

CORRECTED MINUTES *
(Approved by the Committee)

K-12 EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM
INTERIM COMMITTEE
OCTOBER 2, 2013
9:00 AM
EAST WING 42 COMMITTEE ROOM

Members present were: Co-chair Representative Reed DeMordaunt, Co-chair Senator John Goedde, Senators Steve Thayn, Jim Patrick, Fred Martin, Branden Durst, and Representatives Judy Boyle, Wendy Horman, Julie VanOrden and Holli Woodings. Legislative Services Office (LSO) staff included Eric Milstead, Paul Headlee and Charmi Arregui.

Others present at the meeting were Dave Teater, Teater Consulting; Roger Brown, Governor's Office; Col. Brad Richy, Idaho Dept. of Homeland Security; Matt McCarter, Luci Willits and Joyce Popp, State Dept. of Education; Jack Ambrosiani and Mary Jo Ambrosiani, Ambrosiani Pastore Foundation; Penni Cyr, Matt Compton and Robin Nettinga, Idaho Education Association; Karen Echeverria and Anne Ritter, Idaho School Boards Association; Rob Winslow, Idaho Association of School Administrators; Jeff Sayer, Dept. of Commerce; Brody Aston, Lobby Idaho; Phil Homer, IASA; Sherawn Reberry and Mike Caldwell, Idaho Digital Learning Academy (IDLA); Steve Worthley; Doug Jones; Ken Burgess, Idaho Charter School Network; Marilyn Whitney, State Board of Education; and Ryan Hansen, LHMS, PTA Meridian School District.

Co-chair Representative DeMordaunt called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. **Co-chair DeMordaunt** gave opening remarks and called the members' attention to one handout which he said would not be covered in this meeting, adding that Superintendent Luna had announced his budget on October 1, 2013, and a copy of his budget and highlights were given to each member. He encouraged members to look at this handout; he was pleased to see that some concepts and ideas coming out of the Governor's Task Force were reflected in this budget. He noted that there would be vigorous debate, as he thinks there should be, about this budget.

Co-chair Goedde remarked that the members had been given information from the Albertson Foundation based on a study they are doing on our data systems and technology. He extended an invitation to the members to the Idaho premier of "Teach," which was being shown at the Egyptian Theater here in Boise on October 2, 2013.

Co-chair Goedde referred to the September 12, 2013 minutes where **Penni Cyr** mentioned employment or reemployment of teachers that have taken early retirement. **Co-chair Goedde** said he checked with PERSI and that there appears to be a significant problem with the IRS and reemploying those teachers. He said he would have more information on that, as it becomes available.

***Correction:** On page 13, paragraph 4, the 3rd sentence originally read: "**Co-chair DeMordaunt** asked if they had been reinstated since then and **Ms. Cyr** replied that was correct." **Senator Goedde** moved for clarification to read as follows in these **corrected minutes**: "**Co-chair DeMordaunt** asked if they had been reinstated since then and **Ms. Cyr** replied that *there are no evergreen clauses in effect at this time.*"

Co-chair Goedde moved that the minutes from September 12, 2013 be approved with a number of “typo” corrections (given to the Secretary) and he also noted the omission of the listing of LSO staff in the attendees. With those changes, Co-chair Goedde moved that the minutes be adopted, and the motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

Co-chair Goedde introduced the first presenter, **Dave Teater**, and said that he had met **Mr. Teater** when he worked for School District 271, noting that he has 43 years of experience in education, 27 as a school administrator and 16 as a consultant to schools. **Mr. Teater** worked as a classroom teacher, counselor, assistant principal, principal, assistant superintendent and superintendent and has taught graduate classes at Albertson College and the University of Idaho and was awarded the distinguished service award from the Idaho Association of School Administrators. **Mr. Teater** has expertise in many areas; he taught Co-chair Goedde his first lesson on school finance, and he submitted that **Mr. Teater** was one of the top five experts on school finance in this state. **Mr. Teater** has done work in most of the fifty states, and is an expert on school facilities. **Co-chair Goedde** reiterated that the Supreme Court once suggested that the legislature had not fulfilled its constitutional requirement in providing facility funding, adding that the state has taken steps to correct that, and thus far the Supreme Court has not gone any further. **Mr. Teater** has developed an interesting concept and **Co-chair Goedde** said he thought it merited consideration.

Mr. Dave Teater, President, Teater Consulting, came to the podium after his introduction and his PowerPoint presentation entitled “School Facility Planning Overview” can be viewed at:

http://legislature.idaho.gov/sessioninfo/2013/interim/education1002_teater.pdf

The purpose of this discussion, he said, was to explore an idea, adding that he was not pretending to come here today with solutions to all the problems, but hoped this would be the beginning of a discussion. **Mr. Teater** pointed out there are many facility deficiencies in the state, as well as good facilities, but there is underlying tension regarding the lawsuit and what has been done and what many believe remains to be done. A win/win solution or a path through the school facility problem is being sought.

There has been a state intervention at the Plummer School District where a new school was built after the school was determined to be an imminent hazard, and work is now being done in the Salmon School District. There is some polarization in the stances of litigants and some folks believe there is progress, but many others disagree. **Mr. Teater** said that what is needed includes: a long-term, systematic approach to school facility renewal and replacement; a balanced approach to funding; and a thoughtful approach related to accountability based on best practices in the industry. Elements of a possible solution include: a renewal-replacement model; combination of funding sources; and accountability safeguards. A well-built building has a 90-year life, provided there is ongoing maintenance and periodic renewals of that building. For 288,000 students enrolled, about \$200 per square foot is the cost of construction, including soft costs. Facilities are driven by programs, so parameters and assumptions do change in a building. Ongoing building maintenance is very important, and enrollment growth requires new schools. Funding sources are being looked at. Until 2000, 100% of funding buildings was from property taxes, but since then there have been modifications to that. Most school facilities are a property tax issue, with some state assistance in certain areas.

Mr. Teater talked about a funding “Idea A” which would include: local tax dollars (45% of annual renewal cost) estimated today at 28 cents/thousand; lottery dollars presently going into school plant

facility funds; and state general fund dollars being responsible for about \$11 million annually. Those three funding streams would be able to fund an ongoing renewal and replacement of existing facilities.

“Idea B” included: local tax dollars (40% of annual renewal cost) which drops it down to 24 cents/thousand; use one-half of the lottery dollars; and the state share would go up to approximately \$26.5 million.

“Idea C” included: local tax dollars (50% of needed funds) at 31 cents/thousand; use one-half of the present lottery dollars; and the state share would amount to about \$20.1 million. **Mr. Teater** said these are only a few of many combinations that could be used to move to a renewal and replacement cycle for the state.

Mr. Teater has seen things in other states that have not worked well, so accountability safeguards absolutely have to be a part of any approach. He summarized that his overview was a model for renewal and replacement using different combinations of funding sources and having accountability safeguards. Unsolved issues, he said, included how this approach would be administered; how much would the administration cost; how would existing local debt be handled; and with such pent-up demand, would this approach be timely enough?

Senator Thayne asked about the funding ideas and the total amount of funding raised through the different ideas and **Mr. Teater** said it was about \$60 million annually.

Co-chair Goedde said that when facilities are updated, particularly HVAC, there are numbers that show student achievement is affected, and he asked **Mr. Teater** to share that information. **Mr. Teater** replied that intensive research had been done and there are three critical areas that affect student achievement: (1) air quality; (2) lighting; and (3) acoustics. A school rating poorly in all three areas, if improved, could see typically a 6% increase in student achievement.

