, Block, Nielsen, Chadderdon, Shepherd (8), Marriott, Mortimer, Patrick, Thayn, Boe, Pence, Chavez, Durst, Shively

**ABSENT/  
EXCUSED:** Rep. Wills

**GUESTS:** See attached list.

Chairman Nonini called the meeting to order at 9:05 A.M.

**HB 401:** **Dana Kelly**, the Student Affairs program manager for the Office of the State Board of Education presented this bill to the Committee. She explained that this legislation follows up on the OPE report from January 2004 and clarifies the definition of higher education residency requirements. She further explained that the proposed legislation clarifies and strengthens requirements for obtaining residency in Idaho for the purpose of qualifying for resident fees at the state's institutions of higher education. She reported that the Board did approve this legislation in November of 2007 and that if the legislation passes, the board will draft rules for implementation and consistency, and additional methods for proving domiciliary intent. She highlighted OPE's recommendations which are part of the proposed legislation. These recommendations include clarification of full time, nonresident students are presumed to be in Idaho primarily for educational purposes unless they clearly demonstrate they are primarily engaged in activities other than those of a student; clarification of nonresident students must establish and maintain a domicile in Idaho for twelve months in order to qualify for residency; and students who are granted residency on the basis of their parents' Idaho domicile should be financially dependent upon their resident parents and be under a certain age. She explained that in the bill to be financially dependent on their parents, greater than 50% support should come from the parents. **Ms. Kelly** explained that after the print hearing for this bill, she was asked if the Board has data to know how many current students qualified for resident tuition on the basis of their parent's resident status, and if they knew how many of these were "independent" of their parents support. She reported that there is limited information available. The University of Idaho and Boise State University does not track this data. Idaho State indicated that of 1,077 students who received residency based upon their parents resident status, 154 students appear to be independent, and under the new bill would not qualify. Lewis-Clark had 79 students who applied for residency for tuition purposes. Of these, 14 students might be affected by the changes brought forth in the proposed legislation.

**Ms. Kelly** explained that how long a domiciled Idaho resident could be away from the state without losing residency status was a concern. In the proposed legislation there is a 30 month time frame ensures that students who are away from the state, for example on a 24 month church mission, would not lose residency status. She further explained that currently there are two bills which involve changes to statute which impact residency determinations. **HB 385**, which is sponsored by Rep. Killen, is intended to include members of the Idaho National Guard as qualifying for resident fees. She reported that the Board has met with Rep. Killen and are in agreement that the proposed changes in the separate bills are compatible with each other.

In response to questions from the Committee, **Ms. Kelly** explained that the definition of an independent student has some differences than that of Federal Student Aid's. HB 401 specifies the age of a student over 24 is considered independent, and under 24 considered dependent. In response to a question regarding what prompted the OPE report, **Ms. Kelly** responded it followed a JLOC meeting in which legislators directed OPE to look at residency. OPE made three separate recommendations, some of which have already have been initiated. In response to a question regarding where the 50% figure came from, **Ms. Kelly** responded that this number could be altered, but if a student is receiving more than 50% support from his or hers parents, they are usually considered dependent. She clarified that someone coming to the state and worked full time would still need to meet 12 month residency requirement. She further explained that if during that time they are working full time and paying taxes, this bill would allow them to be considered a resident after 12 months.

It was mentioned that there was a typo on Page 3, line 45 "WAMI" instead of "WWAMI"; Rep. Durst reported that if Rep. Kileen's legislation passes, it would take care of this typo. When asked if the proposed legislation would supercede the waiver that is now existing between Idaho and Washington, **Ms. Kelly** responded that she would need to research this issue. She explained that it would not affect students who have already been granted residency. When questioned whether this bill would make it more difficult for Idaho students to gain residency then go to neighboring states, she responded that this would be a public policy discussion. If a student gained residency in a neighboring state, they would have to gain residency if they return to Idaho. She explained that neighboring states have changed their policy regarding residency issues. In response to a question regarding residency for voting purposes, **Ms. Kelly** responded that if a student establishes residency for voting they would be giving up residency in their home state. She explained that the state is not attempting to discourage a student not to vote. In response to a question regarding students who attend community college in Idaho and when they finish their AA degree would they be a resident of Idaho, **Ms. Kelly** explained that the student would fall under a different statute. If they met criteria while at community college for residency then they transferred to another college in Idaho, residency would transfer. She explained that the Legislation would have rules in which some of these issues would be addressed.

It was mentioned that last year there was similar legislation proposed. A change was made to this bill to extend to 30 months from 12 months the time a student can leave the state and return and still maintain residency. The legislation last year was passed out of the House Committee, went through the House then held in the Senate Education Committee. In response to a question regarding funding for in state students and out of state students, she explained that the number of students who are in state are counted for funding purposes, those who are out of state are not. She also explained that she has worked with university staff and there are different needs at different institutions. Some need to manage enrollment, some need to manage for growth, but all are willing to do the work. In response to a question regarding if this legislation is more restrictive than that in current code, **Ms. Kelly** responded that the domicile requirements with parents is more restrictive, but the second part of the legislation regarding the 12 months it takes to establish residency is more broad. When asked if the proposed legislation was driven by the OPE report, **Ms. Kelly** explained that the biggest catalyst for the legislation was the OPE report, but there is a need to look at this issue. There is a need for change, and institutions would agree with this. In response to a question regarding the costs of resident and non resident tuition, **Matt Freeman** explained that there is a difference of between \$11,000 and \$12,000 between non residency costs and residency costs and it varies between institutions. **Ms. Kelly** explained that residency can be transferred to another institution, but waivers cannot be transferred. If residency established in another state, a student would have to reestablish residency in Idaho. There is a difference between a waiver and residency status. Idaho residency can be granted by the institutions.

**MOTION:** Rep. Durst made a motion to **hold HB 401 in Committee**. In speaking to his motion he expressed his appreciation of the work done by the Board in bringing this legislation, but felt that there were concerns expressed in the meeting that need to be dealt with.

**SUBSTITUTE MOTION:** Rep. Nielsen made a Substitute Motion **to send HB 401 to the Floor with DO PASS recommendation**. On a voice vote, the motion passed. Rep. Nielsen will sponsor the bill on the House Floor.

**PRESENTATION** **Christian Zimmerman**, a former legislator, addressed the Committee. He gave a presentation to the Committee regarding an opportunity for Idaho youth to learn the Chinese language. He explained that he returned to China in 2005 to teach. He currently teaches about 200 students and will soon be living in China full time. He explained the importance of starting to offer classes in K-12 to learn Chinese. He further explained that the language, because of the difficulty, must be taught in the K-12 system to work. He reported that currently there is no public school system in America that is offering a K-12 Chinese language system. He further reported that one school district in Idaho has decided to offer this program. Cascade school district will start in fall of 2009. He explained that he was not asking for money or legislation. He further explained that to prepare students to work with China there is a need to be prepared to learn the language. Chinese interns would be sent to help with the language program. They would be 22 to 23 years old. He explained that his students have excellent English and penmanship skills. He explained that he has discussed this idea with SBOE and Superintendent Luna and they do support this, but it is totally up to the



school districts.

He is just promoting an idea. By adopting this language program, there would be a better relationship between the U.S. and Chinese governments and businesses. He introduced **Mr. Vic Koshuta**, Superintendent for Cascade School District. **Mr. Koshuta** explained that his district is starting a K-12 language program in the fall. He feels this program is a good way to secure jobs in a global society. The Chinese interns will be housed with a host family and receive a small stipend. Students in K through 5<sup>th</sup> grade will receive Chinese language instruction 35 minutes a day, 3 days a week. The program will not start in the high school for four years. Chairman Nonini asked that he come back and report to the Committee to see how the program is going.

**HB 423:** **Tamara Baysinger** from the Office of the State Board of Education presented this bill to the Committee. She explained that the purpose of this legislation is to clarify the definition of a public virtual school. It replaces current definition of virtual school. She further explained that this new definition will provide more specific information for new virtual schools to include in their petitions and establish a clearer criteria for use in determining which of Idaho's existing schools may be considered public virtual schools. Instruction is delivered through the internet and it must include online elements. She explained that the Commission is confident that it has addressed the concern from OPE. She explained that language regarding students in more than one district was changed. The Commission felt it was unnecessary since virtual schools could pull from any school districts across school district boundaries. She explained that all virtual schools are aware of the report and did have public comments for this bill. She further explained that "teacher" is used in this bill is intended to mean the certificated teacher hired by the school. She also explained that the reason for deleting public in the language is to allow for more flexibility in this definition. In response to questions regarding the definitions of "synchronous" and "asynchronous", **Ms. Baysinger** explained that there is a standard dictionary definition of these words and it would be cumbersome to define them in the bill.

**MOTION:** Rep. Nielsen made a motion **to send HB 423 to the Floor with a DO PASS recommendation.**

**SUBSTITUTE MOTION:** Rep. Boe made a **Substitute Motion to send HB 423 to General Orders** to add the definition of "synchronous" and "asynchronous" to the bill. In discussing the motion, she explained that this is a new area and there is not enough information available. She explained that it would be helpful to have the definition of these terms in Code.

**ROLL CALL VOTE:** On a roll call vote, the Substitute Motion failed with 6 AYE votes, 11 NAY votes and one absent or excused. Chairman Nonini, Representatives Shirley, Bradford, Block, Nielsen, Chadderdon, Shepherd, Marriott, Mortimer, Patrick, and Thayn voted NAY. Representatives Trail, Boe, Pence, Chavez, Durst, and Shively voted AYE. Representative Wills was absent.

**ORIGINAL MOTION:** The original motion **to send HB 423 to the Floor with a DO PASS recommendation** passed on a voice vote. Rep. Shirley will sponsor the bill on the House Floor.

**HB 397:** **Tamara Baysinger**, from the Office of the State Board of Education presented this bill to the Committee. She explained that this bill was submitted by the Public Charter School Commission. She explained that Idaho code cites “failure to meet generally accepted accounting standards of fiscal management” as one condition obligating an authorized chartering entity to issue a notice of defect to a public charter school. The generality of this phrase has led to repeated confusion with regard to the Public Charter School Commission’s oversight responsibilities as an authorized chartering entity. Specifically, the Commission and other authorized chartering entity would benefit from clarity regarding whether an authorized chartering entity shall issue a notice of defect based on a school’s detrimental financial decisions leading to possible financial default, or only in situations in which the school has violated an accounting principle such as would be reported in a fiscal audit. She explained that charter schools have the same financial audits as public schools.

**MOTION:** Rep. Mortimer made a motion **to send HB 397 to the floor with a DO PASS recommendation**. In the discussion of the motion it was asked if the bill would cover areas of conflict of information. **Ms. Baysinger** responded that oversight is not addressed in this bill, but is addressed in other statutes. Audits are available to the public. On a voice vote, the motion carried. Rep. Mortimer will sponsor the bill on the House Floor.

Chairman Nonini announced that the germane committee chairs will be making a presentation to JFAC regarding Committee recommendations for the budget. Chairman Nonini will be scheduled for Friday, Feb. 15<sup>th</sup>. He explained that the Committee will spend time starting tomorrow discussing the Education budgets. He further announced that the PTA group cancelled their presentation scheduled for today’s meeting. The group will be presenting at 3 P.M. in today’s Senate Education Committee meeting which will be held in the basement conference room of the Supreme Court building. Chairman Nonini encouraged Committee members to attend if possible.

**ADJOURN:** As there was no further business to be brought before the Committee, Chairman Nonini adjourned the meeting at 10:50 A.M.

---

Representative Bob Nonini  
Chairman

---

Claudia Howell  
Secretary

## MINUTES

### HOUSE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

**DATE:** February 8, 2008

**TIME:** 9 A.M.

**PLACE:** Room 148

**MEMBERS:** Chairman Nonini, Vice Chairman Shirley, Representatives Trail, Bradford, Block, Nielsen, Wills, Chadderdon, Shepherd (8), Marriott, Patrick, Thayn, Boe, Pence, Chavez, Durst, Shively

**ABSENT/  
EXCUSED:** Rep. Mortimer

**GUESTS:** See attached list

Chairman Nonini called the meeting to order at 9 A.M.

**RS 17824:** **Rep. Bolz** presented this RS to the Committee. He explained that he had previously presented this legislation to the committee, HB 395. He has since met with the Public Charter School Commission and there has been some concern with some of the language of the bill. He explained that the purpose of this legislation is to allow for Charter Schools chartered by the Commission which has a primary attendance zone within more than one school district to be able to relocate to another school district within the primary attendance zone as established in the charter. He explained that this proposed legislation has changed "shall" to "may" in several places and clarified language. He asked that the Committee to hold HB 395.

**MOTION:** Rep. Wills made a motion to introduce **RS 17824** to print. On a voice vote, the motion carried.

**RS 17803:** **Rep. Shirley** presented this RS to the Committee. He explained that the Legislature first heard about the Idaho Digital Learning Academy five years ago. Since the implementation of this Academy, they have enjoyed tremendous success. The IDLA assists so many students in so many ways. He explained when IDLA was first implemented, it was thought that would be best to operate under a host school district. He further explained that next year there will be over 6,000 students involved and oversight of a school district is no longer necessary. This proposed legislation will not change how they would operate. He explained that the purpose of this legislation is to provide the Idaho Digital Learning Academy with financial independence from a host school district. He further explained that all changes allow IDLA to continue operating in the same fashion as the preceding five years. An additional change allows IDLA to extend service to students in lower grades due to growth and to accommodate stakeholder needs. Currently gifted and talented math students in sixth grade take IDLA pre-algebra. This change would allow the law to reflect an existing service that IDLA provides to gifted and talented students in the state. Rep. Shirley recognized **Donna Vakili**, the Administrator of the IDLA who will speak to the Committee at the bill hearing.

- MOTION:** Rep. Nielsen made a motion to introduce **RS 17803** to print. On a voice vote, the motion carried.
- RS 17821:** **Rep. Block** presented this RS to the Committee. She explained that the proposed legislation is a program in prevention. It educates students about the good things that can happen when good choices are made. She explained that similar legislation was brought before the Committee previously and was passed unanimously by the House. It did not get out of the Senate Education Committee. Changes were made to the previous legislation. She explained this legislation would create a new pilot “Key to the Future Scholarship” program for select Idaho high school students who are drug, alcohol and tobacco free. The State Board of Education will select a large, medium and small school district to participate in this pilot program. Students in these districts will sign an agreement that they will remain drug, alcohol and tobacco free during the 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> grade, and that they will voluntarily participate in a random drug testing program. The pilot districts will receive \$200 for each student that applies for the scholarship to cover costs associated with administering the requirements of the program. Student eligibility also requires at least a 2.5 GPA or an ACT composite score of 20. The scholarship is \$1,000 per year for the first two years for post secondary education. Students receiving the scholarship are expected to remain drug, alcohol and tobacco free during their time of enrollment in a post secondary institution. No testing will be required while in college, however if they receive a DUI or drug conviction they would lose the scholarship. This enabling legislation, and the scholarship it creates, terminates on July 1, 2017. The primary source of funds for this scholarship would be the Millennium fund, and this legislation directs the State Board of Education to make annual application for said funds.
- MOTION:** Rep. Wills made a motion to introduce **RS 17821** to print. On a voice vote, the motion carried. In the discussion on the motion, it was mentioned that Committee members would talk with the Senators on the Education Committee to let them know of their support for the legislation.
- RS 17634C1:** **Rep. Trail** presented this RS to the Committee. He explained that the proposed legislation provides for determination by the State Board of Education of educator fields considered to be “high need” to provide for educator eligibility criteria for application to “high need” loan forgiveness program and for loan forgiveness, to provide for reimbursement of reasonable costs incurred by educators who have not obtained a qualified educational loan and to provide for administration of the program by the Board and providing a sunset date. He explained that this legislation was introduced last year, but there were some problems and it was pulled.
- MOTION:** Rep. Wills made a motion to introduce **RS 17634C1** to print. On a voice vote, the motion carried.
- RS 17819:** **Rep. Pence** presented this RS to the Committee. She explained that this legislation will amend Idaho Code relating to the board of trustees of school districts created by consolidation. It creates a process for districts that consolidate with a transition board. She further explained that consolidation depends on the trustees looking at their situation and making a decision.

She also explained that the proposed legislation will amend Idaho Code in providing that districts that have been consolidated after January 1, 2008 will consist of five members if two districts are consolidated; seven members if three districts are consolidated; and up to nine members if four or more districts are consolidated. The proposed legislation also revises the method of appointed trustees, whereby the tiebreaker is appointed by the board of county commissioners of the county with the most students.

**MOTION:**

Rep. Chadderdon made a motion to introduce **RS 17819** to print. On a voice vote, the motion carried.

Chairman Nonini announced that he has been scheduled for 8 A.M. on Friday, February 15<sup>th</sup> to present JFAC the Committee's recommendations on the Education budgets. Sen. Goedde will be presenting to JFAC on Thursday, February 14<sup>th</sup> at 8 A.M. He suggested that Committee members watch Senator Goedde's presentation in the Committee room (Room 148) if possible. He further announced that the Committee will be hearing from Dr. Mike Rush regarding the budget of the State Board and Richard Budzich, from DFM on the Higher Education budget on Monday, February 11<sup>th</sup>.

Chairman Nonini asked for Committee comments regarding the education budget. He explained that the majority of the Education budget deals with K-12 funds. The following comments were made by Committee members:

Rep. Boe stated that more emphasis is needed on the importance of discretionary funds. Several other Committee members voiced their concern that they have heard from Superintendents in their district about this issue.

Rep. Durst stated that the Rural School Initiative is critically important. He further stated that dual credit needs to be funded. He asked that if the salary based apportionment funding legislation is not addressed this legislative session, he would support keeping the money in the budget and have the money applied to base salaries. Chairman Nonini responded that the Committee could question Richard Budzich on Monday regarding higher education's request for dual credit funding.

Rep. Shirley commented that he would like to hear the Committee's feelings on iSTARS and performance based pay plans and what would happen if iSTARS or weTEACH is not approved. He further commented that it would be a big PR problem if teachers receive nothing because the performance based plan isn't adopted. He explained that he has told the Superintendents in his district to wait and see. He also commented that he has talked to a representative from Governor's office and the Governor is not sure if teacher salary has to be based on merit pay.

Chairman Nonini reported that neither of the performance based pay plans have the support they need to get out of the Senate Education Committee. He explained that he has had meetings with leadership regarding this issue, but no decisions have been made. He further explained that the revenue stream is decreasing greatly. The state has reported that they are \$35 million off in predictions of state revenue for the month of January.

He explained that if state employees get a 3% merit based increase, teachers might get 1.8% increase of their base salary based on last year's appropriation. He mentioned that some compromised legislation may be crafted. The issues such as the category 3 contract and moving into category 4 contract, using the ISAT, and evaluations needing to be fair and consistent across the state, may be compromised in a new performance based compensation plan. The compromise might also include less money than the original \$46 million dollar price tag, and a compromise on category 4. He explained that all support a decent raise for teachers and would like to be able to offer them a fair and competitive salary. He explained that he has not seen this plan yet.

Rep. Durst explained that part of issue is benefits for teachers. He wondered if there was a way to let teachers into the state pool rather than individual district benefits. He would like to see the state offer teachers the same benefits that state employees get. It was mentioned that approximately 32% of the teachers in the state are receiving the \$31,000 base salary. The state is losing teachers, and it takes about 4 to 6 years to move up the pay scale.

**Jim Shackelford**, from the Idaho Education Association explained that he would get the exact number of the teachers at this range. **Lloyd Knight**, from the Division of Financial Management commented that the number changes as base changes. He explained that 22% of teachers are receiving minimum salary.

Rep. Pence expressed her concern regarding the lack of funding for the Math Initiative. She explained that if we are going to require more math and science for students, we need this initiative.

Chairman Nonini discussed the idea of using endowment lands to generate money for education. He explained that he is currently working with Rep. Anderson on how to utilize endowment lands more efficiently to get more money for K-12 education. He is looking for some support on this idea. He explained that he has requested maps of the hot geothermal spots in Idaho which are renewable resource of energy and where these spots exist under endowment lands. He explained that he is trying to solve this issue to find more money for education and asked for support from the Committee. Rep. Block mentioned that there is a geothermal project in Raft River and Cassia County just received a check for a million dollars. He explained that he intends to look at all renewables and will move forward to see if this is possible.

Rep. Trail mentioned that 40% of teachers leave the profession after first 5 or 6 years. He also stressed the importance of the Longitudinal Data System. He expressed the hope that the PLATO project is funded.

Chairman Nonini asked that the Committee members agree on top three to five things to fund. This will be discussed in meetings next week.

**ADJOURN:**

As there was no further business to be brought before the Committee, Chairman Nonini adjourned the meeting at 9:55 A.M.

---

Representative Bob Nonini  
Chairman

---

Claudia Howell  
Secretary

## MINUTES

### HOUSE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

**DATE:** February 11, 2008

**TIME:** 9 A.M.

**PLACE:** Room 148

**MEMBERS:** Chairman Nonini, Vice Chairman Shirley, Representatives Bradford, Block, Nielsen, Wills, Chadderdon, Shepherd (8), Marriott, Mortimer, Patrick, Thayn, Boe, Pence, Durst, Shively

**ABSENT/  
EXCUSED:** Representatives Trail and Chavez

**GUESTS:** See attached list

As Chairman Nonini was presenting legislation in another Committee, Vice-Chairman Shirley chaired the meeting. He called the meeting to order at 9 A.M.

**MOTION:** Rep. Shively made a motion to approve the February 4<sup>th</sup>, 2008 minutes as submitted. On a voice vote, the motion carried.

**MOTION:** Rep. Shively made a motion to approve the February 5<sup>th</sup>, 2008 minutes as submitted. On a voice vote, the motion carried.

**MOTION:** Rep. Shively made a motion to approve the February 6<sup>th</sup>, 2008 minutes as submitted. On a voice vote, the motion carried.

**MOTION:** Rep. Shively made a motion to approve the February 7<sup>th</sup>, 2008 minutes as submitted. On a voice vote, the motion carried.

**MOTION:** Rep. Shively made a motion to approve the February 8<sup>th</sup>, 2008 minutes as submitted. On a voice vote, the motion carried.

Vice Chairman Shirley announced that the Committee will be meeting in the City Council chambers at Boise City Hall at 9 A.M. tomorrow, February 12<sup>th</sup>. The Idaho School Boards Association will be presenting to the Committee.

**Dr. Mike Rush**, interim executive director of the Idaho State Board of Education addressed the Committee. He discussed the budget of the State Board. He explained that the duties of the State Board include administering policies and rules for the State Department of Education; administering scholarships and grants, and administering assessment and teacher quality. He explained that the budget includes about \$9 million in federal funds and \$15 million in state funds which totals about \$24 million. He further explained that the budget includes about \$11 million for scholarships and about \$1.6 million for teacher quality. He reported that in FY08 there was a deficit of \$316,255 dollars. He explained this deficit was related to grade 2 & 9 development cost of the ISAT. He further explained that the work is still valid and if the Board decides to implement test, will not have to do over again.

He discussed the FY09 budget which is \$6,933,133. The Board is asking for additional appropriation to align standards. There is a \$5.8 million request for ISAT test. He explained that responsibility for the NAEP assessment test was transferred from Department to the State Board. This test is federally funded. He explained that the Gear Up program runs from July 2006 to July of 2012. There is a match of \$2.9 million a year and the school match is \$1.4 million. 5,500 students are participating and the program that starts in the 7<sup>th</sup> grade. The Board needs to raise about \$1.5 million a year. The Board is requesting one FTP which would be federally funded. The Board is also asking for carryover authority for scholarships. He explained that a student may apply to several colleges and request an Opportunity scholarship. The school then needs to set aside that money for the student. When the student makes decision, only gets one scholarship, but several have been reserved.

He explained that the Board has four major items in their strategic plan. The first component of the plan is to sustain and improve quality of education. He explained that there is a need for an effective appeals process. The Board has created an appeals committee which would be a part of quality component. The second component of the strategic plan is maintain and increase access. He explained that the scholarship program is hugely important to this access and also dual credit has been emphasized by the Board. He explained that the Board has put together a group of superintendents to look at AYP and is working to identify items for flexibility change within the existing federal law and also looking at efficient use of resources. The other components include relevancy and efficiency. Performance measures include; percent of students who complete high school, percent of income needed to pay for college expenses, freshman at 4 year institutions returning for sophomore year, first time, full time students completing a bachelor's degree within 6 years of college entrance. He explained that the percentage of students going to college after high school is 47.5 %. He explained that there is a need to maintain a high graduation rate. In response to questions from Committee members, **Dr. Rush** explained that all of the statistics pertain to full time students. He briefly discussed the tragedy at Virginia Tech. He explained that education provides hope to people that otherwise may not have hope and there are people out there that want to destroy that hope. Education is the highest service that government can provide.

In response to questions, **Dr. Rush** explained that appropriation for the ISAT tests for next fall for FY 09, was not asked for in next year's budget because it was felt that there was not enough legislative support. Informal discussions regarding this issue have been held. He explained that there has been turmoil at the State Board Office and the chief fiscal officer left, and someone else stepped in. In response to a question regarding funding requests from several different sources for dual enrollment, **Matt Freeman** responded that Idaho State University has requested funding for dual enrollment to make up the difference between the \$65/credit they are currently charging high school students and the regular \$214/credit. The College of Southern Idaho has also requested funding for targeting math and science dual enrollment. They want to hire math and science teachers to provide these classes.



