AGENDA
SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE
3:00 P.M.
Room WW55
Wednesday, January 09, 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>PRESENTER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Page Introduction</td>
<td>Welcome</td>
<td>Chairman Mortimer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Committee Page Introduction</td>
<td>Olivia Love</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules</td>
<td>2019 Rules &amp; Rule Referral</td>
<td>Vice Chairman Thayn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Work</td>
<td>Committee Member Introductions &amp; Discussion</td>
<td>Chairman Mortimer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regarding Future Education Issues &amp; Committee Work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you have written testimony, please provide a copy of it along with the name of the person or organization responsible to the committee secretary to ensure accuracy of records.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS
Chairman Mortimer        Sen Woodward
Vice Chairman Thayn      Sen Lent
Sen Winder               Sen Buckner-Webb
Sen Den Hartog           Sen Ward-Engelking
Sen Cheatham             

COMMITTEE SECRETARY
LeAnn Mohr
Room: WW39
Phone: 332-1321
email: sedu@senate.idaho.gov
MINUTES
SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

DATE: Wednesday, January 09, 2019
TIME: 3:00 P.M.
PLACE: Room WW55

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Mortimer, Vice Chairman Thayn, Senators Winder, Den Hartog, Crabtree, Woodward, Lent, Buckner-Webb, and Ward-Engelking

ABSENT/EXCUSED: None

NOTE: The sign-in sheet, testimonies and other related materials will be retained with the minutes in the committee's office until the end of the session and will then be located on file with the minutes in the Legislative Services Library.

CONVENEED: Chairman Mortimer called the Education Committee (Committee) to order at 3:41 p.m.

WELCOME Chairman Mortimer said he is continuing the weekly tradition of reading a poem from the book, *A Heap O' Living Along Life's Highway*, by Eager A. Guest. He then read the poem, "Opportunity."

PAGE INTRODUCTION: Chairman Mortimer welcomed the new page, Olivia Love, Star, Idaho, and invited her to the podium to introduce herself and share her interests, future aspirations, and long-term goals.

RULES BRIEFING: Vice Chairman Thayn outlined to the Committee the process for reviewing the rules. He stated the Committee will review rules from the State Board of Education (SBE) and from the State Department of Education (SDE). He said there is a rule regarding seed certification in which the Agricultural Committee will review.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST: Chairman Mortimer asked for unanimous consent to send Docket No. 08-0501-1801 to the Senate Agricultural Committee for review. There were no objections.

DISCUSSION: Chairman Mortimer said prior to this meeting he asked the Committee to give a detailed introduction and answer specific questions regarding educational issues. He stated he is seeking input as to how to make the Committee work more effectively.

Those questions were as follows.

1. Are there specific topics, related to education that should be addressed?
2. Are there issues regarding K-16 that should be addressed?
3. Name two things they could do to improve education.

Committee members introduced themselves, explained their backgrounds and answered the questions from the Chairman.
The concerns raised included the following:
• The need to readdress supplemental levies for school funding.
• Explore school choice policy setting which would focus on student learning.
• Explore ways to boost educators' potential.
• Increase opportunities for high school students to take career technical course work.
• Concern regarding teacher shortages; local and nationwide.
• Better teacher compensation.

Chairman Mortimer thanked the Committee for their comments.

ADJOURNED: There being no further business at this time, Chairman Mortimer adjourned the meeting at 4:34 p.m.
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CONVENED: Chairman Mortimer called the Education Committee (Committee) to order at 3:04 p.m. He opened with a reading from the book, A Heap O’ Living Along Life’s Highway, by Eager A. Guest, "The Rough Little Rascal."

STAKEHOLDER OVERVIEW: Greg Wilson, Senior Policy Advisor for Education, Office of the Governor (Governor), cited Governor Little's the State of the State address in which education was his number one priority. He detailed to the Committee those priorities: 1.) Children's Cabinet; 2.) Our Kids, Idaho's Future; 3.) Implementation of the fifth year of the K-12 Task Force recommendations; 4.) Literacy; 5.) Increased teacher salaries; 6.) Higher Education; 7.) Career Technical Education; 8.) Outcomes Based Funding; and 9.) Opportunity Scholarships. Mr. Wilson concluded his presentation by reiterating Governor Little's rigorous support for a strong education system (Attachment 1).

Matt Freeman, Executive Director, State Board of Education (SBE), said his views and opinions do not reflect the official position of the SBE. He listed and explained for the Committee the top education priorities for the SBE: 1.) Fund the fifth year of the Career Ladder; 2.) Continue the work from the Higher Education Task Force recommendations; and 3.) Fulfill the Adult Promise Grant. Mr. Freeman reported in detail the advances the SBE has made in the past 24 months. He explained two policy changes the SBE would recommend. Those are as follows: 1.) Development of a Higher Education funding model that recognizes student success and completion; and 2.) Fixing the Teacher Pipeline (Attachment 2).

Marilyn Whitney, Deputy Superintendent of Communications and Policy, State Department of Education (SDE), provided the Committee with an overview of the legislative and budget priorities for the 2019 Session. She detailed the 6.8 percent increase in the General Fund to support public schools. Ms. Whitney stated the Superintendent's top priorities are to increase teacher pay, implement the recommendations from the Task Force for Improving Education (Task Force), student safety, a continued investment in the literacy initiative, and the implementation of the new science standards and assessment (Attachment 3).
Dwight Johnson, State Administrator, Career Technical Education (CTE), said the mission for CTE is to prepare Idaho’s youth and adults for high-skill, in demand careers. He outlined for the Committee the threefold strategic focus areas. He shared the priorities for 2019. Those are as follows: 1.) Create a CTE Middle School Initiative; 2.) Implement a new Workforce Readiness Incentive Program; and 3.) Implement a State plan for Federal Funding. Mr. Johnson reported the student advances in the past 24 months. He said there have been significant increases in enrollment and course completion. He said if he could make two changes in policies for CTE they would be a statewide marketing campaign and CTE graduation requirements (Attachment 4).

Kari Overall, President, Idaho Education Association (IEA), said she was a 15-year veteran educator from Boise and detailed the make-up of the IEA membership. Ms. Overall outlined the priorities for the IEA. Those are as follows: 1.) Teacher recruitment and retention; 2.) A transparent and flexible Public School Funding Formula; and 3.) Revision of the statewide school report card. She said the policy changes the IEA would like the Legislature to make would be done to create equal opportunity and access for all students (Attachment 5).

Rob Winslow, Executive Director, Idaho Association of School Administrators (IASA), reported the priorities for the IASA. Those are as follows: 1.) The new Public School Funding Formula; 2.) Adequate operational funding; and 3.) improved accountability. He said the advancements that IASA has witnessed is the increase in personalized learning and to focus on the social and emotional needs of students. Mr. Winslow stated the policy changes IASA would like the Legislature to consider areas follows: 1.) Emphasis on good student results; and 2.) Funding of adequate facilitates for rural and charter schools (Attachment 6).

Senator Winder said funding is the key for all school districts. He asked why the focus for funding was only on rural and charter schools. Mr. Winslow replied bonding capacity is especially difficult in the rural communities. Many of those communities are growing fast and are unable to pass bonds to build adequate buildings for students. Charter Schools do not have the ability to bond and often struggle with acceptable buildings. He said he believes funds should be needs based.

Quinn Perry, Policy & Government Affairs Director, Idaho School Boards Association (ISBA), detailed the make-up of the ISBA and explained how the ISBA determines the initiatives they support. She said the priorities for the 2019 Legislative year are the new Public School Funding Formula, literacy, and all-day kindergarten. She said looking back over the past 24 months, the ISBA believes the districts which focus on the continuous improvement do experience student achievement. The areas which the Legislature should address, Ms. Perry said, are facility bonding measures and greater flexibility in spending for support staff (Attachment 7).
STAKEHOLDER OVERVIEW: Bill Russell, CEO, Idaho Charter Schools (ICS), Chairman of the Board of NorthStar Charter School, and Northwest Nazarene University, School of Business Dean, presented on behalf of Terry Ryan. He detailed the priorities for ICS which are as follows: 1.) The Public Schools Funding Formula; 2.) Flexibility in administration; and 3.) Credit enhancement for high performing charter schools. Mr. Russell explained in the past 24 months student enrollment has increased and there are students on waiting lists. The policy changes ICS would like to have considered are to have 1.) Instruction connected to "real life" situations; and 2.) A greater emphasis on student outcomes (Attachment 8).

Murphy Olmstead, Manager, Coalition of Idaho Charter School Families, introduced Melanie Fitzgerald whose daughter attends an Idaho virtual online school. She detailed the successes of the online education and recommended the changes to the Public School Funding Formula (Attachment 9).

Maria Johnson-Lorcher, Vice President of Advocacy, Idaho Parent Teacher Association (IPTA), detailed the priorities for the IPTA in which student mental health and professional staffing are emphasized. She said in the past 24 months, the IPTA has advocated for juvenile justice. Three Idaho schools were honored with the National PTA School of Excellence award. She detailed how the IPTA is working with the SDE to furnish a parents' perspective when drafting and implement programs and policies. Ms. Johnson-Lorcher said the IPTA would like consideration for school choice, state funding use for pre-kindergarten programing, and support for all-day kindergarten (Attachment 10).

RECORDING LINK: The recording for Stakeholder Presentations can be found at https://legislature.idaho.gov/sessioninfo/2019/standingcommittees/SEDU/.

PASSED THE GAVEL: Chairman Mortimer passed the gavel to Vice Chairman Thayn.

DOCKET NO. 08-0104-1801 Tracie Bent, Chief Planning and Policy Officer, Office of the State Board of Education (SBE), presented Docket No. 08-104-1801; Residency. She stated the education rules that are before the Committee have been approved by the SBE. She explained the negotiated rule making process.

Ms. Bent said the changes to Docket No 08-0104-1801 are a technical cleanup. The references to Eastern Idaho Technical College have been changed to reflect the transition to Eastern Idaho Community College. She highlighted to the Committee those changes. Ms. Bent explained the changes that define state residency for students. She stated those updates allow better management in determining eligibility.

MOTION: Senator Den Hartog moved to accept Docket No. 08-0104-1801. Senator Buckner-Webb seconded the motion. Motion passed by voice vote.

DOCKET NO. 08-0202-1803 Ms. Bent presented Docket No. 08-0202-1803 regarding Rules Governing Uniformity. She said this rule makes technical corrections for educator credentials. The changes are to provide consistency with other sections of code and to be consistent with the practice. She emphasized this does not change any procedures. She explained the terminology changes which will encompass all routes to certification. She explained the updates which clarify the standards used for approving the educator preparation program.
Senator Woodward asked if the changes make a distinction between an educator and teacher or do they bring consistency to the rule. Ms. Bent replied the rule is to be inclusive to the staff which serve the students.

**MOTION:** Chairman Mortimer moved to accept Docket No. 08-0202-1803. Senator Den Hartog seconded the motion. Motion passed by voice vote.

**PASSED THE GAVEL:** Vice Chairman Thayn passed the gavel to Chairman Mortimer.

**ADJOURNED:** There being no further business at this time, Chairman Mortimer adjourned the meeting at 4:37 p.m.

___________________________  __________________________
Senator Dean M. Mortimer    LeAnn Mohr
Chair                        Secretary
Intro...

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee.

My name is Greg Wilson, and I’m Governor Little’s Senior Policy Advisor for Education.

I look forward to working with you all and I plan on meeting with each of you one-on-one, if I haven’t already.

In the State of the State, Governor Little said education was his number one priority.

It’s at the foundation of our shared vision of having the best possible opportunities for us, our children, and grandchildren to remain in Idaho— to thrive and enjoy Idaho’s unparalleled quality of life.

I would like to share Governor Little’s education priorities— which move this vision forward— in addition to offering a few other thoughts on Idaho’s education system. I’ll end by taking your questions.

OK, IF, Children’s Cabinet…

First of all, to advise the Governor throughout his term on ongoing education issues and ensure the voices of those on the front lines of education are heard at the Capitol, Governor Little will create a Children’s Cabinet.

This Children’s Cabinet will consist of parents, traditional education stakeholders, and groups across our state dedicated to advocating for children.

This group’s outlook will be broad, providing perspective on issues that impact education in Idaho— including poverty, ESL, and at-risk students, in addition to other issues.

This will be a long-term advisory group to the Governor on a multitude of education matters.

These past four years, with the help of many legislators in this room and stakeholders, Idaho has a successful record of responsible investment and reform in education.

As the Governor expressed in his State of the State, successful education policy requires long-term planning and buy-in from stakeholders.
The Governor has talked with fellow governors and education policymakers in other states—and Idaho’s model of our 2013 K-13 Task Force is highly regarded.

Moving forward, building on this successful approach, the Governor will create *Our Kids, Idaho’s Future*. The charge of this broad-based task force will be to look at our education system holistically, providing Idaho’s next five-year blueprint for education investment and reform.

It will touch on many issues—putting forward recommendations on the career ladder for the next five years, plans for improving our go-on rate and moving closer to the 60 percent goal, discussing the metrics of how we assess our education system, and looking at student achievement… among many additional issues.

Much like the past task force, Our Kids, Idaho’s Future’s work will be fast.

To be clear: these are two different groups, with two different missions.

**Implementing the Fifth Year...**

In addition to these two groups, one permanent, and one working through 2019 to provide the plan and stakeholder support for the next five years of education investment and reform, the Governor’s budget recommendation implements the fifth year of the K-12 task force’s recommendations.

This implementation of the fifth year:

- Funds the **next phase** of increased teacher salaries, under the career ladder.
- Funds **Master Educator Premiums**, an important promise to our most experienced educators.

Additionally, the Governor’s budget recommendation increases the investment in the popular Advanced Opportunity program, which saves Idaho families in tuition costs and aligns with our efforts to get more kids to go-on.

**There are specific priorities that cannot wait, however.**

**Literacy...**

Reading is foundational to our students’ success. It’s at the foundation of every Idahoan’s success in life.

By the third grade, our students must have already learned to read so that now they can read to learn.
The Governor’s budget recommendation proposes doubling literacy program funding.

As they have had these past two years, school districts should continue to have the flexibility to decide the best ways to use the funds to raise reading scores among their students.

This approach, allowing for the use of a variety of research-based methods, recognizes that no two kids are the same… and that no two communities are the same. We want flexibility for teachers and school districts to determine what is the best approach for their students.

Experts have made clear that is the best approach.

Governor Little also expects us to see measurable progress in reading scores in the next two to four years. **While the Governor believes expanding this program is the right thing to do, we must have accountability for this program and we must see clear success.**

$40,000 Teacher Pay

Our state still has many challenges when it comes to recruiting teachers. According to a State Board Teacher Pipeline Report from 2017:

- About 15 percent of Idaho’s teachers leave the workforce after just one year on the job.
- After their fourth year, 30 percent of teachers have left the profession.
- Over 30% of teachers who become certified in Idaho do not teach in an Idaho school.
- And there continues to be teacher shortages in communities across Idaho

**We must attract, recruit, and retain our young educators, particularly in rural, underserved, and border communities.**

In order to achieve this goal, the Governor proposes raising starting teacher pay to $40,000 a year.

His proposal will also look across the entire residency section of the career ladder, in order to prevent compression in those first three years of teacher pay.

The Governor made clear, however, that he expects school districts to continue working with us on reporting measurements that Idahoans need to validate increased education investments to you and to taxpayers.

Raising starting teacher pay aligns with his view of ensuring our best graduates and educators can remain in Idaho to live and raise their families.

**Higher education….
Let me shift to the other side of our education system—Our community colleges, universities, and CTE programs.

The Governor is committed to increasing Idaho’s go-on rate and making greater strides toward our 60-percent goal.

He will continue to look at higher education funding models, including Outcomes Based Funding, and looks forward to working with the Legislature and the State Board on potential options.

He wants this new higher education funding model to align with accomplishing our goal of having 60-percent of our 25- to 34-year olds with a completed degree or a professional certificate.

In lieu of OBF, this year, his budget recommendation increases funding for Opportunity Scholarship applicants, providing a market-based approach to higher education funding, with money following the students, and allowing them to choose the institution and degree that best fits their needs.

Last year, 1,780 applicants were eligible for the scholarship but did not receive an award because of a lack of funding. This popular program seems to have a direct effect on our go-on rate and 60-percent goal.

Overall, the Governor has been impressed with the increase in dual credit opportunities and college preparedness… and seeks to continue to build on this progress.

The Governor wants to have a continued discussion about how we measure those foundational goals for Idaho’s education system—particularly, how we calculate our go-on rate and our 60-percent goal.

This would naturally be a good subject for Our Kids, Idaho’s Future.

If young Idahoans have skills that allow them to have a career where they can comfortably raise their families and plan for retirement, why shouldn’t they count as part of the 60-percent goal?

The Governor also wants to increase the voice of parents and educators in the Capitol, which will be done with the Children’s Cabinet.

**Conclusion:**
Bottom line: The Governor believes a strong education system helps ensure we keep our best and brightest here in Idaho.

Working on economic development across Idaho, he also knows that education is what attracts investors and entrepreneurs to Idaho.

I will be sending around my contact information to all the committee members. Please contact me **any time** with your questions.

With that, I’d be glad to answer any questions.

Thank you.
Remarks to Senate Education Committee  
January 14, 2019

Disclaimer is order: The Board can only take action or a formal position in an open public meeting, so the following views and opinions expressed are mine alone and do not reflect the official position of the State Board of Education.

1. What are the top priorities for your group for 2019?
   a. Funding the 5th year of the Career Ladder is paramount
   b. Continue work on implementations of the Higher Education Task Force recommendations
      i. Developing and scaling Complete College America student success strategies across all eight institutions. This includes the development of clear and consistent pathways to a postsecondary credential across the system, ensuring dual credit is integrated into degree maps. Ensure college math requirements are aligned appropriately to degree programs (e.g., no longer using College Algebra/Pre-calculus as the default. Improving the delivery of remedial Math and English education, developing consistent statewide degree pathways (incorporating dual credit), delivering academic and student support strategies that meet the needs of adult learners, and increasing on-time graduation rates.
      ii. Systems Integration Consultant: assessed current state of administrative operations at BSU, ISU, UI and LCSC. Identified opportunities for increases efficiency and effectiveness. Board work group to prioritize and sequence. Meeting with Gov for input and guidance.
c. Adult Promise Grant
  
  i. As a state we need a sizeable percentage of adults to earn a postsecondary certificate or degree in order to meet a 60 percent attainment rate by 2025.
  
  ii. Last year my staff applied for and received a $400k grant from the Lumina Foundation to raise awareness about the Adult Learners Scholarship and to increase the number of Idaho adults who complete some form of postsecondary education – with priority given to military veterans, Hispanic/Latinos, Native Americans and other adults living in rural areas.
  
  iii. Pilot project in ten rural underserved counties: Adams, Boise, Camas, Clearwater, Custer, Gem, Idaho, Lemhi, Lewis and Shoshone. Include delivery of student advising and educational services for adults through community libraries those counties.
  
  iv. Launch outreach to prospective adult students in partnership with colleges, industry partners, and state and local agencies.
  
  v. Provide support for efforts among faculty to develop a clear and consistent statewide articulation for awarding credit for prior learning and military experience. Specifically, we will develop statewide academic and CTE equivalencies for work-based experience and prior learning assessments, such CLEP exams and courses/training transcribed on Joint Services Transcripts.
  
  vi. It is expected that these efforts will increase visibility for postsecondary opportunities available to adults, while also providing greater accessibility to the use of alternative learning toward the completion of a
postsecondary credential.

d. Developing a statewide strategy for increasing access and affordability to college textbooks in high-impact courses, specifically those used for general education and dual credit purposes (and reducing the cost burden to districts).

2. What advances has your agency witnessed in the last 24 months regarding student growth and achievement?
   a. Common Course Number for 43 courses
   b. Implementation of Apply Idaho
      i. 30,500 total apps
      ii. 10,911 students (21,795 admitted)
      iii. Average 2.9 apps per student
   c. Dual Credit: between FY16 and FY17 we saw almost a 50% increase in the amount of dual credits earned (47% increase in headcount).
   d. Fiscal Year 2014 through 2018, the percentage of postsecondary students taking remedial course has declined. In Fiscal Year 2014, 53% of first year students enrolled full time in community colleges were enrolled in math remediation, in 2018 that rate decreased to just under 48%.
   e. Postsecondary Dashboard
      i. dual credits, remediation, retention, degree progress, graduation, and degrees produced.
      ii. boardofed.idaho.gov / Data & Research

3. If you could make any changes to general education and/or education policy, what two things would those be?
a. Taking the long view, it is incumbent that state fundamentally rethink how it funds higher education. In simplistic terms, we currently fund our institutions based on total student credit hours delivered -- regardless of whether a student ever actually graduates and earns a degree or certificate. We should be paying for what we value, and what we value is degree completion, not just amassing credit hours. There are opportunities to be more strategic in how we fund higher education. We can’t continue to do the same thing over and over again, and expect different results. We look forward to working with the Governor and the Legislature in developing a higher education funding model that recognizes student success and completion.

b. Fixing the leaks in our Teacher Pipeline. Retention is clearly the primary issue facing Idaho’s supply of highly effective teachers. Idaho’s traditional educator preparation programs are steadily producing an average of 800 teachers annually and Idaho issues approximately 400 certificates to teachers from other states; this should be more than enough newly certified teachers to replace the average 500 teachers who retire and the 233 needed annually to address student population growth with hundreds to spare. However, five years of staffing data shows that at least 1,500 teachers leave the profession every year prior to retirement age. Teacher pay and the lack a robust mentoring and induction program are likely major contributors to Idaho’s high rates of attrition. I would hope that we could continue to make meaningful progress in these areas.
Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I’m Marilyn Whitney, Deputy Superintendent, Communications and Policy in the office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

The Supt. appreciates this time to provide the committee with an overview of the legislative and budget priorities for this session. I know you asked for top priorities but I’ll be running through a number of the Supt’s priorities. There is a lot of work to do.

On behalf of the $307,000 students in Idaho, the Supt.’s FY 2020 budget request calls for a 6.8 percent increase in general fund support for public schools, which is $112.5 million of new investment that would will bring state General Fund support to a total of $1.9 billion.

Much of the increase for FY20 will be spent on statutory requirements, including a $48 million dollar increase for the career ladder.

The Supt.’s top priorities reflect her support for continuing the momentum of recent years to increase teacher pay and implement the recommendations of the Task Force for improving education.

In addition to the budget request for the fifth year of implementing the career ladder, the Supt. has asked for $12 million for the master educator premium to help our schools keep master teachers in the classroom.

Ensuring that all students have great teachers is a top priority and the Supt. has proposed just under $1 million to fund a teacher pipeline initiative aimed at addressing the state’s teacher shortage by helping rural and remote school districts find teachers in hard to fill positions. There will be legislation that comes before you this session for your input and discussion on these ideas.

An additional $3 million is being requested to fund the state’s highly successful advanced opportunities program, which you will hear detailed reports about from
the Department and Board of Education. Student participation continues to increase, and the additional funding will help keep pace with that growth.

The Supt. is also requesting $1.4 million in additional funding to expand the mastery-based education initiative beyond the original 20 incubators. This phase 2 investment will provide schools with seed money to begin the transition to a more student-centered environment. The Supt. intends to bring legislation to remove the cap on the incubators and formalize the Department’s Mastery Education Network which supports schools moving to a personalized instruction model.

The FY 2020 request also reflects continued investment in the literacy initiative and proposes an additional $1.1 million for the math initiative, to provide professional development to secondary teachers in the areas of financial literacy, modeling, and data literacy aligned to the state’s math standards. Since the inception of the math initiative, the focus has been on grades K-8. This additional funding would support secondary math and economics educators.

An additional $1.5 million is also requested for professional development for teachers focused on the new Idaho State Science Standards and a new science assessment currently under development.

The budget request also includes an additional $3 million for continued distribution to schools for technology devices, software and teacher training.

The Supt. remains a passionate advocate for school and student safety and her budget request reflects that priority. Efforts over the last few years have focused on anti-bullying education, threat assessments of Idaho public schools and the ability of law enforcement to take action on imminent threats but addressing student safety is an ongoing and critical effort. The Superintendent will continue to work with stakeholders and the Legislature to ensure that student safety remains a top priority moving forward.
The Supt. and Department staff look forward to presenting to you on a number of student achievement developments including the new state report card for schools which was rolled out in early December. This report card will provide policy maker, parents and patrons with important data and information on how your local schools are performing and how the state education system is performing.

We also look forward to providing you with detailed information on the implementation of the new science standards and the new science assessment as well as on how the mastery-based initiative is being implemented.

With that Mr. Chairman and members of the committee again thank you for the time and the Supt. and all the staff at SDE look forward to working with all of you in the coming weeks.
My name is Dwight Johnson and I am the State Administrator of Idaho Career & Technical Education (CTE). The mission of CTE is to prepare Idaho’s youth and adults for high-skill, in-demand careers.

Our long-term strategic focus areas are three fold:

1. To attract more students into our secondary and postsecondary CTE programs
2. Increase the capacity of those programs to accommodate those additional students
3. Continuously improve the quality of those programs to assure Idaho students have outstanding career opportunities and Idaho businesses have a skilled workforce necessary to grow and expand.

We have many priorities for 2019 but I have identified three to share with the committee today to further those strategic efforts. Last year we proposed with the enthusiastic endorsement of the Governor’s Workforce Development Taskforce two new programs that the Legislature created with SB 1212 and SB 1222 that we will be looking to implement.

1. The first created a CTE Middle School Initiative. Senate Bill 1212 allows us to introduce CTE in grades 7 and 8, rather than waiting to the 9th grade. Our goal is to better connect education to careers by creating improved career awareness for students and their parents and we are pleased that the Governor has recommended funding in our FY2020 Budget to continue implementation of this new effort.

   The focus of this new CTE Middle School program is on providing introductory CTE experiences for students so they have greater exposure to the wide range of careers available to them and the education and training they will need to be successful in those careers.

   Increasing student career exploration opportunities in middle school would provide for more informed student choices to participate in secondary CTE programs and help students more effectively plan for high school and beyond as they prepare to enter the workforce in whatever career path they choose.

2. The second priority is implementing a new Workforce Readiness Incentive program that was created last year by SB 1222 and we are pleased that the Governor is recommending funding to begin implementing this program.

   This legislation was endorsed by the Governor’s Workforce Development Taskforce to incentivize Idaho CTE teachers to incorporate workforce readiness skills throughout our secondary CTE curriculum.
This program operationalizes that recommendation by creating a mechanism to promote workforce preparedness by directly rewarding CTE teachers who graduate CTE students who can demonstrate they are workforce ready. This Workforce Readiness Incentive program is patterned after similar best practice models that have been adopted in Colorado and Florida.

3. **Our third priority to implementing a new State Plan for our Federal Funding.** In August of last year the U.S. Congress unanimously reauthorized the federal Perkins Act, which provides federal funding in support of Career Technical Education. We are very pleased with that strong support.

This new federal legislation has some new requirements so we will be writing a new State Perkins Plan for Idaho over the next 18 months. We will be doing outreach to our stakeholders across the state to get their input and want to use this as an inflection point and opportunity to leverage these funds more effectively to improve the quality of CTE in Idaho in better connecting students with career opportunities in their local communities.

We are very pleased with the **student advances over the past 24 months** we are making in CTE programs:

- We have had an overall 13% increase of student enrollment in CTE secondary courses growing from 82,692 in 2016 to 93,850 in 2018.
- The pass rates of our Technical Skill Assessments by High School CTE concentrators have increased from 55% to 66%.
- And the pass rates of our Workforce Readiness Assessments have increased from 75% to 89%.
- At the postsecondary level our enrollment rates have been relatively flat going from 3,512 students enrolled in 2016 to 3,400 students in 2018. But given the low unemployment rate in Idaho we would typically see large decreases postsecondary enrollment based on the opportunity for students to find employment. So, we feel these numbers represent a significant accomplishment.
- And our numbers at our Workforce Training Centers located at our 6 technical colleges, which provide short-term customized training for area businesses, has increased from 44,801 in 2017 to 50,797 in 2018.

**Finally, the two changes I would make to general education and or education policy if I were king for a day would be:**

1. To have the ability and resources to conduct a significant statewide marketing campaign to students and parents to change lingering negative perceptions about CTE so Idahoans would clearly understand the opportunities and competitive advantage that CTE provides for every Idaho student regardless of their career pathway.

2. And secondly, although I understand the difficulty and concerns about adding additional High School graduation requirements, I would love to see CTE incorporated as a graduation requirement rather than seen as an elective.
Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, thank you very much for inviting us to speak today. My name is Kari Overall and I am the president of the Idaho Education Association. I am a 15 year veteran educator from Boise. I am here on behalf of IEA members from across the state. Our membership is a terrific cross-section of early career and veteran teachers, elementary and high school teachers, bus drivers, cafeteria workers, librarians, paraprofessionals, and school counselors. We have members from large, small, urban, and remote districts. We value the expertise, insight, and opinions of all of these dedicated professionals. Teachers know best what they need to be successful in the classroom and what can help them reach and inspire students.

One of the priorities of the IEA is the recruitment and retention of quality educators and working to ensure they are provided with the tools to help them succeed and stay in the classroom. The state board of education released its second teacher pipeline report last month. During 2017-2018, the state department of education issued over 1900 teaching certificates. Of those issued, 35% did not teach in Idaho during the 2017-2018 year. The report also shows Idaho has an attrition rate of 10% each year, which exceeds the national average. In addition to having a large
percentage of those certified never teach in the state, 10% of those who do
teach leave each year. We urge lawmakers to read this report and we look
forward to partnering to create supports for educators to ensure Idaho can
lower its attrition rate and retain the best and brightest educators. Idaho
can and must do more to ensure every student regardless of where they
live has access to a highly qualified teacher.

Next on IEA’s priority list is ensuring Idaho public schools are funded
by a system that is transparent and flexible but which also fulfills the Idaho
constitutional requirement to fund a general, uniform, and thorough system
of public, free, common schools. We remain firm in the resolve there
should not be winners and losers among school districts and the state must
work to alleviate the increased burdens on local communities to fund public
schools. Currently 93 out of 115 school districts rely on supplemental
levies totaling over $200 million. These levies support additional
compensation for educators, programs for students, and smaller class
sizes. The new funding formula must increase the amount provided by the
state in a substantial way. Regardless of the formula used, the formula
must also protect public dollars only going to public schools. The IEA
remains firmly opposed to any form of tax credit, voucher, or any other
proposal which syphons public tax dollars away from public schools to private schools.

As we look at 2017-2018, Idaho public schools are doing great work with the resources provided. IEA members see advances in student growth and achievement nearly every day. Too often student growth and achievement are seen only as increases in test scores. There is more that must be factored into the equation than simply test scores. Students demonstrate growth and learning through a variety of assessments, behaviors, and activities in the classroom. We encourage legislators to look beyond just test scores and see the full picture provided by districts, schools, and individual students. If you have not yet taken a look at the new statewide school reportcard which the state department released this fall, please do so. There is a much richer picture of what is happening in schools beyond just test scores. In addition, please visit the schools in your districts. Classrooms are laboratories for creativity, exploration, experimentation, and innovation. Our students and educators cannot be painted with just one color.

If we could make any policy changes, we would like them to stem from the next task force proposed by Governor Little- our kids, Idaho’s future. The previous governor’s task force addressed many important
issues. We urge the legislature to fund the governor's budget request for the new task force. We believe the collective voices of stakeholders will collaborate to propose innovative solutions to current issues, including veteran teacher pay, further collapsation of line items within the public schools budget, and innovative practices which will free up teachers to do what they do best, teach. We would also like to see the task force dive deeper into the recruitment and retention statistics. With over 1/3rd of those certified not teaching in the state, we would like to see the task force propose solutions to this recruitment issue to ensure more educators want to stay and teach in Idaho.

The iea implore's you this legislative session to make policy decisions through the lens of creating equal opportunity and access for all students regardless of where they live in the state. Poverty, geography, ethnicity, disability, nor access to technology should not determine what type of education a student receives in Idaho.

The iea stands ready, willing, and committed to working together to ensure every child is taught by a well-trained, highly qualified teacher and that Idaho's classrooms are funded by a general, uniform, and thorough system. We look forward to working with this committee, the legislature at
large, and the education stakeholders to ensuring every student leaves Idaho public schools prepared for college or career next steps.

Thank you.
Senate Education Committee

January 14, 2019

Rob Winslow, IASA

Presentation

1. **Top Priorities** - distribute handout of IASA 2019 Legislative Priorities
   a. School Funding Formula (a and c)
   b. Operational funding is still one of our priorities
   c. Improving accountability by streamlining required reporting

2. **Student Growth and Achievement Issues for IASA**
   a. Personalized Learning - Many school leaders are involved with implementing personalized learning/mastery-based education in their schools and districts. Our association has provided workshops to our members from the SDE and our own members on how to implement personalized learning to small and large school districts.
   b. **Addressing the Social and Emotional Needs of Students** - IASA provided interactive online professional development for school leaders on providing positive strategies for addressing the challenging social and emotional needs of many students. The social and emotional needs must be addressed before you can expect student growth in the classroom.

3. **Changes to Education Policy**
   a. Shift required state reporting from an emphasis on the plan or planning to actual outcomes. (Do you want a good reading intervention plan or good results?)
   b. State involved with assisting in funding adequate facilities for rural school districts and charter schools. All children in the state, regardless of where they live and attend school should have a good place to learn.
Mister Chairman and committee members,

My name is Quinn Perry, I am the Policy and Government Affairs Director for the Idaho School Boards Association. ISBA represents over 900 board members who volunteer their time serving their local school districts and charter schools. We represent 100% of the 115 traditional school districts, as well as about 43 charter schools. Before I get started, I’d like to introduce a few of my colleagues who will become familiar faces in your committee. First – Karen Echeverria, who many of you know and has been working in the Education arena for over 20 years. Next is Misty Swanson, who is ISBA’s Chief Deputy and has worked in education for over 12 years. Anyone else attending? ISBA’s mission is to provide leadership and development to board members in all aspects of board service and through a lens of educational equity. Part of that mission is through advocacy efforts.

Our advocacy efforts are determined by and from our members through our Resolution process, which I’d like to briefly explain to new members on this committee. School districts or charter schools will pass resolutions through their boards will come before the ISBA membership, and are voted on in formal parliamentary procedure at our annual convention in November, and resolutions that pass will become a part of our association’s legislative platform for up to two years. To the surprise of nobody, our top priority this year will be changes to the Public School Funding Formula, and we will work to ensure that there is an equitable and intentional allocation of resources, instruction and opportunities for districts and charter schools. In addition, and for many years, our Association has taken a firm stance in standing up for Idaho’s public schools and will continue to educate members of the legislature the risks of diverting public dollars to private or parochial schools. This year, Board members also passed two resolutions related to boosting reading and literacy efforts in our young citizens by advocating for full funding for all-day kindergarten as well as asking for flexibility in using our existing state resources in order to help prepare four-year olds to read.

When we think of the achievement that our Association has witnessed in the last 24 months, what comes to mind first is that leadership matters. When a district or school actually learns and focuses on their continuous improvement plan, it does impact student achievement. It does so by making it the focal point of the district or school, and when boards are regularly discussing this in open, public meetings alongside their data, it becomes a priority to fix shortfalls. Our leadership development team has been working diligently in districts and charters across the state to help boards to have a firm understanding their data and demographics, and how to address areas of improvement.

I’d also like to take a moment to talk about physical growth. ISBA believes it’s time for the state to take a deeper look at extreme hurdles surrounding our State’s facility bond requirements, as school districts are tasked with meeting the unique demands of being
one of the fastest growing states in the country and must also ensure that our students are learning in buildings that are safe and secure.

Finally, if we could change anything about education policy it would be more flexibility with how our districts and schools spend dollars to support staff, and it’s been a longstanding vision of the Association that decisions are best made at the local level with direct input from our communities. We are excited to be working as partners alongside all of the other stakeholders here today, and want to share on a personal level, that all of the stakeholders in this room work very well together and strive to be have transparent communication among one another. We’re excited to work with all of you on Senate Education committee. I think that is all I have, Mr. Chairman and would be happy to stand for questions.
Chairman Mortimer, Vice-Chair Thayn, and members of the committee.

For the record, I am Bill Russell and I am speaking today to you in my role as the CEO of the Idaho Charter School Network.

Idaho’s 46 brick and mortar charter schools and 7 virtual charter schools educate approximately 22,000 kids, with 11,000 more on waitlists. In the fastest growing state in the nation, Idaho’s public charter schools are an important piece of the puzzle in meeting an ever-growing demand for high quality education.

It is my privilege to be with you and to provide answers to the three questions posed by Chairman Mortimer.

1. What are the top priorities for your group for 2019?

We have three priorities that matter greatly to us this year.

First, the state school funding formula. We support Idaho’s effort to modernize and upgrade the state’s school funding formula. The current funding formula, designed in 1994, simply does not provide the flexibility needed by educators to improve learning for all students. Nor does it do anything to encourage innovation in our schools and classrooms, or recognize that different students have different needs. It is a one-size fits all funding formula, and it was designed before public charter schools even existed.

Building level leadership know what their students need most and should be empowered to direct resources in ways that work best for their students. We support the effort to put resources, based on the needs of students, in the hands of local schools and districts, including public charter schools. Local educators should make more of the spending decisions that impact their students
and staff. And, as is currently the case with public charter schools that are required to have "performance certificates" with their authorizer, flexibility to decide how dollars should be spent locally need to be matched by accountability for student outcomes. In short, trust but verify results.

It is also important that some schools not be put at an economic disadvantage by taking away hundreds of thousands of dollars the they rely simply because of a new formula. We strongly resist the wealth adjustment.

**Second, Charter School Administrator Flexibility.** We want to see the charter school administrator flexibility bill that passed both the House and the Senate in 2018 become law. Research tells us that, "effective principals are key to strengthening teaching and schools." We agree and as the nation’s fastest growing state we need to welcome and embrace the very best talent we can for our schools and children. We have some outstanding nontraditional leadership talent wanting and prepared to run a charter school in Idaho.

When launched back in 1998 the legislative intent of the state’s charter school program was to "serve as learning laboratories with hope that successes could potentially be applied throughout the larger public education system." Our administrator flexibility bill builds on this intent. Further, Idaho’s 50 plus public charter schools are required to have a state approved authorizer, and with this authorization comes a detailed performance certificate that all public charter schools must have to operate. In exchange for this additional level of accountability, charter schools are supposed to be free to operate their programs as they think best for students.

**Third, credit enhancement for high-performing and seasoned schools.** We support legislation that would create a credit enhancement for high-performing and seasoned public charter schools, similar to the credit enhancement already available to our traditional district schools. Unlike their public district school brethren, public charter schools do not have access to local property taxes or public levies. On average, according to a new report just issued by Bellwether Education partners, charter schools in Idaho receive just $445 per student in state funding, while public districts on average receive $1,206 per student in both state and local dollars. What’s more, public charter schools pay higher interest rates and more fees than their district peers due to their lower per pupil
funding for facilities and the fact that they don’t have a credit enhancement tool like the traditional districts do.

Texas, Colorado and Utah have active credit enhancement programs for charter schools, and none have seen a default for schools that benefit from these efforts. Time for Idaho to do the same for our established public charter schools.

2. What advances has your agency witnessed in the last 24 months regarding student growth and achievement?

We are proud to report that Idaho’s public charter schools continue to add students and buildings. Since 2016, Idaho has launched eight new charter schools and enrollment has grown from about 20,000 to close to 23,000 students. Despite this growth, the Idaho Education News recently estimated there are almost 11,000 students on charter school waitlists across the state. Charter school students are performing well, as is demonstrated by the table attached to my testimony:

**PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOL STUDENTS ARE LEARNING**

**TABLE 1: PERFORMANCE OF ALL PORTFOLIO SCHOOL STUDENTS
ALL STATE CHARTER STUDENTS & ALL STUDENTS STATEWIDE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Charter Cohort</th>
<th>All State Public Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Share Proficient ELA</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share Proficient Math</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share Making Adequate Growth ELA</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share Making Adequate Growth Math</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 2: PERFORMANCE OF “ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS”
BY PORTFOLIO SCHOOL COHORT, ALL CHARTER COHORT & ALL STUDENTS STATEWIDE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Charter Cohort</th>
<th>All State Public Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Share Proficient ELA</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share Proficient Math</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share Making Adequate Growth ELA</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share Making Adequate Growth Math</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 3: PERFORMANCE OF "MINORITY STUDENTS”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Charter Cohort</th>
<th>All State Public Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Share Proficient ELA</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share Proficient Math</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share Making Adequate Growth ELA</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share Making Adequate Growth Math</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Blumen is appreciative to the Idaho State Board of Education for providing this data and analysis
**Minority student is defined as Hispanic, American Indian, Black, more than one race, and Hawaiian/Pacific Islander
3. If you could make any changes to general education and/or education policy, what 2 things would those be?

Two things: First, we would like to see more instruction that children receive be connected to real life. Despite efforts to move towards things like individualized instruction far too many students in Idaho still take coursework that lack any connection to real life. This bores students to death and is a leading cause of young people giving up on school completely. Schools need to make learning relevant by connecting it to real life.

Second, we would like to see greater emphasis on student outcomes, rather than adult-oriented inputs. Across the country and across the world, in higher education and in elementary and secondary education, the state of the art and best practices answer is outcome driven success evaluation, not input evaluation. Give school leaders greater local control with how they spend their money and how they teach their students, and judge them based not on whether they checked all the boxes people in Boise proscribed to them as part of a thorough education, but based instead on their actual outcomes with their kids.
Murphy:
Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee,
Thank you for having me today, my name is Murphy Olmstead and I manage the Coalition of Idaho Charter School Families. We are a non-profit organization that represents parents, grandparents, students and teachers who support the expansion of school choice in Idaho. I wanted to first ask the parents that took time out of their busy schedules to join us here today to stand. We have the Marjie and Steven Magee family and Melanie Fitzgerald. Thank you all for joining us.

We are here today to speak briefly on the positives of school choice and virtual schooling. With the funding formula change on the table this legislative session, I wanted to speak in support of the proposed funding formula. Our coalition represents many people in the charter school spectrum that are asking for fair funding as we represent many mobile and at-risk students. To change things up a little bit this year, I have asked Melanie Fitzgerald (one of our Coalition parents) to share her story and why she chose Idaho Virtual Academy. I will have her come up and share her story with you all today..

Melanie:
Thank you for having me today Mr. Chairman and members of the committee. My name is Melanie Fitzgerald and my daughter, Matigan, attends an online virtual school here in Idaho. I wanted to talk briefly on how and why we chose an online virtual charter school. Previously, I was a home school teacher for my children. We did home schooling for (# of years) and began to explore other options. We had found out about Idaho Virtual Academy and learned about its flexibility and how it caters for each individual student.

To give a little background about Matigan, she is very active in 4H and is the 4H Rifle State Champion for her age group. She is now training to qualify for the Junior Olympics qualifier this summer in Nebraska. On top of all that, Matigan also does Irish Dancing. This also requires a lot of travel. We spend a lot of time out of state in order for our daughter to pursue her dreams. We wouldn’t have been able to ever do this if we didn’t have the balanced and flexible curriculum of Idaho Virtual Academy. Being able to do school work while we are on the road has allowed for Matigan to achieve great things.

The flexibility of this curriculum has allowed her to excel inside and outside of the classroom. Recently, Matigan achieved a 4.17 GPA and became a member of the National Society of High School Scholars. She has recently scored in the 91st percentile in both the PSAT and SAT exams. She will graduate this spring at the age of 16. She plans on attending Boise State University and to earn degrees in both Elementary and Secondary education and eventually a Masters in Literacy. She hopes to eventually teach in the Idaho school system and also become an agriculture advisor.

I am in support of the recent public-school funding formula change. We hope that you all consider the stories like mine when it comes down to properly funding virtual groups. Thank you committee and Mr. Chairman for allowing me to share my story with you today. I will now leave it open to any questions you may have.
1. What are the top priorities for your group for 2019?

Our top priorities every year for the Idaho PTA is the overall well being of children & students in our state. This year at our Legislative Day on Jan 24th, here at the Capitol, our guest speakers all have to do with student’s mental health. We have Shannon Decker from the Speedy Foundation, a non-profit organization which focuses on promoting mental health education & advocating for suicide prevention. Jeanne Buchaine and Dawn Tolan from the West Ada School District will be talking to parents about the importance of early intervention for mental health issues & educate parent leaders on what resources are available in our schools & districts. There are a lot of for-profit options but currently not a lot of services for those on a fixed income. Parents do not always know where to go for help & historically many of the mental health services have been made for students in higher grades, but we are starting to see the need in the younger students as well.

We understand staffing is a district issue & Idaho PTA is aware that there are districts in our state which do not adequately staff counselors at the school level. In the case of District 25, they do have enough school counselors & are so overwhelmed by the demand of their services they are pulling resources from other departments which is alarming. The current budget the district is working on for next school year is they are proposing pulling a teacher FTE (full time equivalent) from the fine arts department, specifically orchestra in the high schools to help pay for more counselors. The orchestra program will go from being a full time class at every high school to being offered only 1 trimester at each high school basically cutting it by 2/3s.
2. What advances has your agency witnessed in the last 24 months regarding student growth and achievement?

All of our interaction with student growth is more behind the scenes in the schools & not necessarily in the classroom but PTA’s work in conjunction with the education process to help advance student growth & achievement.

Last spring, Idaho PTA was in Washington DC advocating for the Juvenile Justice Reform Act & reauthorization of the Juvenile Justice & Delinquency Prevention Act. While we were there it passed the house from the efforts that the National PTA has made supporting this issue. In December, the President signed it into law. What this means for Idaho is this bill includes provisions that will continue & strengthen protections for children & youth currently in the juvenile justice system including alternatives to incarceration. The Juvenile Justice Reform Act of 2018 is improved by supporting evidence-based programs designed to meet the needs of at-risk youth who are involved with the justice system, continuing the separation of detained youth & adults awaiting trial, continuing to ensure that detained children receive education & have a smooth transition back into the classroom after release & encouraging states to implement strategies to reduce racial & ethnic disparities among youth in the system ensuring greater protections & opportunities for youth both inside & once outside the system.

Idaho PTA is proud to announce 3 schools have been awarded National PTA School of Excellence which recognizes a schools commitment to building an inclusive & welcoming school community where all families contribute to enriching the education experience & over all well being for all students. It is a 2 year distinction & currently there are only 250 schools nationwide that have this accreditation. The schools who have been awarded in Idaho include:

- Chubbuck Elementary, Chubbuck, Idaho
- Seven Oaks Elementary, Eagle Idaho
- Whitman Elementary, Lewiston Idaho

Idaho PTA continues to work closely with the Idaho Department of Education to give a parent perspective when drafting & implementing programs & policy. We are very grateful the collaboration so that parents have a voice in the education decisions for our children.