Senator Patrick stated that he had a question on the valuation of schools. With regard to ongoing maintenance over the years, what value would you put on the school for that expenditure. Would it be replacement cost or something less, since he assumed that replacement cost would include the needed HVAC. He believes that better air quality is important. He said he believes in maintenance and making buildings last longer, but he said he was trying to put a value to the buildings currently, to figure a percentage. **Mr. Teater** said the value in the model is based on replacement value, and lab equipment raises costs over general classrooms, but \$200 per square foot factor is a good average of today’s cost, including HVAC upgrades at 30 and 60 years. In the interim, there would be ongoing maintenance.

Representative Horman commented that she had been on a school board for eleven years and the district experienced much growth and lots of bonding and plant facility work. She asked about the funding model and if **Mr. Teater** was proposing that the state return to a property tax. She also asked if lottery dollars would then be going completely to facilities. **Mr. Teater** answered the lottery portion is distributed on a per capita basis, so larger school systems get enough lottery dollars for larger projects. Smaller districts get a smaller amount and can’t do large projects as easily, so in the model some portion or all of those lottery dollars would be better used by the state as a whole if directed and focused on facility renewal in a systematic way. **Mr. Teater** explained that the tax would be state imposed and everyone would pay that tax, but some states require a local vote, unless they pass a local bond issue for their portion, which is another approach, there being pros and cons to both. **Representative Horman** also wondered about the renewal plan for facilities. **Mr. Teater** replied that there could be an assessment of a school for functional adequacy for education and sometimes a building is a detriment to

the programs taught within. There is no sense in refurbishing a building on the physical side if there are functional issues not being addressed in that same process.

Co-chair DeMordaunt wondered about studies on utilization of buildings, such as year-round school usage and how buildings are being used today and how they could be used more effectively. **Mr. Teater** admitted there are better ways to utilize buildings, such as twelve month usage, and some buildings have office space for teachers, which could improve utilization up to 16% in that one area. There are options available to improve utilization, such as night schools to serve students. **Co-chair DeMordaunt** inquired about buildings in the state right now that are in an imminent situation, asking what things he would list as the top five. **Mr. Teater** answered that he didn't know about all the buildings in the state, but added that in the Salmon School District a seismic roof replacement is being done and those buildings need major help where multiple bond issues have failed. Through the existing rules, the state is unable to address this issue and can only address the seismic roof issue, but other conditions remain unaddressed.

Co-chair Goedde commented that there are models of joint use to be examined, and that **Mr. Teater** has developed an Excel model which can be looked at. He thinks this is an issue that remains unresolved, and the challenge he sees politically is that there are "districts that can't and have, and those that have and don't." He pointed out the Wallace School District has a very small property tax base, but voters stepped up to the plate to assume huge debt to advance their schools, and there are districts that are property-rich and the voters have not chosen to fulfill their obligation. A balance must be found for those who have stepped forward.

Senator Durst expressed his concern for lack of planning and investment and disparity statewide, adding that in the Boise School District, property taxes are higher and they voted to invest in schools. He has concerns about investing more general funds into school facilities when other school districts throughout the state are not willing to put their taxpayers on the same level of burden as those in Boise. Schools are funded differently, and small school districts are compensated, so besides facilities, we also need to look at school district consolidation of services, not just buildings themselves and get more money from the system and also start to invest more.

Senator Patrick agreed that consolidation of school services was a good idea, but property taxes are the least equal taxes in existence, so he believes that a broader-based tax is much better.

Co-chair DeMordaunt believes that facilities can be important to student achievement but also thinks it important for current resources to be utilized to the maximum level.

The next presenter was **Roger Brown** from Governor Otter's office, who was asked to address the task force on school security and the "Burley exercise." Governor Otter had tasked Colonel Jerry Russell , Idaho State Police (ISP), to consult on Idaho public school issues specific to security. It became apparent there are all manner of needs to address at the local level in terms of preparedness and security for students, educators and Idaho communities. Out of that conversation, it was determined that a no-notice exercise at an Idaho school was necessary, using an incident that would give the broadest possible gathering of data as to how a school and community responds to a disaster. **Mr. Brown** said that Colonel Richy would address the task force on that exercise. Representatives of state agencies were also invited to this Burley exercise, since they would be involved in an unfortunate incident on a school campus. Those agencies included the Department of Health and Welfare, the Division of Building Safety, ISP, and the Bureau of Homeland Security. Their presence was designed to convey to local leaders, school boards, and local superintendents that while we are short of a holistic solution in terms

of preparedness, understanding what threats exist and what resources may be necessary, there is an apparatus at the state level to provide assistance and expertise on some of these matters.

Colonel Brad Richy, Idaho Department of Homeland Security, presented next and his PowerPoint presentation can be found on LSO's website at:

http://legislature.idaho.gov/sessioninfo/2013/interim/education1002_richy.pdf

Colonel Richy said that his department takes great pride in trying to prepare the state for any incident or emergency that could occur. They do everything they can to prepare schools and communities to address issues and to deal with issues responsibly and rapidly in order to move forward. Partnerships have been developed with the Governor's Office and other state agencies as training and exercises are conducted throughout the state. In each Idaho county there is an emergency manager coordinator and grant funds are distributed to those counties to allow locals to determine what emergency management activities they want performed within their counties. Homeland Security offers their training and exercise program managers and individuals to provide the most realistic capability and opportunities. In 2011 Homeland Security had six facilitated training events that focused on school safety and response. In 2012 and 2013 they conducted 13 exercises throughout the state that varied in nature and complexity with active shooter and evacuation profiles, fire and earthquakes and some were "table-top exercises" which are important in making plans for an individual building, county or community and the response. Homeland Security supports the Safe Schools Task Force and has members in contact with counties and communities to offer communication, intelligence and possible solutions to threats they may face.

The "Burley exercise" took place on August 21, 2013 and was a great opportunity for Homeland Security to set up a challenging scenario. The scenario was a disgruntled citizen who entered the school and went into the chemistry lab and threatened to take down the school, and then an explosion supposedly occurred. The school went into the emergency response plan and first responders were involved. After an exercise, it is important to do an after-action review as to what went right and wrong, finding areas for improvement. This event was a valuable opportunity and focused on the fact that school districts and emergency managers throughout the state need to make time to do training and exercises.

Colonel Richy said that a pilot project is going on in Payette High School presently to provide live video feed to all the emergency responders in the area. Direct voice communication is a new technology that is being worked on, as well as the ability to lock down a school to keep a threat out and the ability to control that threat. Homeland Security supports the continued efforts of the Safe Schools Task Force and they will help and assist in any way they can.

Senator Durst asked about continuity of leadership and if all the major players were available and ready to act since Homeland Security is seeing significant turnover in the past few years. He wondered how much is expected of the leadership within a building to know and how much is expected at the state level in implementing these kinds of response plans. **Colonel Richy** replied that national leadership has changed, but within the state and at the county levels, little has changed, so the opportunity to work with those individuals continues on an ongoing basis.

Mr. Brown emphasized that it was important to the Governor prior to the "Burley exercise" that leadership, resources and structure be provided at the state level, but he said that leadership at the local level is vital at the school or district to ensure there is an adequate assessment of facilities and awareness of railroad tracks, numbers of doors within a building, etc. With the support of Homeland Security, Health and Welfare, Building Safety, ISP, and the State Department of Education, the Governor's Office wanted to make it clear that they are able to provide assistance, expertise and

support, but that action at the local level is needed to help construct action plans. Needs at the local level must be identified and solutions found through communication and collaboration.