Committee members expressed their concern that the funding for dual enrollment might go away because the Governor has seen the request from other colleges and in the Superintendent's budget.

In response to questions regarding the scholarship fund and carryover amounts, **Dr. Rush** explained that the Board does not have a universal data base that indicates which student is applying for a scholarship and does not know how many duplicate students are applying for scholarships. He further explained that eventually there is a need for a better tracking system. Students are getting the scholarships, but some additional students are being left out. He explained that if the Board had carryover authority, the money would be there for additional students.

There was a discussion of what Idaho needs to expand the concurrent enrollment program. **Dr. Rush** explained that there has been some research done and we do know which areas of the state needs assistance. He is currently working with the Department of Administration to talk about expanding fiber optics to rural areas. Chairman Nonini mentioned that he is working on legislation which would be enabling legislation for the language to set this up.

**Dr. Rush** then discussed the discrepancy of housing data for ISAT test in Department of Education and the Board administering the ISAT. He explained that the Board does have the legitimate role to audit and that includes administering the ISAT. He further explained that there is value in separating roles. He explained that the Department of Education is better equipped to handle the data piece. The solution is to move the assessment back to the Department of Education, but no matter where it is put, there has be to close coordination with the Board. He explained that in order to work together, there has to be systems in place.

In response to a question regarding the carryover authority issue, **Dr. Rush** explained that scholarship funds are not like general account money and carryover fits. It would be fairly controlled. He further explained that the data system is 3 to 4 years out. It was mentioned that the concern may be students who would miss out on scholarships.

When questioned about Idaho's seats on WWAMI, **Matt Freeman** explained that this year two seats were added which brings to total to 74 seats, next year there will be 76 seats, then following year there will be 80 seats.

In response to a question regarding if the Board should be administering tests, **Dr. Rush** explained that NAEP test funds were shifted from the Department to the Board because it is outlined in law that the Board is the oversight for assessment. There is no other assessment person at the Department. When asked why there are two ISAT tests per year and not just the fall test, **Dr. Rush** explained that the Board could only do spring test because it is federally mandated. The Board is sending out a survey now to see if districts want to do fall test and hopefully will get the results in March and he will share these results with the Committee. The Board has a committee that will look at the data and will decide if they will be doing a fall test.

It was mentioned that there is not a school district in the state that are the same and why couldn't school districts compete with itself for AYP. **Dr. Rush** explained that the Board has looked at other states that has done this, will be considering this and look at it seriously. He clarified that transportation issues are handled by Department of Education. In response to a question regarding how many Idaho students who qualify for WWAMI program but there is not enough room to get in, **Dr. Rush** said he would get that information for Committee members.

**Richard Budzich**, from the Division of Financial Management presented an overview of the higher education budget to the Committee. He explained that the higher education budget is 63% of the state's request. The top priority is salaries for state employees. He further explained that there is a \$178 million request for enhancements, which is \$56 million in the higher education budget. The enhancements are 15.08% of the budget. He explained that Colleges and universities are the biggest piece of the pie. There is a 21% increase in funding. He explained that there is \$400 million for the baseline for 09 budget. There is a request for an additional \$50 million to the scholarship programs. He explained that the average scholarship is \$3,000. Additional funding for dual enrollment requested is \$1.1 million and the Governor did not include this request in his budget. In response to questions, **Mr. Budzich** explained that he will get information as to how much money is spent per student versus the money for the university. He will also get the figures for how much the college and university's budgets have gone up in past years.

Chairman Nonini shared information with Committee members from the Idaho School Superintendent Association which shows the school district costs and discretionary funding for a five year trend. Many of the costs, specifically health insurance, utilities, and paper have increased significantly in the last five years. Discretionary funding has not kept up with increased costs in these areas. The ISSA encourages the legislature to consider increasing discretionary funding or create new line items to address the increasing costs.

The Committee then discussed which top three to five budget items that they would like the Chairman to talk about to JFAC on Friday morning.

Rep. Bradford mentioned that the dual enrollment issue is important, along with discretionary funds. It was said that maybe those students in dual enrollment should be means tested and those with more financial means would not get the funding. There is also a need to extend fiber optics. Rep. Boe mentioned that the Chamber of Commerce in Pocatello have started efforts to help those students who cannot pay reduced tuition costs to take concurrent enrollment. Rep. Mortimer mentioned that there is a need to find out what it is costing the universities to offer concurrent enrollment.

Rep. Durst expressed the importance of salary based apportionment, and would like to see that funded to the base salary for teachers and administrators.

Rep. Chadderdon mentioned that there is a need to think about a scholarship fund for concurrent enrollment.

Chairman Nonini explained that he will support concurrent enrollment to JFAC. He asked Committee members for their view on the funding for the Superintendent's Longitudinal data system.

Rep. Boe mentioned that alternative funding for elementary aged students is an important issue. It was explained that there has not been a funding request for this.

Rep. Durst mentioned that funding for the Rural school initiative and math initiative are important. The Committee concurred with the importance for funding for math initiative.

Chairman Nonini explained that the important funding issues from the Committee are dual enrollment, salary based apportionment, longitudinal data system, math initiative, and discretionary funds. He further explained that the Committee will have the opportunity to discuss this more fully later this week before his presentation to JFAC on Friday.

**ADJOURN:**

There being no further business to be brought before the Committee, Chairman Nonini adjourned the meeting at 10:55 A.M.

---

Representative Bob Nonini  
Chairman

---

Claudia Howell  
Secretary

## MINUTES

### HOUSE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

**DATE:** February 12, 2008

**TIME:** 9 A.M.

**PLACE:** City Council Chambers, Boise City Hall

**MEMBERS:** Vice Chairman Shirley, Representatives, Bradford, Block, Nielsen, Chadderdon, Shepherd (8), Marriott, Mortimer, Patrick, Thayn, Boe, Pence, Durst, Shively

**ABSENT/  
EXCUSED:** Chairman Nonini, Representatives Trail, Wills and Chavez

**GUESTS:** See attached list

Because Chairman Nonini was in a meeting with Leadership, Vice Chairman Shirley called the meeting to order at 9 A.M. He thanked the members of school boards from across the state that were present. He asked that the Committee and audience hold their questions until the end of the presentation.

**PRESENTATION** **Karen Echeverria**, Interim Executive Director of the Idaho School Boards Association addressed the Committee. She explained that ISBA is 560 members strong and the Association has just celebrated their 65<sup>th</sup> anniversary. She introduced **Dona Jene Turnbow**, president of ISBA. She also introduced several other members of the executive board. She explained that the executive board is made up from 8 regions across the state with a Chairman and Vice Chairman. She explained that today's presentation is about the Idaho School Boards Association Foundation.

**Ernest Jensen**, treasurer of the Idaho School Boards Association Foundation addressed the Committee. He discussed the ISBA Foundation. He explained the Just for the Kids program. He explained that the Just for the Kids School Reports present complex data in a way that is fair and actionable. These reports are designed to be the first step leading toward more effective schools and highly achieving students. The Opportunity Gap Reports present every school's potential for improvement by grade and subject. Each school's potential is calculated using comparisons to the schools that are similar, but which are getting better results in academic achievement. He further explained all Just for the Kids information, tools and services are predicated on proven high performance. The Just for the Kids Framework of Best Practices is used to organize and present the district, school and classroom practices found in consistently higher performing systems that distinguish them from others. The website presents actual examples of tools that support each practice taken from specific schools and districts in order to motivate and equip educators to learn from their success. Schools and districts in need of improvement can immediately use the Just for the Kids Best Practices framework online as a starting point to structure plans and improvement strategies.

He then introduced the executive director of the Foundation, **Wanda Quinn**.

**Wanda Quinn** addressed the Committee. She explained that the ISBA's Foundation began in November of 2007. The Foundation has allowed them to form a nonprofit arm of the ISBA. The Foundation is currently involved in two research projects. One is Just for Kids which involves best practice studies for the state. She explained this program is under the direction of the deans of education and the cost about \$250,000. She further explained that the Foundation goal is to raise the money for the best practice study. The second research project is the Lighthouse Multi-State Project. She explained that there are three components to this project and Idaho has joined in third component. Idaho will be involved in this project for 5 years. She explained that the first study was conducted in Iowa. The question was asked, do school boards make a difference in student achievement? The major findings were that they studied board behavior and beliefs and district characteristics in consistently high achieving and low achieving districts. There were 7 conditions that were present in high achieving districts. The elevating beliefs include; students viewed as emerging and flexible, the school's job is to release student's potential, no excuses, and there is a constant quest for improvement of the system. The 7 conditions were shared leadership, continuous improvement and shared decision making, ability to create and sustain initiatives, supportive workplace for staff, staff development, support for school sites through data and information and community involvement.

She discussed the second Lighthouse Project which studied if boards can help other boards become like those in high achieving districts. Results of this project included, an increase in board time on student achievement, increases in 7 conditions in four out of five districts, elevated beliefs on boards and in districts about the capacity of students to learn at high levels and the capacity of the district to generate high and equitable student achievement. She explained that the Multi-State project expands on the Iowa Lighthouse project by comparing approaches to delivering and supporting intervention across a variety of districts and state association contexts. States included were Idaho, Iowa, Missouri, Wisconsin and Kentucky. Idaho sent letters out to all districts and asked them if they would commit to a 5 year program. About 15 districts expressed an interest. ISBA agreed to put money in the Foundation to cover \$5,000 cost for districts who wanted to participate in this project. 10 districts agreed to participate in this project. She explained that these districts will receive Lighthouse intervention materials across the state. Data will be collected and each district annually will be given a survey about beliefs and conditions to the board, superintendents, central office, school administrators and teachers. They will also be collecting student achievement data. This will be done for 5 years.

Vice Chairman Shirley complimented the Association on doing this research project and predicted that results will be worthwhile.

Rep. Block commended the ISBA for this positive program. She questioned ways that the community would be involved in this project. **Ms. Quinn** responded that they haven't gotten to that point. She explained that right now they are in the data analysis of student achievement part of the research. She further explained that she would envision going to stakeholders to get input. Committee members also asked to let them know how legislators could get involved with this project.

In response to Committee questions, **Ms. Quinn** clarified that training materials are referred to as interventions and the training will be different from year to year. In response to a question regarding financing the project and the difficulty of finding resources in small school districts, **Ms. Quinn** explained that in the first study finances was not a condition. Thus far, they haven't seen finances making a difference. She further explained that most of the other states only have about 5 districts participating and Idaho has 10. They are currently researching whether the training is making a difference in student achievement. Vice Chairman Shirley stated that the Committee would look forward to their report next year.

In response to a question regarding how the districts were chosen to participate in this project, **Ms. Quinn** explained that they did not choose them, they chose themselves. Training is being done the same across the state. The training is being done in the districts. She further explained that they are doing the training when boards can come together. Districts have the choice to bring who they want to bring into the training. The ISBA Foundation has hired an outside contractor to do training at some of the districts. When asked how will they measure if the school board does affect student achievement, **Ms. Quinn** responded that baseline data is being collected to see if beliefs and conditions change. In response to a question regarding what takes place at one of the training sessions, **Ms. Quinn** explained that so far she has only been involved in two training sessions. She further explained that each session speaks to a different component. The purpose of the first session was to instill a sense of urgency for this important research. The second session consists of explaining beliefs and how they are different and the next is the data discussion. She invited any legislators who are interested in participating in training to contact their districts. She explained that this is a work in progress.

Vice Chairman Shirley thanked **Ms. Quinn** for her presentation. He explained that it is great when we collaborate and participate and gave a lot of credit to the 10 districts that have chosen to participate in this project.

Vice Chairman Shirley discussed what the Education Committee has been doing since the Legislature has convened. He explained that the Committee hears reports from most of state agencies and spends a lot of time questioning them. Some of the key issues that the Committee has focused on is the iSTARS and weTEACH proposed legislation which are performance based pay plans for teachers. He explained that it is one of **Superintendent Tom Luna's** top priorities to have a performance based pay scale. The Committee spent a week in joint hearings with the Senate Education Committee hearing testimony regarding the two plans from educators across the state. He explained that at the moment, we are not sure where we are. Both pay plans are in the Senate Education Committee. He explained that there has been a lot of discomfort with both plans. He further explained that there has been meetings with Leadership and the Superintendent to try and come up with compromise plans. JFAC is concerned about spending the amount of money iSTARS would require. There is a need to have the cost scaled back.

Vice Chairman Shirley mentioned that another top issue for the Committee is dual or concurrent enrollment. This issue benefits students who take college credits while in high school. The Committee is very much interested in implementing dual enrollment across the state and he encouraged participants to make sure this happens.

Another issue of concern for the Committee is if the state is emphasizing the ISAT too much and do we need two tests per year. He invited response from the audience.

**Janet Orndorff**, Vice President of the Boise School Board, questioned if there was additional funding for AP tests. Vice Chairman Shirley responded that the Governor did not include funding for concurrent enrollment in his budget, because higher education was asking for funding for this as well. He explained that the funding issue has to be considered in the future. He further explained that Utah has put a lot of money into their concurrent enrollment program.

**Superintendent Wooley**, reported that they are working with regions and have developed a Memorandum of Agreement with Idaho State University to offer concurrent enrollment. Students at Teton high school last year earned 120 college credits. It has been a positive move for their district.

Rep. Durst, explained that the AP issue is different from concurrent enrollment. Some schools don't accept AP classes but do accept concurrent enrollment classes. The issue is if AP classes are more cost effective than concurrent enrollment classes. The state is seeing that it is more cost effective to offer concurrent enrollment classes.

Rep. Block reported that the College of Southern Idaho has an extensive concurrent enrollment program with schools in the Magic Valley and could be a model for other school districts.

Rep. Nielsen explained that in Idaho we spend about \$6,000 to \$7,000 per student in K-12, and \$11,000 to \$12,000 per student for higher education. He explained that he can see the potential to save the state money if students can get through college faster with concurrent enrollment. He further explained that we are learning a great deal with Westside School district working with Utah.

Rep. Pence reported that concurrent enrollment is good for smaller schools. CSI is asking for teachers to teach concurrent enrollment and there is a need to have qualified teachers to teach concurrent enrollment classes. This is a different approach than other school districts in their funding request.

Rep. Bradford explained that his home district is Preston which is really involved in concurrent enrollment. It gives high school students success in taking college classes. He explained that there is a lot of wasted time in the junior and senior year of high school. Concurrent enrollment gives kids confidence to go to school.

Vice Chairman Shirley explained that the Committee heard a report yesterday that 87% of students in Idaho graduate from high school, but less than half of them go to college. Concurrent enrollment is a boost to student's confidence and encourages them to go on to college.

**Michelle Tanberg**, a teacher at an alternative high school in Nampa spoke to the Committee. She explained that the ISAT test could be a blow to student's self confidence. Alternative kids are labeled because they cannot pass the ISAT.

**Abel Galindo**, a teacher in the Nampa school district, addressed the Committee. He explained that it is not bad to have a measurable way of testing. He complained that the schools promote kids from grade to grade whether they know something or not. In middle school a student could get straight F's and they are promoted to high school. He explained that if you want success there needs to be interventions in the elementary school. He felt that the whole system need to be revamped to increase student success. There is a need to hold kids accountable in middle school.

Rep. Thayne questioned the affect of concurrent enrollment on student's behavior. **Superintendent Wooley** responded that they haven't done research on this yet.

Vice Chairman Shirley thanked the participants and invited any who had additional questions to contact their legislator.

**ADJOURN:**

As there was no further business to be brought before the Committee, Vice Chairman Shirley adjourned the meeting at 10:10 A.M.

---

Representative Mack Shirley  
Vice Chairman

---

Claudia Howell  
Secretary



## MINUTES

### HOUSE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

- DATE:** February 13, 2008
- TIME:** 9 A.M.
- PLACE:** Room 148
- MEMBERS:** Chairman Nonini, Vice Chairman Shirley, Representatives Trail, Bradford, Nielsen, Chadderdon, Shepherd (8), Marriott, Mortimer, Patrick, Thayn, Boe, Pence, Shively
- ABSENT/  
EXCUSED:** Representatives Block, Wills, Chavez and Durst
- GUESTS:** See attached list.
- Chairman Nonini called the meeting to order at 9 A.M. and a silent roll was taken.
- MOTION:** Rep. Shively made a motion to approve the minutes from February 11<sup>th</sup> as submitted. On a voice vote, the motion carried.
- MOTION:** Rep. Shively made a motion to approve the minutes from February 12<sup>th</sup> as submitted. On a voice vote, the motion carried.
- RS 17876:** **Rep. Ken Roberts** presented this RS to the Committee. He explained that this proposed legislation would amend Idaho Code to provide state funding from the Public Education Stabilization Fund to temporarily mitigate the impact on certain Idaho school districts for loss of Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Depreciation Act federal funds. If the Superintendent of Public Instruction determines that the federal government has reauthorized the Secure Rural Schools and Self-Determination Act, these funds will not be distributed. He explained that last year **H 330** was passed by the Legislature which provided \$60 million to be set aside for economic issues across the state. Part of this funding was used for rural school districts who did not receive the federal funds from the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Depreciation Act (referred to as Craig-Wyden money). He further explained that the purpose of the extra money was that if Craig-Wyden money was not appropriated, extra money would be needed. He explained that the extra funds were not needed last year, but there is a question about funding for this year. He explained that the fiscal impact will be based on the distribution made by the federal government for secure schools funding as of December 2007 which is approximately \$6 million dollars. For December 2008, the amount of state funding would be would be 70% or approximately \$4.3 million, in December of 2009 it would be 55% or \$3.3 million, in December 2010 it would be 40% or \$2.4 million and in December 2011 the amount of state funding would be 25% or \$1.5 million. He explained that if the federal government does come up with payment, the school districts would come up with money to pay back to the fund. He explained that the current balance of the Stabilization Fund is more than \$110 million, so there would be no impact on the state general funds.

**MOTION:**

Rep. Bradford made a motion **to introduce RS 17876 to print**. In the discussion on the motion, **Rep. Roberts** explained that the money that was appropriated last year was not expended. He explained that he would provide to Committee members a list of various school districts and how they have been paid previously. He further explained that 90% to 95% of land in these rural school districts is federal land and the federal funds are a way for revenues from federal lands to be given to schools. He further explained that 30% of those dollars are given to the schools. On a voice vote, the motion carried.

In response to Committee questions regarding Superintendent Luna's revamped merit based teacher compensation plan, Chairman Nonini explained that they are in the process of drafting new legislation with compromise language and the details are not known at this time.

Chairman Nonini discussed with the Committee members budget issues they would like him to discuss with JFAC in his presentation on Friday. He reported that the Senate Education Committee will be discussing their recommendations at 3 P.M. this afternoon. He explained that outlined in the Feb. 11<sup>th</sup> minutes there are five things that the Committee is supportive of. He explained that he has spoken with **Matt Freeman**, who is the budget analyst with the Department of Education, regarding the issue of concurrent enrollment and why the Governor did not recommend funding. **Mr. Freeman** explained that the Governor had seen other funding requests for concurrent enrollment in the budget requests from Idaho State University and the College of Southern Idaho. He further explained that CSI is requesting an expansion in dual enrollment in math and science areas for rural schools. ISU is asking for \$700,000 dollars from the state to make up the difference between what they charge students for concurrent enrollment and the university's cost. Currently high school students pay \$65/credit and the college student cost is \$214/credit. Chairman Nonini explained that other colleges have not requested this. He asked for comments by Committee members.

Rep. Boe explained that she does not know the exact details but she does know that concurrent enrollment is a new emphasis for ISU. She explained that it involves the development of high school faculty to become accredited as college faculty. Committee members expressed concerns that the funding request for the state to make up the difference would set a precedence for other colleges.

Rep. Chadderdon explained that the state should be careful on how they proceed forward with concurrent enrollment. She further explained that Washington has a strong concurrent enrollment program, but they do take funds from the school district for this. There is a need to come up with some formula that doesn't harm school districts.

Rep. Thayne referred to a handout from the Division of Financial Management which outlines the cost per student for higher education. He explained that students are not paying the full amount now.

Rep. Mortimer discussed the need to proceed carefully with concurrent enrollment. He explained that ISU is leading out among other institutions. He suggested that a representative from ISU could come in and justify their request. He further explained that ISU's president, Dr. Vailus, has reported that one of the problems in the Utah concurrent enrollment model was accreditation. ISU is putting a lot of focus on making sure concurrent enrollment classes are accredited.

Rep. Nielsen reported that he had talked with the Superintendent at Westside School District last year regarding concurrent enrollment. He explained that students were paying \$50/credit to Utah State and he did not know if they have had a problem with accreditation.

In response to Committee questions, State Board spokesman, **Mark Browning** explained the Board did approve ISU's budget at their meeting last year. He further explained that this issue was not discussed.

Rep. Shirley explained that this is a tough topic to discuss. He explained that ISU is leading out in offering concurrent enrollment and would hate to put a damper on what they are doing. He reported that the schools are excited about it in the eastern part of the state. He further reported that Utah has huge amounts of money appropriated by their legislature for concurrent enrollment and Idaho has to take a different approach. Additional funding might establish a precedence, but the Committee should give ISU a chance to respond. He explained that it costs a lot more than \$65/credit to deliver college credits. Chairman Nonini explained that it is his concern that Governor hasn't funded concurrent enrollment because it has been asked for by other institutions. It was mentioned that the Committee could request the Superintendent's office to work together with universities in their funding requests.

Rep. Marriott explained that there are start up costs associated with any projects. There are costs involved with bringing high school teachers up to accreditation. Rep. Patrick explained that funding for concurrent enrollment should be based across the state, not just in particular schools. There is a need to encourage more of this.

Rep. Mortimer reported that there has been some confusion on the classroom supplies issue in the budget. He explained that one of the issues that has been brought to him was that legislation that was drafted gave flexibility as to how that money was spent. He reported that in eastern Idaho, classroom teachers were not given the entire \$350 dollars. He explained that it needs to be treated fairly across the state. He further explained that if it is a general appropriation, why is it being treated as a line item. There is a need to give the benefits directly to the teachers.

**Luci Willits**, representing the Superintendent's office, responded that there has been pockets in the state of teachers not received all of this money. She explained that it is the Superintendent's priority that this money go directly to the teachers. She further explained that there has been talk about defining the intent language. It was mentioned that the intent is definitely to get money in the classroom and teachers had already had access to money before this legislation. It was further mentioned that in some cases teachers had access to more money than the \$350 for classroom supplies.

After the bill, teachers were shortchanged with their funds. **Ms. Willits** responded that she did not have the information in front of her, but some school districts offered teachers if they already had money that they could supplant this money. Many districts did not have access to money for classroom supplies. Some school districts have handled this money differently. This has been a learning experience and there is a need to be much more careful. It was felt that the language was too broad but it is a good thing and great progress has been made, but there is a need to do better.

**Rob Wislow**, representing the School Administrators Association, explained that there is a concern with the parameters of the intent language and it has caused some concern in how to implement the legislation. He explained that it is not that rare for some school districts to give teachers money for supplies. In the way the intent language was written, administrators could hand out money to the teacher. There is a need for tight parameters. He explained that any language that could clean this up would be helpful to administrators.

**Sherri Wood**, representing the IEA, commented that they are now in the middle of surveying every school in the state to see how the \$350 was given to teachers. They have heard some of the same stories the Committee has already heard. She further explained that some districts already purchase tape, staples, and other office supplies and if the teachers were given \$350 then they had to buy those items. She explained that she will get the survey information back to the Committee at a later date. It was mentioned that some teacher organizations in eastern Idaho were involved with administrators and decided how money was spent. In Boise, teachers received \$250 on a p-card and \$100 was left at the building. Rep. Marriott reported that not everyone in eastern Idaho had problems. Rep. Boe reported that teachers in her district were delighted to get money but she is concerned about other certified employees who did not receive the money.

Rep. Shively explained that the need is at the elementary level. He explained that at the secondary level almost no one bought extra supplies. There is a need to help elementary teachers more.

Rep. Shepherd explained that prior to last year's legislation, funds for classroom supplies came from discretionary funds.

Chairman Nonini explained that there has been agreement among the Committee with the five recommendations from February 11<sup>th</sup> minutes. These recommendations include support for funding of concurrent enrollment, salary based apportionment, a longitudinal data system, the math initiative and discretionary funds.

**ADJOURN:**

As there was no further business to be brought before the Committee, Chairman Nonini adjourned the meeting at 10 A.M.