- Idaho PTA members currently serve on the Department of Education Parent Advisory Council
- We participated with the Idaho Dept of Education in creating Parent/Teacher Surveys which will go out this spring
- We participated with the Idaho Dept of Education in focus groups to give feedback on the new Report Card system for schools
3. If you could make any changes to general education and/or education policy, what 2 things would those be?

The best thing to give parents in regard to the education of our children is options...give parents options. Education is not a 1 size fits all anymore because the dynamic of the American family has changed. We would be remiss to force every family to fit into 1 education scenario, by giving families options gives students an opportunity to succeed.

Idaho PTA supports the idea to change state policy so that districts can use state funds to support pre-kindergarten programs. This would give a school district flexibility to use state dollars as they see appropriate in supporting students entering kindergarten. There are different needs in different districts so giving the districts more flexibility there--by giving parents more options are in the best interest of the child. We are not suggesting that every 3-4 year old go to pre-school but if it can help the family & the child it would be helpful for our families to have the option.

US Census Bureau cites 69% 3-4 year olds are NOT enrolled in early childhood education program. This gap hinders school readiness. If a child would enroll in an early childhood program, it would be age appropriate learning. We are not suggesting 3-4 year olds sitting behind desks but instead interactive or parallel play that allows imagination, creativity type learning for kindergarten readiness.

The Idaho PTA supports state funding for all-day Kindergarten to improve achievement of young learners. Again giving parents options. It may not be appropriate for all children to go to full-day Kindergarten but so many can benefit from this type of interaction. Currently many of the Idaho schools districts offer full-day kindergarten but at a cost to parents. By funding all-day Kindergarten increases financial stability for parents by lessening the cost of education, giving families options instead of just for-profit day-care & the opportunity to learn for young learners.

Finally, in regard to District 25 having to choose between having more counselors in which they desperately need in their district by eliminating teachers in another department like Orchestra. Why do we have to choose? Why cannot we have both? Both are vital to a student's academic success. Districts should have the financial resources to serve all of its student body including the at-risk students, fine art students as well as the academic learners. Please consider increasing discretionary funding so school districts like District 25 can have both a full time Orchestra program and the school counselors their district needs.
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CONVENED: Chairman Mortimer called the Education Committee (Committee) to order at 3:01 p.m.

PASSED THE GAVEL: Chairman Mortimer passed the gavel to Vice Chairman Thayn.

DOCKET NO. 30-0101-1801: Stephanie Bailey-White, Deputy State Librarian for the Commission, presented Docket No. 30-0101-1801, Rules of the Idaho Commission for Libraries Governing the Use of Commission Services (Commission). She said the changes update the Commission's State Funded Grant program to comply with current practices. This allows the Commission to make eligibility requirements the same for state and federally funded grant programs. It also broadens the range of eligible libraries. She stated the changes in the Talking Book Services address the current usage to digital and downloadable content, aligning with the current National Library Services guidelines.

Ms. Bailey-White explained the changes in detail and emphasized the updates bring the rules into the current practice. She remarked some of the changes have allowed the Commission to serve more libraries in the State.

Chairman Mortimer asked if the e-rate funding for broadband is affected by serving more libraries. Ms. Bailey-White replied those funds are included in the granting program for the libraries. She detailed the variety of grants offered to libraries.

Senator Den Hartog asked if libraries affiliated with religious organization are excluded from grants. Ms. Bailey-White replied in the affirmative. She explained the policy is consistent with the Idaho State Constitution.

Chairman Mortimer said the changes in the rules have expanded the library programs. He asked if the funding remains the same, what would be the impact to the Commission. Ms. Bailey-White replied the programs are mostly used by the small and rural libraries. The Commission does not expect an increase in the impact. The changes are to bring the language into the current practices.


PASSED THE GAVEL: Vice Chairman Thayn passed the gavel to Chairman Mortimer.
PRESENTATION: Kelly Brady, Director Mastery Based Education, State Department of Education (SDE), presented Mastery Based Education. She explained the direction for Mastery Based Education is developed to meet today’s changing business climate. She detailed the basis of Mastery Based Education and how a classroom is transitioned. She said Mastery Based Education is a priority for the SDE.

Ms. Brady explained the instructional support for the student-centered learning and outlined the four Idaho district divisions. She recounted how funding from the State has been allocated to support this program. She itemized the observations they have gathered during this incubator period and spoke about the ongoing statewide network (see Attachment 1).

Ms. Brady introduced Greg Bailey, Superintendent, Moscow School District, Moscow, Idaho, to describe how his school district adopted Mastery Based Education in grades K-12. Mr. Bailey emphasized the importance of having all grades participate in this type of learning. He reminded the Committee that change takes time and explained the process his district undertook to make the change involved empowering the staff. He said this type of education is student-centered and student driven.

Donell McNeal, Principal, Central Academy (Academy), West Ada School District, Meridian ID, reported his work and successes using Mastery Based Education in the Academy. He emphasized the student-centered learning has led to higher test scores and completion rates. Mr. McNeal introduced two students, Tyson Woods and Nora Mohammad, who spoke about their experiences and successes at the Academy.

Committee members raised questions regarding: student expectations, how districts measure student testing results, how teachers are responding to Mastery Based Education, how Mastery Based Education interfaces with Advanced Placement classes, if the current legislative policies interfere with the program, and how the school culture has changed with Mastery Based Education. The presenters responded to the individual questions.

RECORDING LINK: To hear the complete presentation, go to: https://legislature.idaho.gov/sessioninfo/2019/standingcommittees/SEDU/.

ADJOURNED: There being no further business at this time, Chairman Mortimer adjourned the meeting at 4:24 p.m.
Idaho Mastery Education
Lessons Learned

Kelly Brady
Director, Instructional Support for Student-Centered Learning

Supporting Schools and Students to Achieve
SHERI YAMBA, ED.S, SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

Good Afternoon – For the record, I am Kelly Brady, Director of Instructional Support for Student-Centered Learning at the Idaho State Department of Education. I am here today to talk with you about Idaho Mastery Education and lessons learned. First thank you for your support. The incubator process has allowed districts and schools to innovate, learn about the great possibilities, and examine both perceived barriers and policy roadblocks. Idaho is getting recognition at both the state and national levels.

Competency Works/INacol, a national group, visited and recently published a series of ten articles highlighting our Idaho Mastery Education Network (IMEN) schools. Chris Sturgis said, “Idaho...saw what early adopters had done, grabbed the best of it, and learned from the mistakes of others to do the best they can for their students.”

Thank you so much for this investment in our Idaho students.

Last week you had the opportunity to hear two speakers that the Idaho Business for Education (IBE) brought in to build upon the conference they helped sponsor around the 4th Industrial Revolution (4IR). You heard from Gus Schmedlen - Vice President for Worldwide Education at HP, who talked about the advances and possibilities of how work and life will look different — focusing on Accelerated Innovation.

Gus mentioned the most In-Demand hard and soft skills – Focusing on things that robots can’t do – Creativity, persuasion, collaboration, adaptability, and time management. He mentioned that our students of today will have between seven and eight careers - Forcing our students to be flexible and adaptive. They will need a global perspective, an understanding of our diverse world, and the ability to be competitive. Our K-12 system must begin preparing students for jobs that don’t yet exist.
As Gus continued to talk, he was describing what is happening in Idaho Mastery Education Network! We know that students learn in a variety of ways and the time for learning varies – Learning must be the constant. Time and teaching should be the variable. This isn’t always so in a traditional classroom – at times we advance students regardless of whether they have learned.
Lesson #1 – What is Mastery Education?

A student-centered educational system that promotes relevant learning while allowing flexibility in both time and teaching methods, where student success is the only option.

So let’s start with Lesson 1 – What is Mastery Education? The definition provided in the enabling legislation is commonly accepted across the country and served as a perfect starting point. Through the past three years our participating schools have built off that foundation and developed a working definition to better communicate with stakeholders. We define Idaho Mastery Education as a student-centered educational system that promotes relevant learning allowing flexibility in both time and teaching methods, where a student’s success is the only option. We must focus on the success of all Idaho students.

Pay close attention to the wonderful pictures throughout this presentation; our own Idaho Students participating in Mastery Education. You will see the joy learning brings to their faces.
As we transition from the traditional classroom to a classroom that supports mastery education, we see four distinct differences.
Transition from the Traditional Classroom

In a traditional classroom teachers teach to the average...in a mastery classroom teachers design experiences that are student-centered.
Students in a traditional classroom receive credit with a passing grade for instance a D...in a mastery classroom students are expected to master content.
Transition from the Traditional Classroom

For years we have progressed students based on age and time spent in a seat...a mastery classroom advances students upon mastery of content.
Assessment is an important part of mastery, allowing students to test when ready which motivates and brings confidence to our students and their mindset about being a learner.
Transition from the Traditional Classroom

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional Education</th>
<th>Mastery Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>WHAT DOES INSTRUCTION LOOK LIKE?</strong></td>
<td><strong>TEACH TO THE TEST VS STUDENT CENTERED</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History, Math, Science</td>
<td><strong>STUDENT CENTERED</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HOW DO STUDENTS RECEIVE CREDIT?</strong></td>
<td><strong>PASSING GRADES VS MASTERY OF CONTENT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History, Math, Science</td>
<td><strong>MASTERY OF CONTENT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HOW DO STUDENTS PROGRESS?</strong></td>
<td><strong>AGE-BASED VS TEST TIME VS UPON MASTERY VS WHEN READY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History, Math, Science</td>
<td><strong>WHEN READY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WHEN ARE STUDENTS ASSESSED?</strong></td>
<td><strong>END OF YEAR VS WHEN READY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History, Math, Science</td>
<td><strong>WHEN READY</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lesson #2 - Why Is Mastery Education a Priority?

Mastery Education Will Prepare Idaho Students for a Rapidly Changing World

- Students will demonstrate mastery of core academic content.
- Schools and teachers are given the flexibility needed to meet the needs of our diverse student population.
- Students will learn how to apply knowledge.
- Instructional practices focus on helping students communicate effectively, work collaboratively and solve complex problems.

In the words of Superintendent Ybarra, “The beauty of a mastery-based education system is that it is rooted in local control and is truly from the ground up. Local communities, schools, and districts will determine through this effort what is best to meet the needs of their students.”

Mastery Education Will Prepare Idaho Students for a Rapidly Changing World - Lesson #2 - Students will demonstrate mastery of core academic content - key-word demonstrate, schools and teachers are given the flexibility needed to meet the needs of our diverse student population. Students learn how to apply knowledge and instructional practices with a focus to communicate effectively, work collaboratively and solve complex problems. All of these priorities relate directly to Linkedin soft and hard skills that our important to the workforce.
Learning how to learn and diversity of skills are both needed in today’s educational system. We need an education system that aligns with skills needed for careers, college, and life. Mastery education gives students the chance to use meaningful content in ways that encourage deeper levels of learning through mastery of concepts and skills. In the Idaho Mastery Education Network we have a shared vision that content and skills are equally vital for the success of our students today.

Last week Miss Love, your Page, stated that she thought our schools should focus on student interests and give students more choice and flexibility in what they learn. She was reminding us of the importance of engaging our students in content and skills; giving our students the voice and choice they need to develop, for the seven or eight jobs they will have, that don’t exist today.
A key lesson from the Mastery Education incubator process is that as we were asking schools to restructure and reimagine to better meet the needs of students, Superintendent Ybarra led our efforts to restructure our staff to better meet the needs of schools.
Our new structure divides Idaho school districts and charter schools from smallest enrollments to largest, with each division covering all regions of Idaho. Division 1 includes 61 small, mostly rural districts with fewer than 1,000 students, plus 48 charter schools.
State Support Must Evolve

Idaho Districts - Division 2
1,000-3,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Districts</th>
<th>30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Students</td>
<td>55,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Mastery Education Districts and/or Schools</td>
<td>1 District 8 Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Charters</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Division 2 covers 30 districts and 4 charters with between 1,000 and 3,000 students.
### State Support Must Evolve

#### Idaho Districts - Division 3
3,000-10,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Districts</th>
<th>17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Students</td>
<td>88,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Mastery Education Districts and/or Schools</td>
<td>5 District 10 Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Charters</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Division 3 includes 17 districts with between 3,000 and 10,000 students.
State Support Must Evolve

Division 4, for enrollments of 10,000 to 40,000, includes the fewest districts – seven – and the most students – 158,629. You can also see that there are mastery schools represented in all four divisions.
Lesson #4 – Investment Needs

Salaries/Benefits
Professional Development
Purchased Services
Supplies/Materials
Travel
Capital Objects

Of the funds the Legislature appropriated for the Mastery Education Initiative. I want to tell you how the funds have been used by the incubator districts and schools.

Early in the process of developing Idaho Mastery Education, I spoke with thought leaders in mastery education around the country. I was able to identify spending categories that would include Salaries/Benefits, Purchased Services, Professional Development, Supplies/Materials, Travel, and Capital Objects.

Funds allocated to Salaries and Benefits were used by schools to compensate educators who attended professional development events over the summer or who spent time planning or otherwise working on mastery education implementation beyond their teaching contracts. Some schools also used funds to hire a staff member dedicated to planning and rolling out Mastery Education. Some schools used these funds to pay substitutes while teachers attended Idaho Mastery Education Network training sessions.

Schools used Professional Development funds to pay for training not provided by the Idaho State Department of Education due to limited capacity of the Department or specialized needs of the incubators.

Supplies and Materials funds were used by some schools to provide digital resources, technology devices, and hands-on instructional resources for students to use.

Travel funds were used to allow incubators to attend Professional Learning Community Training and to visit other schools to see Mastery Education in action.

Some schools used Capital Objects funds to purchase furniture and equipment to support flexible
learning spaces.

We must continue to study our investment as we support districts to shift our current educational system to a mastery educational system.
Observations

- Consistent Statewide Professional Development
- Technical Assistance Providers
- Fund Amounts and Needs Vary
- Needs-based Support Informs Future Spending
- Statewide Communication and Outreach
- System-wide Network Participation and Support

The investment we have made in Mastery Education and the ability to learn from an incubator process has given us the opportunity to learn from successes and failures.

These are the things that we know that we need to do and continue have funding for.

For instance, forming a network of schools and districts to learn together and developing shared resources and common instructional practices in a safe environment has been our greatest success. We have studied how districts can maximize the mastery education funds and how the need for funds changes as they learn more.
Lesson #5 - How are we planning to support, scale, and sustain mastery education in Idaho?

As we plan for the future of mastery in Idaho, the seven arenas of support will help districts come into mastery education at their unique readiness level. We will attach funds to four of the arenas using the previous funding categories. Districts will take a readiness survey to help identify which arena best meets their needs. For instance, we can provide money for new districts to visit our Cohort 1 districts and learn with and from them. Arena 5 will provide districts with money to help with planning and design. We are now able to identify the importance of paying teachers for the additional time it takes to collaborate with their fellow teachers to plan for real change both culturally and instructionally. Level 2, 5, 6, and 7 we hope will be tied to allocated grant funds.
Through a service grant and partnership between the Idaho State Department of Education and Boise State University, focus groups were conducted during the 2017-2018 school year with students, parents, teachers, and school leaders at each of the 32 IMEN incubator sites. The purpose of the research was to examine the partnerships, processes, and challenges that emerged as Idaho’s Mastery Education moved from conception to implementation. The findings will help inform future professional development and strategic planning.

The study found key benefits:

- **Personalized learning**: Students reported being able to work at a flexible pace, and connected the opportunity to have “choice and voice in their learning” with feelings of confidence and preparedness for assessments.
- **Flexibility**: Both parents and educators highlighted the ability to utilize innovative teaching strategies, flexible learning spaces, and increased collaboration among educators.
- **Transparency**: Students, parents, and teachers are all able to work together to set goals, monitor progress, and provide students with differentiated support based on each child’s individual needs.
- **Desire to learn**: Students understand and know how to work through the process of learning, which includes investigation, creation, communication, and synthesizing information.
- **Self-efficacy**: The study found changes in student attitudes toward ownership of their own learning. Similarly, parents and students reported changed attitudes toward success and failure; success is no longer measured by seat time and failure is no longer an acceptable ultimate outcome.
Here you see the existing IMEN cohort 1. The IMEN includes 19 incubators consisting of 32 schools in five regions in Idaho.
These are just a sample of the schools/districts across Idaho who are seeking support. I receive phone calls or emails every week wanting support, more clarification, or interest in being in the next cohort. We are extremely fortunate to have your support over the last three years. We have many challenges ahead, but we feel mastery education is the solution: The possibilities are here...Our Rural schools can use technology to connect our students to the world. Micro credentials – can connect content and assessment to achieve knowledge and ability to perform and respond to the needed skills in our workforce. Design thinking, blended learning, virtual reality, OER resources, next generation learning technologies, and vocational - CTE grounded in mastery, performance assessments, are issues we continue to explore in our Idaho Mastery Education system.
IDAHO MASTERY EDUCATION SUCCESSES

• Innovation/Flexibility
• Student-Centered
• Better Outcomes

Time for students to share
IDAHO MASTERY EDUCATION SUCCESSES

Test Scores are Improving
- "We are very encouraged to see ISAT scores improving, but the increase in SAT scores is an even better indicator of the success of the mastery approach. The average SAT score at Venture grew from 734 in 2015 to 843 in 2017...it was accompanied by an increase in students' interest in college." -Venture High School (Coeur d'Alene)

Students Persist in Their Learning
- "Principal Christie McMillen said mastery transforms students who buy in. Now, it's no longer acceptable to do the minimum, skip the vast majority of tests or assignments and coast through with a D...Instead, students persist until they achieve B or A level work." -From Idaho Ed News, re: Middleton Academy

Students Take Ownership in Their Learning
- "Students are taking ownership of their learning, which has fundamentally changed the discussions we are having with students." -Meridian Academy

Teachers are Enthusiastic
- "We are proud that teachers are enthusiastic about Mastery Education." -Greenhurst Elementary (Nampa)

Students are Advancing Upon Mastery
- "Some students went on to earn high school credit for core classes while they were still in middle school." -Rocky Mountain Middle School (Idaho Falls)

Students are Learning for Today and the Future
- "Students are showing a higher level of motivation, and are actively engaged in pursuing more from their school experience. We are seeing students moving from one course to the next without teacher prompting. Students are taking the lead in some areas and making decisions about their education to further their chances of a more prosperous future." -Three Creek School District (Rogerson)

In addition to my presentation today, we have two reports coming at the end of January.

Let's connect all this back to Senator Mortimer's poem last Wednesday - Because - Mastery is the game changer in Idaho as we develop opportunities: there are tasks to do, as we show our worth, we solve relevant problems, dream of a future we can only imagine, and address each and every human need in Idaho - we must develop a workforce to grow the full potential of our Idaho citizens - this is our task-worth-problem-dream-and lastly need. We can only imagine! With that - I would like to introduce Dr. Greg Bailey who will talk about moving a whole district into a mastery education system. He will address his process, bright spots, and challenges. We also have a few students who will talk about what mastery education has meet to them. I will let the students introduce themselves. The administrators - Donell McNeal from Central Academy in the West Ada School District and Nick Stern from Greenhurst Elementary in the Nampa School District are also available to answer any questions. With that, Dr. Greg Bailey...
Prior Two Years

Idaho Mastery Education 2016-2017
- Capital Objects: 35%
- Travel: 10%
- Salaries/Benefits: 35%
- Professional Development: 10%
- Purchased Services: 10%

Idaho Mastery Education 2017-2018
- Capital Objects: 35%
- Travel: 6%
- Salaries/Benefits: 23.3%
- Supplies/Equipment: 9%
- Professional Development: 10.9%
- Purchased Services: 7%

$1.4 million appropriation each year
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**CONVENED:** Chairman Mortimer called the Education Committee (Committee) to order at 3:06 p.m.  

**PASSED THE GAVEL:** Chairman Mortimer passed the gavel to Vice Chairman Thayn.  

**DOCKET NO. 08-0202-1804**  
Tracie Bent, Chief Planning and Policy Officer, Office of the State Board of Education (Board) presented Docket No. 08-0202-1804, Rules Governing Uniformity. She explained this is new language and has been developed due to the professional endorsement established in Idaho Code § 33-1201a. She said this section of code was created in 2015 with the Career Ladder. She explained the requirements for the professional endorsement granted by the State. Ms. Bent detailed for the Committee the provisions in the new rule.  

Vice Chairman Thayn asked if this relates to the Master Teacher Premium. Ms. Bent replied in the negative. She stated this is only for individuals to earn the professional endorsement so they can move up the Career Ladder.  

Chairman Mortimer said the Career Ladder has been in place for four years. He asked why these new rules are now being brought forward. Ms. Bent replied school districts asked for these updates. They were concerned about the Career Ladder movement for those teachers coming into the State whose professional endorsement requirements have been met. She said the reason this is being brought forward is because this is the first year their movement would be impacted.  

Chairman Mortimer asked if this section specifically applied to a teacher who is coming to work from out-of-state. Ms. Bent replied in the affirmative.  

Chairman Mortimer asked why the rule was not written to specify out-of-state teachers. Ms. Bent replied the current statute is inclusive of all teachers. She explained the school districts requested additional guidance when moving out-of-state teachers on the Career Ladder.  

Senator Den Hartog asked if it will be difficult for out-of-state teachers to gather the necessary documents to support their professional achievements. Ms. Bent replied the Federal Accountability System allows teachers to have access to their data. It is should not be difficult. She explained the process in which school districts accept aggregated data.  

Senator Den Hartog asked if this rule was negotiated. Ms. Bent replied in the affirmative. She explained the process taken with the stakeholders. She said they all support the language in the proposed rule.
MOTION: Senator Ward-Engelking moved to accept Docket No. 08-0202-1804. Chairman Mortimer seconded the motion.

Vice Chairman Thayn said he is not opposed to the rule. He expressed his concerns regarding teacher accountability and the monitoring process. He said he believes the rule is following the intent of the legislation the legislature passed.

The motion passed by voice vote.

DOCKET NO. 08-0203-1803

Ms. Bent present Docket No. 08-0203-1803, Rules Governing Thoroughness. She said this rule pertains to high school graduation requirements. It addresses the STEM diploma the legislature passed in 2018. She explained the procedures taken to develop the rule. She detailed the changes in the requirements regarding math courses and the senior project.

Ms. Bent detailed the other courses students can take in order to meet the math requirements. She explained the graduation requirement for math and said the computer science courses are now able to meet the math requirements. She reviewed the technical changes made to the rule. Ms. Bent said the language was added to the senior project to provide better guidance for the culminating project.

Senator Ward-Engelking asked if the changes allow for more flexibility in the senior project. Ms. Bent replied in the affirmative.

Senator Lent asked if the formal written report is no longer required. Ms. Bent replied the districts at the local level decide the format of the senior project. She explained the requirements of the senior project.

Senator Lent asked if the senior project rigor has been diluted. Ms. Bent replied in the negative. She said the rule is to clarify the intent of the senior project. She stated the senior project standards are set by the individual school districts.

Vice Chairman Thayn asked for clarification of the math requirements in the rule. Ms. Bent explained the exemptions and requirements.

MOTION: Senator Den Hartog moved to accept Docket No. 08-0203-1803. Senator Ward-Engelking seconded the motion.

Senator Den Hartog said she understands the concerns from Committee members but appreciates the flexibly allowed to school districts to decide how the senior project fit their needs. She said the part of the rule which addresses a student's ability to analyze, synthesize, evaluate, and communicate is the intent of the legislation.

Chairman Mortimer said for many years he has struggled with making the senior project meaningful, and believes the school districts have as well. He said any effort to bring new emphasis to the senior project is welcomed.

Senator Woodward said the analogy could be made that every time someone presents to this Committee, they also provide written documentation. This runs parallel to the requirements of the senior project.

Senator Lent said he is looking for a performance aspect as a capstone event. He believes the student, through the senior project, must be able to perform and demonstrate what they have learned.

Senator Crabtree said flexibility is important to school districts. The concern, he expressed, is to not reduce the standards. Students will rise to what is expected of them. He said having measurable outcomes are important.
Senator Buckner-Webb said she agrees with the Committee, standards must be kept at a high level. She expressed her confidence that educators want to maintain high standards. She stated school districts should have the latitude to design the senior project to what best fits their students.

Vice Chairman Thayn said he has had mix feelings about the senior project. He stated his concerns regarding the senior project.

The motion passed by voice vote.

Senator Crabtree requested that he be recorded as having voted nay.

DOCKET NO. 08-0203-1804

Amy Lorenzo, Director of Policy & Organizational Planning, Career Technical Education (CTE), presented Docket No. 08-0203-1804, Rules Governing Thoroughness: Career Technical Education (CTE). She said the rule before the Committee is the addition of a new set of standards for the ongoing CTE programs. She explained the development of the standards which began in 2016 and emphasized that the CTE programs are held accountable to the same extent as the academic programs. Ms. Lorenzo detailed the standard setting process which includes input from CTE instructors and industry business leaders pulling from industry standards. The rules to review include those incorporated by reference.

Chairman Mortimer pointed out the incorporated by reference documents were not delivered to the whole Committee.

MOTION: Chairman Mortimer moved to hold Docket No. 08-0203-1804 in Committee until the call of the Chair. Senate Den Hartog seconded the motion. The motion passed by voice vote.

DOCKET NO. 08-0203-1805

Helen Price, Program Specialist, Board Materials & Rules, State Department of Education (SDE), presented Docket No. 08-0203-1805, Rules Governing Thoroughness. She explained the negotiating process and said the rule was approved by the SBE. It eliminates the information no longer relevant to current procedures. Specifically, it removes references to Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAO), which were used to measure the progress proficiency of Idaho's limited English proficient students under The No Child Left Behind Act. Ms. Price explained in detail the changes to the rule.

MOTION: Senator Crabtree moved to accept Docket No. 08-0203-1805. Senator Buckner-Webb seconded the motion. The motion passed by voice vote.

PASSED THE GAVEL: Vice Chairman Thayn passed the gavel to Chairman Mortimer.

ADJOURNED: There being no further business at this time, Chairman Mortimer adjourned the meeting at 3:58 p.m.

___________________________  __________________________
Senator Dean M. Mortimer       LeAnn Mohr
Chair                            Secretary
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CONVENED: Chairman Mortimer called the Joint Meeting of the House Education Committee and Senate Education Committee (Committee) to order at 3:01 p.m.

PRESENTATION: Representative Wendy Horman presented the Interim Committee Report; Idaho's Public School Funding Formula. She said the Interim Committee (IC) began in 2016 and then reported the results, which received full support of the IC. She introduced the two-minute video which explained the current funding formula and its problems.

Representative Horman said the proposed Public School Funding Formula is evolving to meet and address new ways of learning. She emphasized this formula works to address the educational needs at the local level.

Senator Lori Den Hartog spoke on behalf of Senator Chuck Winder. She said the IC is now handing off the Public School Funding Formula to the Germaine Committee to finalize the work. She explained how learning and schooling has evolved since the current funding formula was developed in 1994. Senator Den Hartog said local school district personnel have asked for a better funding formula. After years of meetings, this formula has been developed; it is systematic and driven by research-based information. She encouraged people to remain open to the changes.

Emily Parker, Policy Analyst, Education Commission of the States (ECS), gave an overview of the organization. She said their mission is to help states create better education policies. ECS is under contract with Idaho to build a better funding formula. She explained the work of ECS with the IC and how they worked with stakeholders to develop the new Public School Funding Formula. She stressed the work they have done has been open and inclusive.

PRESENTATION: Representative Scott Bedke, Speaker of the House, demonstrated the Public School Funding Formula. He explained how the formula works and how the IC with the direction of ECS developed the variety of funding measures. He gave an example of how the formula works and explained the adaptive nature of the model, which meets the charge of the State Constitution of educating Idaho students.
**Speaker Bedke** demonstrated for the audience and Committees the tool in detail by exploring certain scenarios, including: Special Education students, students in grades K-3 and 9-12, small districts, charter schools, salaries, benefits. The tool is designed to show the costs of policy decisions.

**Speaker Bedke** cautioned the Stakeholders to avoid reacting to this tool. He said there will be hearings regarding the policies which will determine how the funds are to be allocated. After the demonstration of the tool, **Speaker Bedke** said the goal is to have the tool implemented by 2021.

**Michael Griffith**, Principal Contractor, School Finance, ECS, further explained the Public School Funding Tool. He demonstrated the tool using a variety of weighting scenarios. He said the tool has weighting factors which reflect State laws. He said the tool was designed to meet the needs and policies of Idaho.

In response to the questions posed by the Committee members, **Speaker Bedke** and **Mr. Griffith** detailed how to determine funding without having losses to any schools, confirming that the weights be adjusted to offset district losses, and assuring the Committee that the formula cannot be manipulated to bypass the intent. Both emphasized it will be the responsibility of the Germane Committee to write the policy language for the new funding formula.

**Representative Horman** concluded the presentation. She told the Committee this new formula will be reviewed every five years to meet the changes in education. She reminded the audience the Interim Committee is handing this off to the Germane Committee and the stakeholders’ input is still needed as Legislation is formulated.

**RECORDING LINK:** To hear the full presentation of the Public School Funding Formula, go to: https://legislature.idaho.gov/sessioninfo/2019/standingcommittees/SEDU/.

**ADJOURNED:** There being no further business at this time, Chairman Mortimer adjourned the meeting at 4:40 p.m.
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DATE: Monday, January 21, 2019
TIME: 3:00 P.M.
PLACE: Room WW55
MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Mortimer, Vice Chairman Thayn, Senators Winder, Crabtree, Woodward, Lent, Buckner-Webb, and Ward-Engelking
ABSENT/EXCUSED: Senator Den Hartog

NOTE: The sign-in sheet, testimonies and other related materials will be retained with the minutes in the committee's office until the end of the session and will then be located on file with the minutes in the Legislative Services Library.

CONVENED: Chairman Mortimer called the Education Committee (Committee) to order at 3:01 p.m. He opened with a reading from the book, A Heap O 'Living Along Life's Highway, by Eager A. Guest, the poem, "Can't."

GUBERNATORIAL APPOINTMENT: Matt Freeman, Executive Director, State Board of Education (SBE) presented on behalf of Mike Keckler, Chief Communications and Legislative Affairs Officer, SBE, introduced Deborah Critchfield, Oakley, ID re-appointed to the State Board of Education (Board) to serve a term commencing July 1, 2018 and expiring July 1, 2023.

Ms. Critchfield introduced herself and spoke about the reasons she serves on the Board and detailed the variety of positions she has served. She said it is important to make education more accessible for Idahoans. She emphasized the need for workforce development and the continued implementation of the Board's strategic goals.

In response to Committee questions, Ms. Critchfield said the new Public School Funding Formula is necessary; it is time to do something different. She said a Board committee has reviewed the non-financial barriers students encounter when deciding to "Go On" after high school and detailed those barriers. Ms. Critchfield reported she would like to see the Board increase its efforts on the Pathways program, workforce development, and addressing the social and emotional needs of students.

Chairman Mortimer thanked Ms. Critchfield for her service to the Board.

PRESENTATION: Dr. Bert Glandon, President, College of Western Idaho (CWI) presented the update for the State's Community Colleges. He introduced the other Community College Presidents: Dr. Jeff Fox, College of Southern Idaho (CSI), Dr. Rick MacLennan, North Idaho College (NIC), and Dr. Rick Aman, College of Eastern Idaho (CEI). They in turn introduced their staff and board members who were in the audience.

Dr. Glandon thanked the Committee for allowing all four of the State Community Colleges (CC) to present as a team. He detailed each of the specific regions CC's serve, the individual annual budgets, student enrollment, total credits taught, and total dual credits taught. Dr. Glandon highlighted how each CC responds to their community's educational needs. Each of the CC Presidents addressed the specific programs unique to their CC (Attachment 1).
In response to Committee questions, the **CC Presidents** explained the challenges they encounter with dual credits, detailed how the reduction of credit hours for the completion of some degrees have contained costs for students, discussed Career Technical Education adjustments, and detailed the shift from traditional learning to mastery based education.

**RECORDING LINK:** To hear the complete presentation of Idaho's Community Colleges, go to: https://legislature.idaho.gov/sessioninfo/2019/standingcommittees/SEDU/.

**PASSED THE GAVEL:** Chairman Mortimer passed the gavel to Vice Chairman Thayn.

**DOCKET NO. 08-0202-1801**

**Helen Price**, Program Specialist, Board Materials and Rules, State Department of Education (SDE), presented **Docket No. 08-0202-1801**: Rules Governing Uniformity; Idaho Standards for Initial Certification of Professional School Personnel, a Document Incorporated by Reference. She explained the process taken to develop the changes in the document and reported the stakeholders who participated in the process. **Ms. Price** detailed each change and said the proposed changes are to update the language to meet current practices.

**Vice Chairman Thayn** asked if there were concerns during the negation of rules. **Ms. Price** responded in the negative.

**MOTION:** Senator Ward-Engelking moved to accept **Docket No. 08-0202-1801**. Senator Lent seconded the motion. The motion passed by voice vote.

**PASSED THE GAVEL:** Vice Chairman Thayn passed the gavel to Chairman Mortimer.

**ADJOURNED:** There being no further business at this time, **Chairman Mortimer** adjourned the meeting at 4:36 p.m.
Fiscal Year 2018
ANNUAL BUDGET

$43,300,000

$46,705,651

$16,926,000

$35,924,300

Excludes $7,320,700 in State CTE Funding
Excludes $5,970,100 in State CTE Funding
Excludes $5,949,272

North Idaho College
College of Western Idaho
College of Southern Idaho
College of Eastern Idaho
TOTAL CREDITS TAUGHT

2017-2018
DUAL CREDITS TAUGHT
2017-2018

59,743
78
17,672
32,814
CHALLENGES

- Expanding Our Reach & Impact
- Broadening Dual Credit
- Better Accessibility
- Keeping Costs Affordable & Providing
- Retention & Completion
- Investing in Student Success: Enrollment
CHALLENGES

The changing nature of higher education

"Technology deficit" and IT systems security and stability

Addressing the commodification of higher education

Unstable funding streams
CHALLENGES

- Balance the proper role / function / outcome of Dual Credit.
- Address short and long term facility needs.
- Secure sustainable and balanced funding to ensure institutional effectiveness.
- Avoid bureaucratizing and traditional mindset / approach to the modern evolving marketplace.
Meeting the needs of rural Idaho with both academic transfer and CTE classes.

Growth of demands on the physical campus beyond the existing buildings. We will be out of space in fall.

Work with strategies to implement CCA principles toward increased retention and degree completion.

Additional faculty and staff as demand for classes increase for a new College.
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CONVENED: Chairman Mortimer called the Education Committee (Committee) to order at 3:03 p.m.

PRESENTATION: Dr. Cynthia Pemberton, President, Lewis-Clark State College (LCSC), presented the annual report to the Committee. She said education matters and provided her personal story of how advanced education changed her life. Dr. Pemberton said LCSC is a special college; it is hands on and interpersonal, delivering a quality private school experience at a State school cost. She explained the opportunities available to students with effortless access and affordability.

Dr. Pemberton detailed the dual credit course work at LCSC and gave suggestions on how to make it more available to more students. She explained how LCSC can support the new Opportunity Scholarship which is available to the adult learner.

Dr. Pemberton gave an overview of the business and educational partnerships. She said the school has met the fundraising goals to build the Schweitzer Career Technical Education Center, which will open in 2020. She spoke about enrollment trends, efforts in student recruitment, and retention with academic coaching (Attachment 1).

In response to a question about the biggest surprise of her presidency, Dr. Pemberton replied she has so much to learn and that there are amazing possibilities at LCSC.

PRESENTATION: Kevin D. Satterlee, President, Idaho State University (ISU), said he has been with ISU for seven months and is excited about the future because of all the support and enthusiasm in the ISU service region. He relayed to the Committee ISU's mission.

President Satterlee said his presentation would answer the questions Chairman Mortimer gave to him the week prior. He reported to the Committee those things that are going right with ISU. He said ISU has a Statewide responsibility in the health sciences. He explained the Statewide expansions which have occurred; they are designed to meet the needs of health care demands and are based on workforce demands. He provided the polling data concerning ISU's Statewide image and said there is the need to increase outreach and visibility. He stated there is a renewed commitment to those efforts and a renewed energy to revitalize the spirits towards achieving those goals in hopes of increasing enrollment. He said ISU is working diligently to engage Idaho students, especially in Southeastern Idaho.
President Satterlee recounted how ISU is addressing cost containment. He detailed the management of the programs which move students into the workforce in a quick manner. He spoke about ISU’s tuition cost and the implemented tuition lock. He explained the cost savings to students with the Advanced Opportunities program and detailed the partnership with Renaissance High School in Meridian, Idaho. He said dual enrollment has created a paradigm shift and higher education must adjust to meet the challenge. He explained how the freshman experience has changed and the need to find a new common bond. He spoke about the rigors of the dual enrollment courses and expressed the desire for collaboration with all educational institutes.

President Satterlee concluded his presentation stating he was a product of Idaho education. A first-generation college student who appreciated all the efforts of others to ensure he had access to education.

Regarding questions from the Committee, President Satterlee said students that have college credits when they start college are inclined to shift their resources to graduate classes. He said the decline in enrollment occurred when international students left. To address enrollment, ISU is working to reach students in their direct service area.

Chairman Mortimer thanked President Satterlee and said it is exciting to have him at ISU. President Satterlee replied it is a fantastic school with a fantastic history.

To hear the complete presentation of Lewis and Clark State College and Idaho State University, go to: https://legislature.idaho.gov/sessioninfo/2019/standingcommittees/SEDU/

Chairman Mortimer passed the gavel to Vice Chairman Thayn.

Helen Price, Program Specialist, Board Materials & Rules, State Department of Education (SDE) presented Docket No. 08-0203-1801, Rules Governing Thoroughness: Special Education Manual. She explained the procedures and approval process implemented in updating this rule. Ms. Price pointed out the changes in the Special Education Manual. She said the changes reflect the current terminology. The outdated terms were either removed or updated.

Chairman Mortimer asked if the updates were changing the terminology or if they are procedural changes. Ms. Price referred the question to Dr. Charlee Silva, Director of Special Education, SDE. Dr. Silva replied the revisions are only updating terminology, not practices.

Senator Den Hartog questioned whether it is the Idaho Bureau of Occupational License that licenses physical and/or occupational therapists. She asked if they would confirm that possible inaccuracy. Tracie Bent, Chief Planning and Policy Officer, State Board of Education, replied the Incorporated by Reference documents are treated the same as actual language with the rules. She said if there is a name error and a technical correction is needed, that can be done by the administrator.

Chairman Mortimer said he has been working with Medicaid reimbursement for schools. He asked if this manual fits with the Federal Medicaid policy to not interfere with Medicaid reimbursement. Dr. Silva replied in the affirmative. She said there is a school Medicaid handbook, that is not in rule, on the SDE website. It is a guide which is updated annually.

Senator Den Hartog asked who will use the document. Dr. Silva replied the Special Education Director and all Special Education Personnel will be using the manual. She said it can be overwhelming but those involved in Special Education are charged to follow the policies. She explained its location on the SDE website and how educators are able to access the information.
Chairman Mortimer moved to accept Docket No. 08-0203-1801. Senator Den Hartog seconded the motion. The motion passed by voice vote.

Amy Lorenzo, Director of Policy & Organizational Planning, Career Technical Education (CTE), presented Docket No. 08-0203-1804, Rules Governing Thoroughness: Career Technical Education. She listed the eleven CTE programs whose educational standards were being updated. She explained the process used to set the program standards involved a comprehensive collaboration between CTE secondary and postsecondary instructors and industry partners.

Vice Chairman Thayn said it is helpful to know the industry partners were involved in setting the standards.

Senator Den Hartog asked if the standards set are aligned to lead the student to licensure. Ms. Lorenzo replied in the affirmative.

Senator Lent asked how often the standards are updated. Ms. Bent replied every two to five years depending on the curriculum. She explained the standards schedule.

Senator Lent moved to accept Docket No. 08-0203-1804. Senator Winder seconded the motion. The motion passed by voice vote.

Vice Chairman Thayn passed the gavel to Chairman Mortimer.

There being no further business at this time, Chairman Mortimer adjourned the meeting at 4:18 p.m.
LCSC’s Educational Mission

“...preparing students to become successful leaders, engaged citizens, and lifelong learners.”

A Framework for Education Outcomes

- Opportunity: Access & Affordability
- Success
- Partnerships

Idaho’s Goals are LCSC’s Goals
Opportunity
Accessibility & Affordability

Question #1: What is going right in your institution?

Question #3: Advanced Opportunities challenges

Opportunity & Accessibility
Education FOR Idaho

- 125-year history of serving Idaho and Idahoans.
- Idaho residents account for 80% of total headcount (2,949 out of 3,684).
- 79% of LCSC’s 950 FA18 honor roll students were Idahoans.
- Students from 43 of Idaho’s 44 counties.
- 66% of LCSC graduates stay in Idaho.
Opportunity & Affordability

Affordability Matters

- 84% of LCSC students receive financial aid, and 35% are low-income (receive Pell grants), the highest total among Idaho’s public four-year institutions consistently.

Opportunity & Affordability

Most Affordable


- In-state tuition at LCSC is over $1,000 less than average of Idaho’s other four-year public institutions.

- Among students who incur debt, typical post-graduation debt at LCSC ($19,061) is $4,247 less than the average among Idaho’s other four-year public institutions ($23,308).
Most Affordable

In-State Tuition & Fees

First Generation Friendly

- 73% of student body are first generation college students, the highest among Idaho’s four-year public institutions.

- First generation students accounted for 61% of LCSC’s fall honor roll.
Dual Credit to Adult Learners

1,120 students completed Dual Credit/Early College coursework through LCSC in 2017-2018 for a total of 6,707 credit hours.

- 20 regional high schools, 44 classes, 114 course sections.
- Challenges...

Launching renewed adult learner initiative:

- Experiential learning credit
- Introductory one-credit course on navigating online courses
- Alternative terms & scheduling (e.g., 8-week terms, evening/weekend classes)
- 30 programs offered fully online
- Supporting & Promoting the State’s adult-focused Opportunity Scholarship

Best College Reviews (Dec 2017) ranked LCSC as #1 school for non-traditional students

Success & Partnerships

We Connect Learning to Life

Question #1: What is going right in your institution?
Question #4: Partnering with other institutions to enhance the learning process and increase accessibility for Idahoans
Success

- Offering a private school feel and quality at a public school price — Outstanding faculty & staff and ideal 13:1 ratio
- Accreditation Hallmark
- 62% of LCSC associate degree graduates continue their education in Idaho
- 97% of CTE and 94% of academic program graduates are successfully placed (job/career or graduate program)
- LCSC has had a record number of graduates in eight of the past 10 years, including the last four (950 last year)
Partnerships
We Connect Learning to Life

- Connecting Learning to Life: Approximately 90% of LCSC programs have an experiential learning component. New initiative will push to ensure that 100% of programs do.

- Workforce Training: 644 non-credit courses had enrollments of 3,563 in 2017-18, an increase of 6.5 percent from the previous year.

- CTE partnership (next slide)
  - Business/Industry, Community and K-12 Education

Schweitzer CTE Center
A partnership with the State ($10M), local industry ($5.2M), the community, and the local school district.

Fall 2020

THANK YOU!
Higher Ed Partnerships

Transfer articulation agreements with:

- North Idaho College
- College of Western Idaho
- College of Southern Idaho
- Signing with College of Eastern Idaho this week (Wednesday, 4 p.m., Main Floor, Rotunda)

Programming partnership examples:

- 2+2: Engineering AS at LCSC, with seamless transfer for BS at UI
- 3+2: Kinesiology instruction at LCSC, transfer to UI for Athletic Training Master’s
- Key online programs (e.g., RN-to-BSN)
- Program referrals for capacity issues

Other partnership examples:

- Reviewing ways to streamline and simplify payment options and processes, and financial resources
- Idaho Regional Optical Network (IRON)

Idaho’s Goals are LCSC’s Goals

60% postsecondary credential/degree

Question #2: Enrollment and increasing costs
**Enrollment: All Hands In!**

![Bar graph showing unduplicated headcount from 2004 to 2018]

**Retention & Completion**

**Student Support Matters**

- **Academic Coaching**
  - Moving advising from transactional information exchange to relational coaching.

- **Student Employment & Career Center**
  - Connecting students to internships, jobs/careers, and alumni networks.

- **Embracing Idaho’s SBOE/System Initiatives:**
  - Direct Admissions, Free & Reduced cost course materials, Complete College America...

**IPEDS Update:**

- Retention is up 6% (from 57% to 63%) among first-time, full-time baccalaureate seeking cohort.
- Completion is also climbing...
Responsible Stewardship of State & Tuition Resources

- No long-term debt
- Unit reorganizations & efficiencies
- Hiring Pause & Reflect

We’re proud of what we do, how we do it, and the role we play in educating Idaho’s citizens for Idaho’s future.

Thank You. Questions?
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<tr>
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<td>Higher Education Service Optimization Study</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation:</td>
<td>Opportunity Scholarship</td>
<td>Matt Freeman, Executive Director, State Board of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation:</td>
<td>Educator Evaluation Review</td>
<td>Tracie Bent, Chief Planning and Policy Officer, State Board of Education</td>
</tr>
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DATE: Wednesday, January 23, 2019
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MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Mortimer, Vice Chairman Thayn, Senators Winder, Den Hartog, Crabtree, Woodward, Lent, Buckner-Webb, and Ward-Engelking
ABSENT/EXCUSED: None
NOTE: The sign-in sheet, testimonies and other related materials will be retained with the minutes in the committee's office until the end of the session and will then be located on file with the minutes in the Legislative Services Library.
CONVENED: Chairman Mortimer called the Education Committee (Committee) to order at 3:00 p.m.
GUBERNATORIAL APPOINTMENT VOTE: Deborah Critchfield, Oakley, ID, re-appointed to the State Board of Education to serve a term Commencing July 1, 2018 and expiring July 1, 2023.
MOTION: Vice Chairman Thayn moved to send the gubernatorial appointment Deborah Critchfield to the State Board of Education to the floor with the recommendation that she be confirmed by the Senate. Senator Crabtree seconded the motion. The motion passed by voice vote.
PRESENTATION: Dr. Chuck Staben, President, University of Idaho (University), presented to the Committee his final report as President of the University. He expressed his appreciation for the opportunity to serve for the past five years.

Dr. Staben responded to the questions Chairman Mortimer gave him the prior week. He detailed the successes of student educational outcomes, agricultural research enterprises, and the promotion of college access through affordability. He commented on the progress of Advanced Opportunities and wondered if the program is serving the students it was designed to help.

Dr. Staben explained the University's efforts to improve the college-going culture with direct admissions; the Fast-Forward program; Vandal Ideas Project: Engage; and Durable Admissions. He pointed out to the Committee the many different areas across the State where the University's law school and extension offices are located. He recounted students' life-changing successes and highlighted an alumni's accomplishments (Attachment 1).

In response to questions from the Committee, Dr. Staben provided information regarding the law school enrollment shift, the variety of scholarships which encourage student enrollment, and the Opportunity Scholarship.