Senator Durst wondered about strategy for cyber terrorism events and what preparation has been done for that situation. **Colonel Richy** said this was a realistic threat and there is a Presidential directive to address cyber security and work is being done at the state level, partnering with INL, adding that the Department of Administration has the overall cyber plan for the state. Homeland Security would be a response agency for issues that might arise.

Representative Horman asked about the outcomes and where we go from here with regard to training after the “Burley exercise.” From past events, often communication is one of the biggest problems. **Colonel Richy** said that follow-up training was not appropriate for Burley High School; they worked through any issues and they worked with the community. Emergency management at the local level is worked on quarterly and they work with first responders and the school districts for total collaboration, which is often overlooked.

Co-chair DeMordaunt inquired about the cost of the “Burley exercise.” **Colonel Richy** did not know what it cost the county for this exercise, but they are required to do three per year, and grant funding can be used. **Co-chair DeMordaunt** said that it would be optimum for all schools in the state to do this type of exercise, and he asked what Homeland Security or the Governor’s Office could do to encourage others to conduct similar learning exercises. **Colonel Richy** meets regularly with emergency manager coordinators around the state, sharing the lessons learned from the “Burley exercise” and the collaboration it takes. Part of his job is getting word out around the state. **Co-chair DeMordaunt** said it would be important for schools around the state to do similar exercises for better preparedness.

Senator Patrick believes that planning is critical, especially since his rural first responders may be 10-15 minutes away. Schools should concentrate on internal controls in a school itself and expand on what is available within each school, such as self-locking doors and good communication during a specific emergency. **Colonel Richy** said that is the exact reason that Homeland Security is supporting the pilot project in Payette High School. If a disaster happens, they want the first responders and the school to have the best available opportunities to minimize the threat, isolate the hazard and deal with it until help arrives. **Senator Patrick** would like to see more pilot projects and more grant money for other schools, using Payette High School as a first step.

Matt McCarter, Director, Student Engagement and Postsecondary Readiness, State Department of Education (SDE), was the next presenter. His handout of a Memorandum dated 9/16/13 to district and public charter school superintendents and administrators regarding Idaho School Safety and Security Threat Assessment Implementation can be found on LSO’s website at:

http://legislature.idaho.gov/sessioninfo/2013/interim/education1002_mccarter_memo.pdf

Mr. McCarter reported on the Safe Schools Task Force and said that the work of that task force is ongoing. In 2008 the Department of Education looked at school safety and security and identified security equipment and capabilities among a large sample of schools. Trends of deficiencies and concerns resulted in tools, training and guidance for districts. Some schools got on board and others did not. Regarding current activity, school safety and security remains a top priority of Superintendent Luna. He convened a stakeholder group to improve school safety and security in Idaho, coming on the heels of the Sandy Hook incident. Almost concurrently, the Governor appointed Colonel Russell (ISP) to inform and compliment SDE’s effort. **Mr. McCarter** said that Colonel Russell has been invaluable with his expertise and guidance moving forward.

Mr. McCarter identified members of the Safe Schools Task Force. His goal is to establish a community-wide, state-wide consensus approach as to how this issue is addressed. The focus of the Safe Schools Task Force includes:

- To identify the critical infrastructure, resources and action steps (statewide plan) to create a culture of readiness to prevent and respond to crises in every school community in Idaho.
- To build capacity for local jurisdictions to effectively prevent and respond to their unique crisis situations.
- To assure that every student, parent and staff member feels safe in Idaho schools.

Mr. McCarter had been asked to update this task force on the current activity of Senate Bill 1200, section 24, which appropriated \$100,000 for FY14 specifically to support the implementation of the common threat assessment tool throughout the state and to support the work of the Idaho Safe and Secure Schools Task Force. The assessment tool is available on the SDE website at:

http://www.sde.idaho.gov/site/safe_secure/

Mr. McCarter stated that the Safe Schools Task Force examined data and reports from Sandy Hook and many other incidents. The number one priority statewide was to identify a valid, reliable, multi-hazard security threat assessment tool. At a local level, the first priority is getting a team together as key first responders. Risk factors were identified, and tools were implemented in sample schools in Idaho, with the goal of 75 schools by January 15, 2014, and 28 have been completed to date.

Mr. McCarter updated the members on section 30 of Senate Bill 1200 which relates to the SDE's foundation funding formula to schools which includes \$300 per support unit specifically for safe environments for learning and classroom discipline. (The SDE has limited authority/oversight over these funds.) SDE has never known in detail what that money goes for and there has been no reporting or accountability regarding this. Senate Bill 1200, section 30, stipulates that SDE will collect that information from districts as to what the expenditures go towards relating to safe environment and discipline. This information will be posted on the SDE website by December 31, 2014.

Mr. McCarter introduced Brian Walker, Principal, Fairmont Junior High School, Boise Independent School District. **Mr. Walker** stated that it was a great opportunity for Fairmont to participate in a safety/security assessment conducted on September 20, 2013. His staff was not prepared in advance because they wanted to get a live look at their circumstances. He said this was a great opportunity to reflect on daily routines, practices, and preparedness in order to provide a safe learning environment for students. They received valuable feedback which pointed out things being done well and pinpointed things to be worked on.

Mr. McCarter shared recommendations, considerations, and next steps which can be found in his complete PowerPoint presentation entitled "School Safety and Security in Idaho Public Education" on LSO's website at:

http://legislature.idaho.gov/sessioninfo/2013/interim/education1002_mccarter.pdf

Co-chair Goedde observed that in 2008 the task force was active but dropped off the radar screen and didn't reappear until Sandy Hook. He asked if anything is being done regarding this topic in legislation or rule. He suggested that an annual report be required by the legislature to remind everyone how important this is and it might also keep the Safe Schools Task Force invigorated.

Senator Durst asked how much of what **Mr. Walker** does is incumbent on him as a principal and how much would be transferable to others in his absence, if an event were to occur. **Mr. Walker** replied that others have gone through administrative training and have their degrees, so any time the Principal or the Assistant Principal is out of the building, one trained staff member covers and there is a prepared team on-site. **Senator Durst** said this might be an opportunity to utilize something from the private sector so that if one system fails, there is another backup system in place, adding that it is great that this is going on at Fairmont.

Co-chair DeMordaunt asked what time commitment is required to perform an assessment, using this tool. **Mr. McCarter** answered that it depends on the size of the school, its age, geography of buildings and portables, but typically a little over one-half day for bigger high schools and one-half day for elementary schools, in general. **Co-chair DeMordaunt** said that it did not sound onerous to do this threat assessment, which was good to hear. With regard to the issue between local and state control or influence, does the assessment tool provide a menu of choices that a local authority can choose from to address threat issues. **Mr. McCarter** noted that there are a range of resources available, given the deficiencies that the threat assessment tool identifies. If there are fifteen gaps in a school system, there can be developed a triage list with the most important gap listed first, in order to prioritize. **Co-chair DeMordaunt** said that answers will be different for different schools, and he wants to make sure the tool being used is adaptable to those situations.

Senator Martin commented that he and other members of this task force had gone to Skyview and he was impressed that a school found something that works for them and he encouraged other schools to look at the Skyview model.

Senator Patrick said he visited the school (Skyview) and he said their tool was affordable, with no state or federal money involved, and no local money since the school got donations. It was put together by local staff from a model used in other instances. He encouraged other schools to look at this model.

Co-chair DeMordaunt said that this task force was anxious to see the results of the 75 tests taking place across the state.