---

Representative Bob Nonini  
Chairman

---

Claudia Howell  
Secretary

## MINUTES

### HOUSE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

- DATE:** February 14, 2008
- TIME:** 9 A.M.
- PLACE:** Room 148
- MEMBERS:** Chairman Nonini, Vice Chairman Shirley, Representatives Trail, Bradford, Block, Nielsen, Wills, Chadderdon, Shepherd (8), Marriott, Mortimer, Patrick, Thayn, Boe, Pence, Chavez, Durst, Shively
- ABSENT/  
EXCUSED:** None
- GUESTS:** See attached list
- Chairman Nonini called the meeting to order at 9 A.M. and a silent roll was taken.
- MOTION:** Rep. Shively made a motion to approve the minutes of the February 13<sup>th</sup> meeting as submitted. On a voice vote, the motion carried.
- H 502:** **Rep. Darrell Bolz** presented this bill to the Committee. He explained that the purpose of this legislation is to allow for charter schools chartered by the Public Charter School Commission which has a primary attendance zone within more than one school district to be able to relocate to another school district within the primary attendance zone as established in the charter. He explained that this would be no different than any other public school. In response to questions, **Rep. Bolz** clarified that the board of directors at each of the relevant school districts would both need to approve the move and it has to be within the primary attendance zone.
- MOTION:** Rep. Wills made a motion **to send HB 502 to the Floor with a DO PASS recommendation.** On a voice a vote, the motion passed. Rep. Bolz will sponsor the bill on the Floor.
- H 384:** **Marty Peterson** presented this bill to the Committee. He explained that the purpose of this legislation is to promote private giving for construction of higher education facilities in Idaho by providing for matching funds from the Legislature. He explained that this legislation is supported by the State Board of Education and the Governor. He explained that the Permanent Building Fund is used as the primary source for building public buildings and renovations for state owned buildings. He gave Committee members a handout which outlined the Permanent Building Fund dedicated revenue sources. (See attached). He explained that the Budget Stabilization Fund is at its maximum amount. He also discussed the average balance and distribution of permanent building fund dollars. He explained that the average annual Permanent Building Fund dedicated income is \$29.4 million. He further explained that it is entirely up to legislature and the Governor if any money goes into the matching fund. It would require a dollar for dollar match, and it would be deposited in an account in the higher education fund. The money in the fund would be appropriated to permanent building fund.

He clarified that it cannot be used for building maintenance. The money from the fund would be used for new construction, renovations and remodels only. The Legislature would determine when funds are put in.

In response to questions, **Mr. Peterson** clarified that money appropriated by the legislature would be from a surplus of general funds. He explained that higher education needed flexibility beyond just state appropriated funds. In response to Committee questions, **Mr. Peterson** explained that maintenance is determined by a dollar level. He further explained that determination would be made by the Permanent Building Fund Advisory Council as to how to distribute the funds. The Council submits a priority list that goes to the Governor then JFAC. Council members are appointed by Governor and consists of a Senator, Representative, a contractor, and one from the public. He clarified that donations would be tax deductible by both the federal and state.

In response to a Committee question regarding what the motivation behind the legislation is, **Mr. Peterson** explained that any given year when there is not a state surplus, the state can only provide about \$7 million from the Permanent Building Fund. He further explained that higher education has significant needs. When asked how would matching funds work, **Mr. Peterson** replied that only monies that would be used for providing a state match would be money appropriated by legislature. If the fund is not appropriated, a donor could have money come back. The legislation does not commit the legislature or the Governor to appropriate matching funds. **Mr. Peterson** explained that community colleges would have access to these funds, but pointed out that they have ability to go out and get a bond for additional funding. In response to a Committee question regarding the other agencies who receive money from the Permanent Building Fund, **Mr. Peterson** explained that the flow of dedicated money from the Permanent Building Fund will continue as it has always been. He further explained that the possibilities of other agencies being able to raise private funds is remote. He explained that creation of a matching fund would not influence how the Commission would prioritize money for projects. There is a possibility that the Commission might appropriate less money out of this fund for higher education because matching funds may be available.

**MOTION:** Rep. Mortimer made a motion **to send HB 384 to the Floor with a DO PASS recommendation**. On a voice vote, the motion passed. Rep. Shirley will sponsor the bill on the House Floor.

**H 506:** **Rep. Mack Shirley** presented this bill to the Committee. He explained that the purpose of this legislation is to provide the Idaho Digital Learning Academy with financial independence from a host school district. All changes allow IDLA to continue operating in the same fashion as the preceding five years. An additional change allows IDLA to extend service to students in lower grades due to growth and to accommodate stakeholder needs. He explained that there are currently gifted and talented math students in sixth grade that take IDLA pre-algebra. This change will allow the law to reflect an existing service that IDLA provides to gifted and talented students in the state. He explained that when "Districts" are referred to in the bill they are not school districts, but patterned after public health districts. The IDLA will gain independent status on January 1, 2009.

He explained that the new sections of the bill were added to better accommodate the transition of IDLA into independent status. The IDLA has received approval and support from the State Board of Education, the Department of Education, the Attorney General's office, the Governor, the Idaho Education Association, the School Board Association, and the Administrators Association.

**Dr. Donna Vakili**, director of IDLA, gave a brief overview of the Idaho Digital Learning Academy. She discussed why districts use them, the course offerings and the benefits to districts. She provided Committee members of a list of who is on their board of directors. She explained that there has been a 58% increase in enrollment from last year. She further explained that 87% districts in Idaho are using IDLA. The IDLA is the first virtual school in the state. She explained that the IDLA is grateful to the Blaine County School District, but they now have grown enough to be independent. This legislation would allow the IDLA to operate status quo. She explained that stakeholders were contacted and everyone is supportive.

**Mike Chatterton**, business manager from the Blaine County School District addressed the Committee. He explained that he has been involved with IDLA since it started. He explained that the Blaine County School District during FY2002 had an expenditure impact for IDLA of \$250 per student, and now the impact is \$970 per student because of the growth. He reported that he has been associated with the IDLA staff for the past six years and is comfortable that they have asked the right questions. He explained that the Blaine County School District will work closely with the IDLA to make the transition a smooth one.

**MOTION:**

Rep. Nielsen made a motion **to send HB 506 to the Floor with a DO PASS recommendation.**

In the discussion on the motion, **Donna Vakili** clarified that the IDLA already gets a sales tax exemption from Blaine County. It was mentioned that there is a need to get support from the Revenue and Tax committee for this legislation. In response to a Committee question regarding the reason for striking "secondary" in the legislation, **Ms. Vakili** explained that it is possible but not probable that a kindergartner could use IDLA. She further explained that the IDLA wanted to leave flexibility in the local school districts hands. In response to a question regarding organizational structure, **Ms. Vakili** explained that IDLA is associated with the Department of Education and the Superintendent of Schools is on their board and presents their budget to JFAC. She further explained that she has worked with Superintendent Luna on the language in the bill. The language in the legislation is maintaining what has been established in the beginning for the IDLA and is modeled after public health districts. IDLA has accountability to the State Department of Education and the State Board of Education. Rep. Mortimer explained that he sees in the legislation that they are responsible only to the rules of the State Board. He further explained that procedure, policy and statute are different. **Ms. Vakili** responded that she could meet with LSO or budget analyst Jason Hancock to clarify why the language was put in the bill this way. It was felt that there is a need to clarify why "State Department of Education" has been stricken on the first page of the bill on line 24.

**Ms. Vakili** explained that IDLA is not creating something that is outside Idaho code.

**Ms. Vakili** clarified that IDLA still allows for adult learners. She also clarified that employees are at will employees. Teachers are independent contractors that work for IDLA.

**SUBSTITUTE MOTION:**

Rep. Mortimer made a Substitute **Motion to send H 506 to General Orders**. He explained that he would work with IDLA and the Department of Education on clarifying the language. After Committee discussion, Rep. Mortimer **withdrew his Substitute Motion** and made a **new Substitute Motion to hold H 506 until time certain Monday, February 18<sup>th</sup>** which would give him time to meet with IDLA and the Department to discuss the language. On a voice vote, the motion carried.

Chairman Nonini announced that Rep. Patrick, sponsor of **H 444**, which was scheduled today, is still having discussions with the Department of Education regarding the bill and the Committee will hold a hearing on the bill at a later time.

Chairman Nonini further announced that he will be presenting to JFAC at 8:30 A.M. on Monday, February 18<sup>th</sup> instead of tomorrow. He reported that **Sen. Goedde** did present to JFAC this morning and did not speak to the math initiative, but did discuss the rest of the same issues as the Committee supports. He mentioned that there is some support among JFAC members for concurrent enrollment.

**ADJOURN:**

As there was no further business to be brought before the Committee, Chairman Nonini adjourned the meeting at 10:20 A.M.

---

Representative Bob Nonini  
Chairman

---

Claudia Howell  
Secretary



## MINUTES

### HOUSE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

- DATE:** February 18, 2008
- TIME:** 9 A.M.
- PLACE:** Room 148
- MEMBERS:** Chairman Nonini, Vice Chairman Shirley, Representatives Trail, Bradford, Block, Nielsen, Wills, Chadderdon, Shepherd (8), Marriott, Mortimer, Patrick, Thayn, Boe, Pence, Chavez, Durst, Shively
- ABSENT/  
EXCUSED:** None
- GUESTS:** See attached list.
- Chairman Nonini called the meeting to order at 9 A.M. and a silent roll was taken.
- MOTION:** Rep. Wills made a motion to approve the February 14<sup>th</sup>, 2008 minutes as submitted. On a voice vote, the motion carried.
- MOTION:** Rep. Wills made a motion to approve the January 21<sup>st</sup>, 22<sup>nd</sup>, 23<sup>rd</sup>, and 24<sup>th</sup>, 2008 joint minutes as submitted. On a voice vote, the motion carried.
- RS 17910C1:** Chairman Nonini presented this RS to the Committee and turned the gavel over to Vice Chairman Shirley to conduct the meeting. Chairman Nonini reported that his presentation to JFAC this morning went well. He explained that he touched on the 5 things the Committee recommended for funding.
- He introduced **Mike Gwartney**, director of the Department of Administration and **Tom Luna**, State Superintendent of Schools, who are co-sponsors of this legislation. He mentioned that the Committee recently has had a presentation regarding the Utah Education Network and he would like to see an Idaho Education Network in place. He explained that the purpose of this legislation is to enable the Department of Administration to start the process of identifying areas in Idaho that do not currently provide broadband capability. The intent of the legislation would allow the Department of Administration to develop a mapping of those under-served areas. This legislation would also create a place for funds when available for the continued development of the Idaho Education Network. He explained that he has already has talked to co-chairs of JFAC and currently there is no money to fund the Idaho Education Network. This legislation would enable the Department of Administration to identify areas of Idaho that do not have broadband capability and create a place for funds when they are available.
- MOTION:** Rep. Durst made a motion to introduce **RS 17910C1** to print. On a voice vote, the motion carried.

**H 506:** Chairman Nonini explained that changes are needed for this bill and new legislation will be introduced. He further explained that language related to taxation needs to be taken out of the bill and a new RS will be drafted for consideration in the Revenue and Taxation Committee.

**MOTION:** Rep. Nielsen made a motion to **HOLD H 506 in Committee**. On a voice vote, the motion carried.

**H 505:** Rep. Pence presented this bill to the Committee. She explained that the purpose of this legislation is to amend Idaho Code relating to the board of trustees of school districts created by consolidation. It also amends Idaho Code in providing that districts that have been consolidated after January 1, 2008 will consist of five members if two districts are consolidated; seven members if three districts are consolidated; and up to nine members if four or more districts are consolidated. The legislation also revises the method of appointed trustees, whereby the tiebreaker is appointed by the board of county commissioners of the county with the most students.

In response to Committee questions, Rep. Pence explained that this legislation provides assurance that each district has a trustee and rules would have to be developed. She further explained that after consolidation, the trustee zones will be divided so that the former districts in the new district will not be split into different trustee zones. There is no fiscal impact. She reported that she had no knowledge of any districts that are ready to consolidate. In response to questions, Rep. Pence explained it would be up to the Superintendent of Schools as to how to deal with the issue when there are five or more districts that want to consolidate. In response to a question regarding on what date would a school district determine the count used for the enrollment figure, Rep. Pence responded that it would be whatever day the school districts use to count their population to get their funding.

It was mentioned that the way the bill is written, private school students would be counted as part of the district. It was suggested that "public school" should be added to the language to clarify that private schools would not be included. When asked when additional trustees are needed if more than three districts consolidate and whether they would they be appointed or elected, Rep. Pence responded that the State Superintendent of Schools would appoint the trustees and they do not need an appointment by the county. It was mentioned that the legislation refers to the State Superintendent of Public Instruction in some places in the bill and Superintendent in other places and more clarity is needed.

Rep. Pence explained that consolidation really works with small schools and probably would not happen with larger school districts. She further explained that the bill was designed for smaller school districts. She also explained that nothing says a school district has to consolidate and it would be voluntary. It was mentioned that maybe language could be added to address population shifts.

**MOTION:** Rep. Shirley made a motion to **HOLD H 505 to time certain, Monday, February 25<sup>th</sup>**. On a voice vote, the motion carried. Rep. Pence will work on clarifying the language in the bill to address the concerns of the Committee.

Chairman Nonini announced that today is the last day for the Committee Page, Morgen Ellis. Morgen mentioned that she would like to attend George Washington University in Washington DC. She commented that serving as a House Page has been more beneficial and fun than sitting in a government class every day. She was presented with a gift card from the Committee.

**ADJOURN:**

As there was no further business to be brought before the Committee, Chairman Nonini adjourned the meeting at 9:45 A.M.

---

Representative Bob Nonini  
Chairman

---

Claudia Howell  
Secretary

## MINUTES

### HOUSE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

**DATE:** February 19, 2008

**TIME:** 9 A.M.

**PLACE:** Room 148

**MEMBERS:** Chairman Nonini, Vice Chairman Shirley, Representatives Trail, Bradford, Block, Nielsen, Wills, Chadderdon, Shepherd (8), Marriott, Mortimer, Patrick, Thayn, Boe, Pence, Chavez, Durst, Shively

**ABSENT/  
EXCUSED:** None

**GUESTS:** See attached list.

Chairman Nonini called the meeting to order at 9 A.M. and a silent roll was taken. The new Committee Page, Nikky Wilson, from Nampa was introduced to the Committee.

**MOTION:** Rep. Shively made a motion to accept the minutes of the February 18<sup>th</sup>, 2008 meeting as submitted. On a voice vote, the motion carried.

**PRESENTATION** **Allison McClintick** from the State Board of Education addressed the Committee. She discussed the teacher mentoring program. She explained that two years ago the teacher mentoring program moved under the School Boards Association. She further explained that the state is working with New Teacher Center from UC Santa Cruz on an Idaho model for teacher mentoring. She reported that Idaho would like the mentoring model to be made available to all school districts statewide, regardless of size. She introduced **Jan Miles**, Regional Director of the New Teacher Center at the University of California at Santa Cruz and **Christina Linder**, director of new teacher standards for the State Department of Education to the Committee. **Ms. McClintick** reported that the State Board and the State Department of Education are working closely together on the mentoring project. She further reported that they are not asking for funds, but will return and report to the Committee at a later time on how the program is working in Idaho.

**Jan Miles**, introduced herself as a "passionate educator". She explained that the New Teacher Center at UC Santa Cruz is a national resource focused on teacher and administrator induction. The Center was established in 1988 as a systematic, mentor-based teacher induction model. In working with new teachers and new principals the Center's programs help novices not only to survive their early years, but to emerge as confident, skilled professionals. Using an integrated, collaborative approach, the Center strives to support essential research, well-informed policy, and thoughtful practice that encourage teacher development throughout the career of a teacher. She explained that just putting money in a program does not make a sound mentoring program. An induction program essential components include, program vision, institutional commitment and support, professional standards, quality mentoring (need criteria for mentors), and classroom-based teacher learning.

She discussed the importance of teacher quality, equity demands that we act, why full time mentors are needed. She also discussed the benefits to mentors. She reported that 50% of those involved in the mentoring program took on leadership positions, 91% returned to work in schools, and 94% reported that mentoring deepened their understanding of teaching and learning. She discussed Idaho's creation of a robust induction program and the next steps. She explained that Idaho has piloted a Mentor Academy series which was grant funded with 15 school districts. The plan is to train mentors in regional geographical areas. She further explained that program standards are critical. She also discussed the program quality factors which include; mentor selection, training, and accountability, on-going professional development for mentors, focus on student work and equitable student achievement, collaborative, reflective processes, and select professional development opportunities.

In response to Committee questions, **Ms. Miles** explained that turnover rate statistics were broken down between elementary and high school and research was looking at K-8 schools and 9-12 schools. In response to a question regarding if mentoring could be used as a measuring tool for merit pay, **Ms. Miles** responded that the mentoring program has produced results that could be rewarded for merit pay. She further reported that she has seen across the nation that merit pay could inhibit collaboration but in some areas it works well. She also has seen student achievement climb as a result of implementation of the mentoring model.

**Christina Linder** addressed the Committee. She explained that the Department of Education has used the lion's share of Title II funds for mentoring model. The state is implementing a baseline survey and will do the same again next year. The state is focusing on 13 school districts. She explained that it is not inexpensive to do the mentoring project right. She further explained that the state does not expect all districts would meet the criteria for this program. She reported that the Department is committed to use state project dollars to show the state how this program works well. It was suggested that pilot project districts that are currently involved in the mentoring project could report to the Committee as to how the program is working in their districts. It was also requested that **Ms. McClintick** would provide the estimated costs for this program for the Committee.

## **PRESENTATION**

**Becky Young**, the Legislative Representative of the Boise Parent Community Advisory Council addressed the Committee. (Written testimony attached). She explained that the PCAC is a parent and community advocacy organization committed to providing a non-partisan, open public forum, communicating concerns regarding public education. They are dedicated toward a high standard of parental involvement and leadership in the community and they educate themselves on issues that affect their children and families. They support Idaho public schools and students. She reported at their meeting in November they met with representatives from the Department of Education regarding teacher pay for performance. She further reported that they support and value the role that teachers have on their children's education and they also support the idea of teacher collaboration. The PCAC has one primary concern regarding merit pay for teachers. She explained that performance pay for teachers measured only by the ISAT results is an unacceptable measure to their parents. They have voiced that concern with the Department.

In response to a question from the Committee, **Ms. Young** explained that the organization is primarily in the Treasure Valley, but it does communicate with parents statewide. It was suggested that with the loss of funding for the "Parents as Teachers" program that PCAC could replace this program. **Ms. Young** responded that the group already has an infrastructure in place and is involved with the Libraries' "Read To Me" program. She further explained that the PCAC would be interested in looking at getting involved with the "Parents as Teachers" program.

Chairman Nonini announced that the Senate Education Committee will be sending a RS regarding merit pay for teachers to the Senate State Affairs Committee for printing this afternoon. He also mentioned that the Senate Education Committee will be hearing a bill this afternoon which deals with streamlining a process to get some teachers out of the profession.

**ADJOURN:**

As there was no further business to be brought before the Committee, Chairman Nonini adjourned the meeting at 9:55 A.M.

---

Representative Bob Nonini  
Chairman

---

Claudia Howell  
Secretary

## MINUTES

### HOUSE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

**DATE:** February 20, 2008

**TIME:** 9 A.M.

**PLACE:** Room 148

**MEMBERS:** Chairman Nonini, Vice Chairman Shirley, Representatives Trail, Bradford, Block, Nielsen, Wills, Chadderdon, Shepherd (8), Marriott, Mortimer, Patrick, Thayn, Boe, Pence, Chavez, Durst, Shively

**ABSENT/  
EXCUSED:** None

**GUESTS:** See attached list

Chairman Nonini called the meeting to order at 9 A.M. and a silent roll was taken.

**MOTION:** Rep. Shively made a motion to approve the minutes of February 19<sup>th</sup>, 2008 as submitted. On a voice vote, the motion carried.

**H 398:** **Dr. Michael Graham**, Administrator of the Idaho Division of Vocational Rehabilitation presented this bill to the Committee. He explained that the purpose of this legislation is to allow Vocational Rehabilitation to pay insurance premiums and travel costs to and from dialysis when needed for their clients who have end stage renal disease. Medicare and Medicaid funds would be utilized before state dollars are utilized. **Dr. Graham** explained that IDVR has been administering the program for end stage renal disease clients since the 1970's which was prior to Medicaid and Medicare. He further explained that about 10% of individuals with end stage renal disease come to IDVR as clients to get back into the workforce. IDVR has made partial payments for dialysis treatment and travel costs, but Idaho statute did not specify they could provide these services. This legislation is asking for IDVR to have statutory authority to provide payment for insurance premiums for clients with end stage renal disease and specifies that the agency does not make medical payments beyond Medicare and Medicaid. He explained that it is a no cost bill. He further explained that there may be a cost in the future. He reported that IDVR serves around 200 end stage renal clients per year.

In response to questions, **Dr. Graham** explained that the average length of time that an end stage renal client is served is about three years. He reported that IDVR has not encountered any insurance issues. He explained that the funds come from State General Fund dollars and the budget for these services is about half a million dollars a year. He explained that of 200 clients, he did not know how many are young people. He also explained that the agency does go before JFAC every year to request the budget for this program. He further explained that the program is unique under IDVR.

**MOTION:**

Rep. Chadderdon made a motion **to send H 398 to the Floor with a DO PASS recommendation**. On a voice vote, the motion passed. Rep. Chadderdon will sponsor the bill on the Floor.

Chairman Nonini reported that Chairman Goedde of the Senate Education Committee will hear the new iSTARS bill in the committee tomorrow. The proposed cost of the new legislation is about \$31 million. He explained that there is a 1% increase in the base pay for teachers and the achievement part cost is approximately \$14 million. He further explained that mentoring was moved down from leadership category to local control and bonuses are \$1,200 and \$600 dollars. **Senator Goedde** then addressed the Committee. He explained that yesterday he introduced two bills and the Senate State Affairs Committee printed them this morning. He explained that in the new iSTARS legislation, there is a student achievement part, a scarcity piece and leadership piece. He further explained that 75% of teachers would be eligible for student achievement piece. He also explained that there is a piece in the proposed legislation about the longitudinal data system that has been requested by the State Superintendent of Schools. The proposed legislation states that the Superintendent will consider other measures for achievement instead of ISAT if the data system is implemented. **Sen. Goedde** explained that it is his intent to have an initial hearing tomorrow and he is concerned about giving educators across the state an opportunity to listen to the hearing. He has spoken with Public Television and they are discussing options such as a webcast or taping the hearing and broadcasting it at a later time. He also reported that the Committee will also be hearing a second bill that streamlines the termination process for teachers. He explained that this was an idea from IEA. He explained that it is his feeling that the bill regarding streamlining the termination process has to run at the same time as iSTARS bill. He further explained that he has not considered a joint hearing as yet.

**PRESENTATION**

**Cindy Johnstone** from the State Department of Education and **Dr. Jonathan Brendefur** from Boise State University discussed the Math Initiative with the Committee. **Ms. Johnstone** explained that the Department has had about 18 people working on a task force utilizing \$350,000 that was appropriated by the Legislature last year for that study. She reported that the Department will be starting a pilot project soon. The goal of the Math Initiative is to develop an initiative that will focus on improving math education in all grades to ensure every student is prepared for higher levels of math in the middle grades, high school, post-secondary, and work force settings. She explained that the three goals that will be addressed are student achievement (assessment, intervention, standards, and curriculum), teacher education, and public awareness. She further explained that the Department is proposing to spend \$2.3 million on student achievement. They will develop and pilot assessment for grades K-2 and continue the direct math assessment for grades 4, 6 and 8. They propose to do an intervention program for middle grade students. She explained that a written assessment would look at the processes students are doing to come up with their answers. Intervention would be looking at teacher education to fill that need. She explained that there is a need for a program that has been researched. She further explained that intervention would include tutoring. She reported that the Department has looked at tutoring program that costs approximately \$1.3 million.



It offers incentives for students and students could work online after school or in the summer. The program would work with students above and below grade level. She explained that the Math Initiative will be working with those from the Rural School Initiative and the Middle School Initiative. In response to a question regarding student access to computers, **Ms. Johnstone** explained that research has shown that 85% of students have internet access at home. She further explained that they would look into the issue of pockets in the state that do not have internet access before any decisions are made.

She explained that to help the Math Initiative move forward, teachers need coordinated training. Part of the student achievement goal is a need to build up standards at the high school level. She reported that the Department has been working on these standards and they are in the final stage and hopefully will be implemented next fall. The Department has also given careful consideration during textbook adoption to choose curriculum in line with Math Initiative goals. She reported that Teacher Education goal cost is \$1.5 million. The Department will develop a core class for all math teachers and administrators that will be required by certification in 2015. It is proposed that the State will pay for the credits for the first three years. She explained that in March the Department will gather representatives from universities across the state to talk about what should be in core class. She clarified that the math core class would be for K-8 teachers and high school teachers that teach that content. She further clarified that the standards would be aligned for out of state educated teachers and the Department is working together with the State Board for an endorsement to add on to teacher certificates. She explained that the Department will be looking at accessing retired math teachers for regional math specialists. She further explained that they would hold regional training seminars so teachers would not have to travel. She explained that the Department is asking for \$100,000 for public awareness to create a broad awareness that high level mathematical thinking is critical to meet the expanding demands and opportunities of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. They plan to do this with brochures, family math nights and newsletters. She explained that it is critical to get the parent's support.

It was mentioned that currently funding for the Math Initiative is not in the Governor's budget. The Committee expressed the hope that it can get funded this year.