Chairman Mortimer thanked him for his years of service to the University.
PRESENTATION: **Carson Howell,** Chief Financial Officer, State Board of Education (SBE), presented the Higher Education Service Optimization Study. He introduced Andy Scoggin, SBE Board Member, who was involved in the study and who helped with the writing of the report.

**Mr. Howell** said this study comes from the first recommendation from the Governor's Higher Education Task Force; the SBE drives the efficiencies and cost savings which provide a higher level of services through back office functions. The suggestion is to migrate from the current federated system of institutions to a more integrated centralized and student-centric system. He explained how Huron Consulting (Huron) was selected to perform the study. He detailed for the Committee the areas Huron reviewed and their recommendations towards "Systemness."

**Mr. Howell** explained the Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) system and detailed the estimated implementation costs and possible long-term savings. He explained what systems Boise State University (BSU) implemented and was unaware of the costs they incurred to execute their ERP (Attachment 2).

In response to Senator Woodward, **President Chuck Staben,** University, said there is considerable potential with consolidation. He stressed the benefits for the institutions, the students, and the State.

PRESENTATION: **Matt Freeman,** Executive Director, SBE, presented the Opportunity Scholarship (Scholarship) report. He reminded the Committee about history; a merit-based scholarship enacted in 2015 with a 13.5 million appropriation. He detailed the different scholarship programs housed under the Scholarship, the student eligibility requirements, and the demographics of those students who have received the Scholarship.

**Mr. Freeman** spoke about the Adult Learner legislation which was passed in 2018. He said the Workforce Development Council has helped market that portion of the Scholarship and that the information can also be found on the SBE website. He reported the number of applicants for the 2018 fall semester and the total moneys awarded for the Scholarship. **Mr. Freeman** said the Post-Secondary Scholarship, which is based on matching funds, is not being utilized to the fullest; there are unused funds (Attachment 3).

**Mr. Freeman** responded to questions from the Committee. He suggested the statutes for the Scholarship be reviewed; often the timing of awarding the scholarships does not match the school cycle. He stated students receiving scholarships are not necessarily seeking high-demand degrees, and the average GPA for scholarship students is 3.4. **Mr. Freeman** stated the SBE has established new guidelines to facilitate the OP distributions and the scholarship is posted on the SBE and all institutions' websites.
PRESENTATION: Tracie Bent, Chief Planning and Policy Officer, SBE, presented the Educator Evaluation Review. She said Idaho Code § 33-1004 states they must conduct an annual review of a sample of teacher evaluations. She reported the SBE's findings in response to the legislative mandate and gave an overview of the evaluation process and results. Ms. Bent described the methodology of the teacher evaluations and the timeline for completion. She said the SBE staff compiled data from teacher files, on-site visits, and surveys.

Ms. Bent said the professionals who participated in the review included current and past superintendents, district leaders, principals, and faculty for Idaho preparation programs. She detailed the review process and ensured there was accuracy and reliability among the raters; all were chosen based upon their current knowledge and use of the State's evaluation framework. Ms. Bent provided the findings to the Committee. She pointed out the findings show most district leaders are striving to improve the evaluation process for their district (Attachment 4).

RECORDING LINK: To hear all the presentations in completion, go to: https://legislature.idaho.gov/sessioninfo/2019/standingcommittees/SEDU/.
UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO PROGRESS

KEY AREAS OF FOCUS

- Positioning for sustained success: educational excellence, career outcomes, research enterprise
- Promoting access and maintaining affordability
- Ensuring dual-credit students are well-prepared
- Enhancing college-going with targeted programs and approaches
IMPROVING IDAHO'S COLLEGE-GOING CULTURE

- Direct Admissions, Apply Idaho
- Fast Forward dual-credit programs
- Vandal Ideas Project: Engage
- Durable Admissions
ENSURING STUDENT SUCCESS

▪ Current retention & graduation success
▪ VandalStar data management tool
▪ Career-focused experiences: Fenway Group
▪ APLU: Powered by Publics initiative
ACADEMIC EXCELLENCE

STEM DEGREE LEADERSHIP
• Degree production: U of I 1,034, BSU 522
• U of I: 53% of degrees STEM (BSU 27%)

IDAHO WWAMI MEDICAL EDUCATION PROGRAM
• 40 students per year
• Curricular changes – Idaho focus
• Project ECHO

U OF I LAW SCHOOL
• Full three-year programs in Boise and Moscow
• Top value in legal education

ADVANCED EDUCATION
• 36 science and engineering doctorates
LIFE-CHANGING OPPORTUNITIES
“SEE IT, AND YOU CAN BE IT.”

▪ From Jerome, Idaho – a first-generation college student
▪ Graduated in 1997 with a degree from the School of Journalism and Mass Media
▪ Senior Vice President for MAGNA Global, advertising firm
▪ New member of U of I Latino Advisory Council
RESEARCH UNIVERSITY DISTINCTION

RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP WITH IMPACT

- New record in annual expenditures – nearly $111 million – to support discovery and innovation for Idaho
- Integrated with education for high-impact learning experiences
- Connected with K-12 system, helping promote STEM education and pipeline

MCCALL OUTDOOR SCIENCE SCHOOL

- Place-based learning to more than 2,100 K-12 students and educators across Idaho annually
- Successfully building scientific literacy and positive attitudes toward science since 2001 in Idaho
- October 2018, MOSS awarded a national Award of Excellence by the University Economic Development Alliance

NEW HORIZONS

U of I student Rajani Dhingra explores “Ultima Thule” at edge of solar system
THANK YOU
Huron Report Summary
Integrated, centralized and student-centric system. Our current federated system of institutions to a more service in back office functions by migrating from efficiencies, cost savings, and a higher level of.

We recommend the State Board of Education drive.

Recommendation #1

Higher Education Task Force, October 2017
September - December

FY 2019 Appropriation - $250,000

Huron Consulting
Identification of Areas of Efficiency

- Single ERP
- Procurement
- Generalists
- Span of Control
Questions?
Span of Control
Opportunity Scholarship

Accepted Awards by Initial Academic Award Term
16.7%

19.1%

18.6%

20.7%

15.3%

White

Hispanic or Latino

Black or African American

Asian

American Indian or Alaska Native

Eligible Applicant Pool

Opportunity Scholarship

Percent change since FY2016
The higher the attendance rate, the higher the immediate.

Higher GPAs result in higher renewal rates.

Research Highlights

Opportunity Scholarship
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Awards</th>
<th>Eligible</th>
<th>Applicants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2019</td>
<td>$77,438</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2018</td>
<td>$50,000 (est.)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Adult Learners Opportunity Scholarship**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 19 Awards Opportunity Scholarship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$739,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>$777,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Colleges</td>
<td>$1,635,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-Year Institutions</td>
<td>$10,727,652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,755</td>
<td>2,974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,188</td>
<td>993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,803</td>
<td>1,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>764</td>
<td>663</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Retention</th>
<th>Scholarship Renewed</th>
<th>Student Scholarship</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Student Retention Opportunity Scholarship**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Recipients</th>
<th>Dual Credit</th>
<th>Awardsed Scholarships</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
<td>4110</td>
<td>6848</td>
<td></td>
<td>Grand Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64%</td>
<td>1169</td>
<td>1824</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fall 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66%</td>
<td>995</td>
<td>1512</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fall 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58%</td>
<td>1403</td>
<td>2423</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fall 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>1089</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recipient Earning Dual Credit Opportunity Scholarship
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Awards</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Idaho Postsecondary Credit Scholarship
INTRODUCTION
Pursuant to Idaho Code § 33-1004B(14), a review of a sample of teacher evaluations must be conducted annually. Effective July 1, 2015, the statute specifically requires the following:

- A review of a sample of evaluations completed by administrators shall be conducted annually to verify such evaluations are being conducted with fidelity to the state framework for teaching evaluation, including each evaluation component as outlined in administrative rule and the rating given for each component.
- A portion of such administrators’ instructional staff and pupil service staff employee evaluations shall be independently reviewed.

The 2015-16 and 2016-17 Evaluation Reviews (summarized in the FY2017 and FY2018 Reports respectively) were conducted in two phases. The first phase assessed compliance with IDAPA 08.02.02.120 while the second phase reviewed district evaluation policy and implementation. Because districts have now had several years to get policy and processes in place, the 2017-18 on-site and desk reviews assessed these aspects simultaneously.


Background
In response to the legislative mandate that initiated oversight by Idaho State Board of Education staff in conducting the 2015-16 Evaluation Reviews, samples of teacher evaluations and supporting evidence were collected beginning in January 2017. Phases One and Two of the Evaluation Review were completed in March 2017, and a final report was presented to the Idaho State Board of Education at the June 2017 meeting.

The FY17 report concluded that inconsistent communication from state entities compounded confusion created over time in the wake of multiple changes to Idaho’s evaluation processes. As a result, not all districts were implementing all aspects of evaluation rule with fidelity – with approximately 30% of evaluations reviewed missing one or more critical elements of the evaluation requirements. To address the areas found to be consistently noncompliant, detailed recommendations were put forth in both final reports encompassing the following areas:

1. Amend IDAPA 08.02.02.120 to clarify, simplify and better align with code for instructional staff, and redefine evaluation standards for pupil service staff based upon their own professional standards
2. Make additional guidance and training available to administrators
3. Create a coalition of representatives for Idaho administrator preparation programs to define consistent measures of preparedness, including specific competencies for administrator recertification requirements
4. Create a clearinghouse of best evaluation practices to be shared across districts

Of these five strands, work was complete through the legislatures acceptance of rule changes during the 2018 Legislature regarding recommendation 1 and work has begun or is substantially complete on the remaining three recommendations. Trainings on evaluation procedures and evidence collection were conducted throughout the state from late September to late October 2017 and 2018. Feedback from the field this year were centered around similar themes as prior years.

In March 2018, superintendents were notified of the pending FY2019 review and informed on which administrators were selected from their districts. Additional information was provided on the process for collecting evidence. As with the previous reviews, the FY19 review focused on the requirements called out in IDAPA 08.02.02.120. The review requires districts to provide evidence that district evaluations meet the fidelity of the state’s evaluation model outlined in administrative rule, including the following:
(i) the evidence used in scoring teacher evaluations;
(ii) documentation of teaching observations;
(iii) progress in documenting teacher’s individual professional learning plans;
(iv) demonstration of growth in student achievement, and;
(v) proof of professional practice as shown through parent or student input, or a portfolio of professional work.

The 2017-2018 Evaluation Review commenced in August 2018 with districts beginning to upload evidence for review. On-site reviews took place from the end of September 2018 through October 2018. A full desk review of remaining evaluations was completed on October 26, 2018, and reviewers discussed possible process improvements and recommendations going forward. The attached report provides the findings and recommendations from the FY2019 evaluation review process.

**METHODS: FY2019 EVALUATION REVIEW**

The Office of the State Board of Education (OSBE) staff randomly selected 180 administrators who conducted evaluations in the 2017-2018 school year. For each administrator chosen, the district was required to upload to a secure server at least two evaluations (with relevant supporting documents) completed in 2017-2018 for both teachers and/or pupil service staff who were randomly selected by Board staff. All evaluation materials were redacted of identifying information, not only to ensure a fully blind review but also confidentiality due to the sensitive nature of the evidence being assessed. In most cases, each evaluation was assessed and scored separately by two different reviewers.

The Office of the State Board of Education (OSBE) staff randomly selected 45 of the 180 LEAs, for an onsite detailed review. Each administrator was instructed to provide two evaluations from
instructional staff and/or pupil service staff for on-site review. Table 1 provides the timeline for data collection and review.

Table 1. Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3/31/2018</td>
<td>Sent out notification to superintendents of randomly selected administrators (102 total LEAs) notifying them which administrators were chosen for evaluation review. Email included sample evidence for districts to model as they prepared their own uploads.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/1/2018</td>
<td>OSBE secure server opened for districts to upload evidence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/25-9/27/18</td>
<td>Regions I and II Training and onsite review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/2-10/3/2018</td>
<td>Region III Training and onsite review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/9-10/11/2018</td>
<td>Region IV Training and onsite review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/16-10/18/2017</td>
<td>Regions V and VI Training and onsite review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/23/18</td>
<td>Server closed and all evaluation materials and completed surveys downloaded and prepared for review and data collection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/24-10/26/2018</td>
<td>Reconvened reviewers to complete desk reviews and discuss data and anecdotal information from on-site reviews, and to assist in developing recommendations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Sources

Board staff collected 327 files containing evaluations conducted on certificated staff through the method described above (163 of 180 administrators submitted evaluations). As with the FY17 and FY18 review, the sample of administrators chosen for review purposefully represents the distribution of school administrators by region across the state of Idaho. This sample represents approximately 20% of administrators statewide, and 20% of certificated staff. Virtual charter schools and IDLA were included in the sampling and reported based on the region in which they are based. In addition to collecting two evaluations per administrator, each administrator was asked to fill out a survey designed to gauge individual perception of preparedness in conducting evaluations, level of desire for additional training in areas related to accurate, growth-producing evaluation practice. Included among the appendices is a full list of districts involved in the review, with districts selected for on-site visits denoted in bold font (Appendix A). A copy of the Administrator's Evaluation Feedback Survey administered during the first phase of the review is also included (Appendix B). The key purpose of the on-site visits was to record qualitative data, as supplied by district office personnel and administrators, regarding implementation of - and fidelity to - the state framework for evaluation. In addition to reviewers’ notes, feedback was captured in a survey completed by the teachers evaluated by administrators. Completion of surveys for teachers was entirely voluntary. This survey instrument for teachers is included in this report as Appendix C.
Review process
A team of 15 experienced educators from across Idaho participated in the review, including current and past superintendents, district leaders, principals, and faculty from Idaho educator preparation programs. A list of reviewers is included as Appendix D. The criteria for reviewing the evaluation documents was drawn directly from IDAPA 08.02.02.120 and Idaho Code § 33-1004B(14) for both instructional personnel and pupil service personnel, as applicable.

The purpose of the desk review, was for each reviewer to assess administrator compliance in conducting evaluations in the following areas: completeness in assigning a score for each of the 22 components of the state framework; reported dates of two documented observations; compliance in using at least one other district-selected measure to inform professional practice; and reported measure(s) of student achievement. A graphic of the content and rationale for each aspect reviewed in this part of the process is included as Appendix E. The process initiated last year was continued, in which all evaluations were blind reviewed by two separate reviewers, with discrepancies being resolved by a third reviewer.

For onsite visits, a volunteer subset of the 15 member team responsible for conducting the desk reviews participated. The purpose of onsite visits was for each reviewer to not only assess administrator compliance, but also to capture feedback and recommendations from practitioners closest to the evaluation process. Teachers voluntarily participated in surveys to assist reviewers in better understanding the implementation of district evaluation policies. During on-site visits, district leaders were interviewed to better understand strengths and challenges in practice.

Reliability of Reviewers
To ensure accuracy and reliability among raters, all reviewers participating were chosen based upon their current knowledge and use of the state’s evaluation framework. The team participated in a three-hour training session reviewing the criteria, discussing state requirements, and participating in calibration activities. Five sample evaluations were chosen for review. Each reviewer evaluated the samples independently, then in a small group lead by veteran reviewers. The entire team then discussed the samples and compared ratings. Training included clarifying conversations about current requirements, and opportunities throughout the three-day review to recalibrate, both in small group and full group discussions, as anomalies arose.

Data Analysis
Data presented here regarding compliance in evaluation practice consists of the total number and percentages of compliant elements required for instructional staff and pupil service staff evaluations (n=327) as submitted by district administrators. These elements include components of the state framework for evaluation, dates of documented observations, measures of professional practice and student achievement.

Data from the Evaluation Feedback Survey (Appendix B) provides an overview of the perceptions of the selected administrators related to their preparedness in conducting evaluations and their desire for additional training.
Data from surveys completed by teachers (Appendix C) is also included for the purpose of exploring teacher understanding of district policy, and perceptions on evaluation as a means for professional growth.

FINDINGS

The findings presented here are based upon the criteria for completing evaluations of certificated personnel called out in IDAPA 08.02.02.120 to determine compliance with state law. These include:

- Use of the state framework which is comprised of 22 components;
- Two documented observations, the first conducted prior to January 1;
- A measure of professional practice such as portfolio or student/parent feedback, and;
- District/teacher selected measure of student performance.

Data Specific to Compliance with IDAPA 08.02.02.120

Compliance – Evaluations meeting all IDAPA requirements

Figure 1. Evaluations meeting all areas of compliance required by the state

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pupil Service Staff</th>
<th>32%</th>
<th>68%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Staff</th>
<th>71%</th>
<th>29%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

☐ Meets all requirements ☐ Does not meet all requirements

Overall compliance increased significantly for instructional staff from 56% in FY2017 to 71% in FY2018 upon clarification of Board Rule for evaluation scoring and documented evidence. There was a low rate of compliance for pupil service staff evaluations due to the transition from requiring the instructional staff evaluation framework to allowing school districts to use performance standards adopted from individual professional organizations.

While a larger number of pupil service staff evaluations were not compliant, most reviewers agreed that the evaluations were being conducted substantively and effectively. Looking at compliance disaggregated by
region, however, the increased number of compliant evaluations for instructional staff is in no way consistent across the state:

**Figure 2. Scores by Component for Instructional Staff**
Compliance increased slightly from 79% in FY18 to 84% in FY19 for instructional staff evaluations. Pupil service staff indicate a much lower level of compliance with rating all 22 components.

**Figure 2:** Evaluations in which all 22 components of the framework were rated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pupil Service Staff</th>
<th>54%</th>
<th>46%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Staff</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

☐ All 22 components have scores  ☐ Some components missing scores

**Figure 3. Scores by Component for Instructional Staff**

### Instructional Staff

| Component 4F | 98% |
| Component 4E | 98% |
| Component 4D | 97% |
| Component 4C | 97% |
| Component 4B | 97% |
| Component 4A | 96% |
| Component 3E | 98% |
| Component 3D | 98% |
| Component 3C | 96% |
| Component 3B | 94% |
| Component 3A | 97% |
| Component 2E | 99% |
| Component 2D | 95% |
| Component 2C | 94% |
| Component 2B | 97% |
| Component 2A | 97% |
| Component 1F | 98% |
| Component 1E | 96% |
| Component 1D | 95% |
| Component 1C | 98% |
| Component 1B | 96% |
| Component 1A | 98% |
Consistent with the FY2017 and FY2018 results, Component 3b-Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques, is the area in which the majority of instructional staff struggle the most along with the addition of Component 2c-Managing Classroom Procedures. This certainly can be seen as an area for increased preparation and professional development opportunities.

**Figure 4. Scores by component for Pupil Service Staff**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pupil Service Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Component 4F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component 4E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component 4D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component 4C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component 4B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component 4A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component 3E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component 3D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component 3C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component 3B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component 3A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component 2E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component 2D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component 2C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component 2B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component 2A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component 1F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component 1E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component 1D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component 1C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component 1B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component 1A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Component 1a-Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy is the area in which the majority of pupil service staff struggle the most. This certainly can be seen as an area professional development opportunities, but may also be a function of the difficulty for to districts to accurately assess pupil service staff.
Figure 4. Evaluations based upon a minimum of two documented observations (n=327)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Type</th>
<th>Have two documented observations</th>
<th>Do not have two documented observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pupil Service Staff</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Staff</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The increase in compliance for this requirement, up from 74%, most likely reflects increased awareness that documentation of observations would be collected. By the time the FY17 evaluation review began, many districts had destroyed evaluation evidence from the previous year. Because district leaders were notified of the FY19 Review prior to the end of the school year, those documents were not destroyed.

Figure 5. Evaluations including at least one district selected measure of performance (n=327)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Type</th>
<th>Have measure of professional practice</th>
<th>Do not have measure of professional practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pupil Service Staff</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Staff</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6. Evaluations including at least one measure of student performance (n=327)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Type</th>
<th>Have measure of student achievement</th>
<th>Do not have measure of student achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pupil Service Staff</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Staff</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In summary, the slight improvement in overall compliance, represented by a 5% increase from the FY17 to the FY18 Review, likely has more to do with greater awareness in reporting than significant change in practice.

Looking at compliance disaggregated by region, however, the increased number of compliant evaluations for instructional staff is in no way consistent across the state:

**Figure 7. Evaluations meeting all areas of compliance required by the region (n=327)**

**Fully Compliant Evaluations: Instructional Staff**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Meets all requirements</th>
<th>Does not meet all requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Region 6</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 5</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 4</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 3</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 2</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 1</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary, Regions 1, 3, 4, and 5 are above the state average in overall compliance.

**Data Specific to Implementation of Evaluation and Related Professional Learning**

**Evaluation Feedback Survey (Administrators) - Results**

Of the 163 administrators who participated in the review, 31% responded to the Evaluation Feedback Survey (n=52). Their geographic distribution indicates a fairly representative sample. While the absolute validity of these survey results must be considered in light of potential response bias, administrator feedback collected through the FY2019 survey instrument remained consistent with information collected through last year’s survey and two years of onsite visit interviews:

- 100% of administrators indicated that they regularly collected performance evidence to support evaluations, with 94% indicating they were confident in their ability to interpret and accurately rate performance evidence. 27% of administrators responded that they would like additional support/training in using evidence to accurately evaluate teachers
• 96% indicated that they regularly engaged in professional conversations about teacher practice stemming from observations/evaluation, with 56% responding that they would like additional support/training in facilitating those conversations.

• 88% of administrators believe evaluations of staff professional practice are completely or mostly accurate, though only 77% believe that the measure of staff impact on student success is completely or mostly accurate.

Figure 8a provides information on areas in which administrators would like additional support:

**Evaluation Feedback Survey (Teachers) - Results**
Teachers who were evaluated in 2017-18 by administrators chosen for review were sent the Evaluation Feedback survey. Unlike the survey for administrators, teacher surveys were completely anonymous, and participation was voluntary. Respondents (n=596) provided input on implementation of evaluation practice in their district and indicated areas for future professional learning in evaluation. Results were slightly stronger than those in the FY2017 report and are as follows:

• 91% of teachers indicated confidence in their ability to provide evidence to support an accurate evaluation of each of the 22 components up from 74%, though 53% reported a desire for more training in this area.

• 92% of teachers reported their administrators regularly collected evaluation evidence, up from 73% in 2016-17.

• 84% of teachers, up from 73%, reported their administrators regularly engaged with them in professional conversations about their practice

• Unlike the 88% of administrators who believe evaluations of staff professional practice are completely or mostly accurate, only 71% of staff agree. Compared to 77% of administrators, only 58% certificated staff believe that the measure of their impact on student success is completely or mostly accurate.
In summary, the FY2018 evaluation review represent dramatic improvement in the percentage of compliant evaluations statewide. Except for Region 6 evaluations, overall compliance is much higher as a result of trainings and clarifying rule changes. In light of feedback from both administrators participating in the review and those who conducted the reviews, however, further clarification may still be necessary to further increase consistency and fidelity in evaluation practice.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION
The two previous reports determined that inconsistent communication from state entities compounded confusion created over time in the wake of multiple changes to Idaho’s evaluation processes. As a result, not all districts were implementing all aspects of evaluation rule with fidelity - with approximately 40% of evaluations reviewed missing one or more critical elements of the evaluation requirements.

Changes to Board Rule on evaluation were put into temporary rule in fall 2017. Trainings on evaluation procedures and evidence collection were conducted throughout the state from late September to late October 2018, and an administrator recertification course addressing all aspects of evaluation requirements is in development and will be launched in spring 2019.

Conclusion
As was the case in the FY2017 and FY2018 report, the vast majority of districts leaders are striving to improve evaluation processes for their districts and within their buildings. Following two years of rule clarification and training, 71% of the evaluations of certificated instructional staff are compliant with Idaho rule and statute, equating to a 20% increase in compliance since 2017. During the FY2019 Review administrators restated the need for consistency and support from all state level agencies, and reiterated their desire to ensure that evaluation process emphasizes professional growth and continuous improvement, in addition to accountability.
RANDOMLY SELECTED ADMINISTRATORS FROM IDAHO PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICTS

- Administrators provide evaluations representing a variety of certificated staff (self-selected during onsite visits to display a range of performance levels)
- Evaluations and supporting documents reviewed (onsite reviews included qualitative data collection: discussion of practice, support, and needs)
- All identifying staff information redacted for confidentiality in all cases

ADMINISTRATORS AND TEACHER SURVEYS Completed to capture multiple perspectives and needs assessment

REVIEWERS

- Practitioners with verified knowledge of Idaho’s evaluation requirements
- Responsible for signing a confidentiality agreement prior to service
- During onsite reviews, recorded feedback from both district leaders and administrators on challenges and strengths related to evaluation

Is this an SDE Approved Policy?
Are all 22 components of the state’s evaluation framework accounted for?
What score ranging between 1 and 4 (or 1-3) is awarded per each component?
Is there evidence of at least 2 observations? Date of #1? Date of #2?
Is there evidence of performance other than observation? If yes; parental, student, or portfolio?
Is there evidence of a student achievement/growth measure? If yes; ISAT, EOC, SLO or Other?
Alignment of practice to rule
Perception of accuracy/fidelity in evaluation
Use of teacher evaluation data
Needs assessment

ALL DATA POINTS COLLECTED VIA SURVEY MONKEY

Statutorily Required Review of Domains and Components
Idaho Code § 33-1004B

Review of Compliance with Evaluation Rule
IdAPA 08.02.02.120

Data to Inform Clarity of Process and Fidelity of Practice
Idaho Code § 33-1004B and Evaluation Rule
08.02.02.120
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>PRESENTER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RS26527</td>
<td>Technical Change to the 2018 School Board Election bill</td>
<td>Senator Mary Souza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS26582</td>
<td>School Improvement</td>
<td>Chairman Dean M. Mortimer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation:</td>
<td>Teacher of the Year 2019</td>
<td>Marc Beitia, American Falls High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation:</td>
<td>Advanced Opportunities</td>
<td>Dr. Tina Polishchuk, Coordinator, Advanced Opportunities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*If you have written testimony, please provide a copy of it along with the name of the person or organization responsible to the committee secretary to ensure accuracy of records.*

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS**
- Chairman Mortimer
- Vice Chairman Thayn
- Sen Winder
- Sen Den Hartog
- Sen Crabtree

**COMMITTEE SECRETARY**
- LeAnn Mohr
  - Room: WW39
  - Phone: 332-1321
  - email: sedu@senate.idaho.gov
MINUTES
SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

DATE: Thursday, January 24, 2019
TIME: 3:00 P.M.
PLACE: Room WW55

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Mortimer, Vice Chairman Thayn, Senators Winder, Den Hartog, Crabtree, Woodward, Lent, Buckner-Webb, and Ward-Engelking

ABSENT/EXCUSED: None

NOTE: The sign-in sheet, testimonies and other related materials will be retained with the minutes in the committee's office until the end of the session and will then be located on file with the minutes in the Legislative Services Library.

CONVENED: Chairman Mortimer called the Education Committee (Committee) to order at 3:01 p.m.

RS 26527 Senator Souza presented RS 26527, Technical Change to the 2018 School Board Election bill. She said the change in the proposed legislation is adding one word and removing unnecessary hyphens. She explained how the removal of the word "January" was necessary.

MOTION: Senator Den Hartog moved to send RS 26527 to print. Senator Crabtree seconded the motion. The motion passed by voice vote.

PASSED THE GAVEL: Chairman Mortimer passed the gavel to Vice Chairman Thayn.

RS 26582 Relating to Education; School Improvement.

MOTION: Senator Winder moved to send RS 26582 to print. Senator Den Hartog seconded the motion. The motion passed by voice vote.

PASSED THE GAVEL: Vice Chairman Thayn passed the gavel to Chairman Mortimer.

PRESENTATION: Dwight Johnson, State Administrator, Career Technical Education (CTE), Introduced Idaho's 2019 Teacher of the Year, Marc Beitia, American Falls High School, American Falls. He said it is a great privilege to have a CTE instructor be named the teacher of the year and then detailed Mr. Beitia's accomplishments.

Chairman Mortimer congratulated Mr. Beitia for his award and invited him to the podium to report on his teaching career accomplishments and share teaching experiences.

Mr. Beitia said as well as teaching, he also serves as the mayor of American Falls. He spoke about the ongoing shortage of a trained technical workers in Idaho and indicated the need for continued funding support in the CTE curriculum. He said he became a teacher because he was passionate about student learning. He expressed his concerns regarding teachers leaving the profession for a variety of reasons. Mr. Beitia reported the demographic makeup of American Falls' student population. Because of the economically disadvantaged situation, area businesses and industries participate in helping to offset the costs associated with the Future Farmers of America (FFA) programs. He told stories to the Committee about students whose careers have benefited from the CTE and FFA programs.
In response to Committee questions, Mr. Beita said it is difficult to recruit and retain teachers for a variety of reasons, the main reason he believes, is that teachers do not feel valued. The pay is low, and they seem to feel disrespected in their communities.

PRESENTATION: Sherri Ybarra, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, introduced Dr. Tina Polishchuk, Coordinator, Advanced Opportunities (AO), State Department of Education (SDE).

Dr. Polishchuk explained the variety of programs which form the AO program, the funding history, participation by grade level, and the top-ten general and non-general education courses students have enrolled in. She explained the program quality is measured with the National Alliance of Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships (NACEP) to ensure the teachers, who are teaching the dual credits, maintain the same level of rigor as the college and university instructors.

Dr. Polishchuk explained the partnership students have with college advisers and career mentors has led to much of the successes in the AO program. She highlighted the promotions that SDE hosts to encourage enrollment. She shared the concerns about the enrollment reduction in low-income students and reported out the diverse ethnicities present.

Dr. Polishchuk listing the factors that lead to successful student achievement. She expressed concerns with school districts not understanding Idaho Code and Statutes and how they are not delivering AO correctly. She concluded her presentation by telling the story of a student who graduated high school with an associates degree and how it is furthering her career path (Attachment 1).

In response to Committee questions, Dr. Polishchuk detailed how colleges and universities are making the philosophical shift in how and who they educate. She said the credit costs are to be addressed at the next State Board of Education's Board meeting. She detailed how good leadership models make AO thrive and how the institutions are helping teachers execute the course work. She called attention to the ongoing role of the SDE in AO.

Chairman Mortimer thanked Dr. Polishchuk and the SDE for her presentation and the continued work in seeing AO to fruition.

RECORDING LINK: To hear the complete presentation, go to https://legislature.idaho.gov/sessioninfo/2019/standingcommittees/SEDU/.

ADJOURNED: There being no further business at this time, Chairman Mortimer adjourned the meeting at 4:07 p.m.

___________________________ ___________________________
Senator Dean M. Mortimer LeAnn Mohr
Chair Secretary
Annual Totals FY 18

Compiled July 25, 2018

*All figures are based on data pulled July 5, 2018.
# Advanced Opportunities Activity and Payment Distributions: FY 18

## Fast Forward Program

### Examinations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Examinations</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Headcount</th>
<th>Students Served</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exam Total</td>
<td>$1,431,672.50</td>
<td>16,218</td>
<td>9,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Placement (AP)</td>
<td>$1,188,890.00</td>
<td>13,272</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Baccalaureate (IB)</td>
<td>$69,400.00</td>
<td>583</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Certification Exams (CTE)</td>
<td>$141,257.50</td>
<td>1,985</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Level Examination Program (CLEP)</td>
<td>$32,125.00</td>
<td>378</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Overload Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overload Courses</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Headcount</th>
<th>Students Served</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overload Total</td>
<td>$1,100,937.00</td>
<td>10,613</td>
<td>6,824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho Digital Learning</td>
<td>$557,690.00</td>
<td>7,436</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Districts</td>
<td>$502,512.00</td>
<td>2,909</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Brigham Young Univ-Independent Study</td>
<td>$40,735.00</td>
<td>268</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Dual Credit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dual Credit</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Headcount</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Students Served</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boise State University</td>
<td>$1,455,490.00</td>
<td>7,437</td>
<td>22,407</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Eastern Idaho</td>
<td>$4,015.00</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Southern Idaho</td>
<td>$2,054,241.00</td>
<td>10,307</td>
<td>31,372</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Western Idaho</td>
<td>$3,705,745.00</td>
<td>18,032</td>
<td>57,096</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho State University</td>
<td>$1,373,283.00</td>
<td>6,572</td>
<td>21,161</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis-Clark State College</td>
<td>$349,320.00</td>
<td>1,656</td>
<td>5,289</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Idaho College</td>
<td>$1,029,795.00</td>
<td>6,044</td>
<td>15,928</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Idaho</td>
<td>$784,655.00</td>
<td>3,806</td>
<td>12,063</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Brigham Young University-Idaho</td>
<td>$3,900.00</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Northwest Nazarene University</td>
<td>$1,096,150.00</td>
<td>5,822</td>
<td>16,867</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Treasure Valley Community College</td>
<td>$103,500.00</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>1,619</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Other</td>
<td>$50,745.00</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>831</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Dual Credit Tuition** | $12,010,839.00 |          |        |

**Out-of-District Tuition** | $1,394,950.00 |

* Funds sent to school districts for distribution related to this activity

## Early Graduation Scholarship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Early Graduation Scholarship</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Students Awarded Scholarships</th>
<th>Eligible Scholarships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post-secondary Scholarships</td>
<td>$118,881.00</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School District Awards</td>
<td>$357,115.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cost of identical college credits after high school: $55,009,327.04

In FY 17, every $1.00 spent on dual credit through AO saved families 4.58 on college tuition.
## Advanced Opportunities Demographic Breakdown FY 18

**Total Students** 32,124

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Percent Participating in Adv Ops</th>
<th>Statewide Comparable Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>0.66%</td>
<td>1.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>2.06%</td>
<td>1.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>0.83%</td>
<td>1.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>4,581</td>
<td>14.26%</td>
<td>17.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td>0.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>25,579</td>
<td>79.63%</td>
<td>75.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>2.25%</td>
<td>2.46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Percent Participating in Adv Ops</th>
<th>Statewide Comparable Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>18,477</td>
<td>57.52%</td>
<td>48.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>13,647</td>
<td>42.48%</td>
<td>51.17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Demographics</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Percent Participating in Adv Ops</th>
<th>Statewide Comparable Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private/Homeschool</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>0.66%</td>
<td>0.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free/Reduced Lunch</td>
<td>8,911</td>
<td>27.74%</td>
<td>32.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>1.79%</td>
<td>9.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504</td>
<td>1,162</td>
<td>3.62%</td>
<td>4.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Risk</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>2.38%</td>
<td>4.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Learners</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>1.29%</td>
<td>2.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifted</td>
<td>3,857</td>
<td>12.01%</td>
<td>7.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neglected/Delinquent</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
<td>0.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>1.15%</td>
<td>1.83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Advanced Opportunities Participation and Expenditure FY 18
ID
785
463
44
455
470
372
242
253
491
458
363
490
331
41
171
287
272
559
274
451
2
149
414
282
273
111
133
418
3
288
150
71
202
305
181
136
401
314
768
251
381
493
151
316
415
243
271
93
134
131
25
139
201
261
411
322
221
59
137
461
351
487
480
452
33
55
283
21
244
475
412
340
281

LEA Name
MERIDIAN MEDICAL ARTS CHARTER
VISION CHARTER SCHOOL
PLUMMER‐WORLEY JOINT DISTRICT
COMPASS CHARTER SCHOOL
Kootenai Bridge Academy
NEW PLYMOUTH DISTRICT
COTTONWOOD JOINT DISTRICT
WEST JEFFERSON DISTRICT
COEUR D'ALENE CHARTER ACADEMY DISTRICT
LIBERTY CHARTER
MARSING JOINT DISTRICT
IDAHO DISTANCE EDUCATION ACADEMY DISTRICT
MINIDOKA COUNTY JOINT DISTRICT
ST MARIES JOINT DISTRICT
OROFINO JOINT DISTRICT
TROY SCHOOL DISTRICT
LAKELAND DISTRICT
THOMAS JEFFERSON CHARTER DISTRICT
KOOTENAI DISTRICT
VICTORY CHARTER SCHOOL
JOINT SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 2
NORTH GEM DISTRICT
KIMBERLY DISTRICT
GENESEE JOINT DISTRICT
POST FALLS DISTRICT
BUTTE COUNTY JOINT DISTRICT
WILDER DISTRICT
MURTAUGH JOINT DISTRICT
KUNA JOINT DISTRICT
WHITEPINE JT SCHOOL DISTRICT
SODA SPRINGS JOINT DISTRICT
GARDEN VALLEY DISTRICT
WEST SIDE JOINT DISTRICT
HIGHLAND JOINT DISTRICT
CHALLIS JOINT DISTRICT
MELBA JOINT DISTRICT
TETON COUNTY DISTRICT
DIETRICH DISTRICT
MERIDIAN TECHNICAL CHARTER DISTRICT
JEFFERSON COUNTY JT DISTRICT
AMERICAN FALLS JOINT DISTRICT
NORTH STAR CHARTER DISTRICT
CASSIA COUNTY JOINT DISTRICT
RICHFIELD DISTRICT
HANSEN DISTRICT
SALMON RIVER JOINT SCHOOL DIST
COEUR D'ALENE DISTRICT
BONNEVILLE JOINT DISTRICT
MIDDLETON DISTRICT
NAMPA SCHOOL DISTRICT
POCATELLO DISTRICT
VALLIVUE SCHOOL DISTRICT
PRESTON JOINT DISTRICT
JEROME JOINT DISTRICT
TWIN FALLS DISTRICT
SUGAR‐SALEM JOINT DISTRICT
EMMETT INDEPENDENT DIST
FIRTH DISTRICT
PARMA DISTRICT
TAYLORS CROSSING CHARTER SCHOOL
ONEIDA COUNTY DISTRICT
FORREST M. BIRD CHARTER DISTRICT
NORTH IDAHO STEM CHARTER ACADEMY DISTRICT
IDAHO VIRTUAL ACADEMY
BEAR LAKE COUNTY DISTRICT
BLACKFOOT DISTRICT
KENDRICK JOINT DISTRICT
MARSH VALLEY JOINT DISTRICT
MOUNTAIN VIEW SCHOOL DISTRICT
SAGE INTERNATIONAL SCHOOL OF BOISE
BUHL JOINT DISTRICT
LEWISTON INDEPENDENT DISTRICT
MOSCOW DISTRICT

AO Payment FY 17
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AO Participation

134,380.00
138,200.00
7,720.00
134,590.00
11,895.00
129,580.00
46,939.50
29,630.00
103,934.00
55,380.00
56,790.00
59,810.00
194,935.00
39,070.00
83,565.00
31,455.00
235,125.00
33,182.00
5,056.00
47,385.00
2,657,144.50
5,530.00
115,553.00
30,610.00
268,258.00
8,060.00
25,790.00
20,234.00
276,626.80
9,165.00
59,990.00
14,700.00
50,966.00
5,974.00
15,430.00
87,479.00
58,222.00
8,730.00
33,863.00
230,029.00
42,868.00
55,651.00
178,662.00
5,700.00
16,135.00
8,479.00
471,034.00
724,542.00
351,022.00
754,508.00
638,448.00
621,281.20
83,992.00
146,845.00
478,493.00
104,953.00
126,591.00
44,389.00
68,705.00
24,660.00
36,080.00
27,670.00
32,195.00
93,665.00
55,640.00
107,645.00
7,360.00
38,375.00
28,935.00
30,415.00
29,573.00
190,952.00
95,783.00

144
152
9
170
16
189
71
45
161
87
90
96
325
66
146
55
412
59
9
85
4,788
10
211
56
491
15
48
38
527
18
118
29
101
12
31
176
120
18
70
477
89
116
376
12
34
18
1,004
1,545
749
1,623
1,392
1,356
184
324
1,056
236
285
100
156
56
83
64
75
221
133
260
18
95
72
76
74
478
240
3

Total Students
7‐12

193
291
150
360
235
467
188
305
557
204
383
294
1,986
453
564
137
2,179
168
72
194
18,057
79
832
158
2,621
169
211
142
2,535
113
393
118
284
82
172
416
788
93
201
2,477
656
325
2,482
75
135
54
4,823
5,597
1,964
6,594
5,914
3,837
1,316
1,742
4,040
832
1,162
372
500
169
429
300
115
1,155
497
1,863
89
597
592
452
566
2,250
1,116

Percent
Participation Rank

75%
52%
6%
47%
7%
40%
38%
15%
29%
43%
23%
33%
16%
15%
26%
40%
19%
35%
13%
44%
27%
13%
25%
35%
19%
9%
23%
27%
21%
16%
30%
25%
36%
15%
18%
42%
15%
19%
35%
19%
14%
36%
15%
16%
25%
33%
21%
28%
38%
25%
24%
35%
14%
19%
26%
28%
25%
27%
31%
33%
19%
21%
65%
19%
27%
14%
20%
16%
12%
17%
13%
21%
22%

1
3
137
4
134
10
13
109
34
8
64
28
100
111
52
11
89
20
120
5
49
119
54
17
91
129
68
44
80
102
32
59
16
110
95
9
107
82
21
84
115
15
108
101
57
25
79
39
12
58
63
18
112
92
51
36
60
43
30
26
83
74
2
86
45
113
81
103
122
98
117
75
72

Expenditure per
Participating Student
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933.19
909.21
857.78
791.71
743.44
685.61
661.12
658.44
645.55
636.55
631.00
623.02
599.80
591.97
572.36
571.91
570.69
562.41
561.78
557.47
554.96
553.00
547.64
546.61
546.35
537.33
537.29
532.47
524.91
509.17
508.39
506.90
504.61
497.83
497.74
497.04
485.18
485.00
483.76
482.24
481.66
479.75
475.16
475.00
474.56
471.06
469.16
468.96
468.65
464.88
458.66
458.17
456.48
453.23
453.12
444.72
444.18
443.89
440.42
440.36
434.70
432.34
429.27
423.82
418.35
414.02
408.89
403.95
401.88
400.20
399.64
399.48
399.10

Expenditure Rank

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
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16
17
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20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
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38
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51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>LEA Name</th>
<th>AO Payment FY 17</th>
<th>Total Students 7-12</th>
<th>Expenditure per Participating Student</th>
<th>Participation Rank</th>
<th>Expenditure Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>413</td>
<td>FILER DISTRICT</td>
<td>$70,528.00</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231</td>
<td>GOODINGS JOINT DISTRICT</td>
<td>$45,749.00</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321</td>
<td>MADISON DISTRICT</td>
<td>$207,224.00</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>2,441</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>BOUNDARY COUNTY JOINT DISTRICT</td>
<td>$56,653.00</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>FREMONT COUNTY JOINT DISTRICT</td>
<td>$36,449.00</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>373</td>
<td>FRANKLINDALE</td>
<td>$72,401.00</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>GLENNS FERRY JOINT DISTRICT</td>
<td>$9,455.00</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>WEST BONNER COUNTY DISTRICT</td>
<td>$35,055.00</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312</td>
<td>SHOSHONE JOINT DISTRICT</td>
<td>$15,450.00</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>GRACE JOINT DISTRICT</td>
<td>$24,060.00</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>ABERDEEN DISTRICT</td>
<td>$33,055.00</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>371</td>
<td>PAVETTE JOINT DISTRICT</td>
<td>$84,469.00</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>391</td>
<td>KELLOGG JOINT DISTRICT</td>
<td>$19,425.00</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>341</td>
<td>LAPWAI DISTRICT</td>
<td>$15,335.00</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>421</td>
<td>MCCALL-DONNELLY JT. SCHOOL DISTRICT</td>
<td>$66,605.00</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>431</td>
<td>WEISER DISTRICT</td>
<td>$62,735.00</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>SHELLEY JOINT DISTRICT</td>
<td>$68,489.00</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>1,040</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233</td>
<td>HAGERMAN JOINT DISTRICT</td>
<td>$16,060.00</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>417</td>
<td>CASTLEFORD</td>
<td>$14,565.00</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>433</td>
<td>MIDVALE DISTRICT</td>
<td>$5,675.00</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285</td>
<td>POTLATCH DISTRICT</td>
<td>$16,525.00</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>CROOKED HILL DISTRICT</td>
<td>$264,522.00</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>2,764</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>476</td>
<td>Another Choice Virtual Charter District</td>
<td>$4,180.00</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>NOTUS DISTRICT</td>
<td>$20,205.00</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>BLAINE COUNTY DISTRICT</td>
<td>$181,801.00</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>1,623</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>465</td>
<td>NORTH VALLEY ACADEMY</td>
<td>$5,099.00</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>VALLEY DISTRICT</td>
<td>$7,720.00</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>393</td>
<td>WARD VALLEY DISTRICT</td>
<td>$13,045.00</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>489</td>
<td>IDAHO COLLEGE &amp; CAREER READINESS ACADEMY</td>
<td>$2,600.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>BOISE INDEPENDENT DISTRICT</td>
<td>$1,083,328.50</td>
<td>3,339</td>
<td>12,310</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>MACKAY JOINT DISTRICT</td>
<td>$8,515.00</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>CLARK COUNTY DISTRICT</td>
<td>$6,850.00</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>485</td>
<td>IDAHO STEM ACADEMY DBA BINGHAM ACADEMY CHARTER DI</td>
<td>$7,745.00</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>MOUNTAIN HOME DISTRICT</td>
<td>$86,720.00</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>1,671</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>795</td>
<td>IDAHO ARTS SCHOOL</td>
<td>$19,462.00</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>466</td>
<td>SUCCEED VIRTUAL HIGH SCHOOL</td>
<td>$2,770.00</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221</td>
<td>SALMON DISTRICT</td>
<td>$33,199.00</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GEM courses are recognized between Idaho public postsecondary institutions as general education courses that are easily transferable and meet general education requirements across a variety of disciplines. Students taking GEM courses in high school are less likely to face transferability challenges when they transfer to an Idaho public institution. GEM courses are identified in 6 categories.