Luci Willits, Chief of Staff, State Department of Education, presented next about current assessments being used, moving toward Idaho Core Standards and the smarter balanced assessments. She introduced her colleague, Dr. TJ Bliss, Director, Division of Assessment, State Department of Education. **Ms. Willits** gave a PowerPoint presentation which is on LSO's website at:

http://legislature.idaho.gov/sessioninfo/2013/interim/education1002_willits.pdf

Ms. Willits stated that Idaho is a leader in assessments, particularly online assessments, which Idaho has been doing for a decade when other states have been using paper and pencils. Idaho's Testing System includes:

- Idaho Reading Indicator in grades K-3;
- Idaho Standards Achievement Tests in Math, Reading, Language Arts in grades 3-10. Science in grades 5, 7, 10;
- College Entrance Exam in grade 11.

This is significantly less statewide testing than even five years ago.

Senator Thayne asked what the term "random" meant in terms of field testing. **Ms. Willits** explained that the whole purpose of the pilot in the field test is to test items to see how students perform, so they

will be random. **Senator Thayne** reiterated that there is an operational field test for everyone this year, so on that field test, a student could have 50 questions that would be different from another student's questions. On the operational test, the year after that, would the students have the same questions or not. **Dr. Bliss** said that the operational test will be adaptive and basically a student takes a grade-level item and based on how they do on that item, they will receive an easier or harder item. Since the test is adaptive, every student will probably see a different set of items though they could see the same items, but the adaptive technology allows for a more exact score to be reached more quickly, which reduces the total test time. The operational test will be adaptive and the field test is to look at items and will be random, so every item gets seen so many times across the consortium.

Representative Horman said she heard a presentation from a Superintendent who said there had been no field or pilot testing done and also that the test was simply too rigorous. She also asked if the list of testing completed is public or could it be made public. **Ms. Willits** answered that the schools can be listed on the website, and she offered to send that link out to this task force. In terms of the tests being too rigorous, she stated that this is about raising standards for our students. In order to have kids ready for college and careers, the preparation includes more rigorous tests. We need to embrace the fact that students can do better; every time standards are raised, comments that students can't meet such standards are proven wrong. When the ISAT began, students were 50% proficient, and now ISAT results reflect 90% proficiency in reading and more than 80% proficiency in math. **Ms. Willits** challenged that superintendent to believe that students can meet higher standards and to expect this of students. These standards are benchmarked with other countries in the world, and students in Idaho can meet higher standards. If students are struggling to go on, the problem is that standards are too low. If we want success, it begins with higher standards. She assured everyone that this complaint had been heard before and it can be overcome.

Senator Thayne asked about how the test is being run with a bank of 22,000 questions, asking if all 22,000 questions were being field tested. **Dr. Bliss** replied that "yes, all 22,000 questions are being field tested with about 1.2 million students participating across 26 states with the goal of having all 22,000 items seen so many times by students to assure appropriateness for the operational test in a year." **Ms. Willits** clarified that while items are being field tested, a certain percentage of those will be made public and will be able to be seen by teachers and parents. Others on the test will be in a secure environment.

Senator Durst asked how Idaho's approach dovetails with the Colorado growth model and the impact on the new assessment model. **Ms. Willits** explained that the Colorado growth model is used by many states for accountability and views growth in terms of cohorts. For example, one child in tenth grade takes the ISAT and sees growth over time, compared to similar students with similar scores and growth can be predicted. Under "No Child Left Behind" there was one measure and a student made it or they didn't for accountability purposes, either on grade level or not and an advanced student's growth was not measured, and there was no reward for getting students higher than the bar. **Ms. Willits** said as a parent she expects growth every year. She added that there will not be as many proficient students originally or initially on this new, more rigorous test. How does that fit into accountability? Does a five-star school become a two-star school? She said that would depend on how the accountability system is framed. Superintendents worry about this and a committee is looking at this to make sure that they are measuring what is important. **Senator Durst** wondered how comparisons would be made across districts since access to resources are very different within districts and opportunities for success may differ. **Ms. Willits** responded that the Colorado growth model is not contingent upon zip code, but rather is statewide, and one student is being compared to peers, wherever they might be in a state, so it is not determined by school or district and that gives a bigger sample. The fairness question, she said, could not be answered today and was far more detailed.

Co-chair Goedde asked about pop quizzes and how those fit into assessments. **Ms. Willits** said that if a pop quiz is not graded, that would be separate from how a student would do on a test. **Dr. Bliss** said it was important to understand that formative assessment is actually an instructional process, so it depends on how a teacher uses a pop quiz. If a teacher gives an ungraded pop quiz, then it would fall in the realm of a formative assessment. Smarter balanced assessment is developing lots of resources for teachers to do more than give a pop quiz to determine where students are on an ongoing basis to make instructional decisions. **Ms. Willits** clarified that tools provided by smarter balanced assessments will be determined by the teacher in the district, and the state will not dictate what is used. There will not be set quizzes mandated by the state.

Co-chair Goedde asked that when pilots were done, were there any problems with devices used in classrooms. **Ms. Willits** said that a survey would provide answers to that question and the members will receive those results. **Co-chair Goedde** said it was his understanding the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC) states had agreed to set common cut scores so that states were not gaming the system, and asked if Idaho was looking at adjusting cut scores. **Ms. Willits** replied that for federal reporting purposes, yes, every state will agree to a common threshold; for a state requirement, like graduation, Idaho could choose to do something different because it is a state requirement.

Co-chair Goedde inquired about SAT data being in the 30% range and that test is being given to a broad spectrum of students. He asked how grades are compared to other states. **Ms. Willits** answered that Maine and Colorado give SAT tests and that Idaho is within the range of those states. She agreed to get a summary of that to the members.

Co-chair DeMordaunt asked about the test question bank and how teachers can use that, the three areas of testing being the summative, interim and formative, and at what point does a teacher get involved with creating these tests and utilizing the test bank. **Ms. Willits** answered that in terms of the interim (not for accountability purposes) questions can be pulled from a bank. There will be a committee of teachers who decide what is on the summative test. Unless the teacher is selected for that, the teacher won't select the test questions, but would have full range in the classroom to use those tools. The summative will be more structured (determined by teachers or a committee that a teacher may or may not be on). **Ms. Willits** clarified that Superintendent Luna's vision has been that involvement in SBAC is contingent on two things: (1) it needs to be a better test, and (2) it must be something affordable, comparable to what is being spent now, or less. This is currently meeting objectives.

The task force recessed for lunch at 12:05 and reconvened at 1:31 p.m.

Co-chair Goedde introduced Dr. Jack Ambrosiani to the task force and said that Dr. Ambrosiani had founded the Ambrosiani Pastore Foundation, Inc. **Co-chair Goedde** noted that students can be hired and taught technical skills, but sometimes the students lack "soft skills" that they really need, and he said that Dr. Ambrosiani had funded three pilots in North Idaho. Dr. Ambrosiani had been asked to address the task force on the progress of teaching "soft skills."

Dr. Jack Ambrosiani, President, Cygnus, Inc., presented his PowerPoint presentation entitled "Relevant Education About Life - Get REAL Program - A Proactive Benefit to Idaho's Economy" which is on LSO's website at:

http://legislature.idaho.gov/sessioninfo/2013/interim/education1002_ambrosiani.pdf

Dr. Ambrosiani and his wife, Mary Jo Ambrosiani, put this program together to turn students around. The program is centered on interactive coaching and mentoring dealing with a student where they are in their lives. **Dr. Ambrosiani** also shared a DVD of students, teachers and parents giving testimony as to the value of this program, which is available in LSO. If a student stays in school and has greater stability, that student will later be a more valuable employee, contributing higher productivity to the state, and money will be saved. The Foundation has committed to pay for 90% of the cost of this program for the first year, 60% of the second year, and 30% of the third year. It is up to superintendents, principals and counselors as to how schools use this program.