**Dr. Jonathan Brendefur** addressed the Committee. He explained the difference between fluency and flexibility in solving math problems. Fluency is having the facts down and flexibility being able to solve problems using other methods and strategies. He explained that students fail in the middle school, and 17% fewer students are proficient in doing algebraic problems. He used the example of 17 multiplied by 17. He explained the various ways to solve the problem. He reported that knowing how the process works is fundamental for students. There is a need to give more contextual problems to kids in younger grades. Teachers have to be able to see relationships and ask all of the questions. Developing mathematical thinking include, take student's ideas seriously, press students conceptually, encourage multiple strategies, address misconceptions and focus on the structure of mathematics.

In response to question regarding class size and the difficulty that teachers have to see if their students have math misconceptions, **Dr. Brendefur** explained that teacher training would focus on what kind of math misconceptions students have at different grade levels.

Chairman Nonini thanked **Ms. Johnstone** and **Dr. Brendefur** for their informative presentation and expressed the Committee's desire that the Math Initiative be funded.

**ADJOURN:**

As there was no further business to be brought before the Committee, Chairman Nonini adjourned the meeting at 10 A.M.

---

Representative Bob Nonini  
Chairman

---

Claudia Howell  
Secretary

## MINUTES

### HOUSE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

- DATE:** February 21, 2008
- TIME:** 8:30 A.M.
- PLACE:** Room 148
- MEMBERS:** Chairman Nonini, Vice Chairman Shirley, Representatives Trail, Bradford, Block, Nielsen, Wills, Chadderdon, Shepherd (8), Marriott, Mortimer, Patrick, Thayn, Boe, Pence, Chavez, Durst, Shively
- ABSENT/  
EXCUSED:** None
- GUESTS:** See attached list.
- Chairman Nonini called the meeting to order at 8:30 A.M. and a silent roll was taken.
- MOTION:** Rep. Wills made a motion to approve the minutes from the February 20<sup>th</sup>, 2008 meeting as submitted. On a voice vote, the motion carried.
- Chairman Nonini turned the gavel over to Vice Chairman Shirley as he had another meeting to attend.
- RS 17963:** Rep. Wills presented this RS to the Committee. He explained that the Committee has already heard about this legislation concerning the Idaho Digital Learning Academy. The purpose of the legislation is to provide the IDLA with financial independence from a host school district. He reported that there has been no testimony against this legislation. He further reported that the Committee already has had testimony regarding the reason for the change. He pointed out that on page 2; lines 28 through 30, the legislation clarifies that the State Superintendent of Schools is a voting member of the IDLA. He also pointed out that on page 4; lines 15 and 16, the legislation clarifies that an annual audit will be conducted of the IDLA. He explained that the legislation is not making a new state entity and there is no fiscal impact.
- MOTION:** Rep. Mortimer made a motion to introduce **RS 17963** to print. **Donna Vakili**, executive director of the Idaho Digital Learning Academy distributed an organizational chart to the Committee members.
- SUBSTITUTE MOTION:** Rep. Bradford made a Substitute Motion to send **RS 17963** to print and send directly to the second reading calendar. Vice Chairman Shirley explained that the Committee has already heard testimony on this legislation and the only change is that the financial part about the IDLA being tax exempt is taken out of the proposed legislation. He further explained that the tax exemption piece will be in a separate RS and will be heard in the Revenue and Taxation Committee. On a voice vote, the Substitute Motion passed.

**RS 17708C1:** **Rep. Jaquet** presented this RS to the Committee. She explained that **Senator Broadsword** worked on this legislation last year. She explained that this legislation will allow any child who is five years of age and who has completed private kindergarten in this state or another state, but has not reached the "school age" requirement in Idaho the opportunity to enter the first grade. She further explained that their entrance into the first grade will be permitted following successful completion of an assessment designed by the State Department of Education to gauge their readiness to enter the first grade. She explained that a cost of \$10,000 is requested to cover the travel expenses of committee members to create the assessment and to provide for any review of the assessment to take place. She explained the purpose of the legislation is to focus on the child and it creates a process for children who have attended kindergarten out of state to attend first grade in Idaho. She further explained that it would be a statewide assessment. She also explained that children both out of state and in state who are not 6 by the September 1<sup>st</sup> deadline who have attended private kindergarten, could take the assessment within 10 days of the beginning of school.

**MOTION:** Rep. Durst made a motion to introduce **RS 17708C1** to print. In the discussion on the motion, **Rep. Jaquet** clarified that the assessment would be given to the school district, then the district would decide how they would use it. She also reported that she has worked with the Superintendents and they felt that there needed to be an assessment. It was mentioned that an assessment would be very important and some counseling of parents to let them know about things like maturity and athletic ability would be needed. On a voice vote, the motion passed.

**RS 17953:** **Jason Hancock**, from the State Department of Education presented this RS to the Committee. He explained that this legislation is not changing the state holidays. He explained that the Department of Education has been working on improving customer service. He further explained that the customers of the Department are the public school districts and charter school districts in Idaho. As state employees, they take off Columbus day and Veterans day, but schools do not. Under this legislation, Department employees will work these two days. In return, Department employees will take Christmas Eve and the day after Thanksgiving off, since public schools in Idaho are not in session on these days. In response to a question from the Committee, **Mr. Hancock** reported that he will look into the holiday pay issue for state employees since Columbus day and Veterans day are federal holidays and Christmas Eve and the day after Thanksgiving are not.

**MOTION:** Rep. Patrick made a motion to introduce **RS 17953** to print. On a voice vote, the motion carried.

**RS 17954:** **Mr. Hancock** presented this RS to the Committee. He explained that this legislation clarifies which materials will be retained in the State Department of Education's curriculum library. He further explained that a complete and cataloged library of all curricular materials adopted in the immediately preceding three years and used in Idaho public schools and all electronically available curricular materials for Idaho public schools are to be maintained at the State Department of Education at all times and open to the public.

**MOTION:** Rep. Trail made a motion to introduce **RS 17954** to print. On a voice vote, the motion carried.

**H 503:** Rep. Block presented this bill to the Committee. She explained that Idaho has one of the lowest rates of students going to college primarily because of the cost. She reported that Idaho also has problems with drugs. She further reported that the average age that an individual tries alcohol is 12.9 years old. Idaho is 5<sup>th</sup> in the nation for methamphetamine use. Teen smokers are 8 times more likely to use marijuana. She explained that tobacco and alcohol are gateway drugs. She further explained that 66,000 Idahoans are in need of substance abuse treatment. 70 to 80% of inmates are incarcerated because of drugs and alcohol. She explained that the answer lies in prevention. The proposed legislation Key to the Future scholarship helps with that prevention. She explained that the legislation would create a new pilot project with three school districts; one large, one medium and one small. The school district would receive \$200 per participant. Interested students in their junior and senior year of high school would pledge to be alcohol and tobacco free. If the student does not fail a drug test for during their junior and senior year of high school they would receive a \$2,000 scholarship for any public or private college in Idaho. Rep. Block explained that there is a new fiscal impact statement and the primary source of funds for this scholarship is the Millennium Funds. She explained that these funds would have to be requested each year and if they are not sufficient, the State Board of Education would have to request additional funds. She explained that it is estimated that 500 students will sign up and the total cost would be \$4,850,000 and the legislation would sunset in 2017.

**MOTION:** Rep. Chavez made a motion **to send H 503 to the Floor with a DO PASS recommendation**. In the discussion on the motion, Rep. Block explained that rules will be promulgated as to how the large, medium and small school districts would be defined. It was mentioned that this is a unique approach. Rep. Block reported that she has been contacted by reporter from Chicago about this legislation. It was mentioned that there is a concern about paying students for what they already should be doing. It was also mentioned that what we are doing now is not working and people do respond to incentives.

On a voice vote, the motion carried. Rep. Block will sponsor the bill on the House Floor.

**PRESENTATION** Rep. Bradford introduced **Kay Lynn Beacher** Logan, Utah, who represented Cashe Services, a Community Rehabilitation Provider (CRP) for individuals with disabilities. She explained that her facility serves approximately 200 individuals through work services and has a \$140,000 budget. Vice Chairman Shirley introduced **Dwight Whittaker**, CEO from Development Workshop, a CRP in Idaho Falls and **Russ Doumas** executive director of TESH, a CRP in Coeur d'Alene. **Mr. Doumas** introduced **John Kemp** to the Committee.

**John Kemp** explained that he is the CEO "ACCESS" which serves people with disabilities. He is an advocate for people with disabilities to live full lives. He explained that he was joined by **Kelly Buckland** and **Bobbi Ball** both of whom are advocates for people with disabilities. He explained that he was born without arms and legs but was able to attend regular schools. His father was able to get him into the public school system in 1954.

He explained that there is a need for kids with disabilities to get the support and services they need to become tax paying adults. He further explained that despite the advancements that have been made, people with disabilities still lag behind those without disabilities.

He reported that according to research, 62% of people with disabilities are unemployed. He further reported that by 2010, there will be 168 million jobs in America with only 158 million workers, but people with disabilities are not included in that number. By 2010 the number of younger workers will decline by 25%. He also reported that 92% of consumers look more favorably to companies with inclusive hiring practices. He discussed the disability concept of choice and that all Americans should have the opportunity to work. People with disabilities are challenged at a young age. Students with disabilities are sometimes steered to things by teachers that think are best suited to someone with a disability. Choice can be easily overlooked by non-disability community. He explained that there should be more choices for people with disabilities. He further explained that the Federal government has attempted to bring more choice in employment.

**Mr. Kemp** explained that he leads the 1% Coalition which requires federal agencies to offer incentives to hire those with severe disabilities. He explained that the goal of the Coalition is to help find 100,000 (or 1%) jobs for people with disabilities. By doing this, there would be a return of \$42 million back to the government. He further explained that now there are many state and federal programs that offer incentives, but unemployment rate for people with disabilities rate hasn't changed in 18 years. He reported that people with disabilities are not ignorant of their options. When choices are limited for people with disabilities, they must trust people that best serve their goals and lifestyles. There is a need for a specialized Vocational Rehabilitation system, and to be well served by providers.

In response to questions from the Committee, **Mr. Kemp** explained that, in general, school systems have not done an adequate job in educating individuals with disabilities, but schools are burdened by many issues. There is a need to properly support teachers, but the most important need is to include students with disabilities in the regular classroom. The public has to realize that there are kids with disabilities in the communities. Schools need to give hope to kids with disabilities and we can do better and more. There is a need to ignite the belief that you can be anything you want to be. Schools lose out on class discussion when they do not encompass all kids.

In response to a question regarding if there is a significant difference in funding non profit programs for people with disabilities as opposed to profit programs for people with disabilities, **Mr. Kemp** explained that the for profit programs tend to isolate the most productive services and non profit programs offer all services. In response to a question regarding how legislators could help with this issue, **Mr. Kemp** explained that there is an obligation that providers to serve all people and many times human services programs are under funded. There is a need to debunk myths. In response to a question regarding what are some common occupations for people with disabilities, **Mr. Kemp** explained that there are no occupations that people with disabilities are more involved with. There is no clustering and that is a good thing.

In response to a question regarding what types of disabilities are the most common, **Mr. Kemp** reported that he is seeing a trend of people coming back from Iraq with cognitive and physical issues, and as the population ages, there are more individuals with vision and hearing loss.

In response to a question regarding how can situations be improved in classrooms for students with disabilities, **Mr. Kemp** explained that educational programs are being tested every day and there are many models for integration and inclusion. He explained that inclusion of kids with disabilities is the best and choice is the best. He also mentioned that Congress passed an act that mandated that special education students would be included in the classroom and promised funding, but that funding has not been given to schools. He reported that this has been the major failure on the part of the federal government. The government has only funded about 16% of the cost and the intent was to fund 40% of the cost. He explained that full funding for IDEA is essential. It was mentioned that there is an association at Idaho State University for disabled individuals to participate in an outdoor wilderness program.

In response to a question regarding if there are lessons to be learned from other countries, **Mr. Kemp** explained that there are countries that are doing great work, but are taxing people heavily. Scandinavian countries do provide a personal attendant for individuals with disabilities that want one. Our country is looking more at natural supports where the workplace rallies around individuals with disabilities and support them. He explained that there is a tendency to overlook natural supports. He explained that he will ask for help, but in return will help someone else down the road.

**Russ Dumas** presented **John Kemp** with an award from the Idaho Association of Community Rehabilitation Providers honoring him for his work with individuals with disabilities.

Vice Chairman Shirley thanked **Mr. Kemp** for his inspiring presentation.

**ADJOURN:**

Vice Chairman Shirley announced that the Committee would not meet on Friday morning. There being no further business to be brought before the Committee, he adjourned the meeting at 10:10 A.M.

---

Representative Mack Shirley  
Vice Chairman

---

Claudia Howell  
Secretary

## MINUTES

### HOUSE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

**DATE:** February 25, 2008

**TIME:** 8:30 A.M.

**PLACE:** Room 148

**MEMBERS:** Chairman Nonini, Vice Chairman Shirley, Representatives Trail, Bradford, Block, Nielsen, Wills, Chadderdon, Shepherd (8), Marriott, Mortimer, Patrick, Thayn, Boe, Pence, Chavez, Durst, Shively

**ABSENT/  
EXCUSED:** None

**GUESTS:** See attached list

**MOTION:** Chairman Nonini called the meeting to order at 8:30 A.M. and a silent roll was taken.

Rep. Shively made a motion to approve the minutes from February 21<sup>st</sup>, 2008 meeting as submitted. On a voice vote, the motion carried.

**H 532:** **Rep. Ken Roberts** presented this bill to the Committee. He explained that this legislation would provide state funding from the Public Education Stabilization Fund to temporarily mitigate the impact on certain Idaho School districts for the anticipated loss of Craig-Wyden federal funds. He further explained that this legislation would be stop gap funding for rural school districts in case federal money is not appropriated. The proposed legislation starts with 70% funding level for FY '09 and decreases thereafter. After 2013, there would be no funding. He provided information to Committee members as to which school districts in the state would receive federal dollars.

In response to a question regarding why is it the state's responsibility to make up these funds, **Rep. Roberts** explained that the proposed legislation is not ongoing funding and it eases the impact of the loss of dollars to school districts. He discussed the disparity between districts in amount of federal funds they spend per student. **Rep. Roberts** explained that the total expenditure listed are all the funds considered and includes emergency levies. He further explained that school districts have an automatic levy rate and some districts are used to spending at a higher level, and the state has allowed this. He also explained that extra money is raised locally and spent per student. He further explained that the some of the disparity is due to how much land is submitted for property tax. Some districts have public land and the tax burden falls on the school district to make up tax money. In response to a question, **Rep. Roberts** explained that the Orofino school district has a reduction in the number of available jobs and also has a great number of public lands. Even though they receive Craig-Wyden money, they have gone to a four day work week to save money. There was a concern raised regarding what will happen in 4 years and if more money will be needed. **Rep. Roberts** said that the legislature should revisit public school funding formula.



Short term funding may be appropriate and the economic landscape is changing. He further explained that if geothermal energy starts to become a substantial industry in Idaho, it could generate money for public schools.

**PRO:** **Dr. Wayne Davis**, Superintendent of Mountain View School District spoke in support of H 532. He explained that expenditures of doing business in rural areas are great. He further explained that rural communities serve as a steward for federal forests. These counties need help from the legislature for stop gap funding, but it is a federal responsibility fix. He explained that counties have received over \$1 million dollars in Craig-Wyden money. He explained that one of the focus of his board is trying to be independent. His county struggles with connectivity. There is no rail service and no airports. The county has pursued federal grants. He further explained that it would be a significant impact if the Craig-Wyden money is not received.

**PRO:** **Bobbie Bodine**, Chair of Mountain View School District Board spoke in support of H 532. She explained that her district struggles in secondary level to offer electives to high school students. She also explained that voters in the district have been reluctant to support schools through levies. The county is used to having federal timber money. She discussed how the potential loss of federal money would affect their district. She explained that they are losing some of their best new teachers because of the uncertainty of funds. They estimate a reduction of 12 teaching positions next year if they cannot come up with additional funding. Timing is also of great concern.

In response to question regarding consolidation and if it would help with funding issues, **Ms. Bodine** explained that some of the smaller districts could consolidate, but it does take away the identity of the district. They are already consolidating services between districts and work to do that as much as they can. She explained that IDLA does help to overcome some of these obstacles and it has especially helped in smaller schools. In response to a questions regarding if the 25% reduction over the next few years is a concern, **Ms. Bodine** explained that they realize that they can't keep coming to the legislature and they haven't given up on Congress and have patrons working on fund raising efforts. **Dr. Davis** responded to a question regarding how rural districts justify taking funds from some districts to give to other districts. He explained that enrollment has declined in his area and it is a tough question.

**PRO:** **Carl Morgan**, superintendent of Salmon River Joint School District spoke in support of H 532. He explained that the money provided through the Craig-Wyden Bill provided approximately \$92,000 to Salmon River's \$1.9 million budget, about 5% of the total revenues. This \$92,000 amounts to the salary of two teachers. He explained that the reduction or elimination of any of the programs funded by these funds in his district will severely impact the students in these remote and rural schools.

**MOTION:** Rep. Trail made a motion **to send H 532 to the Floor with a DO PASS recommendation**. In the discussion on the motion, the concern was raised if more densely population areas should help the rural areas. **Rep. Roberts** responded that people in urban areas recreate in rural areas and have the responsibility to pay for infrastructure of those rural areas. There are services that are needed there and these services link to education.

Rep. Shepherd thanked the supporters who traveled to the Committee meeting to speak in support of the legislation. It was mentioned that it is appropriate for the state to help rural school districts to tide them over until they receive federal funds. Rep. Mortimer pointed out the \$17 million, the total cost of the proposed legislation, is 16.28 percent of state's Stabilization Fund.

On a voice vote, the motion passed. Rep. Roberts will sponsor the bill on the House Floor.

**RS 17970:** Chairman Nonini presented this RS to the Committee and Vice Chairman Shirley conducted the meeting. Chairman Nonini explained that should this RS be printed, it will be referred to another committee. He explained that the reason for this proposed legislation is that dock permits are being denied in north Idaho and there have been concerns with ITD weighing in on dock permits when it is not in their jurisdiction. This legislation would address this concern.

**MOTION:** Rep. Chadderdon made a motion **to introduce RS 17970 to print**. On a voice vote, the motion carried.

**RS 17973:** Rep. Patrick presented this RS to the Committee. He explained that the purpose of this legislation is to enhance the safety of Idaho's public school children by addressing several gaps in the fingerprinting and background check system. These changes include requiring background checks for student teachers, independent contractors and their employees, and other individuals who have unsupervised contact with students in a public school setting. The legislation also requires that background checks for new employees must be performed within 5 days of the start of employment, rather than the current 90 days, and makes it easier for substitute teachers who have passed their background check to work for more than one district. He explained that the proposed legislation also takes out the requirement to send out background information to all individuals. The information would only be sent to people who have requested the information. He explained that he has worked on this legislation with the Department of Education.

**MOTION:** Rep. Chadderdon made a motion **to introduce RS 17973 to print**. In the discussion on the motion, Rep. Patrick clarified "or other persons" would be anyone coming in regularly to work with minors. He explained that volunteers could be included, but school districts only have jurisdiction over those who are paid. He also clarified that the cost of the fingerprinting would be paid by the applicant.

On a voice vote, the motion passed.

**H 505:** Chairman Nonini announced that Rep. Pence is still working on this bill and she will notify the Chairman when she is ready to present.

**PRESENTATION** **Matt McCarter**, from the Department of Education discussed the Safe and Secure School Assessment with the Committee. (See copy of PowerPoint presentation). He explained that potential hazards that can occur on school grounds include natural disaster, abduction, property theft, fighting, terrorist attack, and intruders.

He explained that the school safety assessment is a risk management tool for reducing crime and violence threats, risks, and potential liability. He explained that the Department was allocated \$150,000 in FY 2008 to scope-assess current safety and security gaps and weaknesses of all public K-12 schools in Idaho. Surveys were sent out to superintendents, principals and stakeholders. Site visits were conducted statewide and 12 focus groups and community forums were conducted. He discussed the key findings from the surveys with the committee. 18% of district superintendents felt that general safety and security profiles were fully adequate, 49% were mixed, and 33% felt they were inadequate. The most pressing concerns from superintendents included, 44% said there was a lack of security cameras, and 31% felt that there should be more and better training. From the principals, 55% said there was a lack of security equipment and 41% said that they were concerned about access control. Other highlights of the report included that site visit and survey data indicate that as few as 5% of schools have classroom doors that can be locked from the inside. Also, 75% of principals cite trespassing or intrusion are present in their schools, 38% of stakeholders believe that access control measures are inadequate, over 40% of schools have inadequate visitor policies and over 70% of schools do not have accountability of keys or key cards.

**Mr. McCarter** explained that the current state of safety and security across Idaho is inadequate, and there is a clear concern among school administrators, staff and parents. He explained that the FY09 request of \$150,000 is for a crisis response plan template, school security standardization, statewide vendor identification, secure federal funding to address safety and security gaps, and implement new construction recommendations for safety and security. He explained that it is the intent of the Department to be a resource rather than telling districts what to do. In response to a question regarding the cost of retrofitting buildings built in 50's and 60's, **Mr. McCarter** explained that the rough estimate is about \$22 million to get schools where they need to be and the goal is to look at federal funds for this. The Department is just looking at the elements of safety and security and not building structure. The intention is not to tax to help with security issues. He also explained that there will be training on getting the updated information to schools.

Due to the lateness of the hour, **Mr. Sauer** will present the Middle School Task Force report on Wednesday, February 27<sup>th</sup>.

**ADJOURN:** Vice Chairman Shirley adjourned the meeting at 10:20 A.M.

---

Representative Bob Nonini  
Chairman

---

Claudia Howell  
Secretary

## MINUTES

### HOUSE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

- DATE:** February 26, 2008
- TIME:** 8:30 A.M.
- PLACE:** Room 148
- MEMBERS:** Chairman Nonini, Vice Chairman Shirley, Representatives Trail, Bradford, Block, Nielsen, Wills, Chadderdon, Shepherd (8), Marriott, Mortimer, Thayn, Boe, Pence, Chavez, Durst, Shively
- ABSENT/  
EXCUSED:** Rep. Patrick
- GUESTS:** See attached list.
- Chairman Nonini called the meeting to order at 8:30 A.M. and a silent roll was taken. He mentioned that Committee members had an article in their folder entitled "How to make great teachers". He invited members to read the article then a discussion could be held.
- MOTION:** Rep. Shively made a motion to approve the February 25<sup>th</sup>, 2008 minutes as submitted. On a voice vote, the motion carried.
- H 543:** Chairman Nonini presented this bill to the Committee and Vice-Chairman Shirley conducted the meeting. He explained that the Statement of Purpose has been reprinted because it had talked about mapping and that was not addressed in the bill, so the language was taken out. He explained that with the additional math and science requirements for high school students; this program would have the possibility to hire less teachers and offer these courses through this connectivity. He also explained that there are "E-rate" dollars that are paid on phone bills every month of which about \$1 a month goes to federal government. This money could go back to Idaho instead of leaving millions on the table. He explained that the goal of the Idaho Education Network is to offer comparable access for all Idaho students. He further explained that Idaho could be a leader in the use of technology and promote private sector investment. The legislation goes beyond education.
- PRO:** **Mike Gwartney**, Director of the Department of Administration spoke in support of H 543. He explained that the bill gives Idaho the mechanism to start looking at this connectivity issue. He explained that the first step would be to pull together the people in the business and it will be a cooperative effort. He explained that the state has broadband capabilities in almost all of the communities. He further explained that education will be the top priority. He reported that there are currently four systems in the state. There is a need for this legislation to get things started and give the Department of Administration the impetus to bring people together. He further reported that he has made numerous visits to Utah to look at their Education Network. He explained that by this time next year the Department will have a plan and cost. He further explained that this connectivity could be implemented rather quickly, but cannot do the state all at once. He explained that in a few years, they can have every school in Idaho connected.

- PRO:** **State Superintendent of Schools Tom Luna** explained that he is very supportive of this bill.
- PRO:** **Superintendent Jim Reed** from Weiser School District, spoke in support of H 543. He explained that he represents a small school district of about 1,000 kids. He further explained that Weiser is just starting in distance education and they have formed a partnership with the Seland College of Applied Technology. He reported that he has had experience with costly distance learning and now technology is excellent and the price is reasonable. He further reported that all of the pieces are finally on the table and there is now the opportunity to have a community college in Weiser through distance learning. He reported that Elementary teachers in his district are taking their students to the high school distance program and have participated in virtual field trips.
- MOTION:** Rep. Nielsen made a **motion to send H543 to the Floor with a DO PASS recommendation and to the 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading calendar**. Chairman Nonini mentioned that the sponsors on the bill are from both parties and it has wide support. In response to a question regarding what kind of costs would be needed to update computers, **Mr. Gwartney** responded that there will be a continuing cost for these updates and these costs will be included in the business plan that the Department of Administration will bring to the Legislature next year. **Superintendent Luna** responded that about \$10 million dollars for updating technology is already in the public schools budget. Chairman Nonini reported that he has talked with representatives from colleges and universities and are all supportive and see the beneficial use from the proposed legislation.
- On a voice vote, the motion passed.
- RS 17976C1:** Rep. Thayne presented this RS to the Committee. He explained that the reason for the proposed legislation is that there was different budget requests for concurrent enrollment. This proposed resolution encourages the Governor, the State Board of Education, the Department of Education, state colleges and universities and other interested parties to join members of the Legislature in discussions regarding the challenges facing efforts to increase concurrent enrollment and proposing solutions that can become the foundation for policy discussions during the next legislative session.
- MOTION:** Rep. Shepherd made a motion **to introduce RS 17976C1 to print**. On a voice vote, the motion passed.
- PRESENTATION** Rep. Pence introduced the **Sue Woodyard** from the Blaine County Construction program to the Committee. She explained that this program teaches building skills to high school students.
- Sue Woodyard** addressed the Committee. She introduced **Cyndie Woods**, the coordinator of the Idaho Residential Construction Education program. **Ms. Woods** explained that Blaine County received this grant two years ago from the U.S. Department of Labor. They received \$300,000 to set up construction academies at Wood River high school and the College of Southern Idaho. Partners in this grant included Blaine County school district, CSI, and the Magic Valley Builders Association. These organizations, along with others, formed the Idaho Residential Construction Education program.