### GEM Breakdown: FY 18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Credit Type</th>
<th>Number of Credits</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GEM</strong></td>
<td>129,227</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanistic and Artistic Ways of Knowing</td>
<td>31,304</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematical Ways of Knowing</td>
<td>21,146</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Communication</td>
<td>8,883</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific Ways of Knowing</td>
<td>24,522</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Behavioral Ways of Knowing</td>
<td>25,210</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Communication</td>
<td>14,297</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution Specific</td>
<td>3,865</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-GEM</strong></td>
<td>36,151</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Public Institution</strong></td>
<td>19,416</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>184,794</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### GEM Breakdown by Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Number of Credits</th>
<th>Headcount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Boise State University</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanistic and Artistic Ways of Knowing</td>
<td>5,116</td>
<td>1,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematical Ways of Knowing</td>
<td>2,094</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Communication</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific Ways of Knowing</td>
<td>3,129</td>
<td>830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Behavioral Ways of Knowing</td>
<td>3,789</td>
<td>1,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Communication</td>
<td>1,458</td>
<td>486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution Specific</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Gem</td>
<td>6,821</td>
<td>2,872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total for Institution:</strong></td>
<td>22,407</td>
<td>7,437</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| College of Eastern Idaho          |                   |           |
| Humanistic and Artistic Ways of Knowing | 3                | 1         |
| Mathematical Ways of Knowing      | 4                 | 1         |
| Oral Communication                | 6                 | 2         |
| Scientific Ways of Knowing        | 11                | 5         |
| Social and Behavioral Ways of Knowing | 15               | 5         |
| Written Communication             | 3                 | 1         |
| Institution Specific              | -                 | -         |
| Non-Gem                           | 20                | 5         |
| **Total for Institution:**        | 62                | 20        |

| College of Southern Idaho         |                   |           |
| Humanistic and Artistic Ways of Knowing | 1,379           | 372       |
| Mathematical Ways of Knowing      | 3,602             | 458       |
| Oral Communication                | 1,686             | 931       |
| Scientific Ways of Knowing        | 4,286             | 562       |
| Social and Behavioral Ways of Knowing | 7,944           | 1,071     |
| Written Communication             | 2,511             | 2,648     |
| Institution Specific              | 1,351             | 837       |
| Non-Gem                           | 8,613             | 3,428     |
| **Total for Institution:**        | 31,372            | 10,307    |

| College of Western                |                   |           |
| Humanistic and Artistic Ways of Knowing | 16,701          | 5,177     |
| Mathematical Ways of Knowing      | 10,789            | 2,939     |
| Oral Communication                | 4,793             | 1,598     |
| Scientific Ways of Knowing        | 11,207            | 2,818     |
| Social and Behavioral Ways of Knowing | 5,321           | 1,773     |
| Written Communication             | 4,119             | 1,373     |
| Institution Specific              | -                 | -         |
| Non-Gem                           | 4,166             | 2,354     |
| **Total for Institution:**        | 57,096            | 18,032    |

| Idaho State University            |                   |           |
| Humanistic and Artistic Ways of Knowing | 4,159          | 1,241     |
| Mathematical Ways of Knowing      | 1,322             | 374       |
| Oral Communication                | 453               | 151       |
| Scientific Ways of Knowing        | 2,456             | 628       |
| Social and Behavioral Ways of Knowing | 3,299          | 1,099     |
| Written Communication             | 1,878             | 626       |
| Institution Specific              | 2,175             | 717       |
| Non-Gem                           | 5,419             | 1,736     |
| **Total for Institution:**        | 21,161            | 6,572     |

| Lewis-Clark State College         |                   |           |
| Humanistic and Artistic Ways of Knowing | 180              | 60        |
| Mathematical Ways of Knowing      | 1,158             | 271       |
| Oral Communication                | 231               | 77        |
| Scientific Ways of Knowing        | 895               | 346       |
| Social and Behavioral Ways of Knowing | 1,038           | 293       |
| Written Communication             | 879               | 85        |
| Institution Specific              | 339               | 294       |
| Non-Gem                           | 569               | 294       |
| **Total for Institution:**        | 5,289             | 1,656     |

| North Idaho College               |                   |           |
| Humanistic and Artistic Ways of Knowing | 1,543          | 461       |
| Mathematical Ways of Knowing      | 941               | 270       |
| Oral Communication                | 1,588             | 530       |
| Scientific Ways of Knowing        | 1,480             | 366       |
| Social and Behavioral Ways of Knowing | 2,914          | 938       |
| Written Communication             | 1,568             | 523       |
| Institution Specific              | -                 | -         |
| Non-Gem                           | 5,994             | 2,956     |
| **Total for Institution:**        | 15,928            | 6,044     |

<p>| University of Idaho               |                   |           |
| Humanistic and Artistic Ways of Knowing | 2,223          | 741       |
| Mathematical Ways of Knowing      | 1,236             | 382       |
| Oral Communication                | 126               | 63        |
| Scientific Ways of Knowing        | 1,058             | 305       |
| Social and Behavioral Ways of Knowing | 990             | 330       |
| Written Communication             | 1,881             | 627       |
| Institution Specific              | -                 | -         |
| Non-Gem                           | 4,549             | 1,358     |
| <strong>Total for Institution:</strong>        | 12,063            | 3,806     |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dual Credit Course type</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Headcount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>28,318</td>
<td>8,393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>23,418</td>
<td>7,814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>17,192</td>
<td>5,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>16,447</td>
<td>4,117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>12,822</td>
<td>3,726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>10,316</td>
<td>3,564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>10,214</td>
<td>3,435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>6,924</td>
<td>1,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anatomy</td>
<td>4,411</td>
<td>1,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>4,254</td>
<td>1,418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>4,095</td>
<td>1,416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>4,074</td>
<td>1,358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundations</td>
<td>3,008</td>
<td>1,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>2,669</td>
<td>2,272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allied Health</td>
<td>2,630</td>
<td>1,256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>2,506</td>
<td>603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Terminology</td>
<td>2,327</td>
<td>1,036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Finance</td>
<td>2,022</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>1,960</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign Language</td>
<td>1,928</td>
<td>471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Applications</td>
<td>1,810</td>
<td>1,703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>1,605</td>
<td>535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology</td>
<td>1,516</td>
<td>392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Medical Technician</td>
<td>1,504</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Medicine</td>
<td>1,458</td>
<td>601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Science</td>
<td>1,308</td>
<td>404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>1,245</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>1,189</td>
<td>421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>1,118</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>1,054</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Occupations</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Coding</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welding</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theater</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Science</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Terminology</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dual Credit Course type</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Headcount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drafting</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpentry</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary Studies</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurship</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photography</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Sciences</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Development</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Body</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American Studies</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forensic Science</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Development</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machinery</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aero Space</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Occupations</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Health Professions</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medial Literacy</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Foundations</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Science</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoology</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 184,794 60,493
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dual Credit Course type</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Headcount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>8,256</td>
<td>2,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>7,334</td>
<td>2,679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>4,381</td>
<td>1,606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>3,032</td>
<td>1,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundations</td>
<td>2,702</td>
<td>989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allied Health</td>
<td>2,618</td>
<td>1,252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Terminology</td>
<td>2,327</td>
<td>1,036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>2,303</td>
<td>2,146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>2,034</td>
<td>485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Applications</td>
<td>1,810</td>
<td>1,703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Medical Technician</td>
<td>1,504</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Medicine</td>
<td>1,458</td>
<td>601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>1,367</td>
<td>559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>1,333</td>
<td>452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Finance</td>
<td>1,152</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>1,009</td>
<td>425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>808</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Occupinations</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Coding</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welding</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Science</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Terminology</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drafting</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpentry</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary Studies</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theater</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurship</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photography</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Body</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dual Credit Course type</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Headcount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Development</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machinery</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aero Space</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American Studies</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Occupations</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Health Professions</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Development</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Literacy</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Foundations</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Science</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoology</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Science</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 55,567 21,622
### Grade by Grade Comparison FY18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Total Students</th>
<th>Participation Percentage</th>
<th>Overload</th>
<th>Dual Credit</th>
<th>Exams</th>
<th>Amount Expended</th>
<th>Usage Per Participating Student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>24,015</td>
<td>1.42%</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$39,365.00</td>
<td>$115.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>23,377</td>
<td>3.53%</td>
<td>1,189</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$99,497.00</td>
<td>$120.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2,921</td>
<td>23,498</td>
<td>12.43%</td>
<td>2,015</td>
<td>5,426</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>$603,351.00</td>
<td>$206.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>7,366</td>
<td>22,629</td>
<td>32.55%</td>
<td>2,074</td>
<td>28,564</td>
<td>1,925</td>
<td>$2,238,666.00</td>
<td>$303.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>11,810</td>
<td>21,818</td>
<td>54.13%</td>
<td>2,401</td>
<td>77,495</td>
<td>6,234</td>
<td>$5,826,237.50</td>
<td>$493.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>12,063</td>
<td>20,565</td>
<td>58.66%</td>
<td>2,460</td>
<td>73,274</td>
<td>7,847</td>
<td>$5,736,332.00</td>
<td>$475.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>35,327</td>
<td>135,902</td>
<td>25.99%</td>
<td>10,613</td>
<td>184,794</td>
<td>16,218</td>
<td>$14,543,448.50</td>
<td>$1,715.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Student Usage

**FY17 & FY18 Combined**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount Expended</th>
<th>of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$4,125</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; $3,500</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; $3,000</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; $2,500</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; $2,000</td>
<td>807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; $1,500</td>
<td>1,822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; $1,000</td>
<td>4,544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; $500</td>
<td>11,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; $ 0</td>
<td>27,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>46,154</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# AMENDED AGENDA #1

SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE
3:00 P.M.
Room WW55
Monday, January 28, 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>PRESENTER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presentation:</td>
<td>Office of Safety Report</td>
<td>Brian C. Armes, Manager Idaho Office of School Safety &amp; Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Docket No.</td>
<td>Rules Governing Seed and Plant Certification</td>
<td>Vice Chairman Thayn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08-0501-1801</td>
<td>Rules and Minimum Standards Governing</td>
<td>Shannon Purvis, EES Program Manager, Idaho Division of Vocational Rehabilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extended Employment Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*If you have written testimony, please provide a copy of it along with the name of the person or organization responsible to the committee secretary to ensure accuracy of records.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMITTEE MEMBERS</th>
<th>COMMITTEE SECRETARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chairman Mortimer</td>
<td>LeAnn Mohr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Chairman Thayn</td>
<td>Room: WW39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sen Winder</td>
<td>Phone: 332-1321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sen Den Hartog</td>
<td>email: <a href="mailto:sedu@senate.idaho.gov">sedu@senate.idaho.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sen Crabtree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


MINUTES
SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

DATE: Monday, January 28, 2019
TIME: 3:00 P.M.
PLACE: Room WW55
MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Mortimer, Vice Chairman Thayn, Senators Winder, Den Hartog, Crabtree, Woodward, Lent, Buckner-Webb, and Ward-Engelking
ABSENT/EXCUSED: None

NOTE: The sign-in sheet, testimonies and other related materials will be retained with the minutes in the committee's office until the end of the session and will then be located on file with the minutes in the Legislative Services Library.

CONVENED: Chairman Mortimer called the Education Committee (Committee) to order at 3:02 p.m. He opened with a reading from the book, A Heap O 'Living Along Life's Highway, by Eager A. Guest, "How Do You Tackle Your Work."

PRESENTATION: Brian C. Armes, Manager, Idaho Office of School Safety and Security (Office), presented the annual report. He said the Office was developed in 2016 with the intent of the statute language being developed into actionable programs and processes. He reminded the Committee the Office is to be in all schools by the end of its third year of operation. Mr. Armes explained how the Office accesses the campuses to find any safety vulnerabilities and provides training in a variety of areas to help improve school safety measures.

Mr. Armes said the Office has received resource grants and donated equipment to support the safety initiatives. He reported how the Office is working to acquire radio systems for school facilities and developing the radio response program. He explained to the Committee the site and safety statistics the Office has compiled and the safety comparison between rural and suburban schools (Attachment 1 and 2).

In response to questions from the Committee, Mr. Armes explained The costliness of having School Resource Officers (SRO) on school campuses is often unwarranted. It would serve schools better to have more effectively trained SROs, and having the best trained people costs money. Mr. Armes said the school culture often determines where the safety emphasis is warranted. He emphasized the need to make overall safety the priority for all schools.

RECORDING LINK: To hear the presentation from the Office of School Safety and Security, go to: https://legislature.idaho.gov/sessioninfo/2019/standingcommittees/SEDU/.

PASSED THE GALV: Chairman Mortimer passed the gavel to Vice Chairman Thayn.

DOCKET NO. 08-0501-1801

Vice Chairman Thayn said Docket No. 08-0501-1801, Rules Governing Seed and Plant Certification, was sent to the Senate Agricultural Committee to review. The recommendation from that committee was to accept the docket as written (Attachment 3).

MOTION: Chairman Mortimer moved to accept Docket No. 08-0501-1801. Senator Ward-Engelking seconded the motion. The motion passed by voice vote.
**DISCUSSION:**

**DOCKET NO. 47-0102-1801**

Shannon Purvis, Extended Employment Services Program Manager, Idaho Division of Vocational Rehabilitation (Voc Rehab), presented **Docket No. 47-0102-1807**, Rules and Minimum Standards Governing Extended Employment Services (EES). Ms. Purvis said the proposed changes are to make technical corrections, define terms, and update the application and eligibility process for the Employment Services program. She stated there is no impact to the budget as reviewed by the Legislative Services Office (LSO).

Ms. Purvis detailed the definition changes and how they were relocated to other areas in the rules. She said redundant language was removed and language was added to help in the clarification of the application process. She said the definition expanded because of public comment and input. Ms. Purvis said the proposals take out the provider agreement provisions and update the fiscal year to be consistent with the State’s fiscal year. She specified the changes were made to provide better clarification of standards and services, and consistency in the language.

Ms. Purvis addressed the eligibility process for the work services program. She explained how the program functions and the expansion request for the program. She said the changes provide a mechanism outside of the current process for the individual who is interested in non-competitive nonintegrated employment and detailed the process.

Senator Den Hartog asked if she would explain a nonintegrated employment service. Ms. Purvis said an example would be a sheltered workshop environment in which the individuals go to the employer/provider and receive a more robust support due to their disability.

Chairman Mortimer asked if those in need of long-term support, who are being referred by Voc Rehab counselors to the EES program, are they also being referred to Voc Rehab by the provider. Ms. Purvis replied in the affirmative. She said there are no restrictions for referrals. She stated the distinction is services for the EES program which are based on service level of need.

Chairman Mortimer asked if a provider can recommend EES and not Voc Rehab Services. Ms. Purvis replied in the affirmative and explained the referral process.

Chairman Mortimer asked if Ms. Purvis could better explain the proposed referral services in the docket. Ms. Purvis replied the proposed language in the docket clarifies that if the individual is eligible for Medicaid waiver services then that is the funding source for their services. She said this provision was added to ensure funding was available for individuals who do not have access to any other resources for long term supports. It is important to note that currently, Medicaid does not provide funding for non-competitive, nonintegrated services in the workforce. She stated for those individuals who are eligible for Medicaid waiver are not eligible for the EES services.

Senator Den Hartog asked if service providers participated in the negotiated rule making, and if they did, how many participated. Ms. Purvis replied in the affirmative and reported 8 of the 24 service agencies responded.
TESTIMONY: Glen Roach, Access Behavioral Health Services, spoke against section 500.03.c addition to the docket. He explained to the Committee how the EES started. It was originally housed in the Department of Health and Welfare (DHW). He said the proposed rule will greatly limit the access of services which are designed to prepare individuals who want to work and maintain that employment. Specifically, he said, the area of concern is the part of this section which addresses eligibility. He asked if section 500.03.c could be stricken from the rule.

DISCUSSION: Chairman Mortimer asked if section 500.03.c limits access for his organization. Mr. Roach replied in the affirmative. He said there are services offered through the EES program that would not be provided under the Medicaid provisions. He said his understanding of the proposed rule is that when an individual is eligible for the Medicaid waiver funding, they would not be able to access EES funding; that is where there are limitations.

Chairman Mortimer asked Ms. Purvis if she would address the limitation concerns as voiced by Mr. Roach. Ms. Purvis replied those individuals who have access to the Medicaid funds should apply there first. She explained the severity of their disabilities preempts them from some services because Medicaid does not allow for long term job coaching.

Chairman Mortimer asked if striking section 500.03.c would create problems in flexibility for Voc Rehab. Ms. Purvis replied it could create a duplication of services and take away service dollars from individuals who do not have another option for long term support.

Vice Chairman Thayn asked for clarification of services. Ms. Purvis explained the non-competitive non-integrated services which are not funded by Medicaid. She explained the services offered to individuals by EES.

Senator Woodward said he has received feedback from his constituents stating that this rule makes their business models unfeasible. Ms. Purvis said they worked on the rule during the past year and they met with Medicaid and service providers to understand the reimbursement rates. She explained this rule was put in place to better serve the individuals in need. She stated the EES reimbursement rate is higher than Medicaid's reimbursement rate.

Hannah Liedkie, Medicaid Service Provider, Northern Idaho, said from her experience neither Voc Rehab nor DHW are aware of each other’s services. She spoke in favor of striking section 500.03.c and explained her position.

Chairman Mortimer asked if additional rules are needed to make the work of DHW and Voc Rehab for disabled individuals more expeditious and amiable. Ms. Liedkie replied the federal and state requirements are constantly changing, making their work perpetual. She stated they work to best serve Idahoans with disabilities.

Senator Winder asked if Ms. Liedkie participated in the negotiated rulemaking. Ms. Liedkie replied in the affirmative. She stated she submitted written comments.

Senator Winder asked if Ms. Liedkie thought the removal section 500.03.c would lead to duplication of services. Ms. Liedkie replied in the negative. She stated it is her understanding that an individual cannot get the same services from two different agencies.
MOTION: Chairman Mortimer moved to accept Docket No. 47-0102-1801 excluding section 500.03.c. Senator Den Hartog seconded the motion. The motion passed by voice vote.

PASSED THE GAVEL: Vice Chairman Thayn passed the gavel to Chairman Mortimer.

ADJOURNED: There being no further business at this time, Chairman Mortimer adjourned the meeting at 4:27 p.m.

___________________________  __________________________
Senator Dean M. Mortimer          LeAnn Mohr
Chair                              Secretary
OUR MISSION

- **Goal 1:** Develop and employ a comprehensive process and instrument for triennial school assessments and reports. [33-5902] (4)(5)(8)

- **Goal 2:** Maintain accurate information on school locations and conditions, tracking facility additions and changes. [33-5902] (1)(2)(3)

- **Goal 3:** Identify and implement multiple modes of support for the improvement of safety and security within schools. [33-5902] (1)(2)(3)(6)(7)

- **Goal 4:** Identify and establish connection with the agencies, institutions and organizations that serve schools, school personnel, or provide some type of service useful for promoting safety and security within the school environment. [33-5902] (1)(3)

- **Goal 5:** Identify incidents, conditions and trends that threaten schools. Research and develop effective practices and training. Research and evaluate the efficacy of technological security solutions, advising school on possible implementation. [33-5902] (1)(2)(3)(6)(7)(8)
BY THE NUMBERS

- 498 Assessments done (08/01/16-12/01/18)  \[\text{Goal 1,2,3}\]
  Current campus 730, which includes 27 new school sites (20 charter schools) since 07/01/2016

- Hours of training and consulting  \[\text{Goal 3,5}\]
  - 59.5 hour in 2016-2017
  - 1197 hours in 2017-2018
  - 435 hours to date in 2018 - 2019

  Pre-service Teacher Training  Pre-service administration training
  Effective Supervision Practices  Behavioral Threat Assessment
  Emergency Operations Planning  Radio Communications
  Basics of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED)

- 57 building project applications reviewed  \[\text{Goal 2,5}\]
- $124,000 repurposed radio equipment deployed in districts.  \[\text{Goal 3,4}\]
RESOURCES: GRANTS & EQUIPMENT
GRANTS

US DEPART OF JUSTICE, BUREAU OF JUSTICE ASSISTANCE
- STOP SCHOOL VIOLENCE

- STATE OF IDAHO THREAT ASSESSMENT MODEL FOR SCHOOLS
  - $344,970, 10/01/2018 - 09/30/2021

- STATEWIDE CONFIDENTIAL TIPLINE
  - $195,465, 10/01/2018 - 09/30/2021
## Repurposed Radio Equipment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment type</th>
<th>Freq Range/ERP</th>
<th>Number donated</th>
<th>Replacement Value</th>
<th>School District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motorola Quantar</td>
<td>UHF 100W FDC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>Middleton SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorola Quantar</td>
<td>UHF 100W FDC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>Cassia Co.,SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorola Quantar</td>
<td>VHF 100W FDC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>Idaho Falls SD 91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorola Quantar</td>
<td>VHF 100W FDC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>Snake river SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorola Quantar</td>
<td>VHF 100W FDC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>Marsh Valley SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE Master III</td>
<td>VHF 100W FDC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>Preston SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE Master III</td>
<td>UHF 100W FDC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>Franklin Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris</td>
<td>VHF 50 W 50%DC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>Westside SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE Master III</td>
<td>VHF 100W FDC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>Shelley SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenwood Tk 750</td>
<td>VHF 50W 50%DC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>Shelley SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenwood Tk 250</td>
<td>VHF 5W 40%DC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>Shelley SD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**: $124,000.00
THE IDAHO COMMAND RESPONSES
INITIAL RESPONSE PROTOCOL DESIGNED FOR IDAHO'S SCHOOLS

- Evacuation
- Reverse Evacuation
- Lock Down
- Hall Check

- The product of the cooperative efforts of educational and response stakeholders throughout Idaho
- Applicable to all school environments and designed to be tailored with school and district-specific information
- Distinct operational procedures, but designed so that they may be enacted in series or succession
STATISTICS
ASSESSMENTS STATISTICS

- **BUILDING**
  - Campus perimeter fenced 46% YES
  - Campus fence securable 15% YES
  - Classroom doors can be secured from the inside 73% YES

- **ACCESS CONTROL**
  - Main/primary entry controlled 65% YES
  - All other perimeter doors locked/controlled/monitored 36% YES
  - Visitors required to check-in 62% YES
  - Staff prominently displays photo ID 24% YES

- **SUPERVISION/SURVEILLANCE**
  - Staff monitors entrance/exits during arrival/departure 44% YES
  - Video surveillance in place 73% YES
  - All cameras operational 58% YES

- **COMMUNICATIONS**
  - School office can notify all school interior areas 83% YES
  - All instructional areas can notify school campus 47% YES
ASSESSMENT STATISTICS

- **HEALTH/MENTAL HEALTH**
  - Nurse/medical duties performed by general school staff: 73% YES

- **SCHOOL COMMUNITY**
  - **PERCEIVED BULLYING RATES**
    - Increasing: 20% YES
    - Decreasing: 18% YES
    - Cyber increase: 32% YES
    - Cyber decrease: 18% YES
  - Student perception data available: 52% YES
  - School-wide positive behavioral program in place: 87% YES

- **TRAINING**
  - Certified staff trained on school emergency procedures: 67% YES
  - Classified staff trained on school emergency procedures: 63% YES
  - Substitute staff trained on school emergency procedures: 32% YES

- **COOPERATING AGENCIES**
  - SRO located on site: 27% YES
A TALE OF TWO SCHOOLS: SCHOOL SAFETY AND SECURITY PROFILE

SCHOOL A: RURAL/REMOTE

- Student Supervision
- School Climate and Culture
- Community
- Policy and Training
- Security

SCHOOL B: SUBURBAN

- Student Supervision
- School Climate and Culture
- Community
- Policy and Training
- Security
# REGIONAL SECURITY ANALYSTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region I</th>
<th>Region II</th>
<th>Region III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mark Feddersen</td>
<td>Mike Munger</td>
<td>Guy Bliesner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDA</td>
<td>Meridian</td>
<td>Pocatello</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208.625.7256</td>
<td>208.407.6716</td>
<td>208.221.3145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:Mark.Feddersen@dbs.Idaho.gov">Mark.Feddersen@dbs.Idaho.gov</a></td>
<td><a href="mailto:Mike.Munger@dbs.Idaho.gov">Mike.Munger@dbs.Idaho.gov</a></td>
<td><a href="mailto:Guy.Bliesner@dbs.Idaho.gov">Guy.Bliesner@dbs.Idaho.gov</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2019 Legislative Report
2019 Legislative Report

Progress report

Mission

**GOAL 1:** DEVELOP AND EMPLOY A COMPREHENSIVE PROCESS AND INSTRUMENT FOR TRIENNIAL SCHOOL ASSESSMENTS AND REPORTS. [33-5902] (4)(5)(8)

**GOAL 2:** MAINTAIN ACCURATE INFORMATION ON SCHOOL LOCATIONS AND CONDITIONS, TRACKING FACILITY ADDITIONS AND CHANGES. [33-5902] (1)(2)(3)

**GOAL 3:** IDENTIFY AND IMPLEMENT MULTIPLE MODES OF SUPPORT FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF SAFETY AND SECURITY WITHIN SCHOOLS. [33-5902] (1)(2)(3)(6)(7)

**GOAL 4:** IDENTIFY AND ESTABLISH CONNECTION WITH THE AGENCIES, INSTITUTIONS AND ORGANIZATIONS THAT SERVE SCHOOLS, SCHOOL PERSONNEL, OR PROVIDE SOME TYPE OF SERVICE USEFUL FOR PROMOTING SAFETY AND SECURITY WITHIN THE SCHOOL ENVIRONMENT. [33-5902] (1)(3)

**GOAL 5:** IDENTIFY INCIDENTS, CONDITIONS AND TRENDS THAT THREATEN SCHOOLS. RESEARCH AND DEVELOP EFFECTIVE PRACTICES AND TRAINING. RESEARCH AND EVALUATE THE EFFICACY OF TECHNOLOGICAL SECURITY SOLUTIONS, ADVISING SCHOOLS ON POSSIBLE IMPLEMENTATION. [33-5902] (1)(2)(3)(6)(7)(8)
PROGRESS

510 Onsite Assessments done (08/01/16-12/20/18) \hspace{7cm} (goal 1,2,3)

Current campuses in state: 730

New schools since inception of IOS3: 27 (20 new Charter Schools)

Hours of training and consulting \hspace{7cm} (goal 3,5)
  \begin{itemize}
    \item 59.5 hours in 2016 - 2017
    \item 1197 hours in 2017 - 2018
    \item 435 hours to date in 2018 - 2019
      \begin{itemize}
        \item Pre-service teacher training
        \item Pre-service administration training
        \item Effective Supervision practices
        \item Behavioral Threat Assessment
        \item Emergency Operations Planning
        \item Radio Communications
        \item Basics of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED)
      \end{itemize}
  \end{itemize}

57 building project applications reviewed \hspace{7cm} (goal 2,5)

$124,000 Repurposed radio equipment deployed in districts. \hspace{7cm} (goal 3,4)

State-wide development of Idaho Standard Command Responses \hspace{7cm} (goal 3,4,5)

GRANTS

US Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Assistance: Stop School Violence Grants
  \begin{itemize}
    \item State of Idaho Threat Assessment Model for Schools
      \begin{itemize}
        \item $344,970.00, 10/01/2018 - 09/30/2021
      \end{itemize}
    \item Statewide confidential tip line
      \begin{itemize}
        \item $195,465.00, 10/01/2018 – 09/30/2021
      \end{itemize}
  \end{itemize}
ASSESSMENT STATISTICS

BUILDING
CAMPUS PERIMETER FENCED 46% YES
CAMPUS FENCE SECURABLE 15% YES
CLASSROOM DOORS CAN BE SECURED FROM THE INSIDE 73% YES

ACCESS CONTROL
MAIN/PRIMARY ENTRY CONTROLLED 65% YES
ALL OTHER PERIMETER DOORS LOCKED/CONTROLLED/MONITORED 36% YES
VISITORS REQUIRED TO CHECK-IN 62% YES
STAFF PROMINENTLY DISPLAYS PHOTO ID 24% YES

SUPERVISION/SURVEILLANCE
STAFF MONITORS ENTRANCE/EXITS DURING ARRIVAL/DEPARTURE 44% YES
VIDEO SURVEILLANCE IN PLACE 73% YES
ALL CAMERAS OPERATIONAL 58% YES

COMMUNICATIONS
SCHOOL OFFICE CAN NOTIFY ALL SCHOOL INTERIOR AREAS 83% YES
ALL INSTRUCTIONAL AREAS CAN NOTIFY SCHOOL CAMPUS 47% YES

SCHOOL COMMUNITY
HEALTH/MENTAL HEALTH -
nurse/medical duties performed by general school staff 73% YES

PERCEIVED BULLYING RATES
INCREASING 20% YES
DECREASING 18% YES
CYBER INCREASE 32% YES
CYBER DECREASE 18% YES

STUDENT PERCEPTION DATA AVAILABLE 52% YES

SCHOOL-WIDE POSITIVE BEHAVIORAL PROGRAM IN PLACE 87% YES

TRAINING
CERTIFIED STAFF TRAINED ON SCHOOL EMERGENCY PROCEDURES 67% YES
CLASSIFIED STAFF TRAINED ON SCHOOL EMERGENCY PROCEDURES 63% YES
SUBSTITUTE STAFF TRAINED ON SCHOOL EMERGENCY PROCEDURES 32% YES

COOPERATING AGENCIES
SRO LOCATED ON SITE 27% YES
graphic comparison between representative schools
The graphs organize safety data into associated metacategories, and are delivered to school administrators as a visual description of their particular condition. Shaded areas represent positive attributes as determined by onsite data collection.
## Advisory Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Company Representing</th>
<th>Mailing Address</th>
<th>Original Appointment</th>
<th>Term Expires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suzanne Kloepel</td>
<td>Parent of a Student</td>
<td>1331 Atlantic Drive Burley, ID 83378</td>
<td>09/18/2018</td>
<td>07/01/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Logan Easley</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>West Ada School District 1303 East Central Drive Meridian, ID 83642</td>
<td>07/05/2016</td>
<td>07/01/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senator Lori Denhartog</td>
<td>Idaho Senate</td>
<td>State of Idaho P.O Box 83720 Boise, ID 83720</td>
<td>07/01/2016</td>
<td>07/01/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Dale Fry, Jr.</td>
<td>Representative Local School Board</td>
<td>515 Christie Street Troy, ID 83871</td>
<td>07/01/2016</td>
<td>07/01/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Becky Meyer</td>
<td>Rep. School Superintendents</td>
<td>Lakeland SD #272 15506 N. Washington St. Rathdrum, ID 83858</td>
<td>07/01/2016</td>
<td>07/01/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Freeman</td>
<td>State Board of Education</td>
<td>State Board of Education PO Box 83720 Boise, ID 83720</td>
<td>07/01/2016</td>
<td>07/01/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Gunter</td>
<td>Idaho Police Chiefs Association</td>
<td>Hailey Police Department 115 S. Main, Suite C Hailey, ID 83333</td>
<td>07/01/2016</td>
<td>07/01/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles 'Chad' A. Huff</td>
<td>Idaho Sheriff's Association</td>
<td>Payette County Sheriff 1130 3rd Avenue, Room 101 Payette, ID 83661</td>
<td>07/01/2016</td>
<td>07/01/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Ganske</td>
<td>Idaho State Police</td>
<td>Idaho State Police 700 S. Stratford Meridian, ID 83642</td>
<td>07/01/2016</td>
<td>07/01/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William 'Brad' Richy</td>
<td>Bureau of Homeland Security</td>
<td>State of Idaho 4040 W. Guard St. Bldg. 600 Boise, ID 83705</td>
<td>07/01/2016</td>
<td>07/01/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Gates</td>
<td>Idaho Fire Chiefs Association</td>
<td>Pocatello Fire Department 408 E. Whitman Avenue Pocatello, ID 83201</td>
<td>07/01/2016</td>
<td>07/01/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt McCarter</td>
<td>State Department of Education Superintendent of Public Instruction</td>
<td>State Dept. of Education PO Box 83720 Boise, ID 83720-0027</td>
<td>07/01/2016</td>
<td>07/01/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep. Wendy Horman</td>
<td>House of Representatives</td>
<td>State of Idaho PO Box 83720 Boise, ID 83720</td>
<td>07/05/2016</td>
<td>11/30/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>E-Mail</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Jensen</td>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td><a href="mailto:chris.jensen@dbs.idaho.gov">chris.jensen@dbs.idaho.gov</a></td>
<td>208.332.7100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Whitney</td>
<td>Deputy Administrator, Administration</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ron.whitney@dbs.idaho.gov">ron.whitney@dbs.idaho.gov</a></td>
<td>208.332.7150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Armes</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td><a href="mailto:brian.armes@dbs.idaho.gov">brian.armes@dbs.idaho.gov</a></td>
<td>Direct: 208.332.7153</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cell: 208.559.2910</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Munger</td>
<td>Southwest School Safety and Security Analyst</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Mike.munger@dbs.idaho.gov">Mike.munger@dbs.idaho.gov</a></td>
<td>Cell: 208.407.6716</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guy W. Bliesner</td>
<td>Eastern School Safety and Security Analyst</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Guy.Bliesner@dbs.idaho.gov">Guy.Bliesner@dbs.idaho.gov</a></td>
<td>Cell: 208.221.3145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Feddersen</td>
<td>Northern School Safety and Security Analyst</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Mark.Feddersen@dbs.idaho.gov">Mark.Feddersen@dbs.idaho.gov</a></td>
<td>Cell: 208.625.7256</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kayla Green</td>
<td>Administrative Assistant 1</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kayla.green@dbs.idaho.gov">kayla.green@dbs.idaho.gov</a></td>
<td>Direct: 208.332.7154</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Office: 208.332.7155</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
January 22, 2019

The Honorable Dean Mortimer, Chairman
Education Committee
Idaho State Senate
HAND DELIVERED

Dear Chairman Mortimer,

The Senate Agricultural Affairs Committee has reviewed Docket No: 08-0501-1801, Rules Governing Seed and Plant Certification, and has unanimously agreed that it be approved in the Education Committee.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jim Guthrie
Chairman
Agricultural Affairs Committee
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>PRESENTER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presentation:</td>
<td>Public Schools Funding Formula</td>
<td>Paul Headlee: Manager, Budget and Policy Division, Legislative Services Office</td>
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CONVENED: Chairman Mortimer called the Education Committee (Committee) to order at 3:00 p.m.

PRESENTATION: Paul Headlee, Manager, Budget and Policy Division, Legislative Services Office (LSO) introduced Robyn Lockett, Principal Budget and Policy Analyst, LSO Public School Funding Formula. He also introduced, via phone conferencing, Michael Griffiths, School Finance Specialist, and Emily Parker, Policy Analyst, Education Commission of the States.

Mr. Headlee said they are here today to demonstrate how to navigate the Public School Funding Formula budgeting tool. He told the Committee there have been some modifications made to the original budgeting tool. The version of the model they are demonstrating has been modified with two new attributes. He announced the new version will be available online by week's end.

Mr. Griffiths explained the adjustments to the budget tool and demonstrated how putting different weights into the model changed the funding distributions. This provided the Committee with the ability to see how changes in weighting could impact the available funds to districts. He emphasized the model's flexibility.

In response to questions, Mr. Griffiths explained the "hold harmless strategy" for school districts and the possible long-term impact. He stated there are some schools in Idaho who have unusual situations for which the model doesn't accommodate and suggested the policy writers consider this when drafting the legislation.

Mr. Griffiths emphasized the transition time to the new formula should be brief. Waiting too long will make it difficult to move forward into the new formula. He suggested flexibility in setting and adjusting the funding formula, especially regarding federal funding categories and other unique attendance situations. He reminded the Committee that the new funding formula is designed on a per pupil basis. Mr. Griffiths addressed the factoring of school district wealth categories and the implications for districts that depend on levy funding for operations.

Mr. Headlee reminded the Committee that the current Public School Funding Formula was implemented in 1994 and adjustments were made to make it viable for the school districts.
Chairman Mortimer said the Public School Funding Formula legislative draft is being worked on. He hopes it will be available in the near future for Committee members and stakeholders to review and bring forth their concerns and possible suggestions. He emphasized the need to consider many things before the final draft is completed and ready for a hearing.

Chairman Mortimer thanked the presenters for helping the Committee better understand the workings of the budgeting tool.

RECORDING LINK: To hear the complete Public School Funding Formula budgeting tool presentation, go to: https://legislature.idaho.gov/sessioninfo/2019/standingcommittees/SEDU/.

ADJOURNED: There being no further business at this time, Chairman Mortimer adjourned the meeting at 4:29 p.m.

Senator Dean M. Mortimer
Chair

LeAnn Mohr
Secretary
# AMENDED AGENDA #1
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State Administrator |
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Thayn</td>
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<tr>
<td>Senator</td>
<td>Winder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senator</td>
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DATE: Wednesday, January 30, 2019
TIME: 3:00 P.M.
PLACE: Room WW55

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Mortimer, Vice Chairman Thayn, Senators Winder, Crabtree, Woodward, Lent, and Ward-Engelking

ABSENT/EXCUSED: Senators Den Hartog and Buckner-Webb

NOTE: The sign-in sheet, testimonies and other related materials will be retained with the minutes in the committee's office until the end of the session and will then be located on file with the minutes in the Legislative Services Library.

CONVENE: Chairman Mortimer called the Education Committee (Committee) to order at 3:03 p.m.

PRESENTATION: Dwight Johnson, State Administrator, Career Technical Education (CTE), introduced the Idaho CTE student leaders: Nikoli Carlquist, President, Family Career and Community Leaders of America (FCCLA), Hazelton; Matthew Taylor, President, SkillsUSA, Meridian; and Emily White, Vice President, Business Professionals of America (BPA), Shelley.

Each student leader spoke about their experiences in their respective club programs and about the benefits of the CTE classroom teachings. They stated those experiences have helped them develop confidence and given them the ability to set long-term career goals.

In response to questions, the student leaders each recounted the dual credit course work which lead to certification, as well as their after high school plans.

Chairman Mortimer thanked them for the update and invited Dwight Johnson to give the CTE Agency presentation; CTE Overview.

PRESENTATION: Mr. Johnson announced to the Committee that CTE is celebrating 100 years of Career Readiness. He said in 1919, Governor Alexander Moses signed into law House Bill 26, which created the Idaho Division of Vocational Education.

He detailed the current mission of CTE and explained its importance and listed the broad spectrum of today's CTE programs. He reminded the Committee that CTE is no longer "Grandfather's shop class." He named the seven CTE student organizations and told about the programs that are housed in each one.

Mr. Johnson reviewed student enrollment at the workforce centers across the state and spoke about the variety of courses that are offered. He said there are three strategic areas CTE is focusing on to achieve its mission: 1.) Attracting students; 2.) Expand capacity; and 3.) Improve quality. He detailed strategies and programs for each goal.

Mr. Johnson concluded his presentation with reference to the unanimous reauthorization of the Federal Perkins Act, which helps fund many state programs and sites (Attachment 1).
In response to questions, Mr. Johnson explained the Pathway course completion, the apprenticeship workforce training, and the opportunities for dual credits in CTE programs. He emphasized the need to expand the variety of CTE programs and change the perceived image. It is his hope that there could be a better marketing strategy to promote the benefits and careers for students. He recounted the workforce shortages in the positions CTE equips people to fill. He spoke about the merits of the middle school initiative in helping to fulfill the workforce shortage and the desire to engage college and career advisors to be aware of the CTE opportunities.

Chairman Mortimer thanked Mr. Johnson and the CTE student leaders for sharing their enthusiasm and the programs' ongoing efforts.

RECORDING LINK: To hear the Career Technical Education Overview, go to: https://legislature.idaho.gov/sessioninfo/2019/standingcommittees/SEDU/.

ADJOURNED: There being no further business at this time, Chairman Mortimer adjourned the meeting at 3:59 p.m.

___________________________ ___________________________
Senator Dean M. Mortimer LeAnn Mohr
Chair Secretary
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2019 Legislative Update
Dwight Johnson, State Administrator
Why is our mission important?

- **Jobs**: +105K
- **Labor Force**: +90K
What is Career & Technical Education?

- Agriculture & Natural Resources
- Family & Consumer Sciences
- Health Sciences
- Engineering & Technology
- Business Management & Marketing
- Skilled & Technical Sciences
We prepare Idaho’s youth and adults for high-skill, in-demand careers.

Making education meaningful through applied learning
Secondary CTE

- 705 programs
- 59,849 students enrolled in CTE courses
- 5,926 CTE concentrators (taking a sequence of CTE courses)

67% went on to college compared to 45% of all Idaho students
94% found a job, moved into postsecondary education, or went into the military
Postsecondary CTE

6 Technical Colleges
- 5,597 students enrolled
- 1,852 degrees / certificates earned
- 95% of technical college completers found jobs or continued their education.

6 Workforce Training Centers
- Short-term, customized training
- 50,531 workers trained

6 Adult Education Centers
- 4,931 participants
- 87% completed GED
- 66% retained or improved employment
Career Pipeline for Students
Talent Pipeline for Business

Attract Students
Expand Capacity
Improve Quality
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>PRESENTER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S 1030</td>
<td>Relating to School Board Trustees; Amend, Revise, and Make Technical Corrections</td>
<td>Senator Mary Souza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation:</td>
<td>&quot;Public Charter School Performance in Idaho: What the Data Tells us&quot;</td>
<td>Macke Raymond, Director, Center for Research of Education Outcomes (CREDO), Hoover Institute, Stanford University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 1029</td>
<td>Relating to the School Turnaround Act; Amend and Make Provisions</td>
<td>Chairman Dean Mortimer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minutes Approval:</td>
<td>Approval of the Minutes from January 9, 2019</td>
<td>Senator Jim Woodward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minutes Approval:</td>
<td>Approval of the Minutes from January 14, 2019</td>
<td>Senator Dave Lent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you have written testimony, please provide a copy of it along with the name of the person or organization responsible to the committee secretary to ensure accuracy of records.
DATE: Thursday, January 31, 2019
TIME: 3:00 P.M.
PLACE: Room WW55
MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Mortimer, Vice Chairman Thayn, Senators Winder, Den Hartog, Crabtree, Woodward, Lent, and Ward-Engelking
ABSENT/EXCUSED: Senator Buckner-Webb
NOTE: The sign-in sheet, testimonies and other related materials will be retained with the minutes in the committee's office until the end of the session and will then be located on file with the minutes in the Legislative Services Library.
CONVENEED: Chairman Mortimer called the Education Committee (Committee) to order at 3:02 p.m.
S 1030 On behalf of Senator Souza, Senator Rice presented S 1030, Relating to School Board Trustees; Amend, Revise, and Make Technical Corrections. He explained the bill corrects an oversight error for election dates. The other changes remove misplaced hyphens.
MOTION: Senator Lent moved to send S 1030 to the floor with a do pass recommendation. Senator Crabtree seconded the motion. The motion passed by voice vote.
PRESENTATION: Terry Ryan, Director, Bluum, introduced Macke Raymond, Ph.D., Director, Center for Research of Education Outcomes (CREDO), Hoover Institute, Stanford University. Dr. Raymond introduced Sofoklis Goulas, Ph.D., Senior Research Analyst CREDO at Stanford. He presented "Public Charter School Performance in Idaho: What the Data Tells Us."
Dr. Goulas said today's presentation will focus on two pillars of the study: 1.) Charter School demographics; and 2.) Charter School impacts. He spoke about the comparisons they made between charter and traditional public schools and detailed the demographics. He explained the testing program that was used to gather the learning results during a three-year period and compared charter and traditional school student growth. He stated the findings show that students in charter schools excel in learning.
In response to Committee questions, Dr. Goulas said there was limited diversity in the charter schools which contributes to the effectiveness of student learning. He stated for this study, the charter and traditional public school students in the comparison were demographically alike.
Dr. Raymond continued the presentation. To help the Committee understand how much more charter students learn, she explained the learning growth cycles for math and English for charter and traditional public school students. Dr. Raymond said the charter schools in rural areas performed higher than expected and the impact is significant. She said charter schools in Idaho are performing considerably well and detailed the academic gains made by students per grade level. She concluded her presentation by suggesting possible policy considerations (Attachment 1).
Chairman Mortimer thanked Drs. Goulas and Raymond for the presentation of their study. He said studies like these are beneficial and asked how often a study should be undertaken. They suggested a study every two to three years.

To hear the complete CREDO presentation, go to: https://legislature.idaho.gov/sessioninfo/2019/standingcommittees/SEDU/.

Chairman Mortimer passed the gavel to Vice Chairman Thayn.

Chairman Mortimer presented S 1029. Relating to the School Turnaround Act; Amend and Make Provisions. He explained the history of the proposed legislation. He said after observing student outcome data, he believes this proposed legislation will help schools perform better. He stated the program provides access to resources for schools or districts who are performing low on identified student outcomes, and with school turnaround experts, a plan would be developed to help the school meet the targeted goals.

Chairman Mortimer stated the program would be housed with the State Board of Education (SBE), which has the means to provide resources to those schools in the low performance quadrant. He explained the process and how the SBE will assist the schools. He spoke about how the turnaround experts would be chosen.

In reviewing the legislation, Chairman Mortimer detailed the personnel makeup of a school turnaround expert and the additional funding to administer the program. He explained how the independent experts would be determined and detailed the criteria those experts must possess. He explained the requirements for schools and the State Board of Education (SBE) role in the program. He outlined the reporting functions and timelines. Chairman Mortimer addressed the funding component and said there is a financial incentive for low-performing schools to participate.

Senator Ward-Engelking asked if there are local school turnaround experts available and how would the services be selected. Chairman Mortimer replied there are national and regional experts. He hopes there are Statewide experts who better understand the culture of Idaho schools. He said the proposals would go out for bid.

Senator Crabtree stated schools are reluctant to take advice. He asked if the program is voluntary. Chairman Mortimer replied in the affirmative. He said rather than force schools to participate, the hope is they can see the benefits of participation; the goal is to help them help their students to achieve.

Vice Chairman Thayn asked if Title One schools have federal turnaround money available. Chairman Mortimer replied in the affirmative. He said the State Department of Education (SDE) administers those funds. He emphasized those funds are limited to only Title One schools which perform at the bottom five percent.

Vice Chairman Thayn asked if this proposed legislation would improve those efforts. Chairman Mortimer replied the proposed legislation is a voluntary program for all schools. This is a new approach which is designed to help those schools which are not Title One schools.

Senator Den Hartog asked if he knew how many of the schools in the bottom five percent are Title One Schools. Chairman Mortimer replied he didn’t have that information.
Senator Den Hartog asked if he knew how many school turnaround experts were available in the region. Chairman Mortimer replied he is aware of several in this region. He said the proposed legislation addresses the criteria the turnaround experts must possess in order to be considered for a contract.

Senator Den Hartog asked if the measurements that were the qualifiers to determine the lowest five percent schools would be the same measurements used to determine whether the school turnaround intervention was successful. Chairman Mortimer replied proposed legislation gives flexibility to measure multiple qualifiers, such as literacy and school culture.

TESTIMONY: Jason Kriegenbeck, Contract Lobbyist, Boise, said he worked on this legislation last year with Chairman Mortimer. He introduced Dr. Trent Kaufman, Chief Executive Officer, Education Direction, and an independent turnaround expert who will provide more information about turnaround teams.

Dr. Kaufman explained how the work his company provides helps schools raise educational measurements. He stated often low-performing schools have low morale. He outlined the volunteer aspect of turnaround consulting and how teachers participate. He assured the Committee that there are many turnaround providers, regionally and nationally. He illustrated the process of a turnaround team; they work to engage parents, teachers, and staff to determine the root causes for low performance and then develop a plan to achieve the new educational goals. He explained the coaching that is done to help teachers engage students.

Senator Den Hartog asked about the size and qualifications of the turnaround team. Dr. Kaufman explained the team size varies because it is dependent on the school's needs. He said coaches are former teachers or administrators with experience.

Senator Den Hartog said the fiscal note has a cost allocation. She asked if he could estimate the typical cost per school. Dr. Kaufman replied it depends on the range of services; the average cost is approximately $160,000.