Senator Thayne asked if the cost was for the instructor and **Dr. Ambrosiani** replied that the Foundation covers the cost of the instructor and all benefits to 90%. There is a budget for the first year of teaching materials which cost \$1,200 to \$1,500 to get started. The program is taught in grades 10, 11 and 12 and can be taught in one semester or a year, depending on the school.

Senator Martin asked how students were referred to this program, how students are kept in the program, where and when does this instruction occur. **Dr. Ambrosiani** said that instruction takes place in classrooms, a teacher is paid by the foundation to the school district, guidelines are set by principals and counselors, and word-of-mouth has made the program very popular. Teachers and counselors help to select kids for the program, the students love it, and it sells itself.

Senator Durst commented on the list of curriculum provided in this program, asking whether or not **Dr. Ambrosiani** views this curriculum as being viewpoint neutral. **Dr. Ambrosiani** replied “yes it is viewpoint neutral.” The foundation is a non-denominational, Christian foundation, under the total control of the school board, superintendent, and the principal as to what is taught. **Senator Durst** said that support came from a conservative organization and if constituents in his district have a possibly different perspective, why should the state of Idaho be investing scarce resources into a program that currently has a conservative perspective that may not align with another’s family dynamic. **Dr. Ambrosiani** answered: “Then don’t use it.” **Senator Durst** reiterated that taxpayers in the state would still be paying for it, and **Dr. Ambrosiani** said that another program could be chosen to teach basic life skills, and that it is up to the school district as to programs chosen, but the foundation gives the money to those who choose this program. **Senator Durst** said if this program were brought statewide, then general fund money would be put into the consideration, and even if a district were not associated with his particular district, state general fund dollars might be spent. **Dr. Ambrosiani** said that if there was something that was a problem, then remove it statewide, emphasizing that this is a non-profit program and nobody else’s money is in the program, except the foundation’s money. Anything offensive can be removed from the program. This program can be tailored as needed.

Co-chair DeMordaunt said that in some ways it was sad that there is such a need for a program like this. Things like this used to be taught within families, and he asked what is the role of the family in this program and how are parents engaged in this effort. **Dr. Ambrosiani** answered that instructors report that parents often want to remain uninvolved. These students are being educated to make better choices in their own lives.

Representative VanOrden asked if this was an elective class. **Dr. Ambrosiani** affirmed that it was, adding that principals and counselors have a great deal to do with the program, and that in some counties 100% of students in a school are going through this program.

The next presenter was Eric Milstead from LSO who gave an overview of “sunset” legislation to the task force on legislation passed that now is being revisited. His PowerPoint entitled “2013 Legislation with Sunset Provisions” can be found on LSO’s website at:

http://legislature.idaho.gov/sessioninfo/2013/interim/education1002_milstead.pdf

The legislation discussed included: Senate Bill 1040aa (governs renewable contracts); Senate Bill 1147aa (provides for one-year master contracts) and House Bill 261 (provides for reduction in force). Common on all three bills is that each has a “sunset provision.” This means that if the legislature, during the upcoming session, does not repeal that “sunset provision,” then the amendatory work of these three bills will fall by the board.

Co-chair Goedde asked how the Nampa decision affects these bills and **Mr. Milstead** deferred to stakeholders present to answer that question.

Ms. Penni Cyr, President, Idaho Education Association (IEA), presented next and joining her was IEA General Counsel, **Paul Stark**. **Ms. Cyr** provided a brief summary of IEA’s position on the three pieces of legislation as follows:

Ms. Cyr said that IEA opposed Senate Bill 1040aa and recommended that it be allowed to sunset on July 1, 2014, and to bring appropriate individuals and groups back to the table to identify workable solutions, with the expectation that a new piece of legislation will be jointly agreed to, drafted and presented to the 2014 Idaho Legislature.

Ms. Cyr said that IEA opposed Senate Bill 1147aa and recommendations were as follows:

- Require that districts choosing to hire outside attorneys or negotiators be completely transparent in reporting to the public any and all costs associated with this contract;
- Revise the language that bargaining commence upon the written request of either party;
- Revisit the June 30 deadline.

Ms. Cyr shared that IEA supported House Bill 261 and recommendations included trusting elected school board members to carry out their duties in a responsible manner, and to remove any portion of the law that limits local control.

Ms. Cyr’s PowerPoint presentation can be viewed on LSO’s website at:

http://legislature.idaho.gov/sessioninfo/2013/interim/education1002_cyr.pdf

Co-chair Goedde asked about reduction in force, how much was attributed to a reduction in enrollment versus increase in class size. **Ms. Cyr** said that data was not available at this meeting, but agreed to get that for the members. **Co-chair Goedde** asked about Pocatello, saying that it sounded like they were in violation of the law while negotiating. **Mr. Stark** answered that Pocatello was not part of negotiations, but these individuals got their contracts and their days were reduced. **Co-chair Goedde** asked if what was passed in SB1040aa did not give them the opportunity to do what they tried to do and what was the outcome. **Mr. Stark** said the outcome was that the action was contested and they lost; the school board affirmed their prior decision and their days were reduced. **Co-chair Goedde** asked if that was in violation of the law, and **Mr. Stark** answered yes, that the law passed required either a formal reduction in force or across the board cuts, and neither of those instances happened, yet renewable contract teachers found their days reduced in Pocatello. **Co-chair Goedde** said that **Mr. Stark** indicated an increase in the fund balance in Mackay and he asked what the new fund balance is, as a percentage of the annual budget. **Mr. Stark** replied that the fund balance increased from \$430,000 to \$985,000 in the four years between 2008 and 2012, which is public record. **Mr. Stark** said that he could get more information. **Co-chair Goedde** said that would give him a better understanding of the numbers, since an accountant had told him that 4-6% of annual budget was in an appropriate fund balance. **Co-chair**

Goedde said he appreciated both sides wanting to start bargaining early. He noted a situation where there is an upcoming override and the parties agree to something before the override is passed, then if the override passes, money is left on the table. Conversely, if the school board agrees to a contract before an override passes and it fails, where are the differences made up? **Ms. Cyr** said that negotiated agreements have all kinds of contingencies in them, so coming to the table without that restraint, the local school board can agree to put a contingency in their negotiated agreements that says, if the levy passes or doesn't pass, then come back to the table and reconsider. IEA doesn't see that as a problem.

Representative Horman wondered about HB261 where four districts were listed by the IEA, one being East Bonneville, and said she was not familiar with that district. **Mr. Stark** said they did not have that information, but will find that out and provide that information to the members. **Mr. Stark** also shared that the Mackay revenue amount was \$2.17 million in revenue which is what is reported on their website. He also said he could comment on the Nampa decision if there is still a question on that.

Co-chair DeMordaunt inquired about the link between SB1040aa and the Mackay reserve; how did this reserve somehow impact SB1040aa? **Mr. Stark** said the link is testimony heard from last session, specifically the Superintendent testifying to both committees last year, declaring the woeful state Mackay found itself in, being on the edge of bankruptcy and not having resources. The administration wanted to reduce teacher salaries, but because of the existence of the law, they were not able to do that. They asked for SB1040aa to be passed to allow them to change that so they can reduce that, and the numbers provided were to demonstrate that the financial woes were not as represented. As of 2012 Mackay had nearly a \$1 million fund balance and the revenue was \$2.17 million.