She introduced **Brad Wills**, president and CEO of Wills, Inc. and past president of the Magic Valley Builders Association.

**Mr. Wills** explained that this program has been industry driven. He reported that there are difficulties in the construction industry as far as recruitment. He explained that he is a third generation builder and owns a successful business. He reported that Twin Falls has gone from 150 building permits to 600 permits in a short time. Commercial building has picked up. He further reported that the average age for an individual working in construction is 54 years old. He also discussed the residential construction untrained population.

**Ms. Woods** explained that they had to form an advisory board and also had to serve a minimum of 250 individuals. She reported that the program has gone way over their goal in matching funds. She further reported that the program does have money left over and that they are at the end of the grant. The group has decided to put the extra money toward scholarships. She introduced **Kim Nilsen**, from the Blaine County School Board of Trustees.

**Mr. Nilsen** discussed the partners in their project and the purpose of the Advisory Board. He explained the purpose of the board is to give industry expertise and support, assist in curriculum development, raise awareness of academics and programs and build community support. He also discussed the projects completed by the IRCE. He explained that post secondary education students receive the 10 hour OSHA certificate, an 11 month technical certificate, a two year associates of applied science degree and collaboration between different disciplines.

In response to a question regarding how many girls are in the program, **Ms. Woods** explained that girls who have taken classes have continued on, but she did not have exact numbers as to how many girls have participated. She further explained that they are making efforts to track the students who have participated in the program. In response to a question regarding what kind of relationship there is to construction unions, **Harold Neville** from Professional Technical Education explained that high school students can start their apprenticeship while still in school and can work towards their journeyman while still in high school. In response to a question as to what they do with the houses after they built, **Mr. Nilsen** explained that students do not start a new project until previous project is sold. Rep. Chadderdon reported that North Idaho College buys the lot, students build the home and then it is raffled off. **Ms. Woods** explained that anyone could buy the house constructed by the students in the program, but the push is in the initial grant is to build affordable housing. **Mr. Nilsen** explained that the Blaine county school district is active in low income housing because of the high cost of land.

**Brad Wills** explained that tradesman in their 30s are making more money than college educated person, but have to do more physical work. There is a need for younger people in the construction industry. The program has been able to contact about 3,600 middle school kids and 5,000 high school kids. In response to a question regarding the Hispanic population, **Mr. Wills** explained that they do not see a high population in the Twin Falls area.

In response to a question regarding access to benefits and compensation for those in the construction industry, **Mr. Wills** explained that the industry has to address this. He further explained that most sub contractors do not offer health benefits and employers need to start looking at this. The Committee briefly discussed insurance issues. In response to a question regarding if there is training in financial issues, **Mr. Wills** explained that training is a strong component to keeping strong employees. **Ms. Woods** explained that there is no specific training, but they do have it in part of the curriculum in soft skills. **Mr. Nilsen** responded that students are taught how to budget in the program but not for personal finances. In response to a question regarding potential problems with employee substance abuse, **Mr. Nilsen** explained that it is a real problem with some employees. **Mr. Wills** reported that he would not start someone in the job without doing a drug test first.

**Sue Woodyard** discussed the program challenges and successes. She explained that some of the challenges of the program are educational hurdles with increased graduation requirements and having to vie for time for electives. There is a need to reach out to disenfranchised workers. Hands on is critical for learning. Labs and classroom space is at a premium. Sustainability is also a challenge. They also need sustainability for a coordinator for the program. She reported that at least 27 schools in the state have a building construction program. She also discussed the program successes. She reported that kids are getting certification in this program. They have served about 350 kids in the past two and a half years and have over \$500,000 of in-kind matching donations. She mentioned that there is a need for startup cash for these projects. She introduced to the Committee, "leapfrog technology" from the National Home Builders Association. She explained that this technology consists of seven different books that teach Hispanic workers construction phrases in English. It is an interactive program.

Chairman Nonini thanked the presenters for their informative presentation.

**ADJOURN:**

Chairman Nonini announced that the Committee will meet at 8:30 tomorrow morning. Vice Chairman Shirley announced that the Idaho Digital Learning Academy bill is being held on the House Floor until the trailer bill that was heard in the Revenue and Taxation Committee can be heard on the Floor at the same time.

Chairman Nonini adjourned the meeting at 10:15 A.M.

---

Representative Bob Nonini  
Chairman

---

Claudia Howell  
Secretary

## MINUTES

### HOUSE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

**DATE:** February 27, 2008

**TIME:** 8:30 A.M.

**PLACE:** Room 148

**MEMBERS:** Chairman Nonini, Vice Chairman Shirley, Representatives Trail, Bradford, Block, Nielsen, Wills, Chadderdon, Shepherd (8), Marriott, Mortimer, Thayn, Boe, Pence, Chavez, Durst, Shively

**ABSENT/  
EXCUSED:** Rep. Patrick

**GUESTS:** See attached list.

Chairman Nonini called the meeting to order at 8:33 A.M. and a silent roll was taken. He welcomed former Representative Mike Mitchell who was visiting the Committee meeting.

**RS 18022:** **Rep. Nicole LeFavour** presented this RS to the Committee. She explained that this legislation seeks to make a technical fix to Idaho's Teen Early Intervention Specialist Pilot program. This bill will accommodate the range of grades and ages present in Idaho middle schools as well as alternative schools. She explained that this was passed unanimously last year and a change was needed in the definition of "children" because children is defined as those under the age of 18. She explained that some of the secondary and alternative schools have students over 18 years old who would be affected by this legislation.

**MOTION:** Rep. Boe made a motion **to introduce RS 18022 to print and send directly to the Second Reading calendar**. It was mentioned that there is a need to focus on helping at risk kids while they are still in school. On a voice vote, the motion passed.

**PRESENTATION** **Rob Sauer**, from the Department of Education gave an update of the progress of the Idaho Middle School Task Force. (See attached report). He explained that he was hired about a year ago and his first assignment was to assemble a middle school task force. He mentioned that the task force is comprised of key stakeholders from around the State. He further mentioned that Rep. Chavez serves on the task force. The group has met once a month since May and looked at the issues that concern middle schools. They also have established goals that include; to ensure all students are prepared to be successful in high school, to increase academic engagement and student accountability by middle school students through a relevant and rigorous curriculum, to carefully examine the benefits and issues associated with increasing middle school curriculum requirements, to carefully examine the benefits of strong leadership and a focus on continuous improvement, and to establish positive relationships and increase the amount of guidance and support for all middle school students. He explained that rigor, relevance and relationships drive the task force.



He also discussed the desired outcomes and progress of the task force. He reported that the task force will recommend in about a year to implement a credit system beginning with 7<sup>th</sup> grade. They have also looked at alternate routes to high school and mentioned that it is important to have interventions in place. He explained that if we hold students accountable, there is a need to have some things in place to help them. He further mentioned that they are looking at interventions for those students who are gifted and talented as well.

In response to questions from the Committee, **Mr. Sauer** clarified that they are defining middle school as 6<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grades. The task force has identified from national middle school associations best practices and have brought in educators from across the state to share their best practices. He explained that gifted students have the opportunity to earn high school credit. He further explained that the most important factor in student success is the quality of the classroom teacher.

In response to a question regarding mastery learning, **Mr. Sauer** explained that mastery learning requires an 80% mastery of the subject. He further explained that they are working on creating a tool to focus on mastery and education and the key for this process is professional development. He reported that leadership has also been discussed in the task force. He reported that the average turnover for middle school principals is every 3 years.

In response to a question regarding evaluations, Rep. Chavez explained that one of the primary components in effective evaluations are site-based teams for middle schools. These teams have their own mission and vision of where the school needs to be. The principal is a part of the team. The evaluation process is much more focused and intense. Everybody is a part of the site-based team. She explained that this is how to keep things level and even for the kids.

She also explained that mastery learning is mastery of the skills in that unit, not the total subject. If they master the set of skills, then they would slide to the next component.

**Mr. Sauer** clarified that during school time, the teacher is the most important person in the student's success. He further mentioned that there is representation for smaller K-12 schools on the task force. In response to a question regarding using people from the community as teachers in specialized areas, **Mr. Sauer** explained that there are federal requirements for highly qualified teachers and they cannot use people from the community as lead teachers. He explained that he will come back to the legislature in 2009 and report on the progress of the task force.

## **PRESENTATION**

**Dr. Bert Stoneberg**, NAEP coordinator for the state of Idaho from the State Board of Education discussed the National Assessment of Educational Progress test with the Committee. (See copy of PowerPoint presentation). He explained the differences between the NAEP and the ISAT tests. These differences include; the NAEP tests only test a sample of schools and students, students are tested in only one subject, students do not take all items on the test, they face a variety of test items, and their identity is confidential.

He explained that 3,200 students are tested per grade level. The test is given in odd number years in January through March. He explained that there are no individual student results. He further explained that reading, math and writing are assessed. He also explained that the NAEP test has a variety of test items including, multiple choice, short answer and essay.

He discussed the NAEP cross state comparisons for 4<sup>th</sup> grade reading and math and 8<sup>th</sup> grade reading and math. He explained that Idaho students are doing quite well overall. He explained that Idaho scored higher in 2007 in 4<sup>th</sup> grade reading than in 2003. In 4<sup>th</sup> grade math, Idaho had a significant improvement in 2007 from 2003. In 8<sup>th</sup> grade reading, Idaho showed no significant improvement in 2007 from 2003. In 8<sup>th</sup> grade math, Idaho was significantly higher in 2007 than in 2003.

He also discussed the gender, ethnic and poverty groups scores. He explained that we lose a lot of information when we look at achievement data. He explained that more information about NAEP testing can be found on the State Board's website.

In response to questions, **Dr. Stoneberg** explained that the students are assigned the blocks to take. He also explained that the NAEP uses all test formats because cognitive difficulties are different. Essay questions are scored by two people and they have to agree on the score given. He reported that in Idaho, white students trail their national counterparts and Hispanic and other ethnic students are above their national counterparts. He mentioned that Congress may fund 12<sup>th</sup> grade NAEP tests and Idaho may be one of those chosen for this test.

**ADJOURN:**

Chairman Nonini announced that the Committee will meet at 9 A.M. tomorrow morning. There being no further business to be brought before the Committee, he adjourned the meeting at 10:10 A.M.

---

Representative Bob Nonini  
Chairman

---

Claudia Howell  
Secretary

## MINUTES

### HOUSE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

- DATE:** February 28, 2008
- TIME:** 9 A.M.
- PLACE:** Room 148
- MEMBERS:** Chairman Nonini, Vice Chairman Shirley, Representatives Trail, Bradford, Block, Nielsen, Chadderdon, Shepherd (8), Marriott, Patrick, Boe, Pence, Chavez, Durst, Shively
- ABSENT/  
EXCUSED:** Rep. Wills, Rep. Mortimer, and Rep. Thayn
- GUESTS:** See attached list
- Chairman Nonini called the meeting to order at 9 A.M. and a silent roll was taken. Rep. Marriott introduced two guests from his district visiting the Committee meeting.
- MOTION:** Rep. Shively made a motion to approve the minutes from February 26<sup>th</sup>, 2008 as submitted. On a voice vote, the motion carried.
- MOTION:** Rep. Shively made a motion to approve the minutes from February 27<sup>th</sup>, 2008 as submitted. On a voice vote, the motion carried.
- RS 17816C2:** Rep. Nielsen presented this RS to the Committee. He explained that this legislation would establish the Idaho Nursing Educator Scholarship Act to help get nurses who have a B.S. degree to pursue their education to a master's degree or doctorate degree to be able to teach at the college level. For every \$50 dollars donated, it would reduce the tax liability of the taxpayer by \$4 dollars, and there would be a corresponding reduction in tax revenue to the state. He further explained that he has separated the tax part out of the bill and this proposed legislation deals with just the scholarship.
- MOTION:** Rep. Bradford made a motion **to introduce RS 17816C2 to print**. On a voice vote, the motion carried.
- PRESENTATION** **Nick Smith**, Deputy Superintendent of School Support Services for the Department of Education discussed the Idaho Rural Education Initiative with the Committee. He explained that work on the Initiative started last session and the Legislature appropriated \$100,000 to the Superintendent of Public Instruction to conduct a study and develop plans that address the challenges of rural schools including, but not limited to, the issues of declining enrollment, inefficiencies in administration and service delivery, and recruitment of qualified teachers. He further explained that it is the plan to continue work into next year and bring specific recommendations to the Legislature next session.
- Goals include; propose and examine solutions to issues facing rural schools, and prepare report for State Superintendent, State Board of Education and the Legislature.

He explained that they already know the problems and there is a need to come up with solutions. Desired outcomes include; increase the number of highly qualified teachers in rural districts through recruitment and professional development, improve the retention of highly qualified teachers in rural districts, close the technology gap between rural and urban schools, establish a way for rural districts to improve their facilities, increase opportunities for accelerated learning in rural districts, provide rural districts with assistance in addressing the unforeseen needs of severely disabled children, provide rural districts with remedies for declining enrollment, and provide possible solutions to increased insurance costs faced by all schools. He explained that discretionary dollars are eaten up by insurance costs in rural districts.

**Mr. Smith** discussed the anticipated accomplishments of the committee working on the rural schools initiative which include; research educational trends which have addressed the issues of rural schools through innovation, review policies and procedures that affect rural schools, and analyze solutions that can be achieved without additional appropriations. He explained that the committee did not meet as often as they wanted to. They looked at three main issues, recruitment and retention of highly qualified teachers, funding shortages related to insurance costs and staff allowances, and the technology gap between rural and urban schools.

In response to a question regarding if the committee discussed the possibility of pooling insurance for school employees, **Mr. Smith** explained that they are exploring this. In response to a question regarding rural teacher needs, he explained that he did not have an exact number of how many teachers are needed, but can get the information.

He explained that Idaho and U.S. in general, lack a common definition of "rural school." He explained that topography is not included in the federal definition. **Mr. Smith** is now working to craft a definition of rural for Idaho. He explained that there is also a need to build a stronger partnerships between K-12 and higher education in developing teacher candidates who are highly effective and prepared to meet the challenges of the classroom right out of college, and currently the supply of certificated teachers in Idaho does not meet the demand. He further explained that it is difficult to recruit students to go into education once they are in college. He reported that the numbers of students going into education programs are going down and the solution is simple, pay teachers more. Students educated in Idaho are going to other states to teach. Districts struggle to fill classified staff positions as well as certificated staff and an increasing number of districts and schools in Idaho are opting to move to a four day school week, making an uninformed decision based on finances and not on research. He explained that districts originally thought they would save money, but they are not. It was mentioned that the biggest saving of going to a four day week is transportation. It was also mentioned that if a school is not in session that day, they cannot receive reimbursement for transportation for that day. This a problem for rural districts. It is an issue with increased math and science requirements and the school day is extended for schools on a four day week. There might be a need to eliminate some electives. He reported that 13 districts in the state have gone to four day week. There is a total of 63 schools statewide that are on a four day week and many are thinking about doing it next year.

It was mentioned that the state does not reimburse the district in transportation costs in every instance.

He reported that rural schools lack the means to hire adequate and qualified technology support staff to maintain and keep this equipment and connectivity up to date and operational. It was mentioned that there is talk of coming up with a “super” classified position to encompass computer technology positions and business manager positions and other technical positions. These positions demand higher wages. It was further mentioned that something might come up next year to address this issue. Rep. Shirley reported that he sits on the state’s Technology Council and there is a grants equity issue. Technology is not being distributed equally between districts. **Mr. Smith** responded that the committee has discussed this issue. He further responded that in small districts, the superintendent or business teacher could write a grant, but some lack the expertise or time. It was mentioned that urban areas have individuals that their job is to look at grants for technology. **Mr. Smith** explained that the Department does have an individual that does in services for rural school districts to train how to write grants. Rep. Marriott mentioned that there are school districts in his area that have created a co-op for services and possibly this could be done with grant writing. **Mr. Smith** responded that the committee has looked at co-ops and also the possibility of having someone that does grant writing for several districts. Rep. Shirley mentioned that it would be beneficial to invite **Mr. Smith** to the next State Technology Council meeting to discuss with the council issues that have been discussed today. It was mentioned that connectivity is a big issue for rural schools, and the Idaho Education Network would help with this issue. It was also mentioned that a lot of rural districts are served by small businesses for technology and a statewide network would help with this issue.

**Mr. Smith** explained that professional development is very limited and difficult to come by for teachers in rural school districts. He discussed the standing recommendations from the committee. These recommendations include; the committee supports Superintendent Luna’s iSTARS Plan, which encompasses four of the taskforce’s recommendations for improving the recruitment and retention of highly qualified teachers, establish a separate line item in the Public Schools budget dedicated to covering insurance costs and benefits, fund a position per school district for technology support based on student enrollment benchmark, and continued appropriation of the original \$100,000 into FY 2009 to continue their work in order to bring a thorough and detailed set of recommendations to the 2009 Legislature. He explained that there is also a need to have a nationwide recruitment web site. The taskforce also encourages adoption of “Growing Idaho’s Future Teachers” as a way to attract high school students to the teaching profession, and remove barriers and establish increased reciprocity for teachers coming from other states to teach in Idaho. He discussed a plan of putting high school students in the classroom to do actual teaching and doing lesson plans.

Another solution discussed by the taskforce is to establish a state-funded Teacher Loan Forgiveness program for rural districts for a set number of years and establish regional Co-ops to provide services to districts in the areas of transportation, special education services, grant writing and other areas of need.

Topics for future analysis include; transportation costs, meeting the needs of special needs students while fulfilling federal requirements, and aging and deteriorating school facilities.

Chairman Nonini thanked **Mr. Smith** for his informative presentation. In response to a question regarding if the taskforce has discussed the proposed Longitudinal data system, **Mr. Smith** explained that they have not, but it is an issue that needs to be addressed. Rep. Chavez mentioned that she will follow up with this.

Chairman Nonini announced that the Senate Education Committee will be meeting today at 3 P.M. in the second floor conference room of the LBJ building and will hear a presentation on the WALLACE Foundation and will also be questioning State Board members. He invited Committee members to attend if possible. He further announced that the Committee will not meet tomorrow, but will meet at 8:30 on Monday, March 3<sup>rd</sup>.

**ADJOURN:**

There being no further business to be brought before the Committee, Chairman Nonini adjourned the meeting at 10:15 A.M.

---

Representative Bob Nonini  
Chairman

---

Claudia Howell  
Secretary

## MINUTES

### HOUSE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

**DATE:** March 3, 2008

**TIME:** 8:30 A.M.

**PLACE:** Room 148

**MEMBERS:** Chairman Nonini, Vice Chairman Shirley, Representatives Trail, Bradford, Block, Nielsen, Chadderdon, Shepherd (8), Marriott, Mortimer, Patrick, Thayn, Boe, Pence, Chavez, Durst, Shively

**ABSENT/  
EXCUSED:** Rep. Wills

**GUESTS:** See attached list.

Chairman Nonini called the meeting to order at 8:35 A.M. and silent roll was taken.

**MOTION:** Rep. Shively made a motion to approve the minutes from February 28<sup>th</sup>, 2008 as submitted. On a voice vote, the motion carried.

**RS 18018:** **Dr. Mike Rush**, administrator of Professional Technical Education introduced **Burton Waite**, also from PTE who presented this RS to the Committee. He explained that this legislation updates the requirements for post secondary educational institutions and proprietary schools registration and oversight. It also provides for a different process for funding a tuition recovery fund that would be used to protect the consumer who uses the training provided by the proprietary schools in Idaho. It also provides for personnel to follow-up and provide the oversight for these processes, since currently there is virtually no oversight or follow-up with the current process. **Mr. Waite** explained that PTE and the State Board tried to address concerns and have met with interested stakeholders. He explained that tuition fees will be placed in rule, which is common with other states and it gives additional opportunity to work with proprietary schools. He further explained that the Board and PTE put together a committee last August with private and public schools in the state and feel comfortable that they have included all in the process. He clarified that this proposed legislation does not affect religious schools.

**MOTION:** Rep. Patrick made a motion **to introduce RS 18018 to print**. In the discussion on the motion, **Mr. Waite** explained that when private post secondary schools come to Idaho, they are required to register with the State Board. If they do not register and the Board finds out about it, they are turned over to the Attorney General's office. He further explained that under current legislation, there is not specific dollars assigned to follow up to see if quality education is being offered. In response to a question regarding what type of companies bond these schools, **Mr. Waite** explained that insurance companies bond these schools and he is not aware of anyone ever filing a claim against these bonds. He explained that the bond for tuition recovery is based on the amount of students and the amount of money of the tuition.

**SUBSTITUTE MOTION:**

Rep. Shirley made a Substitute Motion **to send RS 18018 to print and directly to the second reading calendar**. He explained that this legislation was introduced in the Senate and they had some questions. The Board was supposed to work with concerned parties and come back with a new RS, which they have done with **RS 18018**. Chairman Nonini explained that he has met with interested parties and it is his understanding that all of the issues have been resolved. **Kris Ellis**, representing, the Federation of Private and Career Schools and Colleges explained that her organization would like to testify when it is a bill. She explained that because the proposed legislation has a fiscal note, there is a need for caps in the registration and the bond. Because there are still some concerns, Rep. Shirley withdrew his motion.

**ORIGINAL MOTION:**

The original motion **to introduce RS 18018 to print** carried on a voice vote.

**HCR 48:**

Rep. Steven Thayn presented this concurrent resolution to the Committee. He explained that the purpose of this resolution is to encourage the Governor, the State Board of Education, the Department of Education, state colleges and universities and other interested parties to join members of the Legislature in discussion regarding the challenges facing efforts to increase concurrent enrollment and proposing solutions that can become the foundation for policy discussions during the next legislative session.

**MOTION:**

Rep. Shepherd made a motion **to send HCR 48 to the Floor with a DO PASS recommendation**. Rep. Thayn will sponsor the resolution on the House Floor.

**H 566:**

Rep. Jim Patrick presented this bill to the Committee. He explained that the purpose of this legislation is to enhance the safety of Idaho's public school children by addressing several gaps in the fingerprinting and background check system. These changes include requiring background checks for student teachers, independent contractors and their employees, and other individuals who have unsupervised contact with students in public schools. It requires that the background check be performed within 5 days of the start of employment and it makes it easier for substitute teachers who have passed their background check to work for more than one district. Each individual will pay \$40 for the test and the test would only be sent if requested. He explained that there was a change on the fiscal note, which increases the amount of money from ISP from \$8,00 one time and ongoing money to \$23,400 for one time and ongoing. Rep. Patrick explained that this is pass through money and the cost to the Department is paid by the individual paying the \$40 fee. In response to questions, Rep. Patrick explained that volunteers who come on a regular basis would not have to have full background check. He further explained that ISP would be doing the fingerprinting and the Department will contract with ISP to do these checks.

**Christina Linder**, from the Department of Education explained that this legislation would be a safety net for unsupervised volunteers and it may affect people like assistant coaches. She further explained that the current code has far too many loopholes.



She also explained that each school district would make the determination as to who would need a background check. She further explained that they have looked at networking with groups that already do background checks for their volunteers who work in public schools. There was concern expressed about the lack of a definition for “regular” and “irregular” in the legislation. **Ms. Linder** explained that the language was already in the bill and an “irregular” employee would be someone that is not on the regular payroll and does not have a regular contract. She further explained that with any legislation there will be abuses. She explained that this legislation would give proper guidelines for districts to help them enforce the kind of things they need to do. It was mentioned that schools are responsible for everyone who comes in, and it is simple to check sex offender list. An example of someone coming in to fill a vending machine in a school was discussed. **Ms. Linder** explained that they want to make sure there are no gaps in the law. She further explained that before this legislation, the Department already had been working on this issue and have talked to school districts and HR representatives, and they are very much supportive of it. She explained that it is not currently mandated that student teachers get background checks. She acknowledged that the terms “regular” and “irregular” could be defined more clearly. It was mentioned that school districts that have contracts with vending machine employees may already require background checks.

**MOTION:** Rep. Block made a motion to send **HB 566 to the Floor with a DO PASS recommendation**. Rep. Patrick will sponsor the bill on the House Floor.