Vice Chairman Thayn asked if there is data to show the initial effect of the turnaround intervention. Dr. Kaufman replied there is three-year data which show that there are average gains in English and math. Those gains average in the 30 to 40 percentiles.

Vice Chairman Thayn asked if there is data to show the long term effects of a turnaround program on the school. Dr. Kaufman replied on average there was no difference. He explained the difference between "long-term" and "quick-hit" turnaround intervention. He emphasize that the culture of the school must be addressed to achieve long-term effectiveness.

In conclusion, Chairman Mortimer stated it is time for this legislation. Students, teachers, and the overall school need the ability to seek help in turning their school's performance around.

Senator Woodward asked for a clarification of the finances; state funding verses federal funding. Chairman Mortimer explained the current allocation, the federal funding, and how the proposed funding would be used in the schools.

MOTION: Senator Ward-Engelking moved to send S 1029 to the floor with a do pass recommendation. Senator Winder seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION: Senator Ward-Engelking stated she supports this legislation for a variety of reasons, but mostly because this is a voluntary program which adds an additional tool to help schools.
Vice Chairman Thayn stated currently there is already $750,000 allocated to the University of Idaho to help under-performing schools. He asked if Chairman Mortimer knew how those funds were being used. Chairman Mortimer replied the program has been in place for approximately three years. It has been used to help schools around the state. He did not know where the schools were in the evaluation process.

Senator Winder asked if the SDE and the SBE had an opinion on the proposed legislation.

TESTIMONY: Marilyn Whitney, Deputy Superintendent, Communications and Policy, SDE, said the SDE has reviewed the bill and because it is a voluntary program; the SDE has no objections.

Tracie Bent, Chief Planning and Policy Officer, SBE, said similar legislation was brought forth last year and at that time the Board reviewed it and agreed to support it.

DISCUSSION: Senator Den Hartog asked why the SBE would oversee the allocation of funds. Chairman Mortimer explained the SBE should oversee the program and detailed the distinction of the work between the SDE and the SBE. He said the University of Idaho has the resources to provide the assistance.

Vice Chairman Thayn said he hopes by working with school leadership, implementing different teaching strategies, and engaging parents, better pedagogical strategies will be developed and shared amongst the State's schools. He stated he will be voting for the bill.

VOICE VOTE: The motion to send S 1029 to the floor with a do pass recommendation passed by voice vote. Senator Den Hartog requested she be recorded as voting nay.

PASSED THE GAVEL: Vice Chairman Thayn passed the gavel to Chairman Mortimer.

MINUTES APPROVAL: Senator Woodward moved to approve the Minutes from January 9, 2019. Senator Crabtree seconded the motion. The motion passed by voice vote.

Senator Lent moved to approve the Minutes from January 14, 2019. Senator Ward-Engelking seconded the motion. The motion passed by voice vote.

ADJOURNED: There being no further business at this time, Chairman Mortimer adjourned the meeting at 5:08 p.m.
Charter School Performance in Idaho
Topics

• Charter School Demographics
• Charter School Impacts
  – Full Sample
  – School-level
  – Student subgroups
Statewide Comparison of TPS, Feeders, and Charters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TPS</th>
<th>Feeders</th>
<th>Charters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of schools</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average enrollment per school</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of students enrolled</td>
<td>272,869</td>
<td>191,673</td>
<td>19,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students in Poverty</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Leaners</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education Students</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Students</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Students</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Students</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander Students</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American Students</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Racial Students</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Impact Evaluation Methodology

• **Outcome** 1-year academic growth
  » 1 growth period requires 2 years of data
  » Two growth periods are possible

• **Test Scores** used from 56 Charters in Math, 55 in Reading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>2015-16</th>
<th>2016-17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>7,113</td>
<td>7,802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>7,024</td>
<td>7,790</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

» Small samples require big impacts to reach statistical significance

• **Comparisons** are obtained from Virtual Control Records (VCR)
  
  » Feeder and Charter students matched on all demographics and baseline achievement -- 84% match rate
Impact by Growth Period and Years in Charter

![Bar chart showing growth in standard deviations for Reading and Math across two periods: 2015-2016 and 2016-2017. The chart indicates that Math had a higher growth rate than Reading in both periods, with a significant difference in the second period.]

* Significant at p < 0.05
** Significant at p < 0.01
Charter Students by Locale

- Rural: 26%
- Town: 13%
- Urban: 23%
- Suburban: 38%
Impact by School Locale
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* Significant at p < 0.05
** Significant at p < 0.01
Impact by School Level

The chart illustrates the impact of different school levels on academic growth in reading and math. Here are the key findings:

- **Elementary School**:
  - Reading: 0.03
  - Math: 0.04
  - Significant at p < 0.05

- **Middle School**:
  - Reading: -0.06**
  - Math: -0.06**
  - Significant at p < 0.01

- **High School**:
  - Reading: 0.02
  - Math: 0.00

- **Multi-level**:
  - Reading: 0.04**
  - Math: 0.03

* Significant at p < 0.05
** Significant at p < 0.01

*Source: Credo*
Impact by Delivery System

![Bar chart showing growth in standard deviations for Online Charters and Brick-and-Mortar Charters in Reading and Math.](chart)

- Online Charters:
  - Reading: -0.03
  - Math: -0.10**

- Brick-and-Mortar Charters:
  - Reading: 0.05**
  - Math: 0.06**

* Significant at p < 0.05  
** Significant at p < 0.01
School-Level Findings
School-Level Growth and Achievement (Read)

![Contingency table showing school-level growth and achievement.](chart.png)
School-Level Growth and Achievement (Math)
Subgroups
Subgroups

Achievement Gaps

Differences in knowledge between student groups at a fixed point in time.

White students are the benchmark.
Subgroups

Learning Gaps = Differences in growth of knowledge between student groups in the same year or period.

White student growth is the benchmark.

- Same growth – gaps stay the same
- Less growth – gaps increase
- More growth – gaps decrease
## Subgroups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup Impacts</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Math</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charter gains &gt; TPS gains</td>
<td>Whites *</td>
<td>Whites *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Gap eliminated</td>
<td>Whites in Poverty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Gap observed in both Charter and TPS</td>
<td>Poverty Hispanics in Poverty</td>
<td>Poverty Whites in Poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poverty SPED</td>
<td>Hispanics in Poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too few students (Charter and TPS)</td>
<td>Blacks English learners</td>
<td>Blacks English learners</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Denotes statistical significance
Summary of Findings

• In the aggregate, we find positive and significant effects associated with charter attendance for reading and positive but not statistically significant effects for math.

• Brick-and-Mortar Charters outperform Online Charters.

• We find wide variation in individual school effects. There is some good news.

• Charter attendance is associated with improved learning gains for White students.
Policy Considerations

• Facilitate high performers to share and grow.
• Resources need to balance equity and effectiveness.
  – Level is important
  – So are results
• Evidence that stronger authorizing is needed.

Idaho has a unique take on charters – with extra focus on quality, it could be a national exemplar.
Back-up Slide
# Statewide Comparison of Brick-and-Mortar and Online Charters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Charters</th>
<th>Brick-and-Mortar Charters</th>
<th>Online Charters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of schools</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average enrollment per school</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of students enrolled</td>
<td>19,381</td>
<td>14,501</td>
<td>4,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students in Poverty</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Leaners</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education Students</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Students</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Students</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Students</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander Students</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American Students</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Racial Students</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**AGENDA**

**SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE**

3:00 P.M.

Room WW55

Monday, February 04, 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>PRESENTER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presentation:</td>
<td>Boise State University</td>
<td>Dr. Martin Schimpf, Interim President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation:</td>
<td>Education Budget Discussion</td>
<td>Robyn Lockett, Principal Budget and Policy Analyst, Legislative Services Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Janet Jessup, Senior Budget and Policy Analyst, Legislative Services Office</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*If you have written testimony, please provide a copy of it along with the name of the person or organization responsible to the committee secretary to ensure accuracy of records.*

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS**

Chairman Mortimer  
Vice Chairman Thayn  
Sen Winder  
Sen Den Hartog  
Sen Crabtree

**COMMITTEE SECRETARY**

LeAnn Mohr  
Room: WW39  
Phone: 332-1321  
email: sedu@senate.idaho.gov
DATE: Monday, February 04, 2019
TIME: 3:00 P.M.
PLACE: Room WW55
MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Mortimer, Vice Chairman Thayn, Senators Winder, Den Hartog, Crabtree, Woodward, Lent, Buckner-Webb, and Ward-Engelking
ABSENT/EXCUSED: None
NOTE: The sign-in sheet, testimonies and other related materials will be retained with the minutes in the committee's office until the end of the session and will then be located on file with the minutes in the Legislative Services Library.

CONVENED: Chairman Mortimer called the Education Committee (Committee) to order at 3:06 p.m. He opened with a reading from the book, *A Heap O 'Living Along Life's Highway*, by Eager A. Guest, the poem, "The Bumps and Bruises Doctor."

PRESENTATION: Dr. Martin Schimpf, Interim President, Boise State University (BSU), introduced the BSU affiliates in the audience. He reported to the Committee his connection to Idaho and the changes he has witnessed during the last 30 years. He said BSU has grown from a commuter school to a metropolitan school of over 30,000 students.

Dr. Schimpf said his presentation will address the questions that were posed to him by Chairman Mortimer.

In response to what is going "right" with BSU, Dr. Schimpf replied BSU has been reclassified by the Carnegie system as a doctoral research university with high research activity. He said there has been a dramatic increase in recruiting and retaining top students and professors. He explained the type of student who is enrolling at BSU.

Dr. Schimpf said to off-set some of the increasing educational costs to students, BSU is working to advise students so they can have a timely completion of their degree. He said the faculty and staff are developing new transdisciplinary degree programs and detailed some of the new program offerings.

Dr. Schimpf addressed the Advanced Opportunities program. He stated it has created great cost savings for students but possible challenges for colleges and universities. He said BSU will serve over 6,000 new students in the 2018-2019 school year and said the percentage of new students who arrive on campus with dual credits is nearly 40 percent.

In response to collaborative efforts with other state institutions, Dr. Schimpf stated concurrent enrollment has been an ongoing effort. He explained Bronco Connect, which works with students coming out of the College of Southern Idaho and the College of Western Idaho and facilitates the students' seamless transition into BSU.

In conclusion, Dr. Schimpf said BSU is in the list of the top 50 schools in the country and they have played a significant role in the growth and economic vitality of the State.
Dr. Schimpf addressed the questions from the Committee. He reported the graduation rates for four-year and six-year students. There are more out-of-state students graduating at a faster pace, which is bringing up the four-year rate. He noted that the average GPA was the same for both groups. He explained how BSU is working to develop resources for the open source textbooks, college and career advising, concurrent programing, ongoing innovation, and the diversity mix (Attachment 1).

PRESENTATION: Robyn Lockett, Principal Budget and Policy Analyst, Legislative Services Office (LSO), reviewed for the Committee the K-12 Budget requests brought forth by the Governor's Office and the State Department of Education (SDE). She said there are eight appropriation bills regarding education funding. She detailed the 2020 $2 billion request and compared in detail the Governor's request verses the Superintendent of Public Instruction's request (Attachment 2).

Committee members asked for clarification on funding for the Career Ladder, local spending discretion, Mastery Based Instruction, and literacy funding.

PRESENTATION: Janet Jessup, Senior Budget and Policy Analyst, LSO, presented the 2020 proposed higher education budget. She detailed the allocations to the different universities and colleges as well as the line item requests and recommendations. She said the Career Technical Education items are embedded in the institutions budget (Attachment 3).

Chairman Mortimer advised the Committee to study the budget information so they can make budget recommendations at a later meeting.

RECORDERING LINK: To hear the complete BSU and budget recommendations, go to: https://legislature.idaho.gov/sessioninfo/2019/standingcommittees/SEDU/.

ADJOURNED: There being no further business at this time, Chairman Mortimer adjourned the meeting at 4:49 p.m.
Good afternoon. Thank you Mr. Chairman and members of the committee for the opportunity to address you this morning on behalf of Boise State University. I've been in Idaho for only half of my 60 years, but my Idaho roots actually go back further than that. My mother was born in Lewiston and grew up on the edge of the Palouse in Ritzville, Washington. As a child we traveled to Idaho nearly every year, typically visiting the grandparents in Ritzville before heading to Lake Ceour d' Alene for a week of camping, often with my older cousins from Helena, where my Dad was born and raised before heading into the Pacific for World War II.

My mom was a strong woman, full of life, and it was only after a couple years of living in Idaho that I realized where she got her spirit and her grit. I've raised two kids in Idaho – my daughter earned two degrees from Boise State, and my son is currently a Junior in the College of Engineering. Next year I'll finish my thirtieth year working for the State of Idaho, and it goes without saying that I've seen a lot of change, particularly at Boise State, which has grown over that time from a commuter school of around 10,000 students, primarily undergraduate students, into a doctoral research university that serves over 30,000 individual students during the course of a year if you include the 5-6000 high school students across Idaho earning college credit, and the largest number of graduate students of any University in Idaho, which recently exceeded 3500.

That growth and evolution, which remained steady through three recessions over those 30 years, has demanded the same determination and grit from the faculty and staff at Boise State that my mom gave me, and I am proud – and blessed – to have been part of it – starting as an Assistant Professor of Chemistry and moving through the ranks to reach this point, where I have the privilege of addressing you as Interim President.

To your questions:

What is going right in your institution?

• We are attracting young and strong faculty from top universities across the country

• These faculty see an opportunity to make a difference at an emerging national university, which has catalyzed the development of a unique culture at Boise State – one of innovation and constant change – that has earned us national awards and recognition.

• We were recently re-classified in the Carnegie system as a Doctoral Research University with High Research activity

• This is important because it attracts really talented students coming out of high school who are interested in the STEM disciplines – students who ten years ago would have gone to Salt Lake City, Seattle, Fort Collins or some other city to attend a metropolitan research university – but are instead choosing Boise State.

• For local students, that cost is lowered because they don’t have to move and live away from home to go to a strong research university. But we’re also attracting students from other cities across the west whose parents see a lower cost to send their students to a clean, safe city to learn and grow at an affordable cost.
Colleges and Universities are in unique times - enrollment and costs are increasing. How is your institution addressing those issues?

• We are constantly adapting and innovating.

• Through the development of a program prioritization process, which is now integrated into a new budget model for colleges, we have institutionalized incentives for faculty to recruit, retain, and graduate students.

• As a result our faculty and staff are constantly developing new transdisciplinary degree programs that attract students so that their classroom are full – and if they are not we either eliminate them, combine them, or reinvent them – fueling a culture of constant evolution and improvement across campus.

• We launched our new Passport to Education program last fall in partnership with CapEd Credit Union. This program provides access to an online college degree for members at a reduced cost through a monthly subscription, which can save them literally thousands of dollars over the cost of a traditional degree. As part of the package, we offer hands-on advising and guidance, to help them build a custom degree plan based on their needs or goals, and we provide workshops that help them put together portfolios that can earn them credit for workforce learning.

Advanced Opportunities has created great cost savings for students, but possible challenges for Colleges and Universities. What are the challenges for your institution and how are they be addressed?

• For Boise State, advanced opportunities for high school students have been just that – an opportunity.

• We have been steadily increasing our concurrent enrollment enterprise for over a decade – this year we will serve over 6000 such students – we even offer students in certain school districts where we have agreements in place, summer courses on campus at concurrent enrollment prices on a space-available basis. In other words, if we already have a course that is adequately enrolled to cover instructional costs, but still have a few seats available, we open that course up to high school students as concurrent enrollment.

• Percent who brought in any concurrent credits with them to Boise State in fall 2018 = 40.5% (up from 33.2% in fall 2014).

• Percent who arrived with concurrent credits from Boise State (some of whom may also have had concurrent credits from other places, too) - fall 2018 = 20.9% (up from 16.0% in fall 2014)

• This not only benefits students, it’s a great recruitment tool for the local area.

What are you doing with other institutions in Idaho to enhance the learning process and increased accessibility for Idaho students?

• Concurrent Enrollment has been an ongoing effort for years.
• Bronco Connect is a partnership with CWI and CSI which ensures that students coming out of community college with an associates degree can seamlessly transfer to Boise State and be on track to graduate with a bachelor’s degree in two years.

• Students who sign up for Bronco Connect, for example, are advised on location and guaranteed transfer to Boise State under the current catalog, so even if we change degree requirements before they transfer we won’t require them to follow a new catalog – it is as if they had been enrolled at Boise State all along.

• To facilitate this program, CWI and CSI provide us with office space on their campus and several classrooms so we can use Boise State faculty to cover any courses during the first two years of college that they don’t offer.

• As part of this our faculties have developed articulation agreements – program by program – which we refer to as 2+2 agreements, that delineate the full four year plan for a first year student who attends two years at community college followed by two years at Boise State.

• We also made a list of the top twenty colleges and universities that send us transfer students, and over the course of a couple years systematically went through every course requirement for every degree program at Boise State and matched it to a specific course at the transfer institution, so that a transferring student would not have to duplicate any courses or march around campus from department to department to get a signature for every course equivalent they want to transfer.

• We did this to avoid the “gotcha” for students, but it’s turned into a great recruitment tool for Community Colleges and Universities across the intermountain west.

When leaders from the largest universities across the country were asked by U.S. News and World Report to identify the most innovative national universities in the country, Boise State emerged in their list of the top 50 in the country — another sign that what we’re doing here in Idaho is catching the nation’s attention.

The nation has certainly awoken to Idaho, and the Treasure Valley and its University – and as a long-time resident and participant in the Boise State story, I feel in my heart of hearts that Boise State has played a significant role in the growth and economic vitality of this state. Thank you for listening. I’ll try to answer any questions you have — and I’ve brought a few key campus leaders in case I need some help.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. APPROPRIATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources of Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>$1,785,265,900</td>
<td>$1,927,558,900</td>
<td>$1,894,894,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated Funds</td>
<td>$91,010,700</td>
<td>$101,877,300</td>
<td>$101,905,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL APPROPRIATIONS</strong></td>
<td>$2,140,615,100</td>
<td>$2,283,774,700</td>
<td>$2,261,138,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>General Fund Percent Change:</em></td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Total Funds Percent Change:</em></td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II. PROGRAM DISTRIBUTIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory Requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Transportation</td>
<td>$73,010,000</td>
<td>$75,334,700</td>
<td>$75,334,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Border Contracts</td>
<td>$4,200,000</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Exceptional Contracts/Tuition Equivalents</td>
<td>$5,390,900</td>
<td>$5,761,000</td>
<td>$5,761,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Salary-based Apportionment</td>
<td>$203,518,300</td>
<td>$212,578,600</td>
<td>$213,050,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 State Paid Employee Benefits</td>
<td>$38,180,000</td>
<td>$41,197,800</td>
<td>$41,289,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Career Ladder Salaries</td>
<td>$761,686,200</td>
<td>$829,759,300</td>
<td>$812,913,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Career Ladder Benefits</td>
<td>$142,869,800</td>
<td>$155,423,800</td>
<td>$157,542,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Bond Levy Equalization</td>
<td>$23,184,500</td>
<td>$25,968,300</td>
<td>$23,387,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Idaho Digital Learning Academy</td>
<td>$19,788,500</td>
<td>$12,157,600</td>
<td>$11,955,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Idaho Safe &amp; Drug-Free Schools</td>
<td>$4,024,900</td>
<td>$4,024,900</td>
<td>$4,024,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Math and Science Requirement</td>
<td>$5,930,000</td>
<td>$6,590,900</td>
<td>$6,590,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Advanced Opportunities</td>
<td>$15,000,000</td>
<td>$18,000,000</td>
<td>$18,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 National Board Teacher Certification</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Facilities (Lottery) &amp; Interest Earned</td>
<td>$18,562,500</td>
<td>$22,842,500</td>
<td>$22,842,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Facilities State Match (GF)</td>
<td>$3,905,000</td>
<td>$4,104,000</td>
<td>$4,104,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Facilities - Charter School Funding</td>
<td>$7,893,700</td>
<td>$8,840,000</td>
<td>$8,840,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Leadership Awards/Premiums</td>
<td>$17,773,600</td>
<td>$18,400,700</td>
<td>$18,400,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Continuous Improvement Plans and Training</td>
<td>$652,000</td>
<td>$652,000</td>
<td>$652,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Mastery Based System</td>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
<td>$2,800,000</td>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Online Class Portal Managed by SDE</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Literacy Proficiency/Interventions Based on IRI</td>
<td>$13,156,500</td>
<td>$13,156,500</td>
<td>$26,313,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Academic &amp; College/Career Advisors and Mentors</td>
<td>$9,000,000</td>
<td>$9,000,000</td>
<td>$9,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Innovation Schools</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Master Premiums (Salaries and Benefits)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,169,500</td>
<td>$7,175,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>25 Sub-total -- Statutory Requirements</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,356,346,400</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,480,091,600</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,470,117,500</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Program Distributions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Math Initiative</td>
<td>$1,817,800</td>
<td>$2,927,900</td>
<td>$1,817,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Remediation Based on ISAT</td>
<td>$5,456,300</td>
<td>$5,456,300</td>
<td>$5,456,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Limited English Proficiency (LEP)</td>
<td>$4,870,000</td>
<td>$4,870,000</td>
<td>$4,870,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 District and Charter IT Staffing</td>
<td>$8,000,000</td>
<td>$8,000,000</td>
<td>$8,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Distributed Technology Funds (Classroom, WiFi, IMS)</td>
<td>$36,500,000</td>
<td>$39,500,000</td>
<td>$36,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Student Achievement Assessments</td>
<td>$3,100,000</td>
<td>$2,258,500</td>
<td>$2,258,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Prof. Devel., Gifted &amp; Talented, and Teacher Pipeline</td>
<td>$21,550,000</td>
<td>$24,530,000</td>
<td>$21,550,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Content and Curriculum</td>
<td>$6,350,000</td>
<td>$6,350,000</td>
<td>$6,350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Bureau of Services for the Deaf &amp; Blind (Campus)</td>
<td>$7,023,000</td>
<td>$7,468,600</td>
<td>$7,270,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Bureau of Services for the Deaf &amp; Blind (Outreach)</td>
<td>$3,956,400</td>
<td>$4,204,700</td>
<td>$4,102,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Keep Idaho Students Safe (KISS)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,600,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 Federal Funds for Local School Districts</td>
<td>$264,115,000</td>
<td>$264,115,000</td>
<td>$264,115,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. Sub-total -- Other Program Distributions</strong></td>
<td><strong>$362,738,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>$371,281,200</strong></td>
<td><strong>$362,290,800</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II. TOTAL CATEGORICAL EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE DISCRETIONARY FUNDS (Request is $7.36)</td>
<td>$1,719,084,900</td>
<td>$1,851,372,800</td>
<td>$1,832,408,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. million discretionary and $7.43 million health</td>
<td>$421,530,200</td>
<td>$442,401,900</td>
<td>$428,730,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. ESTIMATED SUPPORT UNITS (Best 28 Weeks)</td>
<td>15,339</td>
<td>15,560</td>
<td>15,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. STATE DISCRETIONARY $ PER SUPPORT UNIT</td>
<td>$27,481</td>
<td>$28,432</td>
<td>$27,481</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Public School Support
FY 2020 Request

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FTP</th>
<th>Gen</th>
<th>Ded</th>
<th>Fed</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY 2019 Original Appropriation</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,785,265,900</td>
<td>91,010,700</td>
<td>264,338,500</td>
<td>2,140,615,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supplements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Keep Idaho Students Safe</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>18,500,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Keep Idaho Students Safe</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>610,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>610,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY 2019 Total Appropriation</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,804,375,900</td>
<td>91,010,700</td>
<td>264,338,500</td>
<td>2,159,725,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Noncognizable Funds and Transfers</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY 2019 Estimated Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,804,375,900</td>
<td>91,010,700</td>
<td>264,338,500</td>
<td>2,159,725,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Removal of Onetime Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(19,549,600)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(19,549,600)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY 2020 Base</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,784,826,300</td>
<td>91,010,700</td>
<td>264,338,500</td>
<td>2,140,175,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit Costs</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6,276,200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,276,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement Items</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>147,600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>147,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public School Salary Change</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,448,800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,448,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Employee Compensation</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>34,300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nondiscretionary Adjustments</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>77,103,400</td>
<td>9,932,200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>87,035,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment Adjustments</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(934,400)</td>
<td>934,400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY 2020 Program Maintenance</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,869,902,200</td>
<td>101,877,300</td>
<td>264,338,500</td>
<td>2,236,118,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Items</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Administrators Addl 2% Salary Increase</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,884,200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,884,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Additional Career Ladder Funds</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>27,778,700</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27,778,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Teacher Pipeline Legislation</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>980,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>980,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Classroom Technology</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Discretionary for Health Insurance</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>7,438,100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,438,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Additional Discretionary</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>7,360,300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,360,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Classified Addl 2% Salary Increase</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,006,100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,006,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Mastery-Based Education</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,050,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,050,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Keep Idaho Students Safe</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>990,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>990,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mastery-Based Education</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Professional Development</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Math Initiative</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,110,100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,110,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Services for the Deaf &amp; Blind</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Career Ladder Equivalence</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>279,800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>279,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Speech-Language Pathologist</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>86,700</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>86,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. IT Specialist</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>76,700</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>76,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sign Language Interpreter</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>79,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>79,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Paraprofessional Classified Staff</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>69,200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>69,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Classroom and Office Technology</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Orientation/Mobility Instructor</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>82,300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>82,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY 2020 Total</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,927,558,900</td>
<td>101,877,300</td>
<td>264,338,500</td>
<td>2,293,774,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chg from FY 2019 Orig Approp.</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>142,293,000</td>
<td>10,866,600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>153,159,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Chg from FY 2019 Orig Approp.</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legislative Services Office
Budget & Policy Analysis
# Public School Support

## FY 2020 Govs Rec

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FTP</th>
<th>Gen</th>
<th>Ded</th>
<th>Fed</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY 2019 Original Appropriation</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,785,265,900</td>
<td>91,010,700</td>
<td>264,338,500</td>
<td>2,140,615,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supplementals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Keep Idaho Students Safe</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Keep Idaho Students Safe</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY 2019 Total Appropriation</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,785,265,900</td>
<td>91,010,700</td>
<td>264,338,500</td>
<td>2,140,615,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Noncognizable Funds and Transfers</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY 2019 Estimated Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,785,265,900</td>
<td>91,010,700</td>
<td>264,338,500</td>
<td>2,140,615,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removal of Onetime Expenditures</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(1,049,600)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(1,049,600)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY 2020 Base</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,848,216,300</td>
<td>91,010,700</td>
<td>264,338,500</td>
<td>2,139,565,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit Costs</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6,188,400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,188,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement Items</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>119,100</td>
<td>28,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>147,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public School Salary Change</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>7,341,700</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,341,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Employee Compensation</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>103,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>103,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nondiscretionary Adjustments</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>69,516,900</td>
<td>9,932,200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>79,449,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment Adjustments</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(934,400)</td>
<td>934,400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY 2020 Program Maintenance</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,866,551,000</td>
<td>101,905,800</td>
<td>264,338,500</td>
<td>2,232,795,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Items</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Administrators Add'l 2% Salary Increase</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Additional Career Ladder Funds</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Teacher Pipeline Legislation</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Teacher Pay Raise</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>11,229,400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11,229,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Classroom Technology</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Discretionary for Health Insurance</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Additional Discretionary</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Classified Add'l 2% Salary Increase</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Mastery-Based Education</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Literacy Proficiency</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>13,156,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13,156,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Keep Idaho Students Safe</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mastery-Based Education</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Professional Development</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Math Initiative</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Services for the Deaf &amp; Blind</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Career Ladder Equivalence</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>279,800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>279,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Speech-Language Pathologist</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>86,100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>86,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. IT Specialist</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sign Language Interpreter</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Paraprofessional Classified Staff</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>61,600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>61,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Classroom and Office Technology</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Orientation/Mobility Instructor</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY 2020 Total</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,891,364,400</td>
<td>101,905,800</td>
<td>264,338,500</td>
<td>2,257,608,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chg from FY 2019 Orig Appropriation</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>106,098,500</td>
<td>10,895,100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>116,993,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Chg from FY 2019 Orig Appropriation</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Idaho State Board of Education

Community Colleges
- College of Southern Idaho
- North Idaho College
- College of Western Idaho
- College of Eastern Idaho
- Systemwide Programs

College & Universities
- Boise State University
- Idaho State University
- Lewis Clark State College
- University of Idaho
- Systemwide Programs

Career Technical Education
- State Leadership & Tech Asst.
- General Programs
- Post Secondary Education Program
- Dedicated Programs
- Related Services

Health Education Programs
- UUSOM Education Program
- Family Medical Residencies
- Boise Internal Medicine
- Psychiatry Education
- Eastern Idaho Med. Residencies
- Bingham Internal Medicine
- ID Dental Education Program
- Washington-Idaho Vet Education
- WWAMI Medical Education

Ag Research & Ext. Services

Office of the State Board
- OSBE Administration
- Charter School Commission

Sup. Of Public Instruction
- Department of Education

Idaho Public Television
- Idaho Public Television

Vocational Rehabilitation
- Vocational Rehabilitation
- Extended Employment Services
- Council for the Deaf and HH

Special Programs
- Scholarships & Grants
- TechHelp
- Small Business Develop. Centers
- Museum of Natural History
- Forest Utilization Research
- Idaho Geological Survey

Robyn Lockett
Jill Randolph
Jill Randolph
## State Board of Education

### Comparative Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision Unit</th>
<th>FTP</th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Governor’s Rec</th>
<th>FTP</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY 2019 Original Appropriation</strong></td>
<td>6,055.87</td>
<td>510,069,800</td>
<td>866,788,500</td>
<td>6,055.87</td>
<td>510,069,800</td>
<td>866,788,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reappraisal</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>175,590,400</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>175,590,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health Education Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. FMR, Rural Training Track</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>375,000</td>
<td>375,000</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>375,000</td>
<td>375,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. FMR, Net Object Transfer</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Superintendent of Public Instruction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Crisis Communications Counselor</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>38,900</td>
<td>38,900</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY 2019 Total Appropriation</strong></td>
<td>6,058.37</td>
<td>510,563,700</td>
<td>1,042,792,800</td>
<td>6,058.37</td>
<td>510,563,700</td>
<td>1,042,792,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonrecognizable Funds and Transfers</td>
<td>90.67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22,828,000</td>
<td>90.67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22,828,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure Adjustments</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(4,453,800)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(4,453,800)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY 2019 Estimated Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>6,149.04</td>
<td>510,563,700</td>
<td>1,061,167,000</td>
<td>6,149.04</td>
<td>510,563,700</td>
<td>1,061,167,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removal of Onetime Expenditures</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(3,474,400)</td>
<td>(189,563,600)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(3,474,400)</td>
<td>(189,563,600)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Adjustments</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY 2020 Base</strong></td>
<td>6,151.13</td>
<td>507,089,300</td>
<td>871,603,400</td>
<td>6,151.13</td>
<td>507,050,400</td>
<td>871,664,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit Costs</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>447,100</td>
<td>601,500</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(2,260,300)</td>
<td>(3,612,800)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflationary Adjustments</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,910,800</td>
<td>4,682,100</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>490,200</td>
<td>3,261,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement Items</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>11,834,300</td>
<td>12,299,500</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>844,100</td>
<td>2,018,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide Cost Allocation</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>363,200</td>
<td>431,700</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>363,200</td>
<td>431,700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annualizations</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>68,600</td>
<td>68,600</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6,200</td>
<td>6,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Employee Compensation</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,488,100</td>
<td>5,476,000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>9,941,700</td>
<td>15,496,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nondiscretionary Adjustments</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,306,800</td>
<td>4,306,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment Adjustments</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>366,500</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>287,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY 2020 Program Maintenance</strong></td>
<td>6,151.13</td>
<td>525,201,400</td>
<td>895,529,300</td>
<td>6,151.13</td>
<td>520,722,300</td>
<td>893,762,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Items</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agricultural Research &amp; Extension Service</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. 4-H STEM Education</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>523,600</td>
<td>523,600</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Rock Creek Cattle Research</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>378,400</td>
<td>378,400</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>189,200</td>
<td>189,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Occupancy Costs</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>245,200</td>
<td>245,200</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>122,600</td>
<td>122,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College and Universities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Outcome Based Funding</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>11,000,000</td>
<td>11,000,000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Outcome Based Funding - At Risk</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Open Education Resources</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. College Academy for Parents</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>560,000</td>
<td>560,000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. NextSteps Idaho Expansion</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>123,000</td>
<td>123,000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Idaho American Indian Access Fees</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Higher Ed Dual Enrollment System</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Occupancy Costs - BUU, ISU, and UI</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>1,775,600</td>
<td>1,775,600</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>887,800</td>
<td>887,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. UI, Benefit Cost Offset</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,226,200</td>
<td>1,226,200</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Colleges</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Outcome Based Funding</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. CC Outcome Based Funding - Institution</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. CEI, Enrollment Growth Funding</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Systemwide Expenses</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. CSI &amp; CEI, Transfer of Faculty</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. CSI &amp; NIC. Benefit Cost Offset</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>391,700</td>
<td>391,700</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. NIC, Occupancy Costs</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>234,800</td>
<td>234,800</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>117,400</td>
<td>117,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. CEI, Interest Earning Distributions</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Partial Offset of Negative EWA</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Office of the State Board of Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Associate Chief Academic Officer</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>109,500</td>
<td>109,500</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>108,400</td>
<td>108,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Complete College America Prgm Mgr</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>100,700</td>
<td>100,700</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Career Info System Enhancements</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# State Board of Education

## Comparative Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision Unit</th>
<th>FTP</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>FTP</th>
<th>Governor's Rec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Staff</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>54,700</td>
<td>54,700</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master Ed Premium Portfolio Review</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>263,000</td>
<td>263,000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>263,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio/Visual Web Systems Tech</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>78,900</td>
<td>78,900</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-12 Task Force</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Health Education Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>FTP</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WWAMI, Project ECHO Idaho</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>361,500</td>
<td>361,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UUOSM, Year 4 Build-Out</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>90,800</td>
<td>90,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UUOSM, Leave of Absence</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>22,700</td>
<td>22,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UUOSM, Psych Residents</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>180,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMR, Resident Support</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>990,000</td>
<td>990,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIM, Resident Support &amp; Expan</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>515,000</td>
<td>515,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIMR, Resident Support &amp; Expan</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bingham, Resident Support &amp; Expan</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>180,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Division of Career Technical Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>FTP</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes Based Funding</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Preparation</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>515,000</td>
<td>515,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InSpire to Educate</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>410,000</td>
<td>410,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Analyst</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>95,100</td>
<td>95,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director for Student Engagement</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>123,800</td>
<td>123,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Alignment</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>180,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School CTE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>356,000</td>
<td>356,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce Readiness Incentive Grant</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Quality Initiative</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online CTE Course Development</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear Energy and Adv Reactor Adjust</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>641,900</td>
<td>641,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perkins Federal Grant</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offset of Projected Shortfall</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Idaho Public Television

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>FTP</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education Outreach</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>78,700</td>
<td>78,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Media Technician</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>71,900</td>
<td>71,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Video Production Grant</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>49,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten Readiness Grant</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Special Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>FTP</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FUR, Wood Utilization/Bldg Faculty</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>138,300</td>
<td>138,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUR, Mica Creek Watershed Project</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>123,600</td>
<td>123,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGS, Market-based Compensation</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>137,900</td>
<td>137,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG, College Bridge Grant</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,400,000</td>
<td>2,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG, GEARUP Scholarships</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBDC &amp; TH, Technology Specialist</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>137,000</td>
<td>137,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity Scholarships</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Vocational Rehabilitation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>FTP</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interpreter Training</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOV TECH 1, Network Equip Replacement</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOV TECH 3, Modernization – Consolidate</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(18,100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Law Exemptions</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FY 2020 Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FTP</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6,186,07</td>
<td>556,212,900</td>
<td>930,845,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6,157,88</td>
<td>533,012,800</td>
<td>908,395,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Chg from FY 2019 Orig Approp.                     | 130.20 | 48,143,100 | 64,056,700 |
| % Chg from FY 2019 Orig Approp.                   | 2.1%  | 9.4%      | 7.4%      |
| % Change for Maintenance                         | 3.0%  | 3.3%      | 3.1%      |
College and Universities

Historical Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPERATING BUDGET</th>
<th>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total App</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Approp</td>
<td>Request</td>
<td>Gov Rec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BY PROGRAM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boise State University</td>
<td>234,572,400</td>
<td>204,677,100</td>
<td>206,958,700</td>
<td>224,467,300</td>
<td>225,452,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho State University</td>
<td>231,055,600</td>
<td>143,023,300</td>
<td>149,286,700</td>
<td>150,574,400</td>
<td>149,268,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Idaho</td>
<td>203,326,500</td>
<td>182,693,100</td>
<td>178,804,000</td>
<td>184,680,700</td>
<td>183,625,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis-Clark State College</td>
<td>55,682,000</td>
<td>37,095,300</td>
<td>35,521,200</td>
<td>37,247,100</td>
<td>36,540,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systemwide</td>
<td>5,065,800</td>
<td>803,000</td>
<td>6,215,800</td>
<td>21,898,800</td>
<td>6,365,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>729,702,300</strong></td>
<td><strong>568,291,800</strong></td>
<td><strong>576,786,400</strong></td>
<td><strong>618,868,300</strong></td>
<td><strong>601,252,600</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BY FUND CATEGORY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>287,053,200</td>
<td>287,025,600</td>
<td>295,783,200</td>
<td>323,768,300</td>
<td>304,280,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated</td>
<td>442,649,100</td>
<td>281,266,200</td>
<td>281,023,200</td>
<td>295,100,000</td>
<td>296,971,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>729,702,300</strong></td>
<td><strong>568,291,800</strong></td>
<td><strong>576,786,400</strong></td>
<td><strong>618,868,300</strong></td>
<td><strong>601,252,600</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Change:</td>
<td>(22.1%)</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BY OBJECT OF EXPENDITURE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Costs</td>
<td>530,602,700</td>
<td>442,841,300</td>
<td>455,701,800</td>
<td>467,016,800</td>
<td>473,743,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenditures</td>
<td>160,847,300</td>
<td>99,217,200</td>
<td>98,886,000</td>
<td>110,474,200</td>
<td>108,615,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td>33,644,300</td>
<td>21,172,400</td>
<td>18,060,600</td>
<td>25,058,300</td>
<td>14,735,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustee/Benefit</td>
<td>4,608,000</td>
<td>5,060,900</td>
<td>4,158,000</td>
<td>16,318,000</td>
<td>4,158,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>729,702,300</strong></td>
<td><strong>568,291,800</strong></td>
<td><strong>576,786,400</strong></td>
<td><strong>618,868,300</strong></td>
<td><strong>601,252,600</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Positions (FTP)</td>
<td>4,559.88</td>
<td>4,558.31</td>
<td>4,680.80</td>
<td>4,756.72</td>
<td>4,753.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Division Description

The College and Universities Division includes the following five programs: Boise State University (BSU); Idaho State University (ISU); University of Idaho (UI); Lewis-Clark State College (LCSC); and Systemwide Programs, which includes funding for programs and efforts that benefit all four institutions. The Legislature appropriates both from the General Fund and from dedicated funds to this division. Dedicated funds include endowment funds and revenue from tuition and fees. Federal funds and other "local funds" from specific fees are not appropriated by the Legislature.
### College and Universities

#### Comparative Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision Unit</th>
<th>Agency Request</th>
<th></th>
<th>Governor’s Rec</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FTP</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>FTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2019 Original Appropriation</td>
<td>4,680.80</td>
<td>295,763,200</td>
<td>576,786,400</td>
<td>4,680.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reappropriation</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>162,464,300</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2019 Total Appropriation</td>
<td>4,680.80</td>
<td>295,763,200</td>
<td>739,250,700</td>
<td>4,680.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncognizable Funds and Transfers</td>
<td>69.56</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22,824,500</td>
<td>69.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure Adjustments</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(4,166,300)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2019 Estimated Expenditures</td>
<td>4,750.36</td>
<td>295,763,200</td>
<td>757,908,900</td>
<td>4,750.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removal of Onetime Expenditures</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(1,254,200)</td>
<td>(173,441,900)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Adjustments</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2020 Base</td>
<td>4,750.36</td>
<td>294,509,000</td>
<td>584,467,000</td>
<td>4,750.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit Costs</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>89,600</td>
<td>173,800</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflationary Adjustments</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,236,100</td>
<td>4,000,800</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement Items</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>9,801,200</td>
<td>9,917,900</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide Cost Allocation</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>106,200</td>
<td>106,200</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Employee Compensation</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,341,400</td>
<td>4,151,300</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nondiscretionary Adjustments</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment Adjustments</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>366,500</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2020 Program Maintenance</td>
<td>4,750.36</td>
<td>303,883,500</td>
<td>603,183,500</td>
<td>4,750.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Outcome Based Funding</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>11,000,000</td>
<td>11,000,000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Outcome Based Funding - At Risk</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Open Education Resources</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. College Academy for Parents</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>560,000</td>
<td>560,000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. NextSteps Idaho Expansion</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>123,000</td>
<td>123,000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Idaho American Indian Access Fees</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Higher Ed Dual Enrollment System</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Occupancy Costs - BSU, ISU, and UI</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>1,775,600</td>
<td>1,775,600</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. UI, Benefit Cost Offset</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,226,200</td>
<td>1,226,200</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Law Exemptions</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2020 Total</td>
<td>4,756.72</td>
<td>323,768,300</td>
<td>618,868,300</td>
<td>4,753.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change from Original Appropriation</td>
<td>75.92</td>
<td>28,005,100</td>
<td>42,081,900</td>
<td>72.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change from Original Appropriation</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Division of Career Technical Education

#### Historical Summary

**Operating Budget**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2018 Total App</th>
<th>FY 2018 Actual</th>
<th>FY 2019 Approp</th>
<th>FY 2020 Request</th>
<th>FY 2020 Gov Rec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>By Program</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Programs</td>
<td>25,013,700</td>
<td>20,667,800</td>
<td>20,871,700</td>
<td>23,576,900</td>
<td>22,009,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postsecondary Programs</td>
<td>46,511,900</td>
<td>46,511,900</td>
<td>46,312,600</td>
<td>49,500,100</td>
<td>47,503,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated Programs</td>
<td>890,000</td>
<td>775,900</td>
<td>1,627,000</td>
<td>1,728,100</td>
<td>1,728,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related Services</td>
<td>4,818,200</td>
<td>3,714,200</td>
<td>3,836,500</td>
<td>3,838,400</td>
<td>3,839,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td>80,673,500</td>
<td>74,799,700</td>
<td>75,963,200</td>
<td>82,224,700</td>
<td>78,475,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **By Fund Category**  |                   |                |                |                |                |
| General               | 66,372,000        | 65,284,800     | 66,397,900     | 71,932,300      | 68,172,700     |
| Dedicated             | 1,004,300         | 374,900        | 634,800        | 552,800         | 556,500        |
| Federal               | 14,297,200        | 9,140,000      | 8,930,500      | 9,739,600       | 9,745,900      |
| **Total:**            | 80,673,500        | 74,799,700     | 75,963,200     | 82,224,700      | 78,475,100     |

Percent Change: 1.6% 8.2% 3.3%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>By Object of Expenditure</strong></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Costs</td>
<td>45,431,100</td>
<td>3,167,200</td>
<td>45,236,500</td>
<td>46,245,200</td>
<td>46,326,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenditures</td>
<td>5,141,400</td>
<td>1,106,800</td>
<td>5,160,500</td>
<td>5,622,300</td>
<td>5,291,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td>1,038,600</td>
<td>30,400</td>
<td>583,500</td>
<td>801,500</td>
<td>649,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustee/Benefit</td>
<td>29,062,400</td>
<td>70,495,300</td>
<td>24,962,700</td>
<td>29,555,700</td>
<td>26,207,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td>80,673,500</td>
<td>74,799,700</td>
<td>75,963,200</td>
<td>82,224,700</td>
<td>78,475,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Full-Time Positions (FTP) 582.96 582.96 580.26 585.26 582.26

#### Division Description

The Division of Career Technical Education consists of the following five programs:

1. **The State Leadership and Technical Assistance Program** includes central staff to provide leadership, administrative and technical assistance, oversight, and accountability to a statewide educational system that provides career and technical programs at the state's high schools and technical colleges. This system prepares Idaho's youth and adults for high-skill, in-demand careers including one-year, two-year, and industry certifications, as well as for further educational attainment.

2. **General Programs** receive moneys from the General Fund, dedicated funds, and federal funds to provide secondary students with career and technical programs. General Programs also provide individuals in the workforce with the skills necessary to maintain and/or advance in their chosen occupation.

3. **Postsecondary Programs** provide college students with opportunities to obtain the two-year degrees and shorter term certifications needed for employment in skilled and technical occupations that require less than a baccalaureate degree. The appropriation for this program is intended to fund 100% of the direct costs at Idaho's six technical colleges located within the College of Southern Idaho, College of Western Idaho, Idaho State University, Lewis-Clark State College, North Idaho College, and the College of Eastern Idaho. The appropriation also includes added costs funding, career technical high school funding, program quality incentive funding, and teacher preparation programs through the University of Idaho and Idaho State University.

4. **Dedicated Programs** include funding for the Centers for New Directions at the six technical colleges, which provide underprepared adults, including displaced homemakers and single parents, with the skills necessary to be successful in the workplace. This program also includes funding for the Workforce Training Centers at the six technical colleges. Both of these programs are codified in Section 33-1629, Idaho Code.