Co-chair DeMordaunt asked whether it exists in Mackay or not, the situation could exist somewhere, so the need for SB1040aa isn't mitigated just because of the fact it may or may not be needed in Mackay. **Mr. Stark** answered that a variety of circumstances could arise in many ways in the state, but he perceived the problem was that the prior language said a renewable contract teacher had to be renewed for no less days and no less wages and this was an effort to provide relief if the district found itself in trouble. It was his understanding this was what SB1040aa was about. **Mr. Stark** indicated that his argument before this task force today is that the pendulum swung too far the other way and there were no financial triggers to this ability to reduce contracts and that it didn't have parameters on how it could be executed. The IEA's suggestion to this task force is to allow it to sunset and allow the problem to be addressed. Current legislation is far too open and endless that could and has led to abusive results. There is a middle ground, and he believes that the stakeholders coming together can solve this dilemma.

Co-chair DeMordaunt asked if there were any evergreen clauses that **Ms. Cyr** was aware of. **Ms. Cyr** responded that evergreen clauses went away because the master agreements went away when the Students Come First Law was passed. **Co-chair DeMordaunt** asked if they had been reinstated since then and **Ms. Cyr** replied that there are no evergreen clauses in effect at this time. **Co-chair DeMordaunt** wondered about putting something in law to prevent that from happening again. **Ms. Cyr** said they were trying to strengthen local control. The state is saying what you may bargain and that you may only bargain a one-year contract for finances and you may have only a two-year contract for other issues. IEA's point is that hopefully that will allow locals to make that decision together. If perhaps they want to bargain a five-year agreement or say that these odd issues may be renegotiated every two years and other issues will be renegotiated every three years, etc., those decisions should be local.

Senator Durst stated that there was a report printed on March 11, 2013, that said the Superintendent from Mackay had said that they had reached a point where they were on a financial cliff. He expressed

his concern that he would be persuaded to vote one way or another based on misinformation. He asked **Ms. Cyr** if there had been problems with starting negotiations and reaching a resolution. He wondered how she would feel about a requirement that parties respond within a certain set period of time with a noticeable difference from the previous proposal. How do we really reconcile what good faith negotiations are when one group that has all the power holds the ball, which is what some school boards are doing. **Ms. Cyr** said that IEA hopes that they can do something to compel one party or the other to respond in a timely fashion if requested to meet at the table and that a way be figured out to put in a contingency or some other tool to allow school boards and negotiation teams to not drag their feet waiting for financial information or levies. Then they could go ahead in good faith and bargain together as community members, realizing that there may be things that may require changes. **Senator Durst** wondered if the IEA has the responsibility to respond as well, saying that there is a time certain to make a substantive change to a previous offer, asking if that is something that IEA is willing to do. **Ms. Cyr** answered “absolutely.”

Representative Boyle asked about HB261 and the vague recommendations made and asked where, exactly, in law is the wording that IEA wants changed. **Ms. Cyr** said that any portion of the law that limits local control or says that you may refer to seniority or longevity does not need to be there, in her opinion, because that is telling locals what they can do. IEA’s suggestion is that no side-bars be put on that, adding that should be left up to the districts.

Senator Goedde said that when evergreen clauses were in place, the same hammer that is being suggested that school boards now have, the unions had, and they could drag things out and not reach any agreement. So, maybe there is a middle ground and he applauded the IEA, the ISBA and the ISSA for sitting at the table last year to discuss what came before the legislature. He said there is the opportunity to do that again.

Ms. Cyr introduced Matt Compton, the new IEA Government Relations Director.

Ms. Karen Echeverria, Idaho School Boards Association (ISBA) was next on the agenda, and she introduced Rob Winslow, Idaho Association of School Administrators, and Anne Ritter, President, ISBA, and **Ms. Echeverria’s** PowerPoint presentation (2013 Survey) is in on LSO’s website at:

http://legislature.idaho.gov/sessioninfo/2013/interim/education1002_echeverria.pdf

Ms. Echeverria began by saying that ISBA conducted a survey regarding the sunset bills in each district and 94 responses were received, which gives ISBA a solid understanding of how these laws were implemented. The provisions found in these laws were used exactly as testified that they would be used. They were used by the school districts that needed them. In regard to SB1040aa, which allowed boards to reduce salaries of teachers in their district, the survey showed that only five actually reduced salaries and another three did not pay any movement on the grid. Under the old law, Idaho Code would have required districts to pay all those steps and lanes; without this law in place, the only thing districts could do was to lay off teachers. Instead, they worked with local unions to come to an agreement that worked for their districts. The majority of every district’s budget is made up of salary and benefits and the survey showed that in 80% of districts in Idaho, salary and benefits make up between 80% and 90% of their total budget. It is essential that school boards continue to have this tool should they ever have the need for it. In reference to HB261, which required districts to use other criteria besides seniority, the survey showed that the legislation was used only when necessary. There were five districts that imposed a reduction in force. In a small district, using seniority as the only criteria for RIF, this could be

devastating, since there may be only one teacher for a subject. If seniority is the only criteria allowed, and a teacher is the last hired, then that RIF would have to take place without the law that was passed this past year. With the passage of this bill, districts were able to reduce staff as needed, and not because an employee was the last one hired. In reference to SB1147aa, which requires that all master or negotiated agreements have a length of one year beginning on July 1st and ending on June 30th, ISBA believes that the survey results once again bear out their testimony. ISBA is not talking about teacher's annual contracts, as is usually and widely reported, when this legislation is being discussed. Teacher contracts are not the same as the master agreements. Teacher contracts are a one-page contract that a teacher signs each year. It commits the district and the individual teacher to employment for the next year. The master agreement is the agreement negotiated between the local union and the local board and includes all the terms negotiated. There was concern expressed that having all the agreements in place one year would cause long, difficult, drawn-out negotiations; once again, the survey showed this to not be true at all. The majority of all negotiations began in late April and early May, and was concluded by May 31, after 20 hours or less of negotiations. In order for boards to be able to set an annual budget in a timely manner and to set a budget based on available dollars for the upcoming fiscal year, ISBA members believe strongly that master agreements cannot be open-ended and must have a term life. ISBA members do not believe that today's board should be bound by terms that were negotiated years and sometimes even decades ago. The same would be true for future boards not being bound by terms negotiated today. ISBA believes that school board members all over the state have shown their good faith in using the provisions of the three pieces of legislation only when absolutely necessary and they believe firmly they will continue to do so. ISBA, therefore, recommends removing the sunset clauses and moving forward to allow the legislation to become permanent.

Ms. Anne Ritter, President, ISBA, and Chair of the Board of Trustees for School District #2, Meridian, reiterated that boards across the state have had a difficult time making the necessary cuts over the past five years. In Meridian, they took the philosophy that if the entire system were shrunk, rather than closing programs, eliminating activities or limiting choices for students, the full system would be reinstated when funds allowed. After deep cuts in operational funds, the primary tool left was the use of furloughs for all employees and by year two of the cuts, her district was 14 days below the 190 day calendar. This reduction in days would have been impossible under the original Idaho law. Prior to legislative action that allowed districts to provide contracts shorter in duration or smaller in compensation than the previous year, the only option that would have impacted the budget enough to make them balance would have been layoffs. Shrinking worked for two years, but by year three of the cuts, staff had to be cut to balance the budget. One hundred twenty teachers and twenty administrative positions were eliminated and today the district remains at staffing levels which are 117 teachers and 19 administrators below the state allocation because there is no way to recapture those positions. The current supplemental levy of \$14 million was passed in March of 2012 and is set to expire at the end of this year. The current supplemental levy restores nine instructional days and replaced the one-time money from the ARRA funds and the two-year use of the plant facilities fund to cover the general fund expenses. Should the levy fail this spring, there would be no way to keep the nine instructional days in place. In addition, they are faced with the reality that \$6 million of the district's fund balance was used to balance this year's budget and the projected fund balance at the end of this year is \$2 million which will not cover current budget cuts. Lack of a fund balance sufficient to cover the budget would be disastrous, coupled with the loss of the supplemental levy. This situation is a situation shared with patrons for the past two years and without an infusion of state funds and the passage of the supplemental levy, the district will face the impossible task of balancing the budget even within the current funding levels. In reality, they need restoration of the teaching staff and funding for the restoration of the school calendar. When asked about the impact of the three bills passed last year, **Ms.**