**H 548:** **Liza Carberry** from the State Treasurer’s Office presented this bill to the Committee. Before she discussed the bill, she updated the Committee on the College Savings Program. She explained that legislation was passed in 2000 to set up this program. The purpose of the program is to help Idahoans save for increasing costs of college. She explained that the earnings within these programs are both federal and state tax exempt. She further explained that an added benefit to Idahoans is a tax write off. The legislation created a board, in 2000 they selected an investment firm. The contract with the investment firm was up in 2005 and the board chose not to renew with them. The program now has a new provider, “You Promise”, which serves 15 other states. This provider offers more flexibility and more options. She reported that the program has currently \$134 million in assets and 15, 470 accounts have been opened. She explained that it has been determined that minor adjustments are needed to be made to the rules. She explained that the requested changes to definitions clarify who can own an account and be identified as a beneficiary and align the definitions used in the statute with the Internal Revenue Code. The revisions also clarify the role of the Board in administering the program and eliminate the requirement that the Board establish rules duplicating requirements in the Internal Revenue Code. New language will allow the Board to authorize minors to open accounts. This will encourage young people to save for their own education. She explained that a new section clarifies when dormant accounts will be subject to the unclaimed property laws.

In response to questions from the Committee, **Julie Weaver**, from the Attorney General’s office explained that eligible education institutions are any institutions that offer financial aid.

She further explained that it is the responsibility of the account owner to have receipts to show that money from the account was properly spent on education. She clarified that these funds are subject to taxes after they are deposited. She also clarified that a city could set up an account, then a scholarship could be set up. It would be constantly earning interest because it is invested. Unclaimed accounts defines when it can be unclaimed and there is no age limit to access the account. In response to a question regarding at what point is the account is unclaimed if no additional funds are added, **Ms. Linder** explained that if they are unable to contact an account owner it is quite a process to try and locate the person.

**MOTION:** Rep. Chavez made a motion **to send H 548 to the Floor with a DO PASS recommendation**. On a voice vote, the motion carried. Rep. Boe will sponsor the bill on the House Floor.

**H 553:** **Jason Hancock**, from the State Department of Education presented this bill to the Committee. He explained that the Department of Education is focusing on customer service. Two of the holidays currently observed by Department employees (Columbus Day and Veterans Day) take place on days in which public schools are generally in session. As a result, school districts and charter schools seeking to contact the Department for information on those days are unable to have their questions answered. Under this legislation, Department employees will work these two days and in return Department employees will take off Christmas Eve and the day after Thanksgiving since public schools are not in session on these days. He explained that he has spoken with the Attorney General's office and the Department would not have to give people time and a half if they worked Columbus day and Veterans day.

**MOTION:** Rep. Mortimer made a motion **to send H 553 to the Floor with a DO PASS recommendation**. **Mr. Hancock** clarified that this legislation is only for State Department employees and would not affect when schools decide to take vacation days. On a voice vote, the motion carried. Rep. Mortimer will sponsor the bill on the House Floor.

**H 554:** **Jason Hancock** also presented this bill to the Committee. He explained that this legislation clarifies which materials will be retained in the State Department of Education's curriculum library.

**MOTION:** Rep. Nielsen made a motion **to send H 554 to the Floor with a DO PASS recommendation**. On a voice vote the motion carried. Rep. Nielsen will sponsor the bill on the House Floor.

In Committee discussion, Chairman Nonini clarified that the purpose of pooling "e-rate" dollars for the Idaho Education Network is to help small districts that aren't using "e-rate" money. He explained that the purpose is not to take away "e-rate" dollars, it is to assist smaller school districts.

**ADJOURN:** There being no further business to be brought before the Committee, Chairman Nonini adjourned the meeting at 10:05 A.M.

---

Representative Bob Nonini  
Chairman

---

Claudia Howell  
Secretary

## MINUTES

### HOUSE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

**DATE:** March 4, 2008

**TIME:** 8:30 A.M.

**PLACE:** Room 148

**MEMBERS:** Chairman Nonini, Vice Chairman Shirley, Representatives Trail, Bradford, Block, Nielsen, Wills, Chadderdon, Shepherd (8), Marriott, Mortimer, Patrick, Thayn, Boe, Pence, Chavez, Durst, Shively

**ABSENT/  
EXCUSED:** None

**GUESTS:** See attached list.

Chairman Nonini called the meeting to order at 8:35 A.M. and a silent roll was taken.

**MOTION:** Rep. Shively made a motion to approve the minutes from March 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2008 as submitted. On a voice vote, the motion carried.

**RS 18059:** Chairman Nonini yielded the gavel to Vice Chairman Shirley. Chairman Nonini introduced **Rep. Anderson** who discussed the RS with the Committee. He explained that this proposed legislation gives the opportunity to give direction for **HB 500** which has already passed unanimously by the House. He further explained that **HB 500** proposes to fill a market for renewable resources. Idaho has some of the best wind and geothermal resources in the nation. The proposed legislation would also give Idaho the opportunity to treat renewable energy as a national resource. In response to questions, **Rep. Anderson** explained that low impact hydro is classification of a non headwater hydro, low impact is anything other than large headwater hydro. He further explained that low impact hydro could come from irrigation systems.

Chairman Nonini explained that there are about 2.5 million acres of endowment lands in Idaho. He explained that the purpose of this resolution is to direct and encourage the Governor, the Office of Energy, and the Land Board to work towards the development of energy production of renewable resources on state endowment lands for purpose of maximizing the potential returns for education. He shared with the Committee an article in State News, "An apple for students", which reports that some school districts generate good returns on their investments. It further reports that there are approximately 45 million acres of endowment lands located mostly in the West. Idaho is leading in maximizing returns on investment dollars. In response to questions, Chairman Nonini explained that the Constitution outlines which activities can be done on endowment lands. These activities include; natural resources, logging, and mining. He further explained that **HB 500** opens up these opportunities. He explained that legally there is no problem with this resolution.

**MOTION:** Rep. Patrick made a motion to **introduce RS 18059 to print and send directly to the second reading calendar**, so it can follow as a trailer bill to **HB 500**. In the discussion on the bill, Chairman Nonini explained that environmental studies would still need to be done on endowment lands, and the current legislation would not change that. He further explained that cell phone towers on endowment lands already exist, and the Land Board already leases land currently. **Rep. Anderson** explained that environmental studies have been done, there is still a need to follow the endangered species law. Idaho has vast renewable resource capabilities. Idaho's geothermal resources are among the best in the nation. On a voice vote, the motion carried.

Rep. Boe mentioned that she will be opposed to sending RS's directly to the second reading calendar in the future.

**SCR 129:** **Senator Richard Sagness** presented this resolution to the Committee. He explained that the purpose of this concurrent resolution is to recognize the need for and beneficial effect of additional and improved training for school administrators in the areas of teacher supervision and evaluation and to direct the Professional Standards Committee of the State Department of Education to study and make recommendations concerning training administrators, both initial and continuing. He explained that continuing education is very important. Some administrators have been in schools for a long time, and are sometimes not as familiar with latest techniques and strategies. Administrators are taking on extra duties and are very busy. Teachers need feedback and need to be asked appropriate questions. There is a need to look at the standards and make sure this is being done. **Sen. Sagness** explained that this resolution is supported by the School Administrators Association and the IEA. When questioned about the added requirement to administrator's time, **Sen. Sagness** explained that administrators should be doing this anyway and it should not require additional time if they are supervising effectively. In response to question regarding the importance of mentoring, **Sen. Sagness** explained that mentoring programs can be very successful. It is a critical issue and administrators need to be mentoring each other. Ongoing training is very important. He clarified that administrators are not required to take continuing education. He explained that it is up to principals and superintendents to identify teachers who are struggling and this resolution would fill the gap. It was also mentioned that this resolution would be a benefit in determining merit-based pay for teachers.

**MOTION:** Rep. Durst made a motion to **send SCR 129 to the Floor with a DO PASS recommendation**. In the discussion on the motion, **Senator Sagness** explained that the colleges of education would be directly involved in the process and would not be left out. This is seen as a collaborative endeavor. It is a tool to help administrators get better qualified to be better in working with teachers. He explained that other states are giving more local control and more involvement on the part of the principal. Rep. Thayne mentioned that we should not overlook value of the parent in education, he reported that the total difference in student achievement from the classroom teacher is about 7% and from the family it is about 60%.

On a voice vote, the motion carried. Chairman Nonini and Rep. Boe will carry the resolution on the House Floor. Rep. Boe and Chairman Nonini's names will be added to the SOP as co-sponsors of this resolution.

**S 1403a:** **Senator John Goedde** presented this bill to the Committee. He explained that this legislation requires local school districts, when presented a petition for a charter school, to exercise due diligence in consideration of said petition and to forward evidence of that due diligence to the Public Charter School Commission if they chose to forward the petition to that body. He explained the amendment to the bill is to require at least one member of the Commission to attend a workshop put on by the State Department of Education to they can learn the charter petitioning process.

In response to questions, **Sen. Goedde** explained that the chartering process has been streamlined, but the responsibility for oversight is by the local board and the local board receives the annual audit of the charter school. **Sen. Goedde** explained that in every piece of statute that the legislature passes, this bill is very consistent with statutory responsibility. He further explained that the School Board has the responsibility to exercise due diligence, they can accept the petition and charter the district, or they can reject it, or they could send it on to the State Charter School Commission to deal with it along with their recommendations. He explained that as long as the process they have in place now satisfies the due diligence test there would be no problems.

**MOTION:** Rep. Nielsen made a motion **to send SB 1403a to the Floor with a DO PASS recommendation**. On a voice vote, the motion carried. Rep. Nielsen will sponsor the bill on the House Floor.

**S 1428:** **Senator Goedde** also presented this bill to the Committee. He explained that currently Idaho statute contains no penalty for local school districts being non-responsive to audit inquiries from the Department of Education on results of their required annual outside audit. This bill will give the Department the ability to withhold funds from non-responsive school districts. It inserts an appeal process to the State Board of Education for resolution of conflict. Also, the date required for submission of audits is too close to fiscal year end for compliance; this change would give districts 26 additional days to submit the required report. **Sen. Goedde** reported that in 2007 only 45% of school districts reported results of annual outside audits. He further explained that when the Department receives findings, a letter is sent to local districts asking them to correct or justify these findings. Currently there is nothing in statute that requires school districts to respond to this inquiry.

**MOTION:** Rep. Patrick made a motion **to send S 1428 to the Floor with a DO PASS recommendation**. In the discussion on the motion, **Sen. Goedde** explained that he has discussed this bill with the School Boards Association. It would require ongoing training for audits and also require training for CPAs that do audits of school districts.

**SUBSTITUTE MOTION:** Rep. Nielsen made a Substitute Motion to send SB 1428 to General Orders, with the amendment that on line 34 on page 3 strike "all or", and insert "not to exceed 10%" and on line 45 page 3, strike "all or" and insert "not to exceed 10%" In the discussion on the substitute motion, it was mentioned that there is an appeal process in the bill.

**Sen. Goedde** explained that the school district would not be losing the funds and they would be returned to the district when they comply with the audit inquiry. It was mentioned that there should be no excuse for being late, unless the school district does not have the audit.

Rep. Nielsen amended his Substitute Motion to change to insert “not to exceed 25%” instead of inserting “not to exceed 10%”.

It was mentioned that the local patrons of district elect the School Board members and should leave it to their judgement. It was mentioned that there is some room for mischief if we allow all funds to be withheld. Chairman Nonini explained that if the bill were to go to General Orders, it may be a couple of weeks before the Senate would vote on the amendments. **Sen. Goedde** explained that he does not want the bill not to pass this year. It was thought that maybe the Department could withhold all of the first payment and not the total amount to school districts so language in the bill would not have to be changed. It was mentioned that the Department would not withhold all of the money to a school district. **Sen. Goedde** explained that in the Senate Education committee, there was no opposition to this bill. On a roll call vote, the motion failed by a vote of **13 NAYS, 4 AYES and 1 absent and excused**. Representatives Nonini, Shirley, Trail, Bradford, Block, Chadderdon, Marriott, Patrick, Boe, Pence, Chavez, Durst, and Shively voted NAY. Representatives Nielsen, Shepherd, Mortimer, and Thayn voted AYE. Rep. Wills was absent.

**ORIGINAL MOTION:**

On a voice vote, the Original Motion **to send SB 1428 to the Floor with a DO PASS recommendation** carried. Rep. Patrick will sponsor the bill on the House Floor.

Chairman Nonini announced that on tomorrow’s agenda, the Committee will hear a RS from Rep. Henbest and also **SB 1410**. The Committee will meet at 8:30 A.M. He further announced that the Committee will meet on Friday morning to hear former U.S. Secretary of Education, Rod Paige.

**ADJOURN:**

There being no further business before the Committee, Chairman Nonini adjourned the meeting at 10:15 A.M.

---

Representative Bob Nonini  
Chairman

---

Claudia Howell  
Secretary

## MINUTES

### HOUSE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

- DATE:** March 5, 2008
- TIME:** 8:30 A.M.
- PLACE:** Room 148
- MEMBERS:** Chairman Nonini, Vice Chairman Shirley, Representatives Bradford, Block, Nielsen, Wills, Chadderdon, Shepherd (8), Marriott, Patrick, Thayn, Boe, Pence, Chavez, Durst, Shively
- ABSENT/  
EXCUSED:** Representatives Trail and Mortimer
- GUESTS:** See attached list.
- Chairman Nonini called the meeting to order at 8:30 A.M. and a silent roll was taken.
- MOTION:** Rep. Shively made a motion to approve the minutes from March 4<sup>th</sup>, 2008 as submitted. On a voice vote, the motion carried.
- RS 18049:** **Rep. Margaret Henbest** presented this RS to the Committee. She explained that she had been contacted by two NNU nursing students who were concerned about this issue and she encouraged them to write this RS. She explained that this resolution encourages the adoption nutritional values for food and drinks sold in Idaho's public schools. This resolution mandates that vending machines accessible to students may only contain drinking water, lowfat milk, 100% juice and nutritional foods that meet outlined standards. She explained that the rate of obesity in children has quadrupled since 1963. She further explained that there is a consolidation of efforts from school districts from across the U.S. in this area. She reported that she knows of supporters but no opponents to this resolution. Supporters include health insurance companies, organizations that sell healthy foods, nutritionists and nursing students. In response to a question regarding that if this is voluntary by school districts, but in the SOP it says "mandated", **Rep. Henbest** acknowledged that the word "mandated" should be changed to "encouraged" in the SOP. It was mentioned that school districts are starting to move in this direction and there is a need to start working on the side of prevention.
- MOTION:** Rep. Block Made a motion **to introduce RS 18049 to print and to send it directly to the Second reading calendar**. In the discussion on the motion, **Rep. Henbest** explained that she will change the language in the SOP to not say "mandated". Chairman Nonini explained that this is important legislation. There was a concern expressed with the state of Idaho prohibiting the sale of certain foods. In response to a question regarding if school lunch programs meet nutritional standards, **Rep. Henbest** explained that federal school lunch programs do meet these standards, but there are other school lunches that do not. She further explained that there is competition in schools among food choices and this is a local issue.

She explained that the resolution is not addressing what happens in the cafeteria, just in the hallway with vending machines. There was a concern expressed that the government is trying to tell people how to live their lives.

**SUBSTITUTE  
MOTION:**

Rep. Boe made a Substitute motion **to introduce RS 18049 to print**. In the discussion on the motion, Rep. Boe explained that the Committee would have the opportunity to learn about this issue if it came back for a hearing. There was a concern about the time element to hear the proposed legislation in Committee. Rep. Block made a unanimous consent request to withdraw her motion. There were no objections. The Substitute motion passed on a voice vote.

Chairman Nonini announced that former U.S. Education Secretary, Rod Paige will not be coming to Committee meeting on Friday due to scheduling conflicts. He further announced that the Committee will not meet on Friday.

**S 1410:**

**Jason Hancock**, from the Department of Education presented this bill to the Committee. He explained that this legislation makes a technical correction to Idaho Code. When the State Board of Education removed the requirement that Idaho's public elementary schools be accredited, it had an unintended impact on teachers teaching in those elementary schools. He explained that under current Code, teachers receive an additional salary multiplier for each year that they teach in "accredited" public schools. Since elementary schools are no longer accredited, this means that elementary school teachers would not receive their annual salary multiplier increase for teaching an additional year. In response to question regarding if the change would impede the salary of teacher of a gifted child who could go from elementary school to college, **Mr. Hancock** explained that usually these students move to a high school which would be accredited.

The beginning teacher salary was questioned. **Mr. Hancock** explained that beginning salaries are built off a base salary factor, multiplied by this grid and it is mandated that school districts pay beginning teachers \$31,000 per year. He further explained that this is a funded mandate. He reported that in most years, the minimum salary has been moved up. In response to a question regarding the reference to an accredited private or parochial school in the bill; **Mr. Hancock** explained that this concerns teachers who have taught in a private or parochial school and then transfer to a public school, then they are paid for their experience.

**MOTION:**

Rep. Durst made a motion **to send SB 1410 to the Floor with a DO PASS recommendation**. On a voice vote, the motion carried. Rep. Durst will sponsor the bill on the House Floor.

Rep. Boe discussed a book she is reading entitled "Three Cups of Tea". She explained that this is required reading for the freshman class at BSU. She explained that the book is about a man who built schools in Afghanistan and Pakistan. It is an adventure tale and emphasizes the importance of education. She encouraged Committee members to read the book.



**ADJOURN:** There being no further business before the Committee, Chairman Nonini adjourned the meeting at 9:10 A.M.

---

Representative Bob Nonini  
Chairman

---

Claudia Howell  
Secretary

## MINUTES

### HOUSE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

- DATE:** March 6, 2008
- TIME:** 9 A.M.
- PLACE:** Room 148
- MEMBERS:** Chairman Nonini, Vice Chairman Shirley, Representatives Trail, Bradford, Block, Nielsen, Wills, Chadderdon, Shepherd (8), Marriott, Mortimer, Patrick, Thayn, Boe, Pence, Chavez, Shively
- ABSENT/  
EXCUSED:** Rep. Durst
- GUESTS:** See attached list.
- Chairman Nonini called the meeting to order at 9 A.M. and a silent roll was taken.
- MOTION:** Rep. Wills made a motion to approve the minutes from March 5<sup>th</sup>, 2008 as submitted. On a voice vote, the motion carried.
- MOTION:** Rep. Boe asked that the Committee reconsider her motion yesterday to send Rep. Henbest's resolution on healthy choices in vending machines in public schools (**HCR 55**) to print. She explained that in order to move the process along, it would be beneficial to send **HCR 55** directly to the Second Reading calendar. She made a motion **to send HCR 55 to the Second reading calendar**. On a voice vote, the motion carried with Representatives Nielsen, Patrick and Thayn voting NAY. **HCR 55** will be sponsored by Rep. Henbest on the House Floor.
- RS 18076:** **Jason Hancock**, from the State Department of Education presented this RS to the Committee. He explained that this legislation updates several sections of Code that relate to public school funding. The first is needed because many school districts will no longer have a basis upon which to calculate the additional money that state distributes for exceptional contracts/tuition equivalencies, beginning in FY 2009. He explained that there are added costs for kids in group homes and foster care children are more expensive for the school district to work with. He further explained that the level of funding would be a cost neutral calculation. In response to questions, Mr. Hancock explained that this is state money and there is a line item of about \$6 million going to school districts for these types of students. He also explained that the funding would be through ADA for administration, teachers and support staff.
- He explained that the second change clarifies how hardship bus runs are defined. It also removes state transportation reimbursement for field trips, but increases the state match for home-to-school and school-to-home by a commensurate amount of money, for a statewide net impact of zero. He explained that reimbursable field trips are in a gray area and it is a hard line to draw. School districts could have a certain number of bus runs qualified as hardship bus runs.

There is an unintended consequence encouraging districts to redo their bus runs so they can still qualify for hardship bus runs. In response to questions, **Mr. Hancock** explained the increase in reimbursements can only be used for transportation costs. He further explained that if school districts do not use all of their budget it stays in transportation budget. The local district would fund a portion of the cost for field trips and the state would fund 87.5% of cost. He explained that school districts would have to put less money in school-to-home costs and home-to-school costs and therefore would receive more money for field trips. He explained that this would not preclude fund raisers put on by local schools to fund costs for field trips.

**MOTION:** Rep. Shirley made a motion **to introduce RS 18076 to print**. On a voice vote, the motion carried.

**PRESENTATION** **Steven Snow**, executive director for the Idaho Council for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing addressed the Committee. He discussed his own experiences at the Idaho School for the Deaf and Blind and the impact of the school on the deaf community. Deaf and hard of hearing individuals deserve equal access to jobs, housing, education and information. He explained that the priority of the Idaho Council for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing is quality of life for deaf and hard of hearing individuals. He explained that in a residential school situation, and in a mainstream classroom, self esteem is critical for deaf and hard of hearing students. He explained that he developed what he was capable of being while at ISDB.

He explained that the struggles of deaf and hard of hearing children include; isolation, frustration, few friends, poor communication, social delays, poor self esteem problems with cultural identity and teasing and bullying. He also spoke about the difficulty in finding qualified interpreters. He explained that interpreters follow the student and students have a hard time socializing with an adult interpreter right beside him. He shared the following quote with the Committee; "A child cannot be taught by anyone who despises him, and a child cannot afford to be fooled." (James Baldwin).

He explained that the flow of information is difficult for deaf students and some students are unprepared for the challenges of life. He explained that he acquired his own personal pride while at ISDB by being involved in sporting and other extra curricular activities. He explained that through these experiences, it promoted confidence in the ability to compete, promoted leadership, promoted assertiveness, and promoted feelings of belonging. He explained that 90% of what we learn happens outside the classroom and a residential school gives that 90%. He reported that the health has improved at ISDB with the support of superintendent **Mary Dunne**. He shared another quote with the Committee; "The knowledge of the world is only to be acquired in the world, and not in a closet." (Lord Chesterfield).

He explained that he feels that there are qualified teachers that need to be recruited to teach in a residential school, but the locale in Gooding makes that difficult. By moving the residential school to a larger urban area, it would help with recruitment.

In response to questions, **Mr. Snow** explained that some students come to the residential school already knowing sign language and some have no knowledge of signing.

**PRESENTATION** **Mary Dunne**, Administrator of the Idaho School for the Deaf and Blind addressed the Committee. She explained that she has been in the position for just over a year, but she has been at the school for over 37 years. ISDB provides services to children who are deaf, hard of hearing, blind, visually impaired and both deaf and blind from birth to the age of 21. She explained that some children learn sign language at a very young age if parent is active in that learning. She explained that ISDB works closely with the Infant Toddler program in the state, also with the Department of Health and Welfare and also has a strong auditory oral program in Meridian. They also have preschools in Pocatello, Idaho Falls and as needed in Coeur d'Alene and Lewiston and wherever the kids live. She reported that ISDB has brought down campus costs over a \$1 million, and those costs have been redistributed to outreach programs. She further reported that all of the programs at ISDB are in alignment with Special Education law and national best practices. **Ms. Dunne** explained that she is proud that ISDB has kept pace with best practices as time as gone by. She explained that there are currently 71 students on campus. In response to a question regarding the status of ISDB, **Ms. Dunne** explained that the results of OPE report have been met or are in progress and they have addressed all of the recommendations. She further reported that the OPE report cited high levels of satisfaction with ISDB. She explained that there are other ways of thinking, and she is working with the current interim Executive Director of the State Board of Education, Dr. Rush, and the Transition Coordinator of the State Board and they are taking a thoughtful look at the process. A summit will be held in the next few months where stakeholders across the state will be given the opportunity to share their goals and visions for the future. In response to a question as to how many students go home for the weekend, **Ms. Dunne** explained that all of their students return home for weekends.

Chairman Nonini thanked Mary Dunne and Steven Snow for their presentations and explained that the State should not overlook these students when discussing educational issues.

**ADJOURN:** There being no further business to be brought before the Committee, Chairman Nonini adjourned the meeting at 10:00 A.M.

---

Representative Bob Nonini  
Chairman

---

Claudia Howell  
Secretary

## MINUTES

### HOUSE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

**DATE:** March 10, 2008

**TIME:** 8:30 A.M.

**PLACE:** Room 148

**MEMBERS:** Chairman Nonini, Vice Chairman Shirley, Representatives Trail, Bradford, Block, Nielsen, Wills, Chadderdon, Shepherd (8), Marriott, Mortimer, Patrick, Thayn, Boe, Pence, Chavez, Durst, Shively

**ABSENT/  
EXCUSED:** None

**GUESTS:** See attached list.

Chairman Nonini called the meeting to order at 8:33 A.M. and a silent roll was taken.

**MOTION:** Rep. Shively made a motion to approve the minutes from March 6<sup>th</sup>, 2008 as submitted. On a voice vote, the motion carried.