5. **Related Services** administers Adult Education (AE) and General Educational Development (GED).
## Division of Career Technical Education

### Comparative Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision Unit</th>
<th>Agency Request</th>
<th>Governor's Rec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FTP</strong></td>
<td><strong>General</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reappropriation</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2019 Total Appropriation</td>
<td>580.26</td>
<td>66,397,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncognizable Funds and Transfers</td>
<td>(2.09)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure Adjustments</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2019 Estimated Expenditures</td>
<td>578.17</td>
<td>66,397,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removal of Onetime Expenditures</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(831,500)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Adjustments</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY 2020 Base</strong></td>
<td>580.26</td>
<td>65,566,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit Costs</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>142,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement Items</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>629,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide Cost Allocation</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>25,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Employee Compensation</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>376,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY 2020 Program Maintenance</strong></td>
<td>580.26</td>
<td>66,740,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Outcomes Based Funding</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Teacher Preparation</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>515,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. InSpire to Educate</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>410,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Data Analyst</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>95,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Director for Student Engagement</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>123,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Program Alignment</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>180,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Middle School CTE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>356,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Workforce Readiness Incentive Grant</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Program Quality Initiative</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Online CTE Course Development</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Nuclear Energy and Adv Reactor Adjust</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>641,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Perkins Federal Grant</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Offset of Projected Shortfall</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOV TECH 1. Network Equip Replacement</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Law Exemptions</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY 2020 Total</strong></td>
<td>585.26</td>
<td>71,932,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change from Original Appropriation</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5,534,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change from Original Appropriation</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Source:** FY 2020 Idaho Legislative Budget Book

**Department:** Division of Career Technical Education
## Health Education Programs

### Historical Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPERATING BUDGET</th>
<th>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total App</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Approp</td>
<td>Request</td>
<td>Gov Rec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BY PROGRAM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIMU Veterinary Education</td>
<td>2,076,100</td>
<td>2,076,100</td>
<td>2,116,500</td>
<td>2,165,400</td>
<td>2,159,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWAMI Medical Education</td>
<td>5,303,400</td>
<td>5,303,400</td>
<td>6,399,500</td>
<td>6,952,500</td>
<td>6,610,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho Dental Education</td>
<td>2,560,000</td>
<td>1,920,500</td>
<td>1,828,400</td>
<td>1,892,600</td>
<td>1,997,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Utah Med. Ed.</td>
<td>1,576,000</td>
<td>1,576,000</td>
<td>1,694,900</td>
<td>2,049,800</td>
<td>2,049,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Medicine Residencies</td>
<td>4,440,900</td>
<td>4,440,900</td>
<td>5,000,900</td>
<td>6,400,200</td>
<td>5,867,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boise Internal Medicine</td>
<td>540,000</td>
<td>540,000</td>
<td>617,500</td>
<td>1,132,500</td>
<td>875,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatry Residency</td>
<td>157,800</td>
<td>157,800</td>
<td>397,800</td>
<td>397,800</td>
<td>397,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Idaho Med Residencies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>455,000</td>
<td>1,155,000</td>
<td>1,105,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bingham Internal Medicine</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>526,000</td>
<td>705,000</td>
<td>645,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,654,200</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,014,700</strong></td>
<td><strong>19,035,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>22,850,800</strong></td>
<td><strong>21,608,200</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BY FUND CATEGORY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>15,594,200</td>
<td>15,502,600</td>
<td>18,714,500</td>
<td>22,524,800</td>
<td>21,280,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated</td>
<td>1,060,000</td>
<td>512,100</td>
<td>321,000</td>
<td>326,000</td>
<td>328,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,654,200</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,014,700</strong></td>
<td><strong>19,035,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>22,850,800</strong></td>
<td><strong>21,608,200</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent Change:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3.8%)</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BY OBJECT OF EXPENDITURE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Costs</td>
<td>3,832,100</td>
<td>2,945,300</td>
<td>3,644,000</td>
<td>4,927,200</td>
<td>4,469,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenditures</td>
<td>1,970,900</td>
<td>2,059,300</td>
<td>2,219,200</td>
<td>2,336,700</td>
<td>2,251,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td>244,300</td>
<td>494,800</td>
<td>93,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>12,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustee/Benefit</td>
<td>10,606,900</td>
<td>10,515,300</td>
<td>13,079,300</td>
<td>15,671,900</td>
<td>14,874,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,654,200</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,014,700</strong></td>
<td><strong>19,035,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>22,850,800</strong></td>
<td><strong>21,608,200</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full-Time Positions (FTP)</strong></td>
<td>25.80</td>
<td>25.80</td>
<td>30.15</td>
<td>40.65</td>
<td>36.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Division Description

The nine Health Education Programs include:

1. The WIMU (Washington-Idaho-Montana-Utah) Veterinary Education Program provides access to a veterinary medical education through a cooperative agreement between the University of Idaho and Washington State University.

2. The WWAMI (Washington, Wyoming, Alaska, Montana, Idaho) Medical Education Program provides Idaho students with the opportunity to attend medical school through a cooperative agreement with the University of Washington.

3. The IDEP (Idaho Dental Education Program) provides access to dental education for Idaho students through a cooperative agreement between Idaho State University and Creighton University in Omaha, Nebraska.

4. The University of Utah Medical Education Program provides medical school opportunities for Idaho.

5. Idaho’s three Family Medicine Residency programs (located in Boise, Pocatello, and Coeur d’Alene) provide the final three years of family physician residency training and encourage newly graduated medical doctors to practice in Idaho.

6. The Boise Internal Medicine (BIM) residency program allows training at rural and underserved sites in Idaho, such as small, non-affiliated offices and community-based training sites.

7. The Idaho Psychiatry Residency Program offers training for residents who spend the first two years in Seattle (University of Washington) and the last two years in Boise. Clinical rotations occur at the Boise VA, St. Alphonsus, and St. Luke’s medical centers, as well as at rural rotations around the state.

8. The EIMR (Eastern Idaho Medical Residencies) program allows training at rural and underserved sites in eastern Idaho, based from the Eastern Idaho Regional Medical Center in Idaho Falls.

9. The Bingham (Bingham Internal Medicine) residency program allows training at rural and underserved sites in eastern Idaho, based out of Blackfoot.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision Unit</th>
<th>Agency Request</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Governor's Rec</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FTP</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>FTP</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2019 Original Appropriation</td>
<td>30.15</td>
<td>18,714,500</td>
<td>19,035,500</td>
<td>30.15</td>
<td>18,714,500</td>
<td>19,035,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reappropriation</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>547,900</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>547,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. FMR, Rural Training Track</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>375,000</td>
<td>375,000</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>375,000</td>
<td>375,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. FMR, Net Object Transfer</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2019 Total Appropriation</td>
<td>31.65</td>
<td>19,089,500</td>
<td>19,958,400</td>
<td>31.65</td>
<td>19,089,500</td>
<td>19,958,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncognizable Funds and Transfers</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2019 Estimated Expenditures</td>
<td>34.65</td>
<td>19,099,500</td>
<td>19,961,900</td>
<td>34.65</td>
<td>19,099,500</td>
<td>19,961,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removal of Onetime Expenditures</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(87,500)</td>
<td>(87,500)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(87,500)</td>
<td>(87,500)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2020 Base</td>
<td>34.65</td>
<td>19,002,000</td>
<td>19,326,500</td>
<td>34.65</td>
<td>19,002,000</td>
<td>19,326,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit Costs</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>(1,100)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>17,800</td>
<td>(19,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflationary Adjustments</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>436,600</td>
<td>436,600</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>411,600</td>
<td>411,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement Items</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>9,500</td>
<td>9,500</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Employee Compensation</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>37,600</td>
<td>39,300</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>106,300</td>
<td>111,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2020 Program Maintenance</td>
<td>34.65</td>
<td>19,484,800</td>
<td>19,810,800</td>
<td>34.65</td>
<td>19,509,100</td>
<td>19,837,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. WWAMI, Project ECHO Idaho</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>361,500</td>
<td>361,500</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. UUSOM, Year 4 Build-Out</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>90,800</td>
<td>90,800</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>90,800</td>
<td>90,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. UUSOM, Leave of Absence</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>22,700</td>
<td>22,700</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>22,700</td>
<td>22,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. UUSOM, Psych Residents</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>180,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. FMR, Resident Support</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>990,000</td>
<td>990,000</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>450,000</td>
<td>450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. BIM, Resident Support &amp; Expan</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>515,000</td>
<td>515,000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>257,500</td>
<td>257,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. EIMR, Resident Support &amp; Expan</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>650,000</td>
<td>650,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Bingham, Resident Support &amp; Expan</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2020 Total</td>
<td>40.65</td>
<td>22,524,800</td>
<td>22,850,800</td>
<td>36.65</td>
<td>21,280,100</td>
<td>21,609,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change from Original Appropriation</td>
<td>10.50</td>
<td>3,810,300</td>
<td>3,815,300</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>2,565,600</td>
<td>2,572,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change from Original Appropriation</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### AGENDA

**SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE**  
3:00 P.M.  
Room WW55  
Tuesday, February 05, 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>PRESENTER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presentation: State Board of Education:</td>
<td>College &amp; Career Counseling, Next Steps Website,</td>
<td>Byron Yankey, Program Manager, College and Career Advising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Integration of Career Information into the Next Steps Website</td>
<td>Sara Scudder, Program Manager, Career Information Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minutes Approval:</td>
<td>Approve the Minutes from January 15, 2019</td>
<td>Senator Lent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approve the Minutes from January 16, 2019</td>
<td>Senator Ward-Engelking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approve the Minutes from January 17, 2019</td>
<td>Senator Den Hartog</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*If you have written testimony, please provide a copy of it along with the name of the person or organization responsible to the committee secretary to ensure accuracy of records.*

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS**
- Chairman Mortimer
- Vice Chairman Thayn
- Sen Winder
- Sen Den Hartog
- Sen Crabtree

**COMMITTEE SECRETARY**
- LeAnn Mohr  
  Room: WW39  
  Phone: 332-1321  
  email: sedu@senate.idaho.gov
MINUTES
SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

DATE: Tuesday, February 05, 2019
TIME: 3:00 P.M.
PLACE: Room WW55
MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Mortimer, Vice Chairman Thayn, Senators Winder, Den Hartog, Crabtree, Woodward, Lent, Buckner-Webb, and Ward-Engelking
ABSENT/EXCUSED: None

NOTE: The sign-in sheet, testimonies and other related materials will be retained with the minutes in the committee's office until the end of the session and will then be located on file with the minutes in the Legislative Services Library.

CONVENED: Chairman Mortimer called the Education Committee (Committee) to order at 3:01 p.m.

PRESENTATION: Byron Yankey, Program Manager, College and Career Advising, State Board of Education (SBE), presented the College and Career Counseling, Next Steps Website. Mr. Yankey announced to the Committee that this year, the number of students applying for college admission through the website has grown over 60 percent from the previous year. Now, the challenge is to make sure that many of the applicants arrive on campus in the fall.

Mr. Yankey detailed the work that has been accomplished during the past year and a half, under the broad title of Guided Pathways which works in conjunction with the Direct Admissions. It is a partnership with Career Technical Education (CTE) and the Workforce Development Council (WFC), working with students starting in middle school and progressing into high school. He detailed the progression students can use in the Guided Pathways program and explained the benefit for students to be able to gather college and career planning information on the website. He showed the Committee the variety of Next Step website tools for student, families, and educators that aid in career advancement. Mr. Yankey demonstrated to the Committee the various career exploration tools of the website.

Sara Scudder, Program Manager, Career Information Systems, SBE, presented Integration of Career Information into the Next Steps Website. She detailed the changes for the Idaho Career Information System (CIS) which is now on the Next Steps Website. She explained to the Committee the programs that CIS encapsulates. She demonstrated to the Committee how the website occupation buttons link to the majors of study and then link to state and nationwide schools which offer the programs. Ms. Scudder detailed the new website updates and stated the changes, which are more student and user friendly (Attachment 1). In response to questions from the Committee, Ms. Scudder addressed the new personalized learning plan which helps students to visualize a possible career path through the skills they currently possess. She explained the program and stated it begins in the student's eighth grade year of school.

Tracie Bent, Chief Planning and Policy Officer, SBE, clarified for the Committee the codified eighth grade learning plan. She stated many districts' websites have portals for students and parents to link them to the Next Steps Website. The objective is to see students use this tool from eighth grade to twelfth grade to help them with future educational goals.
Chairman Mortimer thanked Mr. Yankey and Ms. Scudder for their presentation and demonstration of the Next Steps Website. He conveyed his excitement regarding the program and appreciated what the program is doing for Idaho students.

RECORDING LINK: To hear the complete presentation of College and Career Counseling, Next Steps, go to: https://legislature.idaho.gov/sessioninfo/2019/standingcommittees/SEDU/.

MINUTES APPROVAL:

Senator Lent moved to approve the Minutes of January 15, 2019. Senator Buckner-Webb seconded the motion. The motion passed by voice vote.

Senator Ward-Engelking moved to approve the Minutes of January 16, 2019. Senator Thayn seconded the motion. The motion passed by voice vote.

Senator Den Hartog moved to approve the Minutes of January 17, 2019. Senator Crabtree seconded the motion. The motion passed by voice vote.

ADJOURNED: There being no further business at this time, Chairman Mortimer adjourned the meeting at 3:45 p.m.

___________________________  _________________________
Senator Dean M. Mortimer   LeAnn Mohr
Chair                       Secretary
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Additional Questions
### AMENDED AGENDA #1
### SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE
### 3:00 P.M.
### Room WW55
### Wednesday, February 06, 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>PRESENTER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presentation:</td>
<td>New and Improved Idaho School, District and State Report Card</td>
<td>Sherri Ybarra, Superintendent of Public Instruction, State Department of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Karlynn Laraway, Director, Assessment and Accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS26692</td>
<td>Relating to Education; Continuous Improvement Plan</td>
<td>Marilyn Whitney, Deputy Superintendent, Communications and Policy, State Department of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS26697</td>
<td>Relating to Education; Mastery Based Education</td>
<td>Ms. Whitney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS26699</td>
<td>Relating to Charter Schools; Certification for School Administrators</td>
<td>Senator Lori Den Hartog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS26757</td>
<td>Relating to Education; School Levies</td>
<td>Senator Steven Thayn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS26774</td>
<td>Relating to Education; School Flexibility</td>
<td>Senator Steven Thayn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*If you have written testimony, please provide a copy of it along with the name of the person or organization responsible to the committee secretary to ensure accuracy of records.*

### COMMITTEE MEMBERS
- Chairman Mortimer
- Vice Chairman Thayn
- Sen Winder
- Sen Den Hartog
- Sen Crabtree

### COMMITTEE SECRETARY
- LeAnn Mohr
- Room: WW39
- Phone: 332-1321
- email: sedu@senate.idaho.gov
MINUTES
SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

DATE: Wednesday, February 06, 2019
TIME: 3:00 P.M.
PLACE: Room WW55
MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Mortimer, Vice Chairman Thayn, Senators Winder, Den Hartog, Crabtree, Woodward, Lent, Buckner-Webb, and Ward-Engelking
ABSENT/ EXCUSED: None
NOTE: The sign-in sheet, testimonies and other related materials will be retained with the minutes in the committee's office until the end of the session and will then be located on file with the minutes in the Legislative Services Library.

CONVENED: Chairman Mortimer called the Education Committee (Committee) to order at 3:03 p.m.

PRESENTATION: Sherri Ybarra, Superintendent of Public Instruction, State Department of Education (SDE), said they have updated the report card website to be a friendly way for parents, educators, policymakers and the public to retrieve non-biased performance information about Idaho schools and districts, grades K-12. She said this project took over three years to complete and was approved by the State Board of Education (SBE) in March of 2108 as part of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

Superintendent Ybarra introduced Karlynn Laraway, Director, Assessment and Accountability, SDE, to present the New and Improved Idaho School, District, and State Report Card. Ms. Laraway stated data reporting is not a new concept, however, this program is a new in the way which data is presented to the public. She said the website where the program she will be demonstrating can be found is at www.idahoschools.org.

Ms. Laraway said the new report card website is a place where people can learn more information about the schools they are interested in. She gave the Committee a live demonstration of the new website highlighting the following areas: how to find a school, the academic and non-academic indicators of specific schools, and staff and parent engagement. She said the financial tab is still being developed and they are hoping to expand the new report card website to provide additional school information.

Chairman Mortimer thanked Ms. Laraway and Superintendent Ybarra for sharing this incredible information. He hopes parents and others will use this tool to better understand the progress of their school of choice.

RECORDING LINK: To hear the complete ESSA presentation, go to: https://legislature.idaho.gov/sessioninfo/2019/standingcommittees/SEDU/.

RS 26692 Marilyn Whitney, Deputy Superintendent, Communication and Policy SDE, presented RS 26692, Relating to Education; Continuous Improvement Plan (Plan). She said the proposed legislation seeks to eliminate duplicate reporting in the Plans. These plans are created yearly by districts and charter schools to help set student performance goals and then to report the progress of those goals. She said those who helped write the Plan came from the SDE, the SBE, and school administrators, who made recommendations on how to streamline and eliminate duplicate reporting. Ms. Whitney said there is no impact to the General Fund.
MOTION: Senator Winder moved to send RS 26692 to print. Senator Ward-Engelking seconded the motion. The motion passed by **voice vote**.

RS 26697 Ms. Whitney presented RS 26697, Relating to Education; Mastery Based Education (MBE). She said the proposed legislation represents the next step for the implementation of MBE in Idaho. She explained how it lifts the cap of twenty incubator programs from the statute and allows the SDE to expand the number of school districts and charters to join and participate in the network. She stated the proposed legislation would also allow any district or charter to join the network even if they’re not selected to receive that seed money or startup funding.

Senator Ward-Engelking expressed her concerns about Joint Appropriations and Funding Committee (JFAC) being able to fund the program. Ms. Whitney replied the legislature always has the discretion on what is appropriated to any given program.

MOTION: Vice Chairman Thayn moved to send RS 26697 to print. Senator Lent seconded the motion. The motion passed by **voice vote**.

RS 26699 Senator Den Hartog presented RS 26699, Relating to Charter Schools; Certification for School Administrators. She said the proposed legislation would create a new charter school administrator certificate as an alternative to traditional administrator certificates.

Senator Ward-Engelking said out of respect for her colleague, she will vote to print the legislation, but will not be supporting it.

MOTION: Senator Crabbtree moved to send RS 26699 to print. Vice Chairman Thayn seconded the motion. The motion passed by **voice vote**.

RS 26757 Vice Chairman Thayn presented RS 26757, Relating to Education; School Levies. He explained the supplemental levy process and the process needed for a permanent levy. He stated this proposed legislation is to help districts, who depend greatly on the supplemental levies for operation, to not have to hold elections as often.

MOTION: Senator Den Hartog moved to send RS 26757 to print. Senator Buckner-Webb seconded the motion. The motion passed by **voice vote**.

RS 26774 Vice Chairman Thayn presented RS 26774, Relating to Education; School Flexibility. He said the proposed legislation is the culmination of two years of work from a local high school student and it fits well with Idaho’s Mastery Based Education approach. He explained the criteria students must meet to qualify for this program.

MOTION: Senator Winder moved to send RS 26774 to print. Senator Crabbtree seconded the motion. The motion passed by **voice vote**.

ADJOURNED: There being no further business at this time, Chairman Mortimer adjourned the meeting at 3:50 p.m.
# JOINT AGENDA

**SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE**  
**AND**  
**HOUSE EDUCATION COMMITTEE**  
3:00 P.M.  
Lincoln Auditorium  
Thursday, February 07, 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>PRESENTER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Draft Public School Funding Formula Legislation</td>
<td>Idaho Association of School Administrators/Idaho Rural Schools Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stakeholder Agency Comments</td>
<td>Idaho Education Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Virtual Charter Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Idaho Charter School Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Idaho School Boards Association</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Public Comments  
Testimony is limited to 3 minutes or less

*If you have written testimony, please provide a copy of it along with the name of the person or organization responsible to the committee secretary to ensure accuracy of records.*

## COMMITTEE MEMBERS

| Chairman Mortimer | Sen Woodward |
| Vice Chairman Thayn | Sen Lent |
| Sen Winder | Sen Buckner-Webb |
| Sen Den Hartog | Sen Ward-Engelking |
| Sen Crabtree | |

## COMMITTEE SECRETARY

LeAnn Mohr  
Room: WW39  
Phone: 332-1321  
email: sedu@senate.idaho.gov
MINUTES
JOINT MEETING
SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE
HOUSE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

DATE: Thursday, February 07, 2019
TIME: 3:00 P.M.
PLACE: Lincoln Auditorium
MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Mortimer, Vice Chairman Thayn, Senators Winder, Den Hartog, Crabtree, Woodward, Lent, Buckner-Webb, and Ward-Engelking
Chairman Clow, Vice Chairman Kerby, Representatives Shepherd, Boyle, Mendive, DeMordaunt, Moon, Ehardt, Goesling, Marshall, Raymond, Wisniewski, McCrostie, Abernathy, and Berch
ABSENT/EXCUSED: None
NOTE: The sign-in sheet, testimonies and other related materials will be retained with the minutes in the committee's office until the end of the session and will then be located on file with the minutes in the Legislative Services Library.
CONVENED: Chairman Mortimer called the Joint Senate and House Education Committees (Committees) to order at 3:02 p.m.
PASSED THE GAVEL: Chairman Mortimer passed the gavel to Chairman Clow.

Chairman Clow welcomed the audience and stated that today's joint meeting is a listening session for the draft legislation of the Public Schools Funding Formula (PSFF). He reminded the audience the draft legislation that has been made available is not the final version for the PSFF. He set out the guidelines for the Committees and audience participants. Chairman Clow said developing a final draft will take time and patience and today, those who will be writing the final version are listening to all the concerns.

Chairman Clow welcomed Sherri Ybarra, Superintendent of Public Instruction, State Department of Education (SDE), to the podium.

TESTIMONY: Superintendent Ybarra said she served on the interim legislative committee and is in support of the recommendations to move to a student-centered funding formula based on enrollment rather than the current formula. She stated her comments are not in support of or against the draft, rather her comments reflect how the SDE is studying the recommendations for implementation of the new formula.

Superintendent Ybarra provided the following concerns: 1.) Payment schedule, which creates cash flow issues for school districts; 2.) The lack of a payment base, leading to fiscal instability for districts; 3.) Incomplete enrollment data; 4.) What happens to district funding after the third year; 5.) Problematic wealth adjustments; 6.) Value index calculation; 7.) Residency and professional rungs on the Career Ladder; 8.) Lack of appropriations for additional professional education attainment; 9.) Student category definitions not aligning to administrative rule and Federal program, Every Student Succeeds Act; and 10.) An undefined school year (Attachment 1).
**TESTIMONY:**

**Rob Winslow,** Executive Director, Idaho Association of School Administrators (IASA), said he is speaking on behalf of the IASA and Harold Ott, Idaho Rural Schools Administrators (IRSA). He said their associations have been following the draft closely and shared the points of concern, which are as follows: 1.) Data being used is inconsistent; 2.) Requiring the Career Ladder to be implanted as local salary schedules; 3.) The desire to see the model forecasted for three to five years; 4.) Lack of provisions for funding alternative schools; 5.) Distribution of weighted foundation moneys to the school district rather than school; 6.) Current payment schedule causing cash flow problems in every charter and school district; 7.) Idaho Digital Learning Academy needs to be included in the legislation; 8.) Will teacher evaluations still be needed; 9.) Enrollment needs to be defined; and 10.) The school district market weight value explanation is confusing (Attachment 2).

**Kari Overall**, President, Idaho Education Association (IEA), said they are appreciative of the opportunity to express their concerns regarding the drafted legislation. She said the proposed legislation does not meet the goal of being student-centered, transparent, flexible accountable, and equitable. She urged the Committee to address the shift from average daily attendance to enrollment funding and asked that they work diligently with the Governor’s Task Force over the summer to write a well-thought-out formula.

**Karen Echeveria**, Executive Director, Idaho School Boards Association (ISBA), said she was here to testify on behalf of the 900 school board members the ISBA represents. She expressed her concern that during the subcommittee’s work on the draft, ISBA was not included in the discussions. She said there are many technical issues with the draft legislation. **Ms. Echeveria** said there is a lack of consistent terminology and uniform definitions. She said there is a lack of funding for the required Career Ladder. She raised concerns regarding the payment schedule to districts and the requirement of additional data reporting. **Ms. Echeveria** said the wealth adjustment is not accomplishing its intent and recommended that it be amended or removed. She said the legislation as written will make it impossible for the budget writers to set the budget. She reminded the Committees of the collaborative work from the Governor’s Task Force and suggested that as this legislation is being redrafted, that model should be utilized.

**Blake Youde**, Idaho Charter School Network, thanked the various committees for their work to bring this legislation forward. He said they support the formula for both its philosophical and functional reasons. He said charter schools have pressed for funding based on student needs and local control, which leads charters to meet the performance certificate goals. He stated the areas of the draft they like are enrollment base weight student funding, the simplicity of the formula, and the ability to improve the data. He stated the areas of concern are the special education weight, linking outcomes to the data, and programing the model out for three to five years for funding.

**Tom LeClaire**, President, Coalition of Charter School Families, stated they are a coalition who supports the expansion of school choice in Idaho. He stated the new formula is more student-centered and less program-centered. He suggested there will be more local control and flexibility. He stated this formula supports school choice (Attachment 4).
Rod Gramer, President and CEO, Idaho Business for Education (IBE), said his group has not taken a position on the proposed legislation. He noted the biggest concern from IBE is that the key education stakeholders do not support the legislation as it is currently written; it is important that everyone finds common ground. He urged all the stakeholders to collaborate and come to a consensus (Attachment 5).

TESTIMONY: Fred Birnbaum, Vice President, Freedom Foundation, stated there are some technical issues to address before the draft is introduced. He liked that the formula was using enrollment data for funding. He stated the new formula had too many weights and was not consistent. He said the wealth adjustment is a difficult equation. He suggested the model be projected out further than three years (Attachment 6).

Superintendents James Gilbert, Mountain Home; Michael Garrett, Orofino; Kevin Lancaster, Bliss (Attachment 7); Andy Grover, Melba (Attachment 8); GwenCarol Holmes (Attachment 9), Blaine County; Paula Kellerer (Attachment 10), Nampa; Wayne Rush, Emmett; and CFO, West Ada School District Jonathan Gillen, testified against the wealth adjustment. They stated it is not an accurate indication of the wealth of the students and that school leadership cannot control the property market growth of their community. It was suggested that more school superintendents should have been included in the drafting of the legislation.

Brandon Durst, Parent, Boise, stated it is important to change the funding formula, but the proposed legislation needs work. He stated his opposition to the wealth adjustment and stated Idaho Digital Learning Academy needs to be funded.

Nick Smith, Human Resource Director, Boise School District, said the wealth adjustment in the formula is a disadvantage to rural schools. He detailed how it can harm schools. He encouraged the Committees to explore restoring the maintenance and operations levy, to address salary-based apportionment and the Career Ladder funding. He said the formula creates year-to-year volatility in funding for school districts (Attachment 11).

Steve Smylie, former Representative, Educator, Boise testified against the formula. He outlined the disparity the formula causes. He said the new formula won't benefit the small traditional schools and charter schools. He said where he thinks the new formula will help schools is in recruiting highly qualified teachers, offering better teacher pay, increase community involvement, and build a solid curriculum (Attachment 12).

Allison Westfall, Trustee, Nampa School District, said their district is in favor of school choice and school of choice tend to be small schools. The funding formula, as written, penalizes small schools. She stated her concerns about property taxes and supplemental levies.

Chairman Clow thanked those in attendance for sharing their concerns.

PASS THE GAVEL: Chairman Clow passed the gavel to Chairman Mortimer.
Chairman Mortimer reminded the audience that what they have is a draft of the PSFF legislation. He said their input is appreciated and there is still a great deal of work to be carried out before the final draft is ready for the public.

RECORDING LINK: To hear the complete PSFF listening session, go to: https://legislature.idaho.gov/sessioninfo/2019/standingcommittees/SEDU/.

ADJOURNED: There being no further business at this time, Chairman Mortimer adjourned the meeting at 4:41 p.m.

________________________________________________________________________

Senator Dean M. Mortimer                                           LeAnn Mohr
Chair                                                                Secretary

________________________________________________________________________
This is a list of issues of greatest concern:

- The payment schedule included in the legislation creates cash flow problems for the districts. Many districts will not be able to cover payroll, and districts could be forced to adjust, which may mean creating or increasing reserves, short-term borrowing, or making cuts.

- On a related note, payments should be based on the higher of the October enrollment count or the average of the four counts. There is no floor for payments, and so districts will not know what they are getting until the end of the year. This will result in uncertainty and fiscal instability for our districts.

- Using incomplete current year enrollment data and comparing that to the last school year’s full-year data (2017-2018) minimizes the losers. I am not supportive of a plan where school districts lose significant funding.

- The bill contains no off ramps in the event that future revenue does not support ongoing investment to fund the hold harmless provision. What happens after three years? Is there a fiscal cliff for any of the districts?

- The wealth adjustment is problematic. Distributing state dollars to compensate for a lack of local contribution is not a viable solution for communities that are not able to pass supplemental levies. It also creates an expectation that local districts will go to patrons to try to pass a supplemental levy and decreases funds available to all districts (in other words, it reduces the overall pot of funding available to all districts).

- With respect to the value index calculation, my staff is going to have to recalculate the bond levy payments based on enrollment rather than support units to determine the fiscal impact.

- The bill requires districts to have residency and professional rungs and to pay minimums in each placement on the career ladder. This is far more prescriptive than the current statute, which requires districts to pay only the minimum starting salary. The current statute does not prescribe minimums at other placements on the ladder. This limits flexibility at the local level.

- The draft does not recognize a specific state appropriation for additional education attainment – the BA+24 or masters. This is very important to education professionals. I have received feedback from educators and some legislators over the last few days.
• Definitions for at risk, economically disadvantaged, and special education need to be aligned to current administrative rule and to federal ESSA definitions. One example would be that the special education definition is overly broad. As that population is eventually funded with a 100% weight, this could lead to over-identification of students, and I want to remind everyone that once funded you cannot decrease the amount because of Maintenance of Effort.

• School year is not defined, and the bill appears to count summer programs the same as full school year. In other words, summer programs appear to be funded at the same level as full year programs.
Joint Senate and House Education Committee

February 7, 2019

Rob Winslow, IASA and Harold Ott, IRSA

I Intro

Thank you for this opportunity to respond to the January 31st draft on the
ewn funding formula. Our associations have been following the development of
the funding formula very closely. We have an active group that includes the
following: Idaho School Superintendent Association Board, Finance Committee
from ISSA, and Idaho Association of School Administrators Legislative Committee
that includes superintendents and school administrators from all regions of the
state representing large and small districts.

Our original position was to have salary-based apportionment outside the
new funding formula. This draft has it flow through the formula. With that in
mind, our working group has begun an analysis of the draft. As this new model
has evolved it has become increasingly complex. Consequently, it will require a
significant amount of time for our working group to determine the impact at the
local level.

II Our initial concerns are as follows:

1. There are several problematic issues with inconsistent data. Data is being
presented with 2018-2019 in comparison to 2017-2018. Accurate up to date
information is needed.

2. Requiring the Career Ladder to be implemented as local salary
schedules. (P. 4, line 47)

   a. Current local districts salary schedules have only required the
   starting minimum salary

   b. This draft mandates 3 cells in the residency rung and 5 cells in the
   professional rung with stipulated dollar amounts as a requirement
   for every charter and school district. (P. 14, line 24-29)
c. The Career Ladder was an allocation model and not a salary schedule.

d. The Career Ladder included in this draft appears to mandate compensation without direct revenue.

3. The “hold positive” provision is an improvement over the “hold harmless.” However, members are concerned with the consequences after the 3 years implementation. It would be helpful to see the model projected out 3-5 years with additional revenue to determine impact. (P. 11, lines 21-30)

4. Lack of provision for funding alternative schools. Funding at-risk students is a possible solution. (P. 4, lines 12-20)

5. Distribution of weighted foundation moneys must be allocated to the school the student attends. This would preclude expenditure of funds for district wide needs. We suggest adding the words “or district” after the word school. (P. 11, line 11)

6. Schedule of payments in the draft will cause significant cash flow problems in every charter and school district. Payment schedule ought to reflect, as accurately as possible, enrollment at the time payments are given. We suggest the June payment be reduced from 12 and a half percent to 2 percent and the December payment be increased by 10 and a half percent. (P. 11, lines 36-43 and P. 12, lines 1-39)

7. Even though IDLA is not included in this draft, however it is a vital part of meeting the educational needs of students. Consequently, our members believe IDLA needs to be funded in a manner similar to what it is now. It is not a stand-alone service and should be included in the general education support budget.

8. Some concern was expressed regarding the teacher evaluation review requirement as still necessary. (P. 14, lines 30-47 and P. 15, lines 1-2 and lines 9-12)

9. Enrollment needs to be defined, particularly in case of fractional enrollment. (P. 8, lines 37-47 and P. 9, lines 1-9)
10. The school district market value weight explanation is confusing. It appears that school districts would be dramatically affected by having an all or none application of this weight. This weight ought to reflect the wealth of student population of a district more accurately than it reflects the market value in which a district resides. (P.10, lines 41-43 and P. 11, lines 1-13)

III Conclusion

Our association looks forward to a continued dialogue on the components of the new funding formula.
THANK YOU CHAIRMAN CLOW, CHAIRMAN MORTIMER, AND MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEES. FOR THE RECORD MY NAME IS KARI OVERALL, AND I AM THE ELECTED PRESIDENT OF THE IDAHO EDUCATION ASSOCIATION.

WE APPRECIATE THE OPPORTUNITY TO SHARE SOME OF OUR CONCERNS ABOUT THE PROPOSED LEGISLATION FOR THE NEW FUNDING FORMULA. THE COMMITTEE IS PROPOSING MOVING TO A FOUNDATION FORMULA WHICH IS STUDENT-CENTERED AND ALLOCATES FUNDING BASED ON THE DEMOGRAPHIC MAKEUP OF THE SCHOOLS. THE INTERIM COMMITTEE CHARGES INCLUDED MEETING THIS GOAL.

IN OUR VIEW, THE PROPOSED LANGUAGE DOES NOT MEET THIS GOAL OF BEING STUDENT-CENTERED, TRANSPARENT, FLEXIBLE, ACCOUNTABLE, AND EQUITABLE.

FOR EXAMPLE, ON PAGE 11, THE COMMITTEE CREATED THE “SCHOOL DISTRICT MARKET VALUE WEIGHT” OR WEALTH ADJUSTMENT. THIS MEASUREMENT DIVIDES THE WEALTH OF A DISTRICT BY THE NUMBER OF STUDENTS AND THEN DIVIDES THAT NUMBER BY THE STATE AVERAGE. THIS VALUE WILL VARY FROM YEAR TO YEAR AND BE UNPREDICTABLE FOR DISTRICTS TO RELY ON AS THE ECONOMY FLUCTUATES. THIS INCONSISTENCY WILL MAKE BUDGET PLANNING DIFFICULT. STUDENT-
CENTERED FUNDING WHICH FOLLOWS THE STUDENT SHOULD NOT BE DEPENDENT ON THE STATE AVERAGE OF THE WEALTH OF DISTRICTS.

THE DRAFTED LEGISLATION INCLUDED TOO FEW VOICES IN THE DRAFTING PROCESS. SINCE GOVERNOR OTTER’S K-12 TASK FORCE ON PUBLIC EDUCATION IN 2012, PUBLIC EDUCATION STAKEHOLDERS ACROSS THE STATE HAVE ENGAGED IN SUBSTANTIVE AND MEANINGFUL POLICY DEVELOPMENT TOGETHER. THE KEY TO THE SUCCESS IN THAT PROCESS HAS BEEN INPUT FROM ALL STAKEHOLDER GROUPS IN EVERY PHASE OF DEVELOPMENT. THE DRAFT OF THE FUNDING FORMULA HAS DEVIATED FROM THIS PROVEN AND COLLABORATIVE METHOD. ONE OF THE MOST SUCCESSFUL ELEMENTS OF THE GOVERNOR’S TASK FORCE WAS THE CAREER LADDER. IT WAS THE RESULT OF COMPROMISES AMONG STAKEHOLDERS AND DEVELOPED THROUGH A THOUGHTFUL AND THOROUGH PROCESS. IT WAS NEGOTIATED IN GOOD FAITH BY ALL PARTIES AND INCLUDED A FIVE-YEAR FUNDING COMMITMENT FROM THE IDAHO LEGISLATURE. THAT CAREER LADDER IS NO LONGER RECOGNIZABLE IN THE LEGISLATIVE DRAFT.

THE PROPOSED LEGISLATION INTRODUCES POLICY MODIFICATIONS WHICH ARE NOT TRANSPARENT, FLEXIBLE, OR EASY TO UNDERSTAND. THE BIGGEST CRITICISM OF IDAHO’S CURRENT SYSTEM IS THE DIFFICULTY IN CALCULATING THE AMOUNT COMING TO DISTRICTS. ON PAGE 10 OF
THE CURRENT LEGISLATION WE SEE COMPLEX FORMULAS REQUIRED TO CALCULATE DIFFERING AMOUNTS DISTRICTS ARE ENTITLED TO DEPENDING ON SIZE AND UNWEIGHTED ENROLLMENT.

IN ADDITION, THE LEGISLATION DECREASES LOCAL CONTROL AND FLEXIBILITY FOR SCHOOL DISTRICTS. ON PAGE 14 AND ELSEWHERE, THE LEGISLATION REQUIRES ALL DISTRICTS NOW INCLUDE A SALARY SCHEDULE WITH RESIDENCY AND PROFESSIONAL RUNGS. MANY DISTRICTS DO NOT CURRENTLY USE THE CAREER LADDER ALLOCATION MODEL FOR THEIR LOCAL SALARY SCHEDULE BUT INSTEAD CHOOSE TO CREATE THEIR OWN. MANDATING A STATEWIDE SALARY SCHEDULE FAILS TO MEET THE FLEXIBILITY STANDARD. WE ARE ALSO CONCERNED ABOUT THE MINIMUM AMOUNTS REQUIRED FOR THE SALARY SCHEDULE, BUT THE EXCLUSION OF A FIVE YEAR PLAN FOR HOW THOSE AMOUNTS INCREASE.

THERE ARE A COUPLE OTHER AREAS WE FIND PERPLEXING. FOR EXAMPLE, ON PAGE 28, LINES 25-27 WE FIND THE REMOVAL OF LANGUAGE THAT WAS ADDED DURING THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE CAREER LADDER IN GOOD FAITH BY THE IEA AND LAWMAKERS. THE REMOVAL OF THIS LANGUAGE KEEPS ACCOUNTABILITY PROVISIONS IN PLACE WITHOUT THE COMMITMENT BY THE STATE TO FUND THE INCREASED ACCOUNTABILITY REQUIREMENTS. CONTINUING ON PAGE 28, LINES 42-44 LANGUAGE IS
REMOVED WHICH REQUIRES TEACHER CONTRACTS TO BE UNIFORMLY APPLIED TO ALL EMPLOYEES. THE REMOVAL OF THIS LANGUAGE IS UNNECESSARY TO MEET THE CHARGES OF THE COMMITTEE TO CREATE A FORMULA WHICH IS TRANSPARENT AND STUDENT-CENTERED. INSTEAD IT WILL MAKE IT DIFFICULT FOR DISTRICTS TO RECRUIT AND RETAIN QUALITY EDUCATORS. THERE ARE OTHER AREAS THROUGHOUT THE LEGISLATION WHICH ARE A DEPARTURE FROM PAST COLLABORATIVE PRACTICE AND IN FACT MOVE US IN THE WRONG DIRECTION AS A STATE AND UNDO MUCH OF THE GOOD WORK ACCOMPLISHED IN THE LAST 5 YEARS.

WE BELIEVE A FUNDING FORMULA CAN BE DESIGNED WHICH MEETS THE ORIGINAL CHARGES OF THE FUNDING FORMULA INTERIM COMMITTEE. HOWEVER, A FALSE SENSE OF URGENCY HAS BEEN CREATED THAT POINTS TO A NEED TO GET IT DONE THIS LEGISLATIVE SESSION. THERE IS NO MANDATED TIME FRAME ATTACHED TO CHANGING IDAHO’S PUBLIC SCHOOL FUNDING FORMULA.

WE URGE YOU TO START WITH THE SHIFT FROM AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE TO ENROLLMENT FUNDING. THAT POLICY CHANGE CAN BE APPROVED THIS YEAR AND MEETS GOAL 2 OF THE COMMITTEE CHARGES. ALLOW GOVERNOR LITTLE’S NEW TASK FORCE TO WORK COLLABORATIVELY ON THIS THROUGHOUT THE SUMMER AND THE
MONTHS TO COME AND TAKE THE TIME TO GET THE REMAINDER OF THE FORMULA CORRECT. IT IS BETTER TO TAKE THE TIME AND GET THIS RIGHT THE FIRST TIME RATHER THEN SPEND COUNTLESS YEARS PASSING CLEAN-UP LEGISLATION AND RULES TO CLARIFY INTENT.

WE ARE CONFIDENT BY FOLLOWING THE PROVEN, COLLABORATIVE MODEL WITH ALL STAKEHOLDER VOICES AROUND THE TABLE AND IN THE ROOM, A FUNDING FORMULA MODEL CAN BE CREATED WHICH MEETS THE ORIGINAL INTENT OF THE CHARGES AND BENEFITS THE STUDENTS AND PROFESSIONAL EDUCATORS OF IDAHO.

THANK YOU FOR THE OPPORTUNITY TO SHARE OUR CONCERNS WITH YOU TODAY.
Mr. Chairman and members of the committee,

My name is Tom LeClaire and I am the president of the Coalition of Idaho Charter School Families. We are a Coalition of parents, grandparents, students and teachers who support the expansion of school choice in Idaho, equal funding for charter schools, and funding that "follows the child" to the school of their choice. I am here today to support the public-school funding formula change.

The new funding formula will be more student-centered and less program-centered. There will be more local control and spending flexibility for school districts, full funding will follow students as they move from one school to another, and charter schools will be better funded.

Many charter school students fall under the specially weighted groups in the model such as mobile students, at-risk students, ELL students, and students with disabilities. The current funding formula punishes charter schools for taking on many of these special students.

The new formula is more student-centered and will allow for funding to better follow students as they move from one school to another. This will have a positive effect for charter schools in Idaho and the students that rely on and need them.

Voters in Idaho also support school choice and I think they will support your efforts to modernize the funding formula. Over 70% of voters support charter schools and improving school choice for parents.

The Coalition of Idaho Charter School Families will be vigilant during this session of the Idaho Legislature to be sure that the new student-centered funding formula does not get "watered down." During this legislative process we will have parent advocates available to help you learn and support school choice.

We want school choice to get the fair funding it deserves. We hope you consider the families that we represent and vote for this new funding model.

Thank you for giving us this opportunity to promote school choice and offer support for improving the public school funding formula.
I AM ROD GRAMER, PRESIDENT AND CEO OF IDAHO BUSINESS FOR EDUCATION

MR. CHAIRMAN, THANK YOU FOR THIS OPPORTUNITY TO TESTIFY ON THE PROPOSED SCHOOL FUNDING FORMULA LEGISLATION.

IBE HAS NOT TAKEN AN OFFICIAL POSITION ON THE PROPOSED FUNDING FORMULA, ALTHOUGH WE DO HAVE CONCERNS ABOUT CERTAIN ASPECTS OF THE PLAN AS WE UNDERSTAND IT NOW.

ONE OF OUR BIGGEST CONCERNS IS THAT THE KEY EDUCATION STAKEHOLDERS, WHO ARE MOST AFFECTED BY THIS LEGISLATION, DO NOT SUPPORT IT. YET THEIR SUPPORT WILL BE CRUCIAL FOR ITS FINAL IMPLEMENTATION.
WE COMPLETELY UNDERSTAND THAT THE INTERIM LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE WORKED VERY HARD OVER THE PAST THREE YEARS AND ESPECIALLY THIS PAST YEAR WITH THE HELP OF THE EDUCATION COMMISSION OF THE STATES TO CRAFT A NEW SCHOOL FUNDING FORMULA.

AND WE CAN EMPATHIZE WITH THE LEGISLATORS AND LEGISLATIVE LEADERS THAT HAVE PUT THEIR HEART AND SOUL INTO THIS WORK. IT IS EASY TO UNDERSTAND THAT THEY WANT TO RESOLVE THE ISSUE DURING THIS LEGISLATIVE SESSION.

AND THAT MAY BE POSSIBLE IF WE CREATE A FRAMEWORK, AS YOU HAVE SUGGESTED MR. CHAIRMAN, TO BRING ALL THE STAKEHOLDERS TOGETHER, ROLL UP OUR
SLEEVES AND WORK THROUGH THE MAJOR CONCERNS.

WE ALL REMEMBER WHEN THE TEACHER CAREER LADDER WAS INTRODUCED A FEW YEARS AGO. THERE WAS A LOT OF OPPOSITION TO THE FIRST DRAFTS OF THAT LEGISLATION.

YET BY EVERYONE WORKING TOGETHER, LISTENING TO EACH OTHER AND FINDING COMMON GROUND WE ULTIMATELY CAME UP WITH LEGISLATION THAT PASSED BOTH THE HOUSE AND SENATE ALMOST UNAIMOUSLY.

MANY OF US WERE HERE THEN AND WE CAN ALL PROBABLY REMEMBER THE GOOD WILL THAT FLOWED THROUGH THE HALLS OF THE STATEHOUSE THAT DAY.
THIS FUNDING FORMULA LEGISLATION IS MUCH MORE COMPLEX AND THE STAKES ARE EVEN HIGHER THAN THE CAREER LADDER. SO, ARE THE INITIAL CONCERNS OF THE STAKEHOLDERS.

MR. CHAIRMAN, PERHAPS BY FOLLOWING YOUR SUGGESTION OF BRINGING THE STAKEHOLDERS INTO THE PROCESS WE CAN REACH A CONSSENSUS ON A PATH FORWARD THIS SESSION.

BUT IF WE CAN'T, THERE IS PLENTY OF TIME TO DO THIS RIGHT.

EITHER THE GOVERNOR'S NEW EDUCATION TASK FORCE CAN DEVELOP A PLAN THAT ALL STAKEHOLDERS CAN BUY INTO. OR PERHAPS MEMBERS OF THESE GERMANE COMMITTEES, WORKING WITH THE
STAKEHOLDERS DURING THE INTERIM, CAN DEVELOP A PLAN.

BY STEPPING BACK, LISTENING DEEPLY AND INCLUDING ALL STAKEHOLDERS IN CRAFTING THE FINAL PLAN, WE CAN ACHIEVE THE SAME GOOD WILL AND PROGRESS THAT WE DID WHEN THE LEGISLATURE ADOPTED THE CAREER LADDER SEVERAL YEARS AGO.

THANK YOU. FOR THE OPPORTUNITY TO SPEAK TODAY.
My objective today is to point out some of the technical issues that need to be addressed before the final public school funding formula bill is introduced.