Ritter's answer has been consistent. She was hopeful the contract laws would be put in the drawers of all trustees and superintendents in the state and would never have to be used. No one, and she emphasized that no one wanted to use the tools, but there was a sufficient need for trustees to be able to manage the budgets in their districts while attempting to maintain appropriate levels of education for students. What is needed now? With the current reliance of districts on supplemental levies and their maximums of two years, there is great uncertainty in the ability of districts to make long-time financial commitments to their employees. Extending the time that a supplemental levy is authorized would enable districts to engage in more appropriate planning. Regarding the negotiations process this year, it has been unpleasant at best and they were unable to come to agreement with the union prior to the July 1st deadline that required the issuance of teacher contracts. On June 28th, the board's representative advised the MEA that they would issue contracts based on the last best offer they had made. The negotiations had begun on February 27th, the two groups met 11 times, and although the board agreed to meet with the union on any day at any time, they were unable to schedule additional sessions and there was a span of at least two weeks between May and June that they were unable to confer. After suspending negotiations and issuing contracts, the districts newly constituted board agreed to continue discussions with the MEA on solely non-monetary items since the budget hearing had taken place and the budget had been adopted. In the meetings that followed this decision, ISBA had asked to discuss grievance procedures, class sizes, district payment of the union president's salary, union access to employees through email, and elementary release time for report card preparation. Most of these items come with a cost, and to date no agreement has been reached, and the MEA has asked to go to mediation. **Ms. Ritter** said districts need clarity on the ability to impose terms on July 1st. Confusion has caused lingering and unnecessary distress. Districts need the legislation to revisit the issue of the need for a last best offer in establishment of a date certain for the conclusion of negotiations. She has confidence in working with teachers to negotiate an appropriate settlement, but the lack of a target date is problematic for the setting of district budgets. She said that districts have made difficult decisions necessary during these challenging financial times. The districts need the legislature to revisit the contract laws to make it possible for school boards to plan appropriately and balance their budgets. In addition, they need help in restoration of operational funding to avoid another financial cliff and help restore needed funds. **Ms. Ritter** asked for removal of the sunset provisions on the three pieces of legislation, as well as to look at a firm date for ending the negotiations.

Mr. Rob Winslow, Idaho Association of School Administrators, addressed the task force and said that all parties last year met to work on these bills and his greatest disappointment was that they had a sunset clause. There has been time to gather information and he said the position with the superintendents has always been similar to the school boards, adding that these bills add flexibility, even though the tools they provide are not what anyone wants to use. Sometimes tools must be available and that was their position in support of these bills. He said they were very supportive of removing the sunset clause on these three bills.

Senator Goedde expressed his concern about the data received from the Mackay School District and he asked **Ms. Echeverria** to look at that and see if there is a reason that the fund balance increased, outside of something normal. He asked how many districts, prior to the passage of these laws, offered multi-year contracts. **Ms. Echeverria** replied that most master agreements had evergreen clauses, but it was her understanding that teacher contracts are always one-year contracts. **Senator Goedde** said he thought the Boise School District offered two-year contracts, and she confirmed that. **Senator Goedde** commented that in looking for some middle ground, and being concerned about data received, he asked if her association would support sunsets for another year. **Ms. Echeverria** said she could not answer that, but would go back to her board to ask that question. She said that there are discrepancies about

the fund balances and what the SDE is reporting, so there are differences of opinion on what should or shouldn't be included in fund balances. Work is being done to figure out this discrepancy between what is shown and what school districts are showing as fund balances, not just Mackay, but others as well.

Senator Durst asked what they would say to skeptics who believe that the sunset clauses were put on these bills due to the failure of the Students Come First legislation and their repeal. **Ms. Echeverria** said that they all agreed to collect data and that is what has been done, as a result of the sunset clauses. **Co-chair DeMordaunt** affirmed that everyone being here at this meeting discussing this subject will hopefully answer some of those cynical questions. **Senator Durst** commented on the way negotiations have happened, adding that his wife experienced difficulties with MEA negotiations, and he asked how they would feel if the law required a specific length of time in which each party had to respond with a substantive change from their previous proposal. He asked if she supported that change. **Ms. Echeverria** said she believed that her association would support that sort of an amendment and a time certain for response.

Representative Horman asked how many districts at this point remain in negotiations with issues that are keeping districts in negotiations. **Ms. Echeverria** said she was aware of Meridian, Plummer-Worley and Mackay still being in negotiations. **Ms. Ritter** said they felt as though the budget items had been resolved as of July 1, so they were willing to discuss non-monetary issues, but every issue brought forward, almost without exception, has had a cost, which is not negotiable since the budget has been set. **Representative Horman** asked **Ms. Ritter** to elaborate on the issue of a district payment of a union leader's salary. **Ms. Ritter** explained that they wanted to pay them the equivalent of a first-year teacher's salary and make up the difference between whatever that amount is and the salary level of the union president. The district is unwilling to do that since that money should be going toward a classroom teacher. This issue remains a bone of contention. **Representative Horman** asked if that person spent time in the classroom, is the position full-time, and it was affirmed that it was a full-time position. **Representative Horman** wondered how ISBA feels about the balance of local control of their fiscal situations. **Ms. Ritter** believes that trustees have gone to great lengths to do everything short of RIFs and getting rid of employees, because of the negative impact on students. Being able to furlough allows a district to make that financial adjustment and then those days can be added as money becomes available, impacting everyone the same. With the old law, layoffs would have been the only option. With growth in students, it's going to be a continuing problem.

Co-chair DeMordaunt encouraged everyone present to continue dialogue so that everyone understands exactly what is happening as they get closer to session.

Co-chair DeMordaunt emphasized the importance of the link between education and the Idaho work force and how important it is for Idaho's education system to provide students who are college and career ready. On that note, he introduced **Mr. Jeff Sayer**, Director, Department of Commerce, who spoke on the vision moving forward. **Director Sayer** said that the economic impact of this education conversation is a critical piece of what we need to be looking at, and it needs to be an economic impact conversation. To move Idaho's economy forward, we must pay attention to this. Companies live and die on the principal that those organizations who win in the future are those that win the war for talent. Our ability to attract and retain the brightest minds in the nation literally will determine Idaho's economic horsepower, moving forward.

Director Sayer shared some updates and observations including the need for this discussion, adding that solutions need to be real and immediate. The need is right now and he emphasized that Idaho must

move quickly in this conversation to solve needs. Work force needs are varied and advanced and everything is computer controlled, so CNC (computer numeric control) training is vital in the work force. One company in Idaho said they could triple in size today if they had enough machinists to field growth. He estimated pay for these positions at \$20 hourly. Industry needs CNC-trained machinists and we need to find a way to fast track skill sets in that area to serve 2-3 industries simultaneously. The Department of Labor has issued a fascinating grant model they are calling the "work force industry sector grants." In that application process, for example, the timber and dairy industries are coming together expressing the same type of needs with regard to programmable logic control skill sets. How can we find solutions to these needs that are immediate to produce real jobs for Idahoans with relatively short training? **Director Sayer** said there are software needs on the higher end of the education scale, as well as health care needs and engineering, and all are real and immediate. There is a need for expertise in languages, commanding salaries in the \$40,000 to \$60,000 range.