**RS 18071:** Rep. Pence presented this RS to the Committee. She explained that this proposed legislation is a cleaner bill of the previous school consolidation bill and it has the support of Superintendent's association and of the Rural Trustees association. She explained that this legislation will amend Idaho Code relating to the board of trustees of school districts created by consolidation. This legislation will amend Idaho Code in providing that districts that have been consolidated after Jan. 1<sup>st</sup>, 2008 will consist of five members if two districts are consolidated and seven members if three or more districts are consolidated. The proposed legislation also revises the method of appointing trustees. She explained that the proposed legislation also creates a transition school board and it gives districts that consolidate equal representation. She provided to Committee members a chart which outlined the proposed trustee selection. (Copy of chart attached). She further explained that 10 days after school districts consolidate, they would meet with State Superintendent of schools or a representative and choose the trustees. She also explained that trustees with most seniority would be chosen when districts are consolidated and if they have the same amount of seniority, lots would be chosen. She clarified that if more than 3 districts are consolidated, the 7 trustees would be appointed by the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

In response to questions, Rep. Pence clarified that board of trustees are doing the selection from among their own members. She explained that she knew of no opposition to the proposed legislation. She further explained that consolidation is not being pushed by this proposed legislation. She explained that the proposed legislation could be an implementation tool for districts who want to consolidate for administrative purposes. She explained that the Superintendent of Public Instruction is neutral on this legislation and she has not discussed this with the State Board of Education.

- MOTION:** Rep. Patrick made a motion **to introduce RS 18071 to print.**
- SUBSTITUTE MOTION:** Rep. Chavez made a **Substitute Motion to introduce RS 18071 to print and send directly to the Second Reading calendar.** She explained that due to the time frame and the fact that the Committee has seen this legislation before, this legislation needs to be moved on quickly. On a voice vote, the motion failed.
- ORIGINAL MOTION:** On a voice vote, the Original Motion to introduce RS 18071 to print, carried.
- RS 18081:** Rep. Chadderdon presented this RS to the Committee. She explained that the purpose of this resolution is to encourage legislative support for the Blake Webb Motorcycle Safety Awareness Foundation, which educates and informs Idahoans about the importance of motocross riding safety on and off the track. She explained that this legislation came to her from Blake Webb's family, who lost his life while racing about a year ago. She further explained that after Blake was killed, a similar accident happened in California. She explained that after doing research, she found that there is nothing in Idaho code that addresses motocross safety. She further explained that Idaho would be the first state to draft a resolution concerning this issue. In response to questions, she explained because there is nothing in Code, she decided to propose a resolution. She also discussed the purpose of the Foundation. She explained that the proceeds of the Foundation are used to make riders and spectators aware of the importance of riding safe through the promotion of educational and training classes for all riders, donating flags to tracks to be used during unorganized practices, to help riders become properly geared up, and annually sponsoring a new rider with protective gear. Rep. Chadderdon commented that the main purpose of the resolution is to create awareness and promote safety for the sport. In response to a questions regarding the lack of immediate response at practice races, Rep. Chadderdon explained that tracks are owned by individuals and insurance companies usually require immediate response for competitions but not practices.
- MOTION:** Rep. Shirley made a motion **to introduce RS 18081 to print.** On a voice vote, the motion carried.
- S 1405:** **Senator Mike Burkett** presented this bill to the Committee. He explained that this bill adds public charter schools to the list of entities to which school districts may transfer or convey surplus property. It allows the exchange for real property with other government properties and keeps property dedicated to governmental use.
- Rep. Anne Pasley-Stuart** spoke in support of this legislation. She explained that one of the biggest challenges that Idaho charter schools are facing is finding facilities. She further explained that Anser Charter School in her legislative district serves 188 students in K-8th grade and are housed in temporary quarters. The school is bursting at the seams. The proposed legislation would give school districts the ability to sell surplus properties to public charter schools. She explained that it does not force school districts to sell to public charter schools. She explained that the proposed legislation would allow school boards to help charter schools, but anything that would be done must be done with the consent of school board.

**Motion:** Rep. Shepherd made a motion **to send S 1405 to the Floor with a DO PASS recommendation**. On the discussion on the motion, **Ken Burgess**, representing Idaho charter schools, explained that currently there are 10,000 students in charter schools, with an additional 6, 000 on waiting lists. On a voice vote, the motion carried. Rep. Pasley Stuart will carry the bill on the House Floor.

**H 1407:** **Sen. Burkett** also presented this bill to the Committee. He explained that this bill provides for a scholarship for dependents of Idaho's members of the military service who are disabled, (totally and permanently from any employment), as a result of injuries incurred while engaged in the conflict in Iraq and Afghanistan. He explained that "totally disabled" means that the individual cannot work in any occupation. **Sen. Burkett** explained that this proposed legislation was brought to him by **Greg Funk**, a 10 year veteran of the armed forces who served in Iraq. He discussed the fiscal impact which he explained was trying to project what they can expect to occur in Idaho. The projected yearly average of the scholarship is \$65,000. He explained that he received a letter from the State Board of Education and this projection figure may be high. He clarified that a dependent is a spouse who has not remarried, or children.

**Motion:** Rep. Block made a motion **to send S 1407 to the Floor with a DO PASS recommendation**. On the discussion on the motion, Rep. Nielsen explained that now dependents can go to the VA and collect money for education. He further explained that money is available for 45 months for education and can be up to \$400/month. **Sen. Burkett** explained that the proposed legislation would be a secondary scholarship program and the State Board would take other monies into account. **Mark Browning**, representing the State Board explained that the Board would look at priority of funds before the scholarship would be allocated and the impact to the state would be as minimal as possible. The scholarship would be for any public institution in the state.

On a voice vote, the motion carried. Rep. Nielsen and Rep. Wills will carry the bill on the House Floor.

Chairman Nonini announced unless it is absolutely necessary, the Committee will hear no more RS's. He further announced that Dana Kelly from the State Board is scheduled for March 17<sup>th</sup> for a scholarship update. He also reported that because of the high quantity of bills on the third reading calendar, there is a possibility that the House will meet this Saturday. It was mentioned that interested Committee members would like to have the education appropriation bills explained to them by DFM analyst **Tim Hill**. Rep. Nielsen will contact Mr. Hill and let Committee members know tomorrow if a meeting can be scheduled.

**ADJOURN:** As there was no further business to be brought before the Committee, Chairman Nonini adjourned the meeting at 9:50 A.M.

---

Representative Bob Nonini  
Chairman

---

Claudia Howell  
Secretary

## MINUTES

### HOUSE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

**DATE:** March 11, 2008

**TIME:** 8:30 A.M.

**PLACE:** Room 148

**MEMBERS:** Chairman Nonini, Vice Chairman Shirley, Representatives Trail, Bradford, Block, Nielsen, Wills, Chadderdon, Shepherd (8), Marriott, Mortimer, Patrick, Thayn, Boe, Pence, Chavez, Durst, Shively

**ABSENT/  
EXCUSED:** None.

**GUESTS:** See attached list.

Chairman Nonini called the meeting to order at 8:33 A.M. and a silent roll was taken.

**MOTION:** Rep. Shively made a motion to approve the minutes from March 10<sup>th</sup>, 2008 as submitted. On a voice vote, the motion carried.

**H 607:** **Jason Hancock**, from the State Department of Education presented this bill to the Committee. He explained that this proposed legislation updates several sections of Idaho Code that relate to public school funding. The first is needed because many school districts will no longer have a basis upon which to calculate the additional money the state distributes for exception contracts/tuition equivalencies, beginning in FY 2009.

The second change clarifies how hardship bus runs are defined. He explained that the unintended consequence of school districts scarcity factor would cause districts to lose eligibility for hardship bus runs if they end up picking up a lot of kids coming back into town. He further explained that the state would end up paying more money for the match. It also removes state transportation reimbursement for field trips, but increases the state match for home to school and school to home resulting in a statewide net impact of zero.

The third change removes the arbitrary cap on the number of new support units that a charter school can receive in a given fiscal year. This cap was originally put in for state budget planning purposes, but is not now necessary, due to the fact that charter schools must be approved by no later than January 1<sup>st</sup> of the school year prior to opening.

In response to questions, **Mr. Hancock** explained that students who live 1 mile away from elementary schools and 1.5 miles away from secondary schools qualify for a bus ride, but those that live closer to the school radius could appeal to the State Board and be bused if they have to cross a busy street or if there are other factors. He further explained that this change is overall budget neutral, but if this amendment were not made, Boise school district would not lose all of the funding but would lose a significant chunk of funding.



**Mr. Hancock** explained that by basing the calculation on property taxes, it is an unfair formula. Under this formula, the state sends much more money to the property rich district. He reported that Boise has benefitted from this provision. When questioned about the net impact to Boise School District, **Mr. Hancock** explained that he did not have the exact numbers, but would report back to the Committee. He further explained that most rural school districts do not get funding under this specific section. In response to a question regarding hardship bus routes, he explained that the hardship route would allow a district to operate over the cap that is placed on transportation cost. He also explained that there is a cost per mile and a cost per student. In response to a question regarding removing the cap for charter schools, **Mr. Hancock** explained that projections are made, and if there is more growth than expected, there is already a mechanism set up under law that says districts can tap the Public Schools Stabilization Fund. If the projected budgets are less, money goes back into the Stabilization Fund.

**MOTION:** Rep. Thayn made a motion **to send H 607 to the Floor with a DO PASS recommendation.**

**SUBSTITUTE MOTION:** Rep. Durst made a Substitute motion **to hold H 607 in Committee to time certain, Thursday, March 13<sup>th</sup>.** In the discussion on the motion, Rep. Durst explained that he is concerned about a potential loss of funds for Boise School district and would like to get additional information from **Mr. Hancock** before supporting this bill. On a voice vote, the motion failed.

**ORIGINAL MOTION:** On a voice vote, **the Original Motion to send H 607 to the Floor with a DO PASS recommendation** carried. Rep. Thayn will sponsor the bill on the House Floor.

**PRESENTATION** **Val Brooks**, from the Idaho Credit Union League introduced **Le Raye O'Brien**, communications specialist from the Idaho Credit Union League to the Committee. **Ms. O'Brien** discussed with the Committee the state of the personal financial union. These include record low personal savings rates, Americans are unprepared for retirement, record high credit debt, consumer culture is buy, buy, buy, pay day lenders, sub-prime mortgage crisis, and record bankruptcy rates.

The challenge is war on financial illiteracy, the NEFE (National Endowment for Financial Education) high school financial planning program. She explained that the program is performance based, students create their own learning, it is activity-based learning built around a four step approach, experiential opportunities with guest instructors, and there are web resources for students, teachers, and parents. Under the NEFE high school program, students create a financial program for themselves, create a personal budget, propose a personal saving and investing plan, select strategies to use in handling credit and managing debt, demonstrate how to use various financial services, create a personal insurance plan, and examine how career choice affects their financial plan. She explained that the program meets all major educational standards. Teacher training programs are provided in most states, and video training is available. There are student guides for every student and instructor guides for every teacher. There is a program data disk and Spanish language version in PDF. Each student will receive a certificate of completion.

**Ms. O'Brien** explained that this is a free program. Manuals, disks, and access to website are all free. It is a performance based model, with 765, 144 student guides ordered across the nation, which is a 95% increase. In Idaho, 115 teachers were trained in 2007. Idaho ranks 6<sup>th</sup> in the nation in increase. She asked the committee to support financial education, teacher training, financial education for all Idaho citizens, and make sure quality financial education programs are being offered in schools across the state.

In response to questions, she explained that the program is provided for those serving in Correctional facilities. They are also offering this program to 4H groups, church groups, and boy scout groups and are happy to provide training to everyone who is interested. She explained that it takes approximately 16 hours to teach the entire course. She further explained that there is a chart inside teacher's manual that outlines how long each unit would take to teach. It was mentioned that Idaho is one of 4 states who are leading in financial education and Idaho is fortunate to have this program. In response to a question regarding if the program is offered in colleges and universities, **Ms. O'Brien** explained that financial education is recognized, but not offered in college. She further explained that NEFE was just released as a college program, but is only available through their website. NEFE is also partnered with a program for junior high school students. It was suggested that this program could be part of college orientation for incoming freshmen. **Ms. O'Brien** explained that first lady, Lori Otter, has endorsed the program she will be spokesperson for new campaign coming out soon. She further explained that the State Board is also very supportive of this program. She also explained that there are credit unions that are attached to universities that do support this program as well.

Chairman Nonini thanked the presenters for their informative presentation.

**ADJOURN:** There being no further business to be brought before the Committee, Chairman Nonini adjourned the meeting at 9:40 A.M.

---

Representative Bob Nonini  
Chairman

---

Claudia Howell  
Secretary

## MINUTES

### HOUSE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

- DATE:** March 12, 2008
- TIME:** 8:30 A.M.
- PLACE:** Room 148
- MEMBERS:** Chairman Nonini, Vice Chairman Shirley, Representatives Trail, Bradford, Block, Nielsen, Wills, Chadderdon, Shepherd (8), Marriott, Mortimer, Patrick, Thayn, Boe, Pence, Chavez, Durst, Shively
- ABSENT/  
EXCUSED:** None
- GUESTS:** See attached list.
- Chairman Nonini called the meeting to order at 8:33 A.M. and a silent roll was taken.
- MOTION:** Rep. Shively made a motion to approve the minutes from March 11<sup>th</sup> meeting as submitted. On a voice vote, the motion carried.
- RS 18067:** **Clete Edmunson**, from the Office of the Governor presented this RS to the Committee. He explained that this legislation changes the definition of "eligible Idaho post secondary educational institution" in Idaho Code to allow students to use the Opportunity Scholarship at Idaho public, private not-for-profit and private for-profit institutions. He further explained that it is felt that if a student earns a scholarship, they should be able to choose which college they would like to attend. In response to a question regarding how much effort there is to allocate funds to public universities, **Mr. Edmunson** reported that he did not have that specific information, but he will provide it to the Committee at a later time. It was mentioned that tax payers provide funds for public colleges and it should be the first priority to offer scholarships to public universities. It was also mentioned that there should be an increase in the number of scholarships that public institutions can offer. **Mark Browning**, representing the State Board of Education, reported that there are approximately about 3,000 applications for the Opportunity Scholarship on file. He further reported that there is money left on the table, and approximately 642 scholarships have been awarded.
- MOTION:** Rep. Shepherd made a motion to **introduce RS 18067 to print and send directly to the second reading calendar**. In the discussion on the motion, it was mentioned that there could be a conflict with students going to private institutions which cost more than public institutions. **Mr. Browning** explained that students applying for an Opportunity Scholarship must first apply for FASA (federal financial aid), and the student contribution is \$5,000, which could be through a loan or from the family and other scholarships come into play as well. He further explained that the last dollars are the Opportunity scholarship. He reported that this year the scholarship is averaging about \$3,000 per student.

In response to a question regarding the yearly tuition at private colleges, **Mr. Browning** explained that he did not have the exact figures, but is considerably more than public colleges. It was mentioned that eligibility for the Opportunity Scholarship was discussed last year and it was found that some students were excluded because they were home schooled. At that time, the legislature made a commitment to honor student choice and this is what the proposed legislation does. **Mr. Browning** also explained that because of state match, the state is able to offer an additional 70 scholarships. He clarified that the cap per year on the scholarship is \$3,000. It was mentioned that it would be beneficial for more information to have the bill come back to Committee. It was further mentioned that there is a push to adjourn next week and the soonest the Committee could hear this bill would be next week and then it still needs to go through the process in the Senate. Chairman Nonini mentioned that he did not think that this is a controversial bill. It was mentioned that **Kris Ellis**, a lobbyist representing the for profit schools and who is support of this legislation, would be happy to answer any questions the committee would have.

On a voice vote, the motion carried. Chairman Nonini and Vice Chairman Shirley will sponsor the bill on the House Floor.

**RS 17299C2:**

Rep. Trail presented this RS to the Committee. He explained that this piece of legislation was crafted last May, but there was a concern about a litigation process and he was advised to wait until litigation process was resolved. The litigation was resolved on March 6<sup>th</sup>. He explained that this legislation relates to school levies to provide a procedure for increasing the amount of an existing indefinite term supplemental levy at an election and to provide that if the Board of Trustees reduces the levy in one or more years, it may levy the full amount approved by the electors in any subsequent year; declaring an emergency and providing retroactive application.

He explained that Moscow school district had just gone through a year long legal battle over a suit brought by a local dentist concerning an indefinite levy. As a result of the suit, the district lost several classes and a number of teachers and staff had to be let go because of the question of funding. Last March, the voters in Moscow school district approved a \$1.97 increase in the school district supplemental levy. The following May, Dr. Weitz filed a lawsuit claiming an increase was illegal because the ballot did not clearly state the dollar amount to be validated. It listed only the \$1.97 million, but not the total when added to the permanent amount. He explained that Moscow is the only school district in the region that utilizes a state law allowing districts to declare a levy as permanent after seven consecutive successful levy elections. Two other school districts in the state have used this state law. A district court judge ruled that the ballot had not been worded correctly. Another levy election was held in November and passed by 58% of the voters. In January, the judge ruled that Moscow school district could spend nearly \$2 million in contested levy money and also that the Latah County commission and the state tax commission's approval of the March levy could be translated to the November levy.

The proposed legislation would clarify the statutes and thus help other school districts. He explained that this piece of legislation has been reviewed by the Department of Education and the Attorney General's office.

It was mentioned that regardless of what the courts rule, why was it necessary to go back to January 1<sup>st</sup>. Rep. Trail acknowledged that it probably does not make that much difference. He further explained that the increase would be made permanent after just one election, and increases need to follow the same rules as base levy amount. He clarified that a majority is 50 plus one. It was mentioned that the Committee could move to print the RS but would like to remove emergency clause. It was explained that Rep. Trail would have to do a C3, or send the bill to general orders. Chairman Nonini explained that he did send all information to **Jason Hancock** at the State Department of Education and he did not see any problem with this legislation.

Rep. Trail made a unanimous consent request to pull back the RS and do a C3 to remove Section 2 of the proposed legislation so the Committee can hear it tomorrow. There were no objections.

**S 1450:** **Senator Mike Burkett** presented this bill to the Committee. He explained that this legislation amends Idaho Code that currently grants school districts the authority to authorize the transfer or conveyance of any real or personal property owned by a school district to various public entities. This bill adds the Idaho Housing and Finance Association to the list of entities to which school districts may transfer or convey surplus property. He further explained that he is not aware of any other government agency that want to be added to the list.

**Steve Rector**, representing the Idaho Housing and Finance Association spoke in support of the legislation. He explained that by adding the Association to the list it would be another tool that they can use in workforce housing issue, if the opportunity is available.

**MOTION:** Rep. Boe made a motion **to send S 1450 to the Floor with a DO PASS recommendation**. On the discussion on the motion, **Mr. Rector** explained that they are not a state agency and a not for profit, and the association issues state tax credits for families. He further explained that they also have a non profit housing company. He also explained that school districts have a process they need to follow and it would be easier to have them in the Code to not encumber the school districts. In response to a question regarding if the proposed legislation gives them an unfair advantage, **Mr. Rector** explained that it would not be an unfair advantage. He further explained that the Association does work through tax credits and any developer could come through, but they would need to come through them to issue the tax credits. He explained that if a developer said they wanted school district surplus property, it would not be an unfair advantage because the school district has control as to who the property goes to. There has to be a market appraisal. The market is open and the school district makes the decision. It was mentioned that it is important to make sure the school districts get a fair market value for the property. **Mr. Rector** explained that in order to get rid of surplus property school districts currently have to go through the city and they would like to bypass this and deal directly with the association. It was pointed out that in the bill it reads that any state organization, property can go outside a school district.

**Senator Burkett** explained that the school board is required to do an appraisal on the surplus property and also have to sell that property at that appraisal.

**On a voice vote, the motion passed, with Rep. Marriott voting NAY.**  
Rep. Durst will sponsor the bill on the House Floor.

## **PRESENTATION**

Rep. Boe introduced **Elsie Lamp**, president of the Idaho Federation of the Blind who has shared her concerns about the education of blind children in the state. **Ms. Lamp** explained that the Idaho Federation of the Blind is a national organization of blind people. She introduced several colleagues with her. She explained that blind children are a minority, but they are getting the least amount of attention. She further explained that there are strong contentions that the education of the blind and deaf need to be separated. They learn completely different ways and she feels that one of the biggest travesties is to house them together at the Idaho State School for the Deaf and Blind.

She explained that she was raised in Idaho school districts, and she is a good result of education and also a good result in spite of education she received. She explained that even today in school districts, teachers are trying convince students with vision loss to use their limited vision. She reported that among the blind working aged, there is a 70% unemployment rate. Of those, there are 30% that are working and about 90% use braille. There is a need to have educators listen to successful blind people. She reported that she has recently been appointed to the advisory committee for ISDB and there are only two people on the committee who are blind.

She explained that blind people can contribute a lot. She explained that she was awarded the Jefferson award for outstanding community service in 2004. She also explained that 180 blind youth from across the nation went to John Hopkins University to study blind education recently. Teachers are not teaching new techniques for blind students. She explained that the Federation has tried to do what they can to improve lives of blind children in Idaho. They offer scholarships to blind people. She reported that the Federation is holding a state convention in Idaho Falls at the end of the month and will be introducing cutting edge technology. She explained that one of the new technology items is a device the size of a cell phone with audible menus, GPS, downloads from the internet and a camera that can take pictures of documents and reads it to people. The Federation is excited about technology and excited about the things they can do for blind children, but need to make contact with them to mentor them.

She reported that some blind students are graduating from Idaho schools, who do not know how to tell time, tie their shoes, or make their bed. She explained that blind people are a cross section of society, and blindness can happen to anyone.

In response to a question as to what happens to blind children in a school setting, **Ms. Lamp** explained that it depends on the student. Some students are mainstreamed, some are in special education, and some sent to ISDB in Gooding.

When questioned how a teacher deals with a student who is mainstreamed, **Ms. Lamp** explained that it is different for each student. Some have a personal aide, some get specialized instruction for a short time and then are mainstreamed in classroom.

She explained that the skills of blindness include, braille, technology and mobility. There is a lack of people that can teach braille and it is a difficult language to learn. Braille to blind people is literacy. Reading braille is completely different from writing braille. **Ms. Lamp** reported that in Pocatello, the average time is 30 minutes of direct education per week for blind students, and this is the highest in the state.

It was suggested that the Committee could have a report next week from the State Board and the State Department concerning the number of blind students in the state and resources available to teach these students and what is the state doing to educate blind children. The Secretary will contact the Board and the Department to have someone come and report to the Committee next week. It was also suggested to add IEA to the list of those who would report.

**ADJOURN:**

There being no further business to be brought before the Committee, Chairman Nonini adjourned the meeting at 10 A.M.

---

Representative Bob Nonini  
Chairman

---

Claudia Howell  
Secretary

## MINUTES

### HOUSE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

**DATE:** March 13, 2008

**TIME:** 8:30 A.M.

**PLACE:** Room 148

**MEMBERS:** Chairman Nonini, Vice Chairman Shirley, Representatives Trail, Bradford, Block, Nielsen, Wills, Chadderdon, Shepherd (8), Marriott, Mortimer, Patrick, Thayn, Boe, Pence, Chavez, Durst, Shively

**ABSENT/  
EXCUSED:** None

**GUESTS:** See attached list.

Chairman Nonini called the meeting to order at 8:34 and a silent roll was taken.

**MOTION:** Rep. Wills made a motion to approve the minutes from March 12<sup>th</sup>, 2008 as submitted. On a voice vote, the motion carried.

**S 1443:** **Rep. Margaret Henbest** presented this bill to the Committee. She explained this bill amends existing law that provides for the allowance of an inhaler to include allowance for the self-administration of prescribed medication administered through the use of an epinephrine auto-injector by students in school districts statewide. She further explained that it maintains requirements for the use of prescription medication and does not affect the ability of a school district to require that duplicate medications are maintained with a school nurse and that all medications are reported to school officials. She reported that 47 other states have enacted a similar law and Idaho is one of only three states that do not have this type of legislation. She explained that children who have allergies and require an epinephrine auto-injector need timely intervention. Children need to have this medication on them at all times. She explained that the U.S. Congress is currently working on legislation that will give some direction to schools nation wide on this issue.

**MOTION:** Rep. Wills made a **motion to send S 1443 to the Floor with a DO PASS recommendation**. In response to a question regarding insulin, **Rep. Henbest** explained that self injected insulin is addressed at local school district level. In response to a question regarding what kind of reaction a person would have who does not have an allergy and injects epinephrine, **Rep. Henbest** explained that this medication speeds up heart rate, but would not be fatal for someone who didn't have the allergy. **Dr. Murry Sturkie**, further explained that the medication would cause a rapid heart rate, and would also cause blood vessels to constrict. He further explained that the auto-injector is a single dose of medication with a large needle. **Rep. Henbest** explained that children are instructed by their health care provider about how to use the auto-injector. She further explained that most of kids who are at risk, are at risk because they have already had an episode.



It was mentioned that the key word is immediate, and timing is everything.

On a voice vote, the motion carried. Rep. Henbest will sponsor the bill on the House Floor.

**RS 17299C3:**

Rep. Trail presented this RS to the Committee. He explained that he has spent quite a bit of time yesterday on the history of this proposed legislation. He further explained that he has taken out the emergency clause as suggested by Rep. Wills. He also explained that Moscow began utilizing the supplemental levy in 1992. After 7 years, the voters turned it down, but came back in the fall and voted in favor of it.