1. Using enrollment data and moving away from support units is a good step.
2. Our concerns are as follows:
   a. The Idaho web ready model uses 2017-18 funding to compare the current formula, to the new formula which uses 2018-19 funding. This violates the notion of a fair comparison because changes to the model are intertwined with changes in the dollars. The model needs to be updated to keep dollars and enrollment constant such that changes that result from the model – are clearly visible.
   b. It is not mathematically possible to alter the current formula, which has a wide variation of funding per pupil, district to district, and not have a new set of winners and losers. Keeping the dollars constant, formula to formula, lays it bare, and it is the best way to start the necessary conversations.
   c. It stands to reason that given that the current formula has been around for more than two decades, some districts have learned how to use it to their advantage. Therefor a more “equitable” formula will hurt them – and they will oppose it. Perhaps the way you tackle this issue is a more gradual wind-down than three years.
   d. The formula still uses too many factors: base count – yes, special education – yes; however the group of K-3, 9-12, At-risk, ELL, teacher experience, gifted/talented and size adjustment (these 7 should be whittled down to 2 or 3). Finally, wealth adjustment, remote building, and large district – should probably be tossed out. The large district adjustment only applies to two districts Boise and West Ada and the notion of diseconomies
of scale is difficult to fathom given that also in the model you have a small district size adjustment.

e. Economically disadvantaged, English language learners, and special education students all have escalators that take place over 3 to 5 years, increase the weighting of these factors. It is very difficult to project the impact of these changes to districts 5 years hence, for example.

f. One final point, 76% of the dollars in the model are allocated purely on the enrollment base count. Separately I observed that roughly 80% of the costs from the budget estimating tab are teacher and staff salaries and benefits. Perhaps it would make sense to allocate teacher and staff salaries just on the base count enrollments and then use the other 20% to accommodate 2 to 4 additional categories. Then see where the holes are and plug those for a longer period of time than 3 years. A simple model might require a longer phase in to keep districts whole, but it would be a lot easier to explain.
I appreciate the opportunity to stand in front of you today a comment on the funding formula as it pertains to Bliss and similar small schools. I recognize the work on our behalf in particular as we have moved from a devastating number of losing over $375,000 and the closing of our district to only losing $35,000. While these small numbers amount to near nothing in the big scheme of things, it could literally mean the loss of one of the few opportunities we offer at Bliss. I am sure the scenarios of the other small schools Mullan, Nez Perce, Midvale, Cambridge, Culdesac, Camas, etc. that are losing money will have a similar story or worse.

I have been a superintendent/principal in Bliss for the past 25 years. I am an educator, not a politician and feel very out of place as I stand before you. It seems to me that decisions have been made that say our tiny districts are not as important in the current formula as they were in the old, that somehow it has been determined we have been receiving too much of the pie and the excess is being taken and given to those with higher needs.

Since the formula to determine wealth makes us a wealthy district, I thought it was important to share with you that that does not compute into money for our students. Here are a few facts about our district:

- We are down from near 90% but 80% of our students receiving Free and Reduced Lunches
- It has been years since there has been a “student supply list” for starting school. We buy all student supplies. No one is left out and no one is made to feel like they are less than their classmates as they all receive the same pencils, crayons, markers, paper and binders. Many of our families just don’t have the ability to purchase these supplies.
- We have a plant levy of to maintain our 100 year old main building. We had saved enough money over the years that this summer we were able to install heating and air systems to replace our coal furnace. Believe it or not, this is the first time in 25 years that someone other than our maintenance man who shoveled the coal, stayed warm. I have witnessed many times, students with hats, gloves and jackets sitting at their desks doing their work. Never again!

The idea of a simple funding formula is an awesome concept and as the committee has found that awesome concept becomes more and more complicated as we narrow this down to a final product. In most cases the formula works, but in the case of Bliss and other similar districts we need help. Please consider our plight as you finalize your work. Thank you.
Thank you

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, let me begin by saying thank you. Thank you for your hard work as interim committee members over the last three years learning about education funding. Thank you for the countless hours you have spent here and away from your families working on helping to build a better tomorrow for the children of Idaho. And thank you for making how we fund education an important aspect of what we do for our kids.

There are a few things that I would like to discuss with you today. The market value adjustment, the application of the hold harmless, and the importance on projections.

Market Value weight adjustment (wealth adjustment)

When the interim committee met back in September I heard that we wanted a formula that was simple, transparent, and where dollars followed the student.

Simplicity:

Unfortunately, the market value weight adjustment isn’t very simple for me. The driver of this calculation, a district’s taxable value, is neither an item the district can control or effectively influence. Imagine trying to explain to stakeholders that a district gains or loses money solely on the relative wealth of its district. Not necessarily the wealth of its kids or their families but of the district as a whole. That is not wealth that we are guaranteed to be able to tax nor is it wealth that we can get operational dollars from unless voters approve. But if a district is deemed wealthier than others, then you lose money. As a district leader, how do I ensure my district is not impacted? Well, I can’t, because I can’t affect that calculation.

What you may find is that districts are going to tell businesses and developers, “not in my district”. That increase in property value means less dollars for the children of my district. Put that growth and development somewhere else. I can’t afford to have my kids get less money.

Transparency:

Additionally, how does a district plan or budget in situations where revenues are lost. Based on the formula most recently posted on the interim committee’s website – West Ada loses $7.8 million dollars because of the Wealth Adjustment. For those districts that lose on the wealth adjustment, how do we explain to our stakeholders the driver of that loss or what we are going to do to replace the funding. If we go to our voters and ask for additional funds to fill that gap, how do we explain to them that because of our relative wealth, some of the dollars you approve, effectively go to other districts. Of the roughly $194 million dollars in supplemental levy’s approved in 2017, $116 million of that was levied by districts who are subject to the wealth adjustment. How transparent is that for our stakeholders. How do we help them see the benefits of a supplemental levy and or this adjustment?
As the CFO I am tasked with ensuring our district is fiscally responsible. As I read this draft legislation I see that we are using the market values that would be used to calculate a bond levy. Those are calculated in September. How should a district adjust to a budget reduction such as the one experienced by West Ada if they won’t know that number until three months into their fiscal year?

**Dollars follow the students:**

The dollars we receive should follow our students. As we all know, Idaho is one of the fastest growing states in the nation. With this unprecedented growth, I think there is a belief that student growth must also be happening. One would anticipate record increases in enrollment but that has not been the case. With market value growth of upwards of 10% to 15% annually, West Ada just saw its smallest increase in enrollment over the last four years.

**Hold Harmless:**

The hold-harmless calculation abounds with questions. While we are grateful for the 2% minimum increase year over year, that is not enough for districts to ensure they can be competitive. 2% does not allow us to bring in the best teachers, the classroom materials we need, and also to maintain the talent we need to ensure our schools’ successes. We also need further clarification on how the 2% will work, and is it an annual increase or 2% against a static year. What about for growing districts. Is the 2% inclusive of growth or will a growing district receive additional dollars. The same questions come when you look at the 7.5% growth cap. Will districts be limited by this growth if their demographics change and they have more students who qualify for the weightings.

**Projections:**

What these statements tell us is that we have questions. Questions we cannot answer without more information. I cannot say enough about the importance of a model that shows the impact of the formula on multiple fiscal years, and only through this projection, looking at the current and proposed models both within the same fiscal year and across multiple fiscal years that we can identify trends, see the impacts on schools, and find both the intended and unintended consequences of the formula. I urge you to not make such an impactful and comprehensive decision without ensuring that the effects of our actions are what we intended them to be.

**How can we help:**

I came to West Ada a little over a year ago. I came here for two reasons – the first was that I wanted to be able to impact the lives of kids in Idaho every day, and the second, selfishly, is that I wanted to positively impact the way we fund education in this state. Through this funding formula I have been able to meet some amazing colleagues, individuals from across the state who are here to positively change the lives of kids every day. How can we help you do that? How can we work together to make this formula the best it can be for boys and girls in this state. We are here to help you.

Thank you for allowing me this time to share.
Public Comment to the Joint Senate and House Education Committees
February 7, 2019
From: GwenCarol Holmes, Ed.D., Superintendent of the Blaine County School District.

Chairman Mortimer, Chairman Clow, Members of the Senate and House Education Committees, I am GwenCarol Holmes, Superintendent of the Blaine County School District.

Thank you for this opportunity to express my views on the proposed Public School Funding Formula.

As I know you are aware, the Idaho Constitution recognizes the importance of education for maintaining a vibrant state and therefore calls for the legislature “to establish and maintain a general, uniform and thorough system of public free common schools.” (Article IX, Section 1) Thank you for your relentless dedication year after year to make this happen for our children.

As Americans and Idahoans, we have long believed that education is the path to a better future, both as a collective body of people and as individuals. Horace Mann, with his gift of oratory, helped us recognize the importance of education in our country. He called education the great equalizer. (Life and Works of Horace Mann) He recognized that an education for any and every child is a gift, especially to those children who come from less fortunate circumstances. An education helps ensure these children become productive and contributing citizens of Idaho and of the United States.

This expectation that each and every child receive a free, uniform and thorough education has not always been an expectation of society. Again, Horace Mann noted that “the public school is the greatest discovery ever made by man.” I am very proud that in our country and in the great state of Idaho, that a free and thorough education is not only the expectation for every child, but also the gift to every child.

We work to ensure that every child has the same opportunities by having Idaho Content Standards that guide us in ensuring that children educated in Idaho, whether from the panhandle or the southeast or the southwest or even the central mountains where I live, graduate from our schools having received a uniform and excellent education.

Our children come to school, each one unique and precious, with the expectation, as given to them by our constitution, that each of them will be educated to the same high level regardless of their circumstances. As educators, our obligation and the expectation of Idahoans, is to make it happen for every child. There are no exceptions due to circumstances. This means our education system has to be based on equity, not equality. This is the fundamental priority that needs to be recognized if we expect to create an education system that assures that all students master the standards.

The Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development (OECD) defines two dimensions of equity in education:

- Fairness, which means ensuring that personal and social circumstances do not prevent students from achieving their academic potential.
- Inclusion, which means setting a basic minimum standard for education that is shared by all students regardless of background, personal characteristics, or location.
The proposed Public School Funding Formula is a recognition of the need for equity in fulfilling our constitutional obligation of a ‘uniform and thorough system of free public schools.’ The formula recognizes that all children must master the Idaho Content Standards and to do so will require that some children receive additional supports. In the Blaine County School District, we allocate staff and budget dollars based on equity formulas, not equality. We embrace the goal of ensuring all students master the Idaho Content Standards and understand that achieving this will require differentiation for each child. We often use this illustration.

The three children in this picture all want to watch the ball game. Being able to see over the fence is the minimum standard required. One child can do it on her own. Another child needs some support or a box to stand on. And the third child needs even more supports or two boxes to stand on. However, the end result is that all children get to watch the game.

This proposed funding formula directs our conversation to students. As we talk about funding schools we talk about how much base is needed for each student? How much additional support is needed for students that are learning English as a second language? For students with disabilities? For students from poverty or at-risk? For students that have a specific area of giftedness? For students attending small and remote schools? And so on. This conversation is about our children, our children. I welcome that and I applaud and support your efforts.
I have heard some of my fellow educators express concerns about the new formula having ‘winners’ and ‘losers.’ I have also watched the Interim Committee for three years work very hard to gather public input and continue to adjust the formula so that children in Idaho are attending schools that have the flexibility to use their resources to meet the unique needs of their students. They have worked hard to ensure our children are winners and that there are no losers.

While we will continue to debate what the weights should be, and what are the circumstances of our children that require additional supports, (Some of you have received emails from me debating this with you.) I strongly support the adoption and implementation of a funding formula that is focused on STUDENTS, not adults, and provides EQUITY for our students. A formula that expects the same great education for all our students while recognizing their often very disparate circumstances.

Thank you again for the opportunity to address the joint committees. I greatly appreciate your dedication to the children of Idaho.
Dear Esteemed Legislators:

Thank you for the opportunity to share some thoughts on the funding formula.

First of all – let me say that Nampa is NOT in opposition to a funding formula based on enrollment which creates a base funding amount and then adds additional weights added for “special student populations”. We agree with the charge given the interim committee in House Concurrent Resolution 49.

There are areas where our district has distinct concerns:

1. We are in agreement with 80% of our colleagues who took the IASA survey that salary based apportionment should not be included in the funding formula. The inclusion of SBA creates confusion at the negotiation table and weakens and perhaps unravels the gains we have experienced with the career ladder implementation.

2. We oppose the Wealth adjustment as a lever. It is not aligned with the charge given to the joint task force. In addition, it consumes almost 5% of the total funding – this is money that should be directed to specific student needs. In learning together with our small rural districts in our area, several benefit from the Wealth Adjustment. While we concur that these small rural districts should be winners, they should be winners because they are small, rural districts serving students of need. In addition, the wealth adjustment creates an environment that is not supportive of economic growth in a community.

3. As Chairman Westfall has already stated, we have significant concerns about unintended inequities in the formula which allocate higher per pupil revenues to LEAs who serve fewer students of poverty, fewer students qualifying for special education, and no or few students whose first language is not English. The disparity is significant and does NOT reflect the intended outcome of the new funding formula. The small school lever should be applied toward small, rural schools.

4. Alternative School Funding. Nampa is working hard on finding multiple pathways for all of our students to graduate on time and pursue opportunities after graduation. We have increased our graduation rate by more than 4% this last year and now have a higher graduation rate than the state average. One of the pathways we have used to achieve this significant event is alternative schools. This formula offers little support to continue this option for our students.

We would encourage you to spend some time evaluating whether or not the proposed formula as is actually achieves the goals outlined in the Concurrent Resolution. This is the accountability and assessment piece. Do the numbers demonstrate that we value weights to serve students with the greatest need? In our attempts to understand the current formula, we would have to answer “not yet”. We urge you to slow down, take the time to implement the “right” formula that honors all students and LEAs in Idaho, and not just “a” formula to say that the work is done.

For your reference:

Local Education Agencies (LEAs) serving students in Nampa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District/LEA Identifier</th>
<th>Total New Funding Model WITH CAP</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Revenue Per Pupil</th>
<th>FRL</th>
<th>SPED</th>
<th>EL</th>
<th>GT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEA 1</td>
<td>$ 1,543,156.82</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>$ 5,321.23</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA 2</td>
<td>$ 6,545,072.59</td>
<td>1117</td>
<td>$ 5,859.51</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA 3</td>
<td>$ 83,297,992.09</td>
<td>14066</td>
<td>$ 5,921.94</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA 4</td>
<td>$ 53,514,972.16</td>
<td>8664</td>
<td>$ 6,176.71</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA 5</td>
<td>$ 2,154,676.85</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>$ 6,883.95</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA 6</td>
<td>$ 2,867,029.60</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>$ 7,167.57</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA 7</td>
<td>$ 3,031,941.67</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>$ 7,323.53</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA 8</td>
<td>$ 979,827.17</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>$ 9,243.65</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Good afternoon Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee,

My name is Nick Smith and I am the Human Resources Director for the Boise School District.

Before I get started, I want to thank you for the opportunity to testify today and provide input on the Draft Legislation and Funding Model. I truly appreciate all of the work that has gone into both the model and draft legislation to this point and appreciate the Legislature’s efforts to continue to refine the legislation and model based on the feedback you have been receiving.

For those of you thinking that I look familiar, prior to working for the Boise School District, I served as Deputy Superintendent under Superintendent of Public Instruction Tom Luna. I also grew up in Camas County and started my career as a teacher and administrator in the Bliss School District in the Magic Valley.

Today I want to talk to you about some concerns I have related to the Wealth Adjustment aspect of the formula. Because of my background growing up and working in a rural school district and as a result of my time working at the State Department of Education, overseeing the Rural Education Taskforce and Idaho’s Rural Education Achievement Federal Program, I always look at legislation and initiatives through the lens of small rural school districts and how they will impact those districts which is why the Wealth Adjustment concerns me. When you look at the Wealth Adjustment, it is driving 4% of the total funding allocation in the draft model which equates to approximately $62 Million.

When you look at the Wealth Adjustment, it is basically a Market Value Adjustment, taking a District’s Market Value, divided by the number of students they serve and then comparing that to the the state average. Schools above the state average do not receive any additional money under the Wealth Adjustment. Those that fall under the state average receive additional funding. The issue with this is when I looked at some of the schools that do not receive additional funding under the Wealth Adjustment, I had to do a double take.

As mentioned before, I started my educational career in Bliss. For those of you that have ever driven through or past Bliss, it is far from what I would consider a wealthy area. In fact 82% of their students come from low income families. In addition, when I worked in Bliss, we tried two times to pass a bond to build a new K-12 school and finally had to significantly reduce the amount of the bond, and were only able to build a handful of new classrooms to get it passed.

For those of you from up North, another District that is not receiving the Wealth Adjustment despite serving a large low income population is the Plummer-Worley School District. Plummer Worley has 98% of their students coming from low income families yet they do not qualify for the Wealth Adjustment under the current formula. Some of you might recall that Plummer-Worley was the first school district in the state to tap into Idaho’s Safe Public School Cooperative Funding Program which the Legislature established under Idaho Code 33-909 back in 2006. The only other District to take advantage of this program since its inception is the Salmon
School District. Under this law, since an elementary school in the Plummer-Worley was deemed by the Division of Building Safety as a safety hazard and the District failed on multiple attempts to pass a bond to replace it, the state had to step in. This program was established by the Legislature to ensure that Idaho was providing a uniform and thorough system of public, free common schools as required under the State Constitution. The Plummer Worley scenario proves to me that Plummer Worley is far from a District that can afford not to qualify for the Wealth Adjustment as they serve a large low income population and have a difficult time passing bonds.

If we as a state want to look at an equalization factor, I would enrouge the Legislature to explore restoring the Maintenance and Operations Levy that was repealed during the 2006 Special Session called by then Governor Risch.

In addition to my concerns over the Wealth Adjustment, as a HR Director, I am also concerned with Salary Based Apportionment and the Career Ladder funding being rolled into the new funding model as the Career Ladder has brought stability and predictability to the negotiations process thereby preventing District from having to engage in lengthy and controversial negotiation sessions across the state.

Another concern is that several of the dials or factors involve comparisons to the state averages. As a result, the formula creates volatility in funding for all districts from one year to the next.

Again, I appreciate the work that the Funding Formula Committee has done on behalf of Idaho Districts and appreciate the fact that the legislature gave us this opportunity to provide feedback today. I believe that through this collaborative process, we will be able to arrive at a better funding formula model.
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- Definition of a camel and an expert
- Idaho needs to do a better job of funding schools (40th to 49th depending on survey)
- Many districts receive in the $5-6000 per student range, others receive over $10,000
- Idaho lags the nation in important factors like teacher pay, per student funding, wages and our Go On rate
- Our present formula is too complex
- The new formula won’t solve these clearly identified problems
- The new formula probably won’t help improve student achievement
- The new formula won’t solve that we have 115 traditional and 47 charter districts, most serving fewer than 1000 students
- Things that will help:
  - Highly qualified teachers (advanced degree, certified in their teaching area)
  - Better teacher pay (career ladders helped, need to continue & fully fund)
  - Community involvement
  - Salary based apportionment
  - Solid curriculum
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SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE
3:00 P.M.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>PRESENTER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RS26831</td>
<td>Relating to Education; Certificate Renewal</td>
<td>Senator Kelly Anthon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS26806</td>
<td>Relating to Public Charter Schools: CTE Funding</td>
<td>Suzanne Budge, SBS Associates, LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS26807</td>
<td>Relating to Education: Repeal Section 33-1004</td>
<td>Suzanne Budge, SBS Associates, LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS26832</td>
<td>Relating to Driver Training; Scholarships and</td>
<td>Marilyn Whitney, Deputy Superintendent, Communications and Policy, State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>Department of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS26820</td>
<td>Relating to Education; Facilities Funds for</td>
<td>Blake Youde, Youde &amp; Associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Charter Schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS26821</td>
<td>Relating to Public Charter Schools; Facilities</td>
<td>Emily McClure, McClure Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS26789C1</td>
<td>Relating to Education; Provide Funding for CTE</td>
<td>Senator Steven Thayn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS26778</td>
<td>Relating to Education; Literacy Intervention</td>
<td>Chairman Dean M. Mortimer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion:</td>
<td>Setting Budget Priorities</td>
<td>Chairman Mortimer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you have written testimony, please provide a copy of it along with the name of the person or organization responsible to the committee secretary to ensure accuracy of records.
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COMMITTEE SECRETARY
LeAnn Mohr
Room: WW39
Phone: 332-1321
email: sedu@senate.idaho.gov
DATE: Monday, February 11, 2019
TIME: 3:00 P.M.
PLACE: Room WW55
MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Mortimer, Vice Chairman Thayn, Senators Winder, Den Hartog, Crabtree, Woodward, Lent, Buckner-Webb, and Ward-Engelking
ABSENT/ EXCUSED: None
NOTE: The sign-in sheet, testimonies and other related materials will be retained with the minutes in the committee's office until the end of the session and will then be located on file in the Legislative Services Library.
CONVENE:
Chairman Mortimer called the Education Committee (Committee) to order at 3:02 p.m. He opened with a reading from the book, A Heap O 'Living Along Life's Highway, by Eager A. Guest, "Story Telling."
MOTION:
Senator Den Hartog moved to send RS 26831, RS 26806, RS 26807, RS 26832, RS 26820, RS 26821, RS 26789C1, and RS 26778 to print. Vice Chairman Thayn seconded the motion. The motion passed by voice vote.
COMMITTEE DISCUSSION:
Chairman Mortimer said he will be presenting the Committee's education funding recommendation before the Joint Appropriation and Finance Committee. He asked the Committee members to report their top funding priorities.
Senator Ward-Engelking outlined the following priorities: 1.) Career Ladder; 2.) Health insurance in discretionary funding; 3.) K-3 Literacy; and 4.) Increased funding for the support units.
Senator Lent said he would like to see priority funding in the following areas: 1.) K-3 Literacy; 2.) Mastery Based Education; and 3.) Career Technical Education.
Senator Den Hartog reported her priorities: 1.) Increased funding for teacher health insurance; 2.) Literacy proficiency; 3.) Career ladder; and 4.) Mastery-based education. She said her interests in literacy proficiency and mastery-based education are not necessarily funding increases. Instead, she would like to see policy adjustments.
Senator Buckner-Webb outlined her funding priorities: 1.) Career Ladder; 2.) Health insurance for teachers: 3.) Literacy intervention; and 4.) Mastery Based education.
Senator Woodward listed his funding priorities as follows: 1.) Career Ladder; and 2.) Reading proficiency. He questioned if the Advanced Opportunities program is meeting the intended goals. Senator Woodward said his concerns were a result of the College and University Presidents' presentations.
Senator Crabtree explained his priorities: 1.) Career Ladder; 2.) Idaho Digital Learning Academy; 3.) Mastery Based Education; and 4.) Literacy Proficiency.
Chairman Mortimer listed his funding priorities as follows: 1.) Career Ladder; 2.) Discretionary spending; it's importance is due to what it encompasses; 3.) Literacy proficiency; 4. Health insurance; and 5. Technology budget.
During the discussion, Senators emphasized the need to replenish and build-up the Public Education Stabilization Fund (PESF). They expressed their concerns regarding the lower than expected State revenues and the possible impact to education funding. The importance of the Opportunity Scholarship for the Colleges and Universities was also mentioned. They recommended addressing policy setting rather than budget increases to impact educational goals.

RECORDING LINK: To hear the complete budget discussion, go to: https://legislature.idaho.gov/sessioninfo/2019/standingcommittees/SEDU/.

ADJOURNED: There being no further business at this time, Chairman Mortimer adjourned the meeting at 3:48 p.m.

__________________________________________________________
Senator Dean M. Mortimer
Chair

__________________________________________________________
LeAnn Mohr
Secretary
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**SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE**  
3:00 P.M.  
Room WW55  
Tuesday, February 12, 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>PRESENTER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presentation:</td>
<td>Workforce Development</td>
<td>Wendi Secrist, Executive Director, Idaho Workforce Development Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation:</td>
<td>State Board of Education: Data Dash Board</td>
<td>Cathleen McHugh, Chief Research Officer, State Board of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation:</td>
<td>Virtual Schools Presentation</td>
<td>Kelly Edginton, Head of School, Idaho Virtual Academy,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IDVA Data</td>
<td>Impact of Mobility on School Success Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ITCA Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>iSucceed Data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CONVENEDE Chairman Mortimer called the Education Committee (Committee) to order at 3:02 p.m.  

PRESENTATION: Wendi Secrist, Executive Director, Idaho Workforce Development Council (WDC), updated the Committee about their work. She outlined the criteria from the Governor's Workforce Development Task Force. She said WDC, through its programs, is to maintain a highly skilled workforce, provide efficient use of resources, and increase awareness and access to career education and training. She named the different agencies with which they collaborate.  

Ms. Secrist emphasized the partnership with the State Board of Education (SBE) and explained the work partnership with the goal to close the skills gap and to develop a talent pipeline for statewide employers. She provided actual examples of how employers are training workforce students.  

Ms. Secrist said there are workforce development training funds available to help students. Those funds are employer grants, industry sector grants, and innovation grants. WDC also sponsors outreach projects to provide public information on career education and workforce training opportunities. She shared with the Committee the legislative priorities for WDC (Attachments 1, 2, and 3).  

In response to Committee questions, Ms. Secrist stated WDC is sensitive to the needs of all regions in Idaho. They are working to identify gaps and find investments to fill those. She explained the age groups of the people they work with the majority being adults. She said the Department of Health and Welfare is a required partner under the Federal Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act, which gives WDC access to communicate with over 30,000 people across the state who receive food stamps and welfare payments. Ms. Secrist detailed the funding amounts and sources and emphasized there are no General Funds being used for their budget. She said she would like to see more career technical education opportunities in middle schools and the integration of Nextsteps Idaho.
PRESENTATION: Dr. Cathleen McHugh, Chief Research Officer, State Board of Education (SBE), presented the Data Dash Board (DDB). She disclosed to the Committee where on the SBE website they could find the DDB page. She stated there are three different components to the DDB: 1.) K-12; 2.) Transition to postsecondary education; and 3.) The postsecondary education component. Dr. McHugh said in building the DDB they knew there would be many types of users, and accordingly the DDB has pages for each. A summary page is also available. She demonstrated to the Committee a variety of data points available on the site. The DDB is being expanded with the goal to provide information to parents, administrators, policymakers, and others to share the information.

Matt Freeman, Executive Director, SBE, detailed the arenas where the SBE has shared the DDB and the work they are doing to build awareness.

Chairman Mortimer expressed his appreciation with this tool and with the work of the SBE. He said this will help improve efforts in education.

PRESENTATION: Kelly Edginton, Head of School, Idaho Virtual Academy (IDVA), presented IDVA data and informed the Committee the school has been accredited since 2005. She explained the student demographic composition of IDVA, and the reason parents enroll their children with IDVA. She reported that 57 teachers are employed with the virtual school. She reported the graduation statistics and said she would provide the Committee with the exact numbers to support her report. Ms. Edginton concluded saying the IDVA serves an indispensable role in Idaho's public education system (Attachment 4).

PRESENTATION: Jessica Shopoff, Accountability Specialist, K12 Inc. (K12), presented the Impact of Mobility on School Success Measures. She said K12 is a curriculum provider for alternatives to traditional brick and mortar schools and she is an accountability specialist. She highlighted for the Committee the demographic percentage of students who are served by brick and mortar versus online charter schools, emphasizing those students who are special education students as well as those in poverty. Ms. Shopoff stated research has found that student mobility has a negative impact on student learning. When reporting data, the State Department of Education should consider mobility factors (Attachment 5).

PRESENTATION: Monti Pittman, Head of School, Idaho Technical Career Academy (ITCA), said ITCA was founded in 2014 to meet Idaho's labor needs in business and industry. The intent was to create a quality virtual charter school that uses technology to connect academically at-risk, underserved, or geographically dispersed students in the state. He detailed the four career pathways offered at ITCA: 1.) Agricultural Manufacturing/Food Processing Systems; 2.) Business/Marketing Management (Entrepreneurship); 3.) Health Science/Pharmacy Tech; and 4.) Web Development and Digital Communications. He reported ITCA's enrollment numbers and detailed the student demographics. Mr. Pittman conveyed the number of certificates and diplomas awarded by ITCA (Attachment 6).

PRESENTATION: Katie Allison, Executive Director, iSucceed Virtual High School (iSucceed), said iSucceed as a statewide accredited online school, grades 9 through 11, authorized by the Public Charter School Commission, and open to all students in Idaho. She stated online schools educate the extremes: from high performing students to high-risk students. She stated the number one reason students enroll is the bullying they receive in their brick and mortar school. Ms. Allison emphasized the importance of online schools. She said without them, students would not be receiving a diploma.
Chairman Mortimer thanked the presenters for the work they do to help Idaho students achieve.

RECORDING LINK: To hear the complete Workforce Development Council and Online School presentation, go to: https://legislature.idaho.gov/sessioninfo/2019/standingcommittees/SEDU/.

ADJOURNED: There being no further business at this time, Chairman Mortimer adjourned the meeting at 4:36 p.m.

___________________________  ___________________________
Senator Dean M. Mortimer    LeAnn Mohr
Chair                      Secretary
Governor’s Workforce Development Task Force Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comprehensive Statewide Strategic Workforce Development Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workforce Development Council led initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empower an industry-led Workforce Development Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish a sustainable funding mechanism for the Workforce Development Training Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public outreach/engagement to increase career awareness and connection to training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase apprenticeships</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If Idaho does not act now there is a real risk of becoming a talent exporter and, losing businesses to those states that have created the required workforce.
Workforce Development Council Charge

“Increase the role and responsibilities of an industry-driven Workforce Development Council to champion the development and implementation of a statewide, strategic workforce development plan that meets industries’ needs today and tomorrow.”

• Improve the effectiveness, quality and coordination of programs and services designed to maintain a highly skilled workforce.
• Provide for the most efficient use of federal, state and local workforce development resources.
• Increase public awareness of and access to career education & training opportunities.
Idaho LEADER
Learn. Do. Earn.
leader.nextsteps.idaho.gov
Workforce Development Training Fund Programs

- **Employer Grant**: Awarded to a company to reimburse workforce development training costs.
- **Industry Sector Grants**: Granted to a consortium who has identified a training solution to alleviate an industry specific skill gaps.
- **Innovation Grants**: Designed to fund projects serving youth or adults and benefiting localized and/or rural efforts.

The council also strategically sponsors **Outreach Projects** that provide public information and outreach on career education and workforce training opportunities, including existing education and training programs and services not funded by the training fund.
Number of Grants by Type
Calendar Year 2014-2017

- Employer Grant: 48 (69%)
- Innovation Grant: 12 (17%)
- Industry Sector: 10 (14%)

Number of Grants by Type
Calendar Year 2018

- Employer Grant: 13 (54%)
- Industry Sector: 7 (29%)
- Innovation Grant: 4 (17%)
Number of Grants by Region
Calendar Year 2014-2017

1- North - 11
2- North Central - 12
3 - Southwest - 24
4 - South Central - 7
5 - South East - 8
6- East - 6

Number of Grants by Region
Calendar Year 2018

1- North - 2
2- North Central - 4
3 - Southwest - 6
4 - South Central - 5
5 - South East - 4
6- East - 3
Workforce Development Training Fund
2018 Annual Report

Idaho Workforce Development Council
State of Idaho
Brad Little, Governor
In late 2017, Governor C.L. “Butch” Otter issued an executive order to move the Idaho Workforce Development Council to the Executive Office of the Governor following recommendations from the Workforce Development Task Force. At that time, the Council was re-comprised to increase the role of industry in addressing workforce challenges facing all of Idaho’s employers. The legislature codified changes to the structure of the Council under House Bill 432 and shifted responsibility of the Workforce Development Training Fund (a dedicated fund generated by a 3% offset of unemployment insurance taxes) to the Council. The charge given to the Council by the Governor and legislature is to champion the development and implementation of a statewide, strategic workforce development plan that meets industries’ needs today and tomorrow. The Council now serves as a coordinating body across state agencies, education, and economic development partners in order to address one of the most critical issues threatening the continued growth of Idaho’s economy – developing a skilled workforce that meets the needs of Idaho’s employers.

One of the key achievements of the Council this past year is conducting a complete review and update to the policies of the Workforce Development Training Fund. The goals for the training fund are:

1. Increase the economic mobility of Idahoans through training that leads to wage gains and retention.
2. Provide timely assistance to businesses while shifting focus to broader talent pipeline development strategies that serve multiple employers.
3. Support growth of the economy by assisting employers with job creation and integration of technology, specifically through the development of skills in their existing and/or new employees.
4. Provide a return on investment to Idahoans as evidenced by increased wages, job creation, capital investment, retention of Idaho’s workforce, credential attainment and/or customer satisfaction (employer and trainee).
5. Promote innovation in talent development.

The following charts reflect the Council’s priority to shift focus from helping employers one-at-a-time to broader sector strategies. From the inception of the Industry Sector Grant program in 2014 to the end of 2017, 14% of the grants awarded were sector grants. In this past calendar year, the Council has increased that to 29% of the grants awarded while focusing on supporting efforts throughout the entire state.
The Council has also started funding Outreach Projects to meet the responsibility of increasing public awareness of, and access to, career education and training opportunities, as added to the eligible uses of the Workforce Development Training Fund in House Bill 432. Future reports will include metrics and success stories on the use of the fund for these efforts to better connect education to careers.
# Workforce Development Training Fund

**YEARLY FINANCIAL SUMMARY for FY2017 & FY2018**  
(UNAUDITED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ACTUAL FY2017 7/1/16 - 6/30/17</th>
<th>ACTUAL FY2018 7/1/17 - 6/30/18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beginning Cash Balance</strong></td>
<td><strong>$13,070,130</strong></td>
<td><strong>$13,656,183</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collections*</td>
<td><strong>$5,111,328</strong></td>
<td><strong>$7,162,073</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td><strong>$118,322</strong></td>
<td><strong>$252,542</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,229,650</strong></td>
<td><strong>$7,414,615</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDTF Grants</td>
<td><strong>$3,849,810</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,338,801</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Expenses</td>
<td><strong>$793,787</strong></td>
<td><strong>$922,510</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,643,597</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,261,311</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ending Cash Balance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outstanging Grant Obligations</td>
<td><strong>$6,201,946</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,858,815</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ending Unobligated Balance</strong></td>
<td><strong>$7,454,237</strong></td>
<td><strong>$12,950,672</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes a $2.5m general fund transfer into the Workforce Development Training Fund in FY18 to offset the impact of the unemployment insurance tax rate reduction passed in 2018.
### Employer Grants
Direct grants provided to new and expanding business with an emphasis on transferrable skills and structured training programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COMPLETED</th>
<th>ACTIVE*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Contracts</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount Awarded</td>
<td>$4,704,841</td>
<td>$8,336,614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expended</td>
<td>$4,331,272</td>
<td>$1,323,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Hourly Wage</td>
<td>$17.46</td>
<td>$20.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Trainees</td>
<td>1,607</td>
<td>5,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Cost per Trainee</td>
<td>$2,695</td>
<td>$1,618</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Industry Sector Grants
Education institutions partner with three or more industry partners who provide a cash match and/or in-kind resources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COMPLETED</th>
<th>ACTIVE*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Contracts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Awarded</td>
<td>$244,341</td>
<td>$1,602,433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expended</td>
<td>$175,733</td>
<td>$269,587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Hourly Wage</td>
<td>$16.00</td>
<td>$16.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Trainees</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Cost per Trainee</td>
<td>$5,858</td>
<td>$1,912</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Innovation Grants (formerly Micro-Grants)
Community consortiums of business, education and other partners to solve workforce issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COMPLETED</th>
<th>ACTIVE*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Contracts</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Awarded</td>
<td>$40,800</td>
<td>$67,899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expended</td>
<td>$40,629</td>
<td>$23,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Hourly Wage</td>
<td>$15.74</td>
<td>$15.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Trainees</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Cost per Trainee</td>
<td>$484</td>
<td>$679</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Information provided for active grants show planned wages, trainees and cost per trainee.*
Workforce Development Training Fund

Award Highlights

The fund, established in 1996, is one of the state’s most powerful workforce development tools available to support new and existing businesses as they seek to relocate or expand.

Highlights from just a few of the companies and organizations that have been boosted through the program illustrate not just the economic impact of the program, but also the human factor.

Region 1 - Northern Idaho
North Idaho College, Health Career Pathway Solutions (Coeur d’Alene) – industry sector grant

Period of Performance: July 1, 2018, through June 30, 2020
Total Dollars Awarded: $207,590.19
Estimated Number of People Trained: 54
Estimated Post-Training Wages: $12.74/hour to $14.55/hour

North Idaho College received a $207,590.19 Workforce Development Training Fund grant to support training more than 50 health care professionals through a partnership of six healthcare organizations - Kaniksu Health Services, Kootenai Health, Heritage Health, North Idaho Advanced Care Hospital, Northwest Specialty Hospital and the Rehabilitation Hospital of the Northwest. Funds are being used to train incumbent certified nurse assistants (CNAs), advancing them to medical assistants (MAs) and patient care technicians, positions in high-demand.

The grant project will also provide open enrollment in the Medical Assistant program for up to 21 individuals.

The MA training uses an apprenticeship model, allowing incumbent workers to “earn and learn” as they work towards certification and higher wages without having to quit working. Training includes a combination of classroom time and on-the-job training.
A total of 10 training sessions over the two-year length of the grant will include the medical assistant, patient care technician I and patient care technician II, and all who complete the training earn a certification. All classroom work takes place at NIC.

Participants can expect wage increases after earning certifications of approximately $2 per hour plus benefits.

Employment for medical assistants in North Idaho is projected to grow 23.5% between 2016 and 2026, according to the Idaho Department of Labor. Healthcare support occupations are expected to increase 23.2% between 2016 and 2026, making them one of the fastest growing occupational groups in the country.

Region 2 - North Central Idaho
Clearwater County Economic Development (Orofino) – innovation grant

Period of Performance: June 1, 2018 to May 31, 2019
Total Dollars Awarded: $7,418.25
Estimated Number of People Trained: 30
Estimated Post-Training Wages: $7.50 to $15/hour

Clearwater County Economic Development is using a $7,418 Workforce Development Training Fund innovation grant to provide basic employee skills training for individuals participating in Clearwater County’s Problem Solving Court.

Problem Solving Courts, a judicial branch of the Idaho Supreme Court, divert non-violent, substance abusing offenders from prison and jail into treatment. This project involves training individuals for employment who have an agreement with the court system to make positive changes in their lives and behavioral patterns.

Training will focus on basic math, Microsoft Word and Excel courses through an online, self-paced curriculum. Each participant will be able to obtain certifications and participate in a workplace excellence workshop series, which emphasizes soft skills to expand individual capacity and employability characteristics.

Participants also will have the opportunity to obtain a C-STOP certification (Contractors Safety and Orientation Program), which is a nationally recognized workplace safety curriculum that meets U.S.
Occupational Safety and Health Administration standards. Following training, workers can expect to find jobs earning wages up to $15 per hour.

Clearwater County Economic Development is matching the grant with $7,418 of in-kind support.

This project will become another incentive for court participants to enter into gainful employment. According to Idaho Problem Solving Courts website, “a decade of research indicates that Drug Courts reduce crime by lowering re-arrest and conviction rates, improving substance abuse treatment outcomes and reuniting families and also produce measurable cost benefits.”

Region 3: Southwestern Idaho
Associated General Contractors of America Inc., Idaho Branch (Boise) — industry sector grant

Period of Performance: Oct. 1, 2018 to July 31, 2020
Total Dollars Awarded: $250,000
Estimated Number of People Trained: 180
Estimated Post-Training Wages: $13.92/hour

Idaho’s construction industry is booming, but finding workers with the skills and knowledge to fill the positions required to keep up with demand has been challenging.

That was the impetus for the Idaho Chapter of the Associated General Contractors of America to apply for a Workforce Development Training Fund industry sector grant to fund employer-driven solutions. The Idaho AGC is working with community partners and six colleges to provide a series of nine, four-week long courses in construction training designed to recruit unskilled and/or underemployed individuals to the industry.

For several months Idaho had the fastest rate of growth in construction, but the industry couldn’t find applicants for the jobs, said Wayne Hammon, CEO of Idaho AGC. Using a pre-employment training model, similar to one used in Denver, Hammon and his organization decided to apply for the grant to implement that same training model across Idaho.

AGC wants to introduce the basics of construction to people who may never have considered working in the construction industry. The group intends the basic skills training program to encourage people that there are not only job opportunities, but also careers for them in industry.
Over the 24-month span of the grant, AGC plans to train 180 individuals in the four-week courses. Week one is construction basics and career options. Week two is construction math and job types. Week three is building techniques and job types. Week four covers professional development such as developing resumes, practicing interview skills, launching a job search and culminates in a hiring fair. The courses will be offered at the College of Western Idaho, the College of Southern Idaho, the College of Eastern Idaho, North Idaho College, Lewis Clark State College and Idaho State University.

Partners helping to recruit trainees include the Idaho Department of Health and Welfare, Idaho Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, Idaho Department of Labor, Wyakin Warrior Foundation, Centennial Job Corps, AFL-CIO, Department of Veterans Affairs, International Rescue Committee, Idaho Office for Refugees and the Boise Rescue Mission.

ACG anticipates 135 individuals will find employment within 60 days of completing the training with an anticipated starting hourly wage of $13.92 plus benefits.

Industry partners and AGC members, who have provided input to the training curriculum with the intent to hire individuals after their training is completed, include McAlvain Companies Inc.; HK Contractors Inc.; Wright Brothers, The Building Company; Extreme Excavation Inc.; ESI; and Starr Corporation.

Each of these partners are providing match for materials, student tuition and other expenses.

**Region 3 – Southwestern Idaho**  
**Woodgrain Millwork Inc. - Emmett**

**Period of Performance: Jan. 1, 2018 to Dec. 31, 2020**  
**Total Dollars Awarded: $107,867**  
**Estimated Number of People Trained: 52**  
**Estimated Post-Training Wages: $20.24/hour**

When Fruitland-based Woodgrain Millwork Inc. purchased the Emmett sawmill, it was a commitment of expansion and change. The company invested millions to remodel and upgrade the aging facility to a state-of-the-art modern sawmill.

With such changes comes the need for workers with updated skill sets – in this case, moving from a labor-intensive, high-touch model to a knowledge-intensive, low touch one. The
Workforce Development Training Fund employer grant of $107,867 is a critical element in providing the training required to bring the workforce up to speed with the updated mill.

Using a combination of internal training and external vendor training, the skills workers will learn range from technical specifics of how scanning and optimization works, to the advanced maintenance required of high-tech sawmilling, to continuous improvement and how to work in teams.

Train-the-trainer format using Training Within Industry (TWI) methods is the primary approach to the internal, site-specific topics. External technical training covers topics such as programmable logic controls and hydraulic training, along with industry-specific subjects such as saw filing, kiln drying and lumber quality.

Vendors providing external training include Boise State University, Tech Help, College of Western Idaho and Hew Saw US, manufacturers of sawing machines.

Woodgrain intends to train 52 workers for new permanent full-time positions at an hourly average wage of $20.24 plus benefits.

The workers will be training for a myriad of positions, including electrician, debarker operator, controller, lead millwright, log buyer, kiln operator, heavy equipment mechanic, production manager, scaler, saw filer, sales manager, stockroom/buyer, safety/financial supervisor and many others.

Region 4 – South Central Idaho
Cassia Joint School District #151 – industry sector grant

Period of Performance: Nov. 15, 2017 to Nov. 14, 2019
Total Dollars Awarded: $248,745
Estimated Number of People Trained: 42
Estimated Post-Training Wages: $14/hour

The Magic Valley has seen tremendous manufacturing growth in the past several years. In particular, Minidoka and Cassia counties have experienced the expansions of McCain Foods, High Desert Milk and Fabri-Kal and all have faced a shortage of machine operators. With county unemployment rates barely above 2 percent, finding workers became a challenge.
With the help of a $248,745 Workforce Development Training Fund industry sector grant, the three companies teamed up with the Minidoka and Cassia school districts to develop a machine operator School to Registered Apprenticeship Program - or STRAP – for junior and seniors.

The training program involves 280 hours of classroom instruction and 1,820 hours of on-the-job training. Through this “earn while you learn” model students work part time during the school year and full time in the summer. They are paid an hourly wage between $10 and $12 after signing a contract to ensure they attend classes and show up for work.

Topics covered in the classroom training include safety management, food safety and security, maintenance, mechanical techniques, electrical and instrumentation systems, environmental safety, continuous improvement and workplace excellence skills.

When students complete the joint classroom and on-the-job training they will graduate from the program with a nationally recognized credential from the U.S. Department of Labor.

Students who complete the STRAP program and have graduated from high school are offered full-time permanent positions, including benefits with the partner companies - McCain Foods, High Desert Milk and Fabri-Kal. The new workers can expect to earn average hourly wages of $14.

The team has created and structured the machine operator apprenticeship program so the students of Minidoka and Cassia School Districts in each succeeding class, year after year, will be trained and have full-time employment opportunities with the industry partners, thus creating an ongoing workforce pipeline.

Region 5 – Southeastern Idaho
Spudnik Equipment Company (Blackfoot) – employer grant

Period of Performance: June 1, 2017, to May 31, 2019
Total Dollars Awarded: $158,271.25
Estimated Number of People Trained: 20 new; 250 retrained
Average Estimated Post-Training Wages: $15.36/hour

North America’s largest potato equipment manufacturer is training 20 individuals for new, permanent full-time positions and retraining 250 current workers for its facilities in Blackfoot with the help of a $158,271 Workforce Development Training Fund employer grant. Spudnik continues to grow each year and expects to increase the size of its workforce by 20 percent over the next five years to keep up with demand. In addition to normal growth, the
company has an aging workforce and anticipates 10 percent of its workforce will retire over the next five years, taking a lot of institutional knowledge with them when they retire.

Twenty-five individuals will be trained through registered apprenticeship programs as assemblers, machinists, welders and fabricators at starting at $12 per hour. Wage increases are built into the programs so that workers are compensated as their skills increase.

The 250 workers are participating in retraining for those same positions as well as laser operators, nesters, manufacturing engineers, production managers, IT support specialists, maintenance technicians, mechanical, electrical and hydraulic engineers, production control specialists, engineer support specialists, service technicians and drafters. Hourly wages for incumbent workers after training will range from $13 to $24 plus benefits.

An extensive array of skills are included in the training, provided by several organizations and equipment manufacturers such as Underwriters Laboratories, Idaho State University, Cadex, TPCTrain CO, Bystronic, TRUMPF, Bigfoot and IFPS. A combination of classroom instruction, hands-on practice and on-the-job training will be used over the two-year length of the grant.

Region 6 – Eastern Idaho
College of Eastern Idaho (Idaho Falls) – industry sector grant

Period of Performance: Aug. 31, 2018 to Aug. 30, 2020
Total Dollars Awarded: $250,000
Estimated Number of People Trained: 180 current; 40 new
Estimated Post-Training Wages: $17.24/hour

The Idaho Department of Labor projects a 17.5 percent increase in welder jobs statewide between now and 2026. Many of those openings will be caused by retirements. Nationwide, the projected shortage is even higher, and southeastern Idaho wants to be ready.

The College of Eastern Idaho obtained a $250,000 Workforce Development Training Fund industry sector grant to counter the current shortage and plan for future by training 220 welders over a two-year period.

The program was developed among a partnership of southeastern Idaho organizations that provided cash match as a shared investment in building up the area’s welder workforce.
Businesses providing the matching funds are Premier Technology, American Fabrication Inc., Cives Steel Company, Idaho Steel, Spudnik Inc. and the Idaho National Laboratory.

The six-week course takes place on Saturdays, 8 a.m. to 5 p.m., at the college’s Workforce Development Department where part-time instructors teach modularized basic and advanced welding techniques. The training is based on standards established by Idaho Career & Technical Education’s Idaho Welding Technology Program.