Director Sayer mentioned the influence that Chobani has had in the Magic Valley. That event has gotten the attention of a number of food processors in the industry, and there are three projects currently in the mix, with the equivalent of 900 jobs and close to \$700 million in capital investment. He mentioned a new grant that CSI got so they can now advance work force development for the food processing industry. These are the kind of connecting points we need to continue to nurture going forward. There is growth in manufacturing, in the firearms industry, in aerospace, software and across a number of other industries. **Director Sayer** noted that if this problem is truly going to be solved, that state and community leaders and educators need to pay attention to the need to be creative. Companies are expressing a need for skills, so can we as a state create training programs to provide the skills to get people to work immediately and create a structure for workers to go back to school and get the rest of their education. In the software industry, companies have a need to hire right away. Programs can be set up in community colleges to provide training, but how do you find someone from the industry who will be the teacher and who is willing to give up a huge salary to teach to create a pipeline of workers in the software industry. That may take creative work, providing an allowance for that particular industry in the state payroll system, or we may have to go to the industries to ask for their help in loaning executives to teach. **Director Sayer** emphasized that we need to nurture speed. There is much enthusiasm in the higher education system, but so often the response is to tell us what you need five to ten years from now, because that is what they can solve. His appeal to all is that we cannot wait that long and we need to recognize immediate needs and find a solution right now, as well as to plan for the future. **Director Sayer** said that his final recommendation was that K-12 education needs to be relevant, since we hear about college and career readiness, but relevant means: do students have those skills to be effective when they set foot in an employer's office? Industry has identified that technical skills are most lacking in employees needed in industry today. Employees also need to be able to communicate effectively. **Director Sayer** paid tribute to many people around Idaho who are working on solutions to problems regarding technical education, hoping to create a template for others, to be used in various industries. **Director Sayer** said that one thing everyone can do is to help continue nurturing connecting points and help build on that momentum, because traction in a few areas will really light the fire on industry in Idaho. Idaho can move faster than anyone else, if we want to, and he challenged state leaders and educators to nurture speed, look at the best models available, and find a way to innovate faster and better than anyone else. This will advance Idaho's economy.

Representative Woodings asked about vocational-technical education and if there has been movement in getting professional training into high schools, since many students are completing graduation requirements so early, allowing time for career training. **Director Sayer** responded that links are being made between K-12 and higher education and this is being worked on. Problems and challenges are

being identified and solutions are being worked on. Industry is very anxious to help and wants to be part of the solution, but they keep saying they don't want to be invited to another summit to spend time talking about far-off solutions. Industry tells us what is needed now to make a difference and they will be there to help. **Director Sayer** says that speed and progress are critical.

Senator Patrick mentioned that a group was working on legislation to help restructure and refine agriculture classes, since that is Idaho's number one industry and provides 50% of the revenue in the Magic Valley. There is a need to expand this program and to talk to **Director Sayer** to refine the legislation to fit better. He said he's a firm believer in professional-technical education in high school, particularly.

Senator Durst expressed concern that education should not just be a job-training program. He asked **Director Sayer** to address that. **Director Sayer** said that was at the heart of the issue being grappled with going forward because we need to be careful not to make higher education become just job training. The challenge is that there is an urgent need to move the economy; we need to provide skills and the benefit comes from doing that quickly, which means being creative to find a way to respect both sides of that discussion. If there is industry-specific training, can we attach college credit to that and then students have an on-ramp to higher educational institutions, but can have relevant skills for a high-paying job now. **Senator Durst** expressed frustration about industry saying what is needed. He wants to challenge them about what he may need from them, which is often money. He wondered if industry would be willing to put a checkbook up front to get better results. **Director Sayer** said that question is about to be tested with industry sector grants. Three \$1 million grants have been allocated to a higher educational institution who has partnered with industry to create specific work force development skills. The grant requires that they have a 25% cash match from industry, and a CEO isn't going to write a check until convinced that they get back what they need. If this can be accelerated, industry will put money into an endeavor, if they get what they need.

Representative Horman commented that she had seen **Director Sayer** plead to legislators for technology for students, and asked why that is so important in the work he does. **Director Sayer** answered that if you look around the world and where it is going, it is technology driven and every industry is being touched by technology. His appeal was out of discouragement for those three propositions, knowing that one would drive a large investment of technology in schools. If we wait, Idaho is going to get behind and lose traction, but if that investment can be made, finding different models and best practices, let's not stop, but keep going because the world is moving so fast. If we stop to argue over issues, the world will not wait and we need to keep investing and find the right solutions for Idaho.

Senator Goedde commented that Howard Stephenson from Utah has an interesting perspective, which is that if there is scarcity, they will want it, and his theory is to provide grant money for public education and have schools compete for that grant, which has worked very well in Utah. Teachers can apply for grants to get technology and he believes that educators embrace technology. With regard to professional-technical education, the challenge facing community colleges is money for development of new programs. Commerce would be a welcome partner in that arena, he said.

Co-chair DeMordaunt asked what the barriers today are as to speed, expressing the desire as a legislator to facilitate the interaction between education and business, since industry wants to see results. **Director Sayer** replied that bureaucracy may be industry's response since they want to be heard and they want to know that what they say can create real results. Strip out bureaucracy; let's get down

to business, and let's make things happen, not really knowing exactly what that would mean. Industry is ready to help and wants to be part of the solution. Leaders need to find one or two industries and about six leaders from that industry to provide guidance on precisely what they need to come up with a curriculum, a potential solution and go back to them to confirm they are on the right track. Then the whole industry can be consulted as to whether a need would be met, remaining laser-focused on specific needs, moving quickly, and creating a real solution for that industry. The biggest challenge, he said, is to come to the table with a sense of respect for both sides. Educators in the state are phenomenal, but somehow they need to understand the pace and speed at which business needs to operate, and businesses need to understand that change cannot occur overnight, so that gap needs to be bridged. Let's keep it small, laser-focused, finding solutions and traction to break down bureaucracy creating real results and building trust, credibility and enthusiasm from industry.

Co-chair DeMordaunt suggested a potential model, that being Toyota, having developed a program where they reached down even as far as the fifth grade, but the substantive part of the program is at the community college level where they developed an entire curriculum, partnering with local community colleges. What they are doing might be applicable across other industries. **Director Sayer** mentioned that another state has partnered with industry where they have technical colleges geared to creating work force pipelines just for an industry, which draws an industry to that state. He is convinced that if we create those education/industry pipelines, industry will come to Idaho since they are hungry for work force.

Senator Goedde passed out a brochure from the National Conference of State Legislatures entitled "Educators Guide for Educator Effectiveness." He said it was an effective document, giving a road map as to the right questions to ask educators and he encouraged the members to read this. He said he looked forward to further discussion on what had been covered at this meeting today. A copy of this brochure is available in LSO.

Co-chair DeMordaunt invited attendees at this meeting to share information that would be helpful to this task force to spawn thought, and asked for that information to be forwarded to Eric Milstead in LSO who will forward it to members. He announced that the next meeting would be on November 5, 2013, and that agenda will be forthcoming. **Senator Goedde** suggested picking a December date for a possible meeting, if that becomes necessary, so members agreed to give Mr. Milstead their available dates in December.

Co-chair DeMordaunt adjourned the meeting at 4:13 pm.