**Harold Ott**, representing the Idaho Rural Schools Association and a former superintendent, provided more background for this RS. He explained that he has read the information that was provided by Rep. Trail. He further explained that he has read the Deputy Attorney General's letter, and this proposed legislation clears up this problem. In response to question regarding the issue of a permanent levy and if the proposed legislation would be increasing a temporary levy to a permanent levy by one vote, Rep. Trail responded that it does not make it permanent. He further explained that was the indication he got in talking to his superintendent. **Mr. Ott** explained that in the proposed legislation the levy increase would be for an indefinite number of years but the amount could be reduced.

**MOTION:**

Rep. Nielsen made a motion **to introduce RS 17299C3 to print**. In the discussion on the motion, it was mentioned that the letter from AG gives the voters a clearer picture of what they are voting on. Rep. Nielsen explained that the proposed legislation should be printed, and should be made available for the those in the community to see it.

**SUBSTITUTE MOTION:**

Rep. Thayn made a **Substitute Motion to return RS 17299C3 to the sponsor**. In the discussion on the motion, Rep. Thayn mentioned that he felt there will be unintended consequences with the proposed legislation and that the increase in the levy would be permanent. He further mentioned that schools do not want that power and it is not healthy tax policy. He explained that it is an issue of local control, and those serving on the school board are elected, and if they make mistakes, they will be held accountable for it.

**AMENDED SUBSTITUTE MOTION:**

Rep. Durst made an **Amended Substitute Motion to introduce RS 17299C3 to print and send directly to the second reading calendar**. In the discussion on the motion, Rep. Durst explained that the Committee has already heard the information regarding the proposed legislation. On a voice vote, the **Amended Substitute Motion failed**.

**VOTE:**

After discussion, Rep. Thayn **withdrew his Substitute Motion**.

On a voice vote, the Motion **to introduce RS 17299C3 to print carried**.

**HCR 57:**

Rep. Chadderdon presented this resolution to the Committee. She explained that this resolution encourages legislative support for the Blake Webb Motorcycle Safety Awareness Foundation, which educates and informs Idahoans about the importance of motocross riding safety on and off the track. She explained that this sport has grown throughout the nation.

She further explained that she has looked through Idaho Code and found that there are no regulations for motocross safety, so that is why she decided to do this resolution.

**MOTION:** Rep. Chavez made a motion **to send HCR 57 to the Floor with a DO PASS recommendation**. In a response to a question, Rep. Chadderdon clarified that there are 10 commercial tracks in the state, but there are many motocross racing events. She reported that Monday, March 17<sup>th</sup> is the first anniversary of Blake's death, and it would be meaningful to present the resolution on that day. On a voice vote, the motion carried. Rep. Chadderdon will carry the resolution on the House Floor.

**H 618:** Rep. Pence presented this bill to the Committee. She explained that this bill is the second part of a framework to outline the process for districts that want to consolidate. She explained that legislation was passed in 2007 that allowed for fiscal benefits for consolidation. She further explained that this bill simplifies the process of choosing trustees when school districts consolidate. She reported that the State Department of Education, the State Board of Education and the Superintendent's Association do support this legislation.

**Karen Echeverria**, Executive Director of the Idaho School Boards Association explained that they are supportive of the legislation.

**MOTION:** Rep. Thayn made a **motion to send H 618 to the Floor with a DO PASS recommendation**. On a voice vote, the motion carried. Rep. Pence will sponsor the bill on the House Floor.

Chairman Nonini announced that the Committee will not meet tomorrow.

**ADJOURN:** As there was no further business to be brought before the Committee, Chairman Nonini adjourned the meeting at 9:25 A.M.

---

Representative Bob Nonini  
Chairman

---

Claudia Howell  
Secretary

## MINUTES

### HOUSE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

**DATE:** March 17, 2008

**TIME:** 8:30 A.M.

**PLACE:** Room 148

**MEMBERS:** Chairman Nonini, Vice Chairman Shirley, Representatives Trail, Wills, Chadderdon, Shepherd (8), Marriott, Mortimer, Patrick, Thayn, Boe, Pence, Chavez, Durst, Shively

**ABSENT/  
EXCUSED:** Representatives Bradford, Block, and Nielsen

**GUESTS:** See attached list.

Chairman Nonini called the meeting to order at 8:30 A.M. and a silent roll was taken.

**MOTION:** Rep. Wills made a motion to approve the minutes from March 13<sup>th</sup>, 2008 as submitted. On a voice vote, the motion carried.

**H 642:** **Mr. Phil Homer** gave some historical background this bill. He explained that he was the superintendent of schools in Blaine County when the current permanent override levy law was codified. He explained that the old system was based on the amount of property value in each district. The more property value a district had, the fewer state dollars were allocated. Because Blaine County grew rapidly in market value, the school district was losing state funding rapidly and relying on property taxes to fund its schools. Because of this issue, they began a three year quest to attempt to rectify this problem. After two years of concentrated effort to lobby the legislature for additional state dollars, they agreed that Blaine County would not receive additional state funding. The permanent override bill was drafted based on a Boise School district charter very specifically for the Blaine County School district. In order to qualify, a district had to pass overrides for seven consecutive years. The override had to be 20% or more of the school district budget.

In response to questions, **Mr. Homer** explained that he is not aware that Mullen school district has an override levy. **Jason Hancock**, from the State Department of Education, explained that he knows that Moscow and Blaine county have used this override levy. He clarified that the intent of statute is to allow the permanent override levy be increased by one vote. He also explained that this was fair because at the time Blaine school district was facing some devastating times and it is a fairness issue.

Rep. Trail explained that 40% of property in Moscow is tax exempt because of the University of Idaho. He explained that the intent of **HB 642** is not to change original bill (**SB 1560**) but correct ambiguous language. He explained that overrides are voted on for 7 consecutive years and the levy can be reduced by a majority of the voters in any given year.

He explained that the district does have the authority to ask the voters for an increase and the total amount has to be referenced on the ballot. He reported that the thrust of the bill are technical changes to clarify the language.

**Jim Shakleford** representing the Idaho Education Association spoke in support of **HB 642**. He explained that the proposed legislation simply puts into statute and makes clear as to what school districts need to do. The proposed legislation outlines that the amount of the increase has to be included on the ballot, the total amount of the levy would have to be listed, and then inform the voters that the additional amount would have to be approved by the voters. He explained that this legislation helps districts to know what they have to do if they decide to do an override levy.

**Karen Echeverria**, Executive Director of the Idaho School Boards Association, spoke in support of **HB 642**. She explained that the increased levy does not have to be within 20% of the budget.

**Jason Hancock**, from the State Department of Education explained that the Superintendent has not taken a stand on this bill. He further explained that the Department does not see any unintended consequences of this bill.

Rep. Trail reported that he only knows of two school districts that have used this override levy and this proposed legislation is not making any substantive changes to what is already in statute.

**MOTION:**

Rep. Wills made a **motion to send HB 642 to the Floor with a DO PASS recommendation**. In the discussion on the motion, it was mentioned that there is some uneasiness about being able to increase a levy by just one vote. It was also mentioned that there is agreement that the state needs to support school districts, but it is not fair to the voters one vote could add on a permanent levy increase. It was mentioned that this is not good tax policy.

On a voice vote, the motion carried. Rep. Trail will carry the bill on the House Floor.

**PRESENTATION**

**Rich Rayhill**, vice president of Ridgeline Energy made a presentation entitled "Renewable energy opportunities for Idaho". He explained that wind energy is enjoying rapid growth. He explained that Texas leads the way. They generate 25% of the U.S. wind energy. Since 1995, Texas has added 12,000 jobs in wind farms. He explained that wind farms operate about a third of the time. Wind farms train and hire locally and 18 new degree programs have recently been established. These programs follow wind energy development. He explained that when a wind farm is built, a local college develops a program to train and supply workers.

He reported that there is a 15,000 megawatt potential in Idaho. Idaho's increasing electricity needs will be met by conservation, coal, natural gas and wind. He further reported that there is a three year plus backlog on equipment for natural gas production. He explained that 12% of coal plants slated for construction have actually been built and there is a lot of uncertainty about carbon.

He explained that wind is cost competitive. Wind energy is growing, electricity demands are rising, and generation options are limited. Policy drives generation. He reported that there are 240,000 jobs nationwide in the wind boom. He further reported that if Idaho captures this, there would be an additional 3,011 jobs available in the state. He explained that the rule of thumb in the wind industry is that ten permanent jobs are created on the wind farm for every 100 megawatts. The competition is fierce, and Idaho must fight for jobs. He reported that Texas hopes to double wind generation and quadruple wind manufacturing. Oregon has special enterprise zones for wind. Idaho wind means Idaho jobs. He reported that Nordic Windpower has decided to locate its first North American facility in Pocatello.

In response to questions, he explained that \$5,000 to \$12,000 dollars could be generated per year per wind tower. He further explained that it could be profitable for the company and still give money to the state if wind farms were built on state endowment lands. He explained that to get wind to transmission lines could be a big hurdle. They are currently working on a storage system for wind. He explained that the best way to incorporate wind is through a hydro system. Wind power can be used during the peak times of heating and cooling, and the water could be banked in reservoirs. He explained that by 2050, 30% of bird species will be extinct if carbon activity continues. Some conservation groups have reevaluated and have decided that the risk of climate change warrants turbines. Aesthetics are taken into consideration when building wind farms. Other states are proposing similar models on state endowment land, and they are aggressively pursuing this. This is being pursued in all of the western states, but they are not at the point where they are seeing any revenues for schools yet. He reported that there is enough wind power in North Dakota to meet the demands of the entire nation twice over.

Chairman Nonini announced that due to the lateness of the hour **Dana Kelly's** scholarship update will be rescheduled. He also shared a letter with Committee members from the State Superintendent of Schools voicing the Department's support of **HCR 48**, regarding concurrent enrollment. He further announced that the Committee has one more Senate bill to hear tomorrow and will hear no more RSs.

**ADJOURN:** There being no further business to be brought before the Committee, Chairman Nonini adjourned the meeting at 9:50 A.M.

---

Representative Bob Nonini  
Chairman

---

Claudia Howell  
Secretary

## MINUTES

### HOUSE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

**DATE:** March 18, 2008

**TIME:** 8:30 A.M.

**PLACE:** Room 148

**MEMBERS:** Chairman Nonini, Vice Chairman Shirley, Representatives Trail, Bradford, Block, Nielsen, Chadderdon, Shepherd (8), Marriott, Mortimer, Patrick, Thayn, Boe, Pence, Chavez, Durst, Shively

**ABSENT/  
EXCUSED:** Representative Wills

**GUESTS:** See attached list.

**MOTION:** Rep. Shively made a motion to approve the minutes from March 17<sup>th</sup>, 2008 as submitted. On a voice vote, the motion carried.

**SCR 134:** **Senator Mike Burkett** presented this resolution to the Committee. He explained this concurrent resolution highlights the importance of international education to improve higher education in Idaho through the support for additional classes in international studies, promoting the study of foreign languages, providing opportunities for students to participate in study abroad programs and encourages K-12 integration of materials and programs. He further explained that this resolution would have an impact on grant funds and program funds, and the plan is to use this resolution to show that Idaho is on board in supporting international education. He explained that 14 states already have this resolution. He further explained that 10% of jobs are derivative to international trade. He reported that 2,000 international students study in Idaho at the college level each year.

He explained that this resolution was brought by those at the University of Idaho working in research programs. **Sen. Burkett** explained that he added language to the resolution to include; "encouraging early foreign language learning and implementation of dual language practices and curriculum in Idaho elementary schools." He explained that the best time to learn a foreign language is at a young age. He further explained that a child can learn 3 or 4 languages at a very early age. Studies indicate that people who have bilingual skills function at a higher efficiency. He explained that international language is key to education and development and also key to our economy and ability of our state to compete internationally.

**Bob Neuenschwander**, director of International Programs for the University of Idaho spoke in support of **SCR 134**. He explained that international trade trips underscore the need for international language study.

He reported that many international students go home and become leaders in their own country. He explained that we should treat international education as integral part of education. In response to questions, he explained that students who have studied abroad have written articles in local newspapers and have done classroom presentations. He explained that it is difficult to learn things without being immersed in it. He further explained that language learning is a long process. He explained that if young children learn a foreign language they can speak as the native speakers, as they get older can participate in exchanges with other countries, and at the university level they could participate in study abroad programs. He reported that at the federal government level there is currently a "Study Abroad Act", which the goal is to have 1 million students studying abroad and provide funding for at the federal level. He explained that students in most other countries learn several foreign languages at the elementary level.

**Dr. Sabine Klahr**, director of international programs at BSU spoke in support of **SCR 134**. She explained that students must be exposed to global issues and there must be a workforce that demonstrates global competence. Idaho needs graduates who can continue to develop and increase business and trade opportunities abroad. She explained that she originally came from Germany. She came to the U.S. as an exchange student and decided to stay. While in Germany, she took classes in English and Latin. Her 5 year old daughter is completely fluent in German. She explained that it is a requirement in Germany to take English classes starting in the 5<sup>th</sup> grade. She explained that this resolution would raise awareness, raise visibility among parents and school boards to develop these opportunities for students at a young age.

**MOTION:** Rep. Shirley made a **motion to send SCR 134 to the floor with a DO PASS recommendation**. In the discussion on the motion, concerns were raised as to the reason for the resolution and how the ideas would be financed.

**SUBSTITUTE MOTION:** Rep. Nielsen made a **Substitute Motion to hold SCR 134 in Committee**. In the discussion on the motion, the need for better skills and communication was discussed. The value of learning more than one language was discussed. It was mentioned that there are other ways to learn and the state does not have the money to do this. It was also mentioned that the opportunities are there now, and the greatest product to send to other countries is democracy and the free enterprise system.

**ROLL CALL VOTE:** On a roll call vote, the Substitute Motion failed with 12 NAY votes, and 5 AYE votes and 1 absent and excused.

**ORIGINAL MOTION:** On a voice vote, the **Original Motion to send SCR 134 to the Floor with a DO PASS recommendation carried** with Representatives Nielsen, Marriott, Patrick and Thayn voting NAY. Rep. Trail will sponsor SCR 134 on the House Floor.

**PRESENTATION** **Dana Kelly**, from the State Board of Education gave a scholarship update for the Committee. She explained that the Board currently manages about \$19.9 million dollars in scholarship money. Some of the scholarships are centralized and some are decentralized.

She further explained that the Board now has an online application process to streamline the process and also to allow students to receive earlier notification if they are scholarship recipients. She explained that with the online process, applicant numbers continue to rise and comments on the process are positive. She explained that she would be discussing 2007 data.

She reported that changes were made to the Promise A scholarship to include home schooled students and excludes rank in class. The Board awarded 40 new Promise A scholarships last year. She explained that the Board currently does not have a mechanism to know how many of the recipients went to Idaho schools.

She discussed the Opportunity scholarship with the Committee. She explained that they are currently in first year of implementation and will be serving approximately 700 students. It is a need-based scholarship and has \$10 million to the endowment. State benefits include; rates of return on baccalaureate education are far higher than those associated with any other educational step. She also explained that the federal government needs to partner with states in scholarships. Board responsibility includes determining the cost of attendance, and determining the amount of student responsibility. She discussed the eligibility requirements of the Opportunity scholarship, which include; applicant has to be an Idaho high school graduate, be an Idaho resident, apply for and accept all federal grants, be enrolled full time in an undergraduate program and use the scholarship funds for education costs only. She reported that there were 700 awards this past year, and the maximum award is \$3,000. She explained that the interest return on the \$10 million endowment is approximately \$300,000. She further explained that they are able to leverage additional federal funds. She clarified that it is a needs based scholarship, but there is an academic weighting. She explained that the Board does not have the information as to how many freshmen were awarded the scholarship, but hope to have this information available next year. She reported that the Board already has over 4,000 applications for the scholarship for next year.

Chairman Nonini announced that the Committee will meet at 8:30 tomorrow morning and will hear two presentations.

**ADJOURN:**

There being no further business to be brought before the Committee, Chairman Nonini adjourned the meeting at 10:00 A.M.

---

Representative Bob Nonini  
Chairman

---

Claudia Howell  
Secretary



## MINUTES

### HOUSE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

**DATE:** March 19, 2008

**TIME:** 8:30 A.M.

**PLACE:** Room 148

**MEMBERS:** Vice Chairman Shirley, Representatives Bradford, Block, Nielsen, Wills, Chadderdon, Shepherd (8), Marriott, Mortimer, Patrick, Thayn, Boe, Pence, Chavez, Shively

**ABSENT/  
EXCUSED:** Chairman Nonini, Representatives Trail and Durst

**GUESTS:** See attached list.

Due to the absence of Chairman Nonini, Vice Chairman Shirley called the meeting to order at 8:34 A.M. and a silent roll was taken.

**MOTION:** Rep. Shively made a motion to approve the minutes from March 18<sup>th</sup>, 2008 as submitted. On a voice vote, the motion carried.

**PRESENTATION** **Matt McCarter** introduced **Shannon Page** and **Pat Stewart** from the State Department of Education. **Ms. Page**, Coordinated School Health Director, discussed the youth risk behavior survey, substance abuse, safety and the school climate survey. She explained that when causes of underachievement are examined, many times it is due to poor health. Good health is necessary for academic success. She explained that multiple groups impact schools. She explained that the 8 components of a coordinated school health program include; comprehensive school health education, physical education, school health services, nutrition, counseling, health school environment, school site health promotion for staff, and family and community involvement. Healthy kids make better students and better students made healthy communities.

**Ms. Stewart**, HIV/Health Education Coordinator and **Mr. McCarter** Safe/drug free Schools Coordinator then spoke to the Committee. They discussed the Youth Risk Behavior Survey. They explained that funding for survey was from the Center on Disease Control. They further explained that this is a national survey and is set up for grades 9 thru 12 only. They explained that some of the questions deal with sexual behavior, and districts expressed a concern about giving the survey to lower grade students. They clarified that students always have the right not to participate in the survey. They explained that one of the challenges is the transitory population of students.

Statistics for binge drinking was discussed. They clarified that binge drinking is 5 or more drinks in one sitting. It was pointed out that binge drinking is increasing, especially among 12<sup>th</sup> graders, but fewer kids are drinking and driving. Binge drinking is also a problem among college students. It was also pointed out that driving under the influence has increased among 12<sup>th</sup> graders.

Methamphetamine use was also surveyed. It was mentioned that there are stable statistics among those who have tried meth. It was pointed out that marijuana use has increased and this is a community issue. There is a challenge to turn this around at the school level. Regional data will be provided by **Matt McCarter** for the Committee. It was reported that more than one half of all students (54.6%) surveyed reported that school had been their primary source of information about the dangers of drugs and drinking.

They explained that tobacco usage has jumped from 2005 to 2007. It was also reported that one in eight high school students were hit, slapped, or physically hurt on purpose by their boyfriend or girlfriend during the previous 12 months. It was also reported that weapon carrying is higher in boys than girls. They clarified that a weapon is defined as anything brought on campus intended to do harm to another student. They further reported that incident reports for weapons on campus have increased from 652 in 2006 to 917 in 2007.

They reported that 60% of seniors in high school said they have been sexually active and less than 45% talk to their parents about sexual behavior. 5% of students indicated that they had sexual relationships before they were 13 years old.

**Ms. Page** explained that the CDC has appropriated \$360,000 for an additional position for the coordinated school health program and an additional person at the Department of Health. She explained that funding for her position is from state funds. She also discussed the goals of the program which include; increase and strengthen intra-agency and interagency collaborative partnerships, increase the number of districts/schools that implement effective policies, increase high quality instructional programs in health education and physical education and increase the assessment and evaluation capacity at the state and local levels to improve program approaches and activities.

Vice Chairman Shirley encouraged the presenters to continue to collect data and work with the school districts. He thanked them for their important and excellent presentation.

There was a concern mentioned about the lack of adequate alcohol prevention information at some schools. **Mr. McCarter** explained that districts have established a local advisory board, and parents should go to this board if they have a concern.

## **PRESENTATION**

**Sherri Wood**, president of the Idaho Education Association discussed the education of blind students in Idaho. She explained that she taught for 28 years in Caldwell and has taught students who were visually impaired and had various other disabilities. She explained that in 28 years, she only had one student who was legally blind. She explained that teachers only have to take a one semester class in special education to deal with all exceptionalities in education.

**Joe Grover**, a teacher for 19 years, spoke to the Committee. He explained that he lost his vision in the first grade, and only has peripheral vision in one eye. He explained that his educational needs were met because of the commitment from his family.

The commitment was so strong, that when he registered for college, his 4<sup>th</sup> grade teacher came with him. He explained that the federal "Reading First" grant is negatively impacting special education students. He further explained that the program is designed to teach the middle of the road student and requires 2 ½ hours of reading instruction daily.

He explained that he currently teaches 21 3<sup>rd</sup> graders and has one student who is totally blind. Because of the way a blind student learns, he does not learn at the rate of other children. **Mr. Grover** mentioned that he feels this student is being left behind, and does not know how to change this.

He explained that technology has changed his life and with appropriate education and adaptations, most disabled people can be gainfully employed. He mentioned that he hopes to impact his blind student as much as he was impacted when he was a student. In response to questions, he explained that he had a better opportunity to learn because there were no mandates from federal government that impacted curriculum. He explained that there are extra resources available for blind students.

**Cindy Grover**, a teacher for the blind and visually impaired for Caldwell School district explained that she sees the blind student in **Mr. Grover's** class for about 7 hours per week. She explained that she has near vision, but no far vision. She has a degree in elementary education and a master's degree. She has a caseload of 18 students in 7 different schools. She explained that she tries to be an advocate for her kids. In response to question, she explained that she has an assistant who drives for her and also works with students.

**Aylee Schaefer**, transition coordinator for the State Board of Education addressed the Committee. She explained that she is a certified teacher of the visually impaired. She explained that the Committee had heard the perspective from a regular classroom teacher who felt frustrated because she was not trained adequately to teach students with disabilities; and from a teacher who was prepared to teach students with disabilities but felt restrained by structure and curriculum. She explained that it is the state's responsibility to provide an expanded core curriculum. She further explained that people who are blind need to learn the expanded core curriculum, and the teachers of the blind are supposed to provide this. She explained that in Idaho there are 22 teachers statewide for the blind and visually impaired. She further explained that there are 395 students in the state who are blind and visually impaired. She explained that the reason that blind students are graduating without the skills they need is that sometimes the state does not meet their needs. There is a need for more professionals. She explained that she has been hired to study this problem and find a solution. She further explained that a summit will be held this summer to more deeply analyze this problem and find a solution.

Vice Chairman Shirley thanked **Ms. Schaefer** for her presentation and mentioned that it would be beneficial for her to return next year to present to the Committee.

Vice Chairman Shirley that the Committee would meet for the final time tomorrow at 9 A.M.

**ADJOURN:** There being no further business to be brought before the Committee, Vice Chairman Shirley adjourned the meeting at 9:56 A.M.

---

Representative Mack Shirley  
Vice Chairman

---

Claudia Howell  
Secretary

## MINUTES

### HOUSE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

**DATE:** March 25, 2008

**TIME:** 8:00 a.m.

**PLACE:** Room 145

**MEMBERS:** Chairman Nonini, Vice Chairman Shirley, Representatives Trail, Bradford, Block, Nielsen, Wills, Chadderdon, Shepherd, Marriott, Mortimer, Patrick, Thayn, Boe, Pence, Chavez, Durst, Shively

**ABSENT/  
EXCUSED:** Reps. Shirley, Bradford, Nielsen, Wills, Chadderdon, Boe, Durst, and Shively

**GUESTS** Jason Hancock, State Department of Education

Meeting was called to order at 8:00 a.m. **Chairman Nonini** explained that **H 607** had been amended on the Senate floor because, in the Senate's opinion, the three components of the bill did not have unity of subject. The Senate's amendments removed Section 2, dealing with transportation support, and Section 3, dealing with charter school financial support. Chairman Nonini said the legislation contained in the two sections is still necessary and thus these two sections will be introduced as two separate, stand-alone bills.

**RS 18157** **Jason Hancock**, State Department of Education, explained that **RS 18157** is the exact language taken from H 607, Section 2, dealing with state reimbursement for pupil transportation costs.

**MOTION** **Rep. Mortimer** moved to **introduce RS 18157** and move it directly to the second reading calendar. **Motion carried on voice vote.**

**RS 18158** **Mr. Hancock** stated that **RS 18158** is the exact language taken from H 607, Section 3, which removes the arbitrary cap on the number of new support units that a charter school can receive in a given fiscal year.

**MOTION** **Rep. Trail** moved to introduce **RS 18158** and move it directly to the second reading calendar. **Motion carried on voice vote.**

**Chairman Nonini** asked **Rep. Thayne** to sponsor the two bills on the floor, since he had served as House floor sponsor for H 607; Rep. Thayne agreed to do so. Chairman Nonini also advised the committee that he does not anticipate further meetings this session, but he asked members to remain willing to meet if it becomes necessary.

**MOTION** **Rep. Patrick** moved to have the minutes of today's meeting sent to committee members on an individual basis for any necessary corrections and for approval. **Motion carried on voice vote.**

**ADJOURN:** There being no further business to come before the committee, the meeting was adjourned at 8:07 a.m.

---

Representative Bob Nonini  
Chairman

---

Mary Lou Molitor  
Secretary