Curriculum includes a combination of classroom presentations and hands-on welding practice. In the sixth and final class, students complete a skills assessment to demonstrate competency. Students earn SkillStack welding badges based on results. Badges indicate an individual has mastered a particular skill set and increases employability.

Initially, there will be nine rounds of training year-round to meet the goal of 220 trainees. Post training, the average hourly wages students can expect will vary depending on experience with an average of $17.24, plus benefits.
Grant Summaries
ACTIVE CONTRACTS CY2018
Type of
Grant
Employer
Employer
Employer
Employer
Employer
Employer
Employer
Employer
Employer
Employer
Employer
Employer
Employer
Employer
Employer
Employer
Employer
Micro
Micro
Micro
Micro
Sector
Sector
Sector
Sector
Sector
Sector
Sector

Company Name

Start Date

Basic American Foods
10/18/2018
CS Beef Packers
10/1/2016
DA Glass
7/1/2018
Diversified Fluid
1/1/2017
Fresh Air Manufacturing
1/1/2016
House of Design
8/15/2017
McCain
8/13/2017
Orgill Inc.
11/1/2016
Premier Technology
6/14/2018
Semiconductor Components Ind
6/13/2017
Simplot
12/1/2018
Sorrento Lactalis
7/1/2016
Spudnik
6/1/2017
Paylocity Corp.
12/1/2015
Unitech
4/1/2018
Western States Equipment
6/5/2017
Woodgrain Millwork
1/1/2018
Clearwater CNA
9/17/2018
Clearwater Problem Solving Court 6/1/2018
Franklin County LPN
8/20/2018
Lewiston High School Dist. #1
7/1/2017
Cassia JSD #151
11/15/2017
CEI Nursing
9/1/2017
CEI Nuclear
8/1/2018
CEI Welding
8/31/2018
Idaho AGC
8/1/2018
NIC Health Careers
6/1/2018
NIC Wood Products
3/1/2017

End Date
1/31/2019
9/30/2019
6/30/2020
12/31/2019
12/31/2019
8/14/2019
8/12/2019
10/31/2019
6/13/2020
6/12/2019
11/30/2020
1/8/2019
5/31/2019
11/30/2018
3/31/2020
6/4/2019
12/31/2020
9/16/2019
5/31/2019
8/19/2019
5/31/2019
11/14/2019
8/31/2019
7/31/2020
8/30/2020
7/31/2020
5/31/2020
2/28/2019

Amount Expenditures
Balance
Awarded
thru 2018
$54,991
$0.00
$54,991
$1,099,935
$0.00
$1,099,935
$110,655
$0.00
$110,655
$308,949
$295,623.49
$13,326
$80,000
$32,633.69
$47,366
$99,984
$2,031.00
$97,953
$2,500,000
$0.00
$2,500,000
$151,032
$19,138.10
$131,894
$423,690
$0.00
$423,690
$335,959
$133,188.88
$202,770
$552,438
$0.00
$552,438
$282,927
$0.00
$282,927
$158,271
$36,999.90
$121,271
$1,200,000 $790,789.24
$409,211
$822,337
$0.00
$822,337
$48,243
$13,400.85
$34,842
$107,203
$0.00
$107,203
$10,481
$0.00
$10,481
$7,418
$0.00
$7,418
$25,000
$0.00
$25,000
$25,000
$23,134.72
$1,865
$248,745
$18,532.00
$230,213
$79,516
$21,899.52
$57,616
$84,000
$0.00
$84,000
$250,000
$0.00
$250,000
$250,000
$0.00
$250,000
$207,590
$0.00
$207,590
$482,582
$229,155.61
$253,427

# of
Trainees

Average
Wage

856
701
55
96
23
34
753
167
254
84
490
91
270
500
421
18
52
14
30
4
52
42
13
160
180
180
49
214

$16.58
$17.28
$14.00
$19.54
$20.87
$31.78
$20.60
$16.93
$18.35
$25.18
$42.17
$27.02
$15.36
$21.09
$14.47
$12.00
$20.08
$14.00
$17.25
$17.00
$14.00
$14.00
$17.85
$13.25
$17.24
$13.92
$14.55
$20.00

Balance

# of
Trainees

Average
Wage

$0
$0
$0
$87,302
$202,500
$23,042
$36,222
$24,504
$49
$122
$68,608

54
667
252
364
135
87
31
17
80
4
30

$20.58
$17.00
$21.43
$13.52
$17.38
$22.00
$19.61
$25.00
$16.00
$10.46
$16.00

COMPLETED CONTRACTS CY 2018
Type of
Grant
Employer
Employer
Employer
Employer
Employer
Employer
Employer
Employer
Micro
Micro
Sector

Company Name

Start Date

End Date

AMFEC Inc
Amy's Kitchen
Clif Bar & Company
Comenity Servicing
Federal Cartridge Co.
Hearthside Food Solutions
R.C. Bigelow
St. Joseph Regional Medical Center
ISU Construction
Oneida County LPN
University of Idaho Fire Science

4/18/2016
12/1/2014
9/1/2014
3/1/2016
7/1/2016
10/15/2015
7/1/2016
3/1/2016
3/21/2018
8/1/2017
5/1/2016

4/17/2018
12/31/2018
12/31/2018
2/28/2018
6/30/2018
10/14/2018
6/30/2018
3/28/2018
3/30/2019
9/30/2018
4/30/2018

317 W. Main St.
Boise, ID 83735
208.488.7560

Amount
Awarded
$197,505
$2,000,000
$2,016,000
$87,302
$202,500
$83,120
$58,915
$59,500
$15,902
$24,898
$244,341

Expenditures
thru 12/31/18
$197,505.00
$2,000,000.00
$2,016,000.00
$0.00
$0.00
$60,077.60
$22,692.73
$34,996.28
$15,853.16
$24,775.77
$175,733.32
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Idaho Workforce Development Council
Legislative Priorities

The Council works to champion the development and implementation of a statewide, strategic workforce development plan that meets industries’ needs today and tomorrow.

Though the council does not have any pending legislation we support these initiatives, as well as policies that support college credit for work-based learning.

Idaho Career & Technical Education
Initiatives

• Post-Secondary Funding:
  • Capital Replacement (FY20 – $594,600) – Funds the replacement of outdated equipment in post-secondary institutions to ensure students are trained on equipment equivalent to what is used in industry today.
  • Nuclear Energy Workforce (FY20 - $320,000) – Start nuclear safety training program at CEI and expand ESTEC program at ISU to meet increased workforce demand at INL and suppliers.

• Workforce Readiness Incentive Grants: (FY20 – $200,000) - ICTE is working with the Governor’s office and Idaho Business for Education to develop a program to incentivize school districts who graduate workforce ready students.

• Middle School CTE: (FY20 - $200,000) – Starts the implementation of the new middle school CTE program which includes identifying standards, creating assessments, developing curriculum, and working with the identified pilot schools to ensure the new middle school CTE program is listed in school or district’s FY21 course catalogs.

• Program Alignment: (FY20 - $95,000) - Continue to connect and align CTE secondary and postsecondary programs to allow high school students opportunity to earn CTE college credit and move through school and into careers more efficiently.

Idaho Department of Labor
Initiatives

• Idaho Job Corps Demonstration Project: (FY20 - $4,323,500 Spending Authority) - The Idaho Department of Labor will partner with the College of Western Idaho to serve 150 students annually in the Treasure Valley and expand the program to serve an additional 150 students at other community colleges throughout Idaho during years two and three.

• Apprenticeship Idaho: The Idaho Department of Labor is using $2.247 million in federal funds from the US Department of Labor to increase registered apprenticeships in nontraditional industries. Since the program’s inception, registered apprenticeships have increased by 66 percent the number of Idahoans enrolled has more than doubled. The goal is to continue that growth by 20 percent annually until 2020 with a focus on nontraditional industries like advanced manufacturing, health care, high tech, and power and energy.

Idaho State Board of Education
Initiatives

• Opportunity Scholarship: ($7 million) - In FY18 1,780 eligible applicants did not receive the scholarship because of a lack of funds. If the proposal becomes law, the Opportunity Scholarship fund will increase from $13.77 million to $20.77 million. This provides a market-based approach to increasing higher education funding by awarding scholarships to students who choose which institution best fits their needs. This will support the 60% goal, increase responsiveness of institutions to student needs, and address access and affordability.
Idaho Department of Education
Initiatives

- All Idaho Students persevere in life and are ready for college and careers:
  - Implementing Recommendations of the Task Force for Improving Education (K-12): In 2013 the Task Force for Improving Education (K-12) recommended 20 ways Idaho could better prepare students to achieve success. These recommendations have helped shape Department of Education initiatives and objectives. The FY20 budget recommendation includes funding to continue implementing the task force recommendations, including Literacy Proficiency ($26 million), Master Educator Premiums ($7.2 million), and Advanced Opportunities ($3 million).

- Idaho attracts and retains great teachers and leaders:
  - Strengthening the Career Ladder to Improve Teacher Pay: The FY20 budget recommendation includes funding the fifth year of the career ladder ($48 million) and increasing the salary for a newly credentialed teacher to $40,000 ($11.2 million).

STEM Action Center
Initiatives

- Computer Science Initiative: (FY 20 - $1M) – Onetime funding for the Computer Science education initiative including educator professional development, camps, student competitions, and grants. As a national leader in Computer Science education, and in partnership with other state agencies, Idaho STEM Action Center will work collectively to build a workforce prepared to fill the growing number of Computer Science jobs available in Idaho.

Idaho Bureau of Occupational Licenses
Initiatives

- Water/Wastewater Apprenticeship Rule Changes: The proposed changes will reduce barriers and provide additional pathways to licensure through apprenticeships for those seeking jobs in the drinking water and wastewater professions.
Idaho Virtual Academy (IDVA) has been accredited by NWEA and now AdvancED since 2005. IDVA underwent an accreditation site visit last week and received a glowing verbal exit report. We will receive a written report in about a month. During the verbal exit report, the Lead Site Reviewer specifically noted:

- Parents appreciate that our school addresses their children’s individuality and that staff makes strong connections with them.
- Parents and students said that our school uses data to drive interventions.
- Kids noted that our school is attentive to their needs.
- Parents of students with disabilities said we are doing phenomenal work with their students.
- When referring to the parent and student interviews, the Lead Reviewer said, “They know they’re being taken care of here.”

**IDVA Demographics**

- IDVA employs 57 Idaho certified teachers
- IDVA’s student population is highly mobile. About half of our students are new each year.
  - Parents choose to enroll their children with IDVA for specific reasons, and often for *non-academic* reasons. In a survey of new parents conducted last fall, 76% choose “concerned about the school environment (safety, drugs, distractions, peer pressure, bullying)” as the reason for enrolling their child with IDVA.”
- IDVA students enroll from throughout the state, including rural areas where there are few, if any, brick-and-mortar charter schools or other alternative public-school options.
- A significant percentage of the high school students enrolling new each year at IDVA are credit deficient before enrollment at our school. For IDVA VHS, in school years 14/15, 15/16, and 16/17, 16-31% of students, by grade level, were credit deficient with new 10th graders between 24-28% credit deficient. For our alternative high school, in school years 14/15, 15/16, and 16/17, 53%-78% of students, by grade level, enrolled credit deficient.
- Students who enroll with IDVA after the first day of school are typically more academically at-risk. For our charter renewal application last year, we compared ISAT performance of late start students to that of returning students. In Spring 2017, 14% fewer late start students were proficient on Math ISAT and 15% fewer proficient on ELA ISAT as compared to returning IDVA students.
- IDVA’s Economically Disadvantaged population varies between about 50-60% and is currently 53.04%.
- IDVA’s students with disabilities (SWD) population varies between about 13-15% and is currently 13.71%.
- IDVA has had 10 graduating classes and has graduated 1288 students.
  - Number of graduates in each class.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Grads</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Grads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IDVA Academic Performance Highlights in recent years**

- In 2016, IDVA’ economically disadvantaged students and students with disabilities outperformed the state in Math, ELA, and Science ISAT.
- In 2017, IDVA’ economically disadvantaged students outperformed the state in ELA ISAT.
- In 2017, IDVA’ students with disabilities outperformed the state in Math, ELA, and Science ISAT.
- In 2018, IDVA’s students with disabilities outperformed the state in Math, ELA, and Science ISAT.
- In 2018, IDVA’s high school students outperformed the state in Math, ELA, and Science ISAT.
- In 2018, IDVA outperformed the state in Science for all students, economically disadvantaged students, and students with disabilities.
- Over the last three years, IDVA’s economically disadvantaged students and students with disabilities outperform the state quite consistently within the state tested grade levels.
For IDVA’s charter renewal last year, we looked at the effect of persistence on ISAT performance. The group of students who stayed enrolled for 3+ years had a far higher percentage of students At or Above Proficiency on ISAT in Spring 2017 than those who were enrolled less than 1 year.

For students enrolled at IDVA with ISAT results in both 2015-16 and 2016-17 (377 students):
- Almost one-quarter of them improved their achievement level on ISAT in Math or ELA. Ex: Below Basic to Basic, Proficient to Advanced, etc.
- 16% of them improved their achievement level in Math and 22% improved their achievement level in ELA.

For students enrolled in 2015-16 that were not proficient on ISAT but stayed enrolled in 2016-17:
- 20% of the 232 students improved their achievement level in Math, with almost half of those moving into a level at or above proficiency.
- 32% of the 196 students improved their achievement level in ELA, with more than half of those moving into a level at or above proficiency.

Persistence matters for economically disadvantaged students. The group of students who stayed enrolled for 3+ years had a far higher percentage of students At or Above Proficiency on ISAT in Spring 2017 than those who enrolled less than 1 year.

Persistence matters for students served by Special Education Services. The group of students who stayed enrolled for 3+ years had a far higher percentage of students At or Above Proficiency on ISAT in Spring 2017 than those who enrolled less than 1 year.

IDVA’s graduation rate improved 7 percentage points from 60% in 2017 to 67% in 2018 and has improved 42.5 percentage points from 2014 to 2018.
Impact of Mobility on School Success Measures

Idaho Senate Education Committee Hearing
February 12, 2019
“Overall, within-sector comparisons in Table 2 indicate that online charter schools serve larger shares of students who are disadvantaged on various dimensions than brick-and-mortar charters.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Charters</th>
<th>Brick-and-Mortar Charters</th>
<th>Online Charters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of schools</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average enrollment per school</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of students enrolled</td>
<td>19,381</td>
<td>14,501</td>
<td>4,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students in Poverty</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learners</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education Students</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Students</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Students</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Students</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander Students</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American Students</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Racial Students</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A Tale of Two Charter Types

Online charter schools are serving:

- **65% more** Students in Poverty

AND

- **Almost double** the amount of Special Education Students than their brick-and-mortar counterparts.
Virtual Twin: Missing Factors

Match factors include:

- Grade level
- Gender
- Race/Ethnicity
- Free or Reduced-Price Lunch Status
- English Language Learner Status
- Special Education Status
- Prior test score on Idaho state achievement tests

MISSING:
- Length of Enrollment
- Enrollment Date (Time of Year)
- Reason for School Switch

Research: Student Mobility

A 1999 study in California found that student mobility not only has negative impacts on mobile students, but also on non-mobile students if they attend high schools with high mobility rates (40% or higher), resulting in a lower average test score on a standardized math assessment.

A meta-analysis of studies completed from 1975 to 1994 that examined the effects of school mobility on reading and math achievement for students in elementary school found that 25 of the 26 studies noted negative effects and that on average, mobile students were 3-4 months behind in achievement as measured by assessment results.

Sources: “The Educational Consequences of Mobility for California Students and Schools”, 1999, page 72
“School mobility and achievement: a meta-analysis”, 2004
Mobility and Graduation Rate

As evidenced in our research in Oregon, it is very apparent that there is a strong negative correlation between graduation rate and mobility rate – meaning the higher the school’s mobility rate, the lower the school’s graduation rate. In fact, the bottom 25 percent of schools by graduation rate have an average mobility rate that is more than four times the average mobility rate of the highest 25 percent of schools.

Source: “How Mobility Impacts School Graduation Rates: What the data tell us”, ECS, 2017
In Texas, we found that highly-mobile schools, whether charter schools or traditional public schools, had significantly lower state assessment proficiency rates than their not highly-mobile counterparts in all subjects.
Summary: In Closing

- Based on decades of research proving that mobility matters, it is imperative that student mobility be used as a matching factor when utilizing a virtual twin model.
- Many states are beginning to acknowledge the impact of mobility on student and school results by building mobility factors into accountability systems and policies and this is an opportunity that should be explored in Idaho.
- While the data we provided was from other states, we have no reason to believe that Idaho is an outlier and with the proper data we expect many of these findings could be replicated. This is why we encourage the Idaho State Department of Education to begin to report out school mobility rates publicly in order to further advance research in this area.
Questions?

Contact Information:

Jessica Shopoff
214-927-2669
jshopoff@k12.com
Mission
ITCA is a virtual career-technical education charter school that provides an occupational sequence of instruction that will prepare Idaho students to obtain the necessary technical skills needed to succeed.

Vision
To create a virtual career-technical education charter school which will provide an appropriately sequenced curriculum that will equip the student with the foundational academic and technical skills to enable them to pursue post-secondary education, achieve occupational certifications, or enter directly into the work force.
Career Pathways Offered

- Agricultural Manufacturing/Food Processing Systems
- Web Development & Digital Communications
- Business/Marketing Management (Entrepreneurship)
- Health Science/Pharmacy Tech
ITCA Enrollment year over year

Enrollment
## Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Special Ed | 12 | 7.02% |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Students</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>American Indian</th>
<th>Other/Undefined</th>
<th>Hawaiian or Pacific Islander</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>8.77%</td>
<td>1.75%</td>
<td>82.46%</td>
<td>1.17%</td>
<td>1.17%</td>
<td>1.75%</td>
<td>2.92%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pathway</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Pharmacy Tech</th>
<th>Web Design</th>
<th>Food Production</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Students</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Free & Reduced Lunch and Credit Deficient

Free and reduced lunch by grade level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Credit deficient upon enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Student Leadership Organizations

#### Business Professionals of America (BPA) Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Year</th>
<th>Regional</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Info</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16-17</td>
<td>4 Students</td>
<td>2 Students</td>
<td>1 student took 5th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-18</td>
<td>24 Students</td>
<td>4 Students</td>
<td>1 to Nationals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-19</td>
<td>6 Students</td>
<td>3 Students</td>
<td>State: Mar 7-9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ITCA NOCTI Results Compared to NOCTI National Averages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pathway</th>
<th>ITCA School Average</th>
<th>NOCTI National Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business Pathway</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
<td>62.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Pathway</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Pathway</td>
<td>68.3%</td>
<td>70.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Industry Certifications

• 2017 – 8 Microsoft Word Certifications

• 2018 – 4 Microsoft Word Certifications

• 2018 – 6 Adobe Web Development Certifications

• 2019 – 25 Microsoft Word Certifications this semester

• 2019 – 8 Adobe Web Development Certifications this semester

• Indeed.com: search for Microsoft Word lists 528 new jobs; 324 new jobs at $45,000+ (637 jobs total)

• Indeed.com: search for Adobe Creative Suite lists 25 new jobs; 17 new jobs at $41,200+ (27 jobs total)

February 8th, 2019
## ITCA Graduates by Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Year</th>
<th>Graduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15-16</td>
<td>9 Seniors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-17</td>
<td>14 Seniors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-18</td>
<td>11 Seniors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# AMENDED AGENDA #1

## SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

3:00 P.M.
Room WW55
Wednesday, February 13, 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>PRESENTER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presentation:</td>
<td>Public Charter School Commission</td>
<td>Alan Reed, Chairman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moving the Needle for All Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engaging the Larger Community &amp; Targeting At-Risk</td>
<td>Matt Strong, Elevate Academy Founder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Serving Low-Income Families with a STEM Model</td>
<td>Amanda Cox, Future Charter School Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal Charter School Program Grant</td>
<td>Terry Ryan, Bluum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capacity Building for Charter School</td>
<td>Tamara Baysinger, Director</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you have written testimony, please provide a copy of it along with the name of the person or organization responsible to the committee secretary to ensure accuracy of records.

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chairman Mortimer</th>
<th>Sen Woodward</th>
<th><strong>COMMITTEE SECRETARY</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vice Chairman Thayn</td>
<td>Sen Lent</td>
<td>LeAnn Mohr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sen Winder</td>
<td>Sen Buckner-Webb</td>
<td>Room: WW39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sen Den Hartog</td>
<td>Sen Ward-Engelking</td>
<td>Phone: 332-1321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sen Crabtree</td>
<td></td>
<td>email: <a href="mailto:sedu@senate.idaho.gov">sedu@senate.idaho.gov</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MINUTES
SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

DATE: Wednesday, February 13, 2019
TIME: 3:00 P.M.
PLACE: Room WW55
MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Mortimer, Vice Chairman Thayn, Senators Winder, Den Hartog, Crabtree, Woodward, Lent, Buckner-Webb, and Ward-Engelking
ABSENT/ EXCUSED: None
NOTE: The sign-in sheet, testimonies and other related materials will be retained with the minutes in the committee's office until the end of the session and will then be located on file with the minutes in the Legislative Services Library.

CONVENED: Chairman Mortimer called the Education Committee (Committee) to order at 3:05 p.m.

PRESENTATION: Alan Reed, Chairman, Public Charter School Commission (PCSC), presented Moving the Needle for All Students. He explained how the Commission is working with the charter schools to fully educate students. He said charter schools are taking on a different look. He highlighted the work of the virtual charter schools and their accomplishments. Mr. Reed said charter schools have many unique educational methods benefiting all types of students. The school formats extend to virtual online academies, those that are STEM education focused as well as international baccalaureate programs. He stated there are more charter schools entering the state with a diversity of educational opportunities. He spoke about the demographic challenges of the charter schools and shared with the Committee the variety of school models which are addressing diversity.

PRESENTATION: Matt Strong, Founder, Elevate Academy (Academy), presented Engaging the Larger Community and Targeting At-Risk Students. He reported why the Academy was founded and its educational history. He said they visited many of the area's industries to determine what students needed to know to become successful employees and with that knowledge, they created a hands-on academy. Mr. Strong explained the exploratory model for students in grades six through ten and the path selection course work beginning for students in the eleventh grade students.

In response to Committee questions, Mr. Strong explained how the Academy incorporates cultural learning into the curriculum. He reported the difficulties they have incurred in hiring Career Technical Educators (CTE). He said students have complete their high school degree while they address the CTE required course work.

PRESENTATION: Amanda Cox, Administrator, Future Public Charter School, presented Serving Low-Income Families with a STEM model. She explained the partnership they have developed with the Boys and Girls Club of Ada County. The goal of the school is to build engineers to become the problem solvers of the future. She reported the diverse demographics of the student population. Ms. Cox spoke about the importance of the facility and how the classrooms are furnished. She told the Committee of the school's projected growth.
PRESENTATION: **Terry Ryan**, Director, Bluum, presented the overview of the Federal Charter Schools Program (CSP) Grants which is funded under Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA); the grant award to Idaho was over $17 million. He outlined Idaho 2018 CSP Grant Objectives: 1.) Increase the number charter school seats in Idaho; 2.) Support the Public Charter School Commission's effort in expanding quality authorizing; and 3.) Evaluate and disseminate the successes and lessons of high-quality charter schools to impact the broader education system. He spoke about the variety of grants available for charter school expansion and detailed the logistics of those grants (Attachment 1).

In response to Committee questions, **Mr. Ryan** explained his role as the Director of Bluum and its responsibility to Idaho. He detailed the study performed by the Center for Research on Education Outcomes (CRED0) and its importance of establishing a measurable performance baseline for Idaho's charter schools. He said they are hoping to redo the study in approximately three years.

PRESENTATION: **Tamara Baysinger**, Director, Idaho Public Charter School Commission (PCSC), presented Capacity Building for Charter Schools. She explained the current and projected increased rate of charter school openings. She stated the PCSC is building processes and programs to ensure the leaders of the new charter schools are well equipped to lead and explained the partnerships they have with the State Department of Education (SDE) and the State Board of Education (SBE) to advance this goal. **Ms. Baysinger** said they have received a federal grant to support those efforts. She detailed the partnership PCSC has with Bluum to disperse the grant dollars.

**Ms. Baysinger** detailed the areas of training charter school leaders are receiving from the PCSC, such as, governance, academic data, and financial management. She said currently, that training is limited, but it is an area the PCSC would like to expand.

Addressing questions from the Committee, **Ms. Baysinger** said all charter schools have a performance certificate. The standards for the certificates indicate academic and financial strengths. Each charter school's rating is listed on the PCSC website. She stated some charter schools are growing, but those that are not are usually staying small because that was the intent of the charter school.

**Alan Reed** concluded the PCSC presentation emphasizing that those who lead schools and teach children are passionate about education. He said there have been difficulties regarding the concern that charter schools were to be an incubator and were to transfer information to public schools. He said that goal is slowly moving forward (Attachment 2).

**Chairman Mortimer** thanked the presenters for sharing the new and exciting opportunities for charter schools and the PCSC.

**RECORDING LINK:**
To hear the complete Charter School presentations, go to:

**ADJOURNED:** There being no further business at this time, **Chairman Mortimer** adjourned the meeting at 4:02 p.m.
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What’s Bluum?

- Bluum is a Boise-based 501(c)3 nonprofit organization founded in 2014 to seek out, vet and support innovative leaders and high-performing school models.

- We believe that school choice helps families, children and educators achieve more and do better.

- We share research and lessons learned widely in Idaho and beyond.

- We currently receive support from the J.A. and Kathryn Albertson Family Foundation, the New Schools Venture Fund, the Charter School Growth Fund, the Louis Calder Foundation and anonymous Idaho-based donors.
**Bluum Partners and Albertson’s New School Investments since 2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; Location</th>
<th>Albertson Grant*</th>
<th>Grant Year</th>
<th>School Type</th>
<th># of Seats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Idaho STEM (Rathdrum)</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Public Charter</td>
<td>372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sage International 1 (Boise)</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Public Charter</td>
<td>530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Carmen (Salmon)</td>
<td>$123,015</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Public Charter</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compass 1 (Meridian)</td>
<td>$1,093,220</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Public Charter</td>
<td>478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEM Innovation (Nampa, Meridian &amp; Pocatello)</td>
<td>$4,601,500</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Public Charter</td>
<td>1,786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho Arts (Nampa)</td>
<td>$1,546,280</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Public Charter</td>
<td>582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alturas International (Idaho Falls)</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Public Charter</td>
<td>598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace Lutheran (Pocatello)</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasure Valley Leadership (Nampa)</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathways in Education (Nampa)</td>
<td>$775,000</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Public Charter</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Ignatius (Meridian)</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Public School (Garden City)</td>
<td>$1,980,000</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Public Charter</td>
<td>576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevate Academy (Caldwell)</td>
<td>$1,250,000</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Public Charter</td>
<td>487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forge International (Middleton)</td>
<td>$1,601,000</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Public Charter</td>
<td>653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compass (Meridian)</td>
<td>$555,000</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Public Charter</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasure Valley Classical Academy (Fruitland)</td>
<td>$1,620,000</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Public Charter</td>
<td>510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ALBERTSON GRANT SUPPORT:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$19,794,605</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>8069</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Average Amount Per New Seat: $2,453

*Albertson Grant Amounts include new school grants, planning grants and Fellowship grants.

---

**Overview of Federal CSP Grants Program**

The CSP Grants to State Entities program is funded under the *Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).*

It enables sub-grants to:

- Open and prepare for the operation of new, high-quality **public charter schools**.
- Replicate and expand high-quality public charter schools.
OVERVIEW

Idaho’s Consortium

- **Bluum** – project lead and grant recipient.
- **J.A. and Kathryn Albertson Family Foundation** – critical nonprofit funding partner.
- **Idaho State Board of Education** – ultimate state quality control agent.
- **Idaho Public Charter School Commission** – lead authorizer for new and expanded public charter schools.
- **Building Hope** – nationally-recognized facilities finance experts.

The 2018 CSP Competition

- Idaho received $17,111,111 over 5-years; $8,939,900 in the first two years.

OVERVIEW

Idaho’s Grant Rationale

- *Supply of school seats is tight.* Idaho and Nevada were the nation’s fastest-growing states between July 2017 and July 2018. Both states’ populations increased by about 2.1 percent in the last year alone. – “Our schools are overcrowded.”
- *Idaho’s charter sector is well established, capable of adding students, and high performing.* For over 20 years the number of schools and enrollment have steadily grown, on average adding two to three new schools a year.
- *Public support and demand for charter schools in Idaho is robust* – 3 out of 4 Idahoans favor charter schools described as “public schools that have a lot more control over their own budget, staff and curriculum, and are free from many existing regulations.”

Who Supports Idaho’s CSP Effort

- Governor Butch Otter
- Senate President Pro Tempore Brent Hill
- House Speaker Scott Bedke
- Senate Education Chair Dean Mortimer
- House Education Chair Julie VanOord
- Representative Wendy Horman
- Idaho State Board of Education Executive Director Matt Freeman
- Idaho Public Charter School Commission Chairman Alan Reed
- US Senator Mike Crapo
- Congressman Mike Simpson
- Congressman Raul Labrador
- J.A. and Kathryn Albertson Family Foundation
- Executive Director Roger Quaries
- Idaho Farm Bureau President Bryan Searle
- Building Hope President Joe Bruno
- Public Charter School Leaders across Idaho
- Business and Philanthropic Leader
PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Idaho’s 2018 CSP Grant Objectives:

• Increase the number of quality charter school seats by 8,200 students, especially for our most educationally disadvantaged and rural students, through start-up, replication and expansion;

• Support the PCSC in expanding its quality authorizing efforts while disseminating and supporting best practice for other authorizers statewide; and

• Evaluate and disseminate widely the successes and lessons of high-quality charter schools to impact the broader education system.

PUTTING NEW GROWTH INTO HISTORICAL CONTEXT

Idaho’s Growing Charter School Sector 1998-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th># of Schools</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th># of Schools</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11,959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14,611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16,048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1,083</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>17,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1,478</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>18,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3,058</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>19,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4,767</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>19,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5,975</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>20,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8,003</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>21,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9,543</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>22,000+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10,768</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DEFINITIONS

Must be approved by a state-sanctioned charter school authorizer as:

- **New Charter School** – approved and in planning year or 1st-year of operations.

- **Replication of a High-Quality Charter School** – open a new charter school or campus based upon the educational model of an existing high-quality charter school.

- **Expansion of a High-Quality Charter School** – significantly increase enrollment or add one or more grades to a high-quality charter school.

DEFINITIONS FOR REPLICATION/EXPANSION

High-quality for schools currently in operation (emphasized by Communities of Excellence application)

- Evidence of strong academic results, including above state average growth and proficiency on ISAT.

- No significant issues identified by authorizer in areas of student safety, school finance, operational management, or statutory/regulatory compliance.

- Success in significantly increasing student achievement, including graduation rates for all students and for each subgroups defined by ESSA (e.g. economically disadvantaged, students with disabilities, Hispanic or Latino, and ELL).

- Good standing with authorizer and lenders.

- Evidence of a student waitlist.

- Evidence of strong and stable leadership and governance.
DEFINITIONS FOR NEW SCHOOLS

High-quality for start-up schools (emphasized by Communities of Excellence application)

- Evidence of a committed board of trustees that own the charter school process and have the demonstrated capacity to deliver for children and families.
- Identified quality instructional leader who is either experienced or proven in running a high-performing school and/or has received first-class charter specific training.
- Demonstrated ability to attract, recruit, retain and develop top teaching talent.
- Sustainable business plan.
- Well-conceived facility plan.
- Evidence of market-demand for the school.
- Innovative and effective learning model that meet the needs of disadvantaged and/or rural students.
- Defined and clear transportation plan for students.

ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS

- Competitive Grant Process.
- Must have an approved charter petition from a state-sanctioned public charter school authorizer.
- Bluum will fund only high-quality plans.
- Applicants that submit proposals that are high-quality and meet the definitions for new, replication or expansion will be considered after a rigorous peer review process.
**Grant Logistics**

**Idaho’s $17,111,111 Application Distribution**

- At least 90 percent must be provided in competitive subgrants to eligible applicants.
- At least 7 percent must be utilized for state-level technical assistance activities and program evaluation/research. Three percent of this to the Idaho Public Charter School Commission for technical assistance and new school supports.
- No more than 3 percent for administration.

---

**Grant Logistics (Tentative)**

**Four Competitive Subgrant Competitions**

- In March 2019 there will be up to 6 available subgrants for up to $800,000 each (3 start-up, 2 replication & 1 expansion).
- In October 2019 there will be up to 6 available subgrants for up to $800,000 each (2 start-up, 2 replication & 2 expansion).
- In October 2020 there will be up to 5 available subgrants for up to $825,000 (3 start-up, 1 replication & 1 expansion).
- In October 2021 there will be up to 2 available subgrants for up to $837,500 (1 start-up & 1 expansion).

Total subgrant period is up to 42 months, of which up to 18 months may be designated for planning and up to 24 months for implementation.
**GRANT LOGISTICS**

**Subgrant allowable activities**

(a) Preparing teachers, school leaders, and specialized instructional support personnel, including through paying costs associated with —

(i) Providing professional development; and (ii) Hiring and compensating, during the eligible applicant’s planning period specified in the application for funds, one or more of the following: (A) Teachers. (B) School Leaders. (C) Specialized instructional support personnel.

(b) Acquiring supplies, training, equipment (including technology), and educational materials (including developing and acquiring instructional materials).

(c) Carrying out necessary renovations to ensure that a new school building complies with applicable statutes and regulations, and minor facilities repairs (excluding construction).

(d) Providing one-time startup costs associated with providing transportation to students to and from the charter school.

(e) Carrying out community engagement activities, which may include paying the cost of student and staff recruitment.

(f) Providing for other appropriate, non-sustained costs related to opening, replicating, or expanding high-quality charter schools when such costs cannot be met from other sources.

---

**GRANT LOGISTICS**

**Restrictions**

- No construction; funding cannot be used to build buildings.
- Our application is a “contract” with the USDOE. Bluum will be held accountable for what is written in the grant.
- Funding cannot be redirected for other uses (e.g. traditional public schools that are not charters).
- Virtual charter schools are not eligible to apply.
**TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE**

Seven percent of total funding must be utilized for state level activities. Bluum’s plan includes:

- Capacity building for new schools, educators and community members.
- Support for Idaho Public Charter School Commission and other authorizers.
- Develop innovative practices and instructional models to share across schools settings (e.g. International Baccalaureate, STEM, Career Technical).
- Focus groups with stakeholders and town hall style meetings for sharing findings.
- Research study to evaluate impact of charter schools on student achievement.
- Technical assistance workshops with state and national experts.

---

**DATE** | **EVENTS & IMPORTANT DATES (Tentative)**
--- | ---
March 4, 2019 | Communication Blitz – share information per CSP opportunity statewide
March 14, 2019 | Charter School Technical Assistance Training (statewide - online)
March 15, 2019 | Open RFA 1st Competition (pending approval of US DoE)
March 15, 2019 | Charter School Technical Assistance Training (Boise - in person)
March 18, 2019 | Charter School Technical Assistance Training (Idaho Falls - in person)
March 18, 2019 | Charter School Technical Assistance Training (Twin Falls - in person)
March 20, 2019 | Charter School Technical Assistance Training (Coeur d’Alene - in person)
March 22, 2019 | Charter School Technical Assistance Training (statewide - online)
April 12, 2019 | RFA Close
April 25, 2019 | Reviews finalized
May 3, 2019 | Management Review Completed
May 10, 2019 | Notice of Awards
May 13, 2019 | Schedule Individual Completeness Check with Budget Training (2 hours; online, dates TBD)
May 20, 2019 | Post Award Webinar/Email Guide to New Sub Recipients
May 31, 2019 | $ Begins to be Disbursed to Sub Recipients
September 30, 2019 | Y1 Funds Commitment Date
Ongoing | Technical assistance as needed in real time and in ongoing fashion
October 1, 2019 | Similar Cycle for 2nd Competition begins
Questions, comments or concerns

"Idaho's Communities of Excellence Project"

Expanding Opportunities through
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Feb 13, 2019 Senate Education Committee Presentation Notes

Public Charter School Commission – Chairman Alan Reed and Director Tamara Baysinger

**KEY QUESTION**

Key question the Commission is asking: Are we moving the needle? Are we, as a charter sector, achieving positive change for students?

A recent CREDO report cited several positive outcomes for Idaho’s charter students, but it’s important to the Commission that this applies to all our kids, across demographic groups, in both the charter and traditional sectors.

**SCOPE OF OPTIONS**

A broadening scope of educational options is now available as rate of new petition submissions increases.

In addition to the Harbor, classical, and virtual models you’re familiar with, we are also seeing proposals for schools designed to:

- prepare at-risk students to meet needs identified by community business leaders
- bring STEM education to low-income, elementary-age students
- integrate outdoor and place-based learning into the core curriculum
- offer International Baccalaureate programs outside major urban centers
- leverage the strong suits of both online and in-person delivery in blended classrooms

**DEMOGRAPHIC DIVERSITY**

Demographic diversity in Idaho’s charters is an issue the PCSC cares deeply about. This is an area in which an authorizer such as ourselves can encourage, but not enforce, change.

The majority of Idaho’s charters are less diverse than their surrounding districts in the demographic categories tracked by the state: FRL eligibility, Special Needs, Non-White, English Language Learner, & at-risk. However, there are clear exceptions.

Many charter schools are focusing their efforts on meeting the needs of underserved students.

- Future Public School – low income (Garden City)
- Elevate Academy – at-risk (Caldwell)
- Chief Tahgee Elementary Academy – Native American students (Blackfoot)
- Alturus International – low income (Idaho Falls)
- Another Choice – special needs (Treasure Valley)
- ICON – institutionalized students (statewide)
- Heritage Community Charter School – Hispanic students (Caldwell)
- KBA – credit recovery (Coeur d’Alene)

Leaders from two of these schools are here today to share a bit about their experiences and goals.
BOARD CAPACITY BUILDING

Over the past couple years, our staff has increased its focus on identifying and shoring up weak areas with regard to services available to public charter schools. We’ve surveyed schools, analyzed our own observations, and worked with other entities, such as the SDE and ISBA, to determine what tools are already available and how we can fill any gaps. In short, our goal is to provide schools – especially young or struggling schools – with the best possible resources to maximize their chances of success.

As Terry indicated, our ability to continue this work will be assisted by the federal grant. A portion of grant funds is dedicated to helping authorizers increase technical assistance to schools. (Some of you who serve on JFAC are wondering how this will work with regard to spending authority. The answer is that the grant funds will flow only through Bluum, who will contract with individuals to support this work, rather than through any state agency.)

One of the greatest areas of need we’ve identified is for specific, ongoing training both for new and evolving charter school boards. We plan to develop modules focusing on the basics of school governance, overseeing school finances, and using academic data to effect meaningful change.

We’d also like to build out training for administrators who are new to charter schools, where they often find themselves performing a broader scope of work than they may have encountered in the traditional sector.

Finally, we’re looking forward to participating in training for other potential authorizers, such as school districts or nonsectarian institutions of higher learning.
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MINUTES
SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

DATE: Thursday, February 14, 2019
TIME: 3:00 P.M.
PLACE: Room WW55
MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Mortimer, Vice Chairman Thayn, Senators Winder, Den Hartog, Crabtree, Lent, Buckner-Webb, and Ward-Engelking
ABSENT/EXCUSED: Senator Woodward

NOTE: The sign-in sheet, testimonies and other related materials will be retained with the minutes in the committee's office until the end of the session and will then be located on file with the minutes in the Legislative Services Library.

CONVENED: Chairman Mortimer called the Education Committee (Committee) to order at 3:01 p.m.

S 1107 Suzanne Budge, SBS Associates, presented S 1107, Relating to Education; Repeal a Section. She said the proposed legislation affects the State's virtual schools, alternative schools, and many rural schools, all of whom have mobile students. She said in 2016, H 603 was designed to address student mobility issues. She stated S 1107 lifts the sunset from H 603 until the new Public School Funding Formula is put in place.

TESTIMONY: Alan Reed, Executive Director, Idaho Charter School Commission, spoke in support of lifting the sunset and would like the funds to stay with the student to fill the gap until the new funding formula is put into place.

MOTION: Senator Ward-Engelking moved to send S 1107 to the floor with a do pass recommendation. Senator Den Hartog seconded the motion. The motion passed by voice vote.

S 1058 Senator Den Hartog presented S 1058, Relating to Charter Schools; Administrators Certification. She said the proposed legislation was brought before the legislature in 2018. The purpose is to create an alternative certificate for charter school administrators. The current legislation requires charter school administrators to hold a traditional school administrator certificate and the lack of flexibility is creating a hindrance in hiring charter school leads.

Senator Den Hartog said the proposed legislation creates a new charter school administrator certificate which will place the certificated individual under the purview of the Professional Standards Commission. She outlined the specific criteria the individual must possess to be eligible for the certificate. She reported that most states do not require charter school administrators to be certified.

DISCUSSION: Senator Buckner-Webb asked if the charter school administrator could be hired in a secondary position until they had the qualifications under current statute to become an administrator. Senator Den Hartog replied the proposed legislation does not preclude that scenario. She stated it would be encouraged, because it would allow that person to grow into the position.

Senator Ward-Engelking asked if charter schools currently can hire administrators who are not certified. Senator Den Hartog replied in the affirmative. She explained the proposed legislation allows the skill set to match the needs of the charter school without having another administrator on staff.
Senator Ward-Engelking asked if the stakeholders were consulted for this proposed legislation. Senator Den Hartog replied in 2018 they did speak with the Idaho Administrators Association in 2018. At that time there was not any interest.

Senator Den Hartog stated charter schools could still hire an administrator with a traditional certificate. This proposed legislation gives charter schools options. It allows the charter school's board of directors to hire the best qualified person to lead their school.

TESTIMONY: Kari Overall, President, Idaho Education Association (IEA) spoke against S 1058. She stated the IEA believes administrators must maintain valid administrator licensure and have periodic teaching experience in order to be certified and employed as administrators. She outlined the role a school administrator has in the school they serve (Attachment 1).

Blake Youde, Idaho Charter School Network, spoke in support of S 1058. He stated S 1058 provides an option for local charter school board of directors to hire an administrator that best meets the needs of their individual school. He said there are other states that do not require the charter school administrator to have an administrator’s certificate. The current standards make recruiting efforts difficult for Idaho’s charter schools. He stated the proposed legislation allows disciplinary action for a bad administrator. He emphasized the standards to receive the alternative certificate is high and this is not to repeal the current administrator’s certificate, but to give charter schools options. Mr. Youde said during the negotiated rulemaking they were not able to come to a consensus, so therefore S 1058 is being brought forward.

Senator Ward-Engelking asked if he would elaborate on the negotiated rulemaking discussion. Mr. Youde replied the group that met intended to find an alternate certification that would apply to both the traditional public schools and the public charter schools. Unfortunately, they were unable to come to a consensus, therefore S 1058 was written.

Rob Winslow, Executive Director, Idaho Association of School Administrators (IASA), spoke against S 1058. He stated the IASA has charter school administrators as members. He explained the current process to move people into the administrator role, which is built on certification, beginning with a teaching certificate. He said there are requirements to become an administrator and the IASA is not comfortable compromising that the alternate administrator certificate is not built on a teaching certificate (Attachment 2).

DISCUSSION: Senator Ward-Engelking asked what was required of superintendents. Mr. Winslow reported those duties to the Committee. He said as an adjunct professor at Boise State University’s Education Leadership Program, he prepares teachers to become principals. He stated his concerns that the training they receive, while adequate for a principal, is not sufficient for the tasks of a superintendent. He said the charter school administrator functions more as a superintendent; a role of running a whole school system.

Senator Den Hartog said in closing, it is important to consider that public charter schools are structured with a team and a specific educational theme. They often need a person with administrative talents to augment the team. The charter schools need the flexibility to hire a person with specific skills outside of a traditional educator certificate. She reminded the Committee there are other states who operate with the alternative certification for their administrator and are doing well. Senator Den Hartog stated there has been work to reform occupational and professional licensing, as well as removing barriers to entry for people coming into our state.
Senator Buckner-Webb stated she understands from her corporate experience that people with different expertise can be very successful in a unique position. She stated her concern is that in the eagerness for innovation, children’s education will be neglected.

Vice Chairman Thayn said the charter school movement was intended to be where innovation takes place. Idaho’s charter schools are different than other states’ charters. He stated he agrees with Senator Den Hartog to remove barriers from entry and not devalue the importance on superintendents or certificated professional staff. He said he is satisfied with the sideboards placed in the proposed legislation.

**MOTION:** Vice Chairman Thayn moved to send S 1058 to the floor with a do pass recommendation. Senator Den Hartog seconded the motion.

**DISCUSSION:** Senator Ward-Engelking said she is apprehensive about the proposed legislation. She detailed her concerns regarding the lack of a professional administrator certification. She stated school administrators have many different roles within a school. Often, they are the teachers’ instructional leaders. Without proper training, the unintended consequence makes it harder for teachers to teach, putting learning for children at risk.

Vice Chairman Thayn said there are many different occupations that offer different routes for certification; either through schooling or experience. He detailed the years of professional experience the proposed legislation lists in order to receive the alternate certification. He said the sideboards that have been set are high are strong enough for him to support S 1058.

**VOICE VOTE:** The motion to send S 1058 to the floor with a do pass recommendation passed by voice vote. Senators Buckner-Webb and Ward-Engelking requesting that they be recorded as voting nay.

S 1060 Vice Chairman Thayn presented S 1060, Relating to Education; Flexible Student Schedules. He described the progression in writing the proposed legislation. He stated student graduation flexibility is an issue that should be addressed, especially as schools move into mastery based education models. He said if a student has met their educational obligation by age 16, rather than dropping out, the proposed legislation allows them to address other options.

Vice Chairman Thayn walked the Committee through the S 1060. He detailed the sideboards in the proposed legislation, explaining the college readiness score, core class requirements, and cumulative grade point average. He stated some of the definitions will be set in rulemaking.

**DISCUSSION:** Senator Den Hartog asked if a student meets the early graduation requirement, would they be eligible for college scholarships. Vice Chairman Thayn replied in the affirmative.

Senator Buckner-Webb asked if students still participate in work study programs. Vice Chairman Thayn referred the question to Tracie Bent, Chief Planning and Policy Officer, State Board of Education (SBE). Ms. Bent replied the work study program is practice at the post-secondary level.

Senator Crabtree stated he is concerned with a high school student’s emotional maturity. He said they may be academically prepared and asked if there is any evidence to support students’ ability to be emotionally and socially equipped for the rigors of college. Vice Chairman Thayn replied some emotional maturity is exhibited when a student rises to the challenge of graduating early. Ultimately, the parent or guardian helps the student to make that decision. He said those same questions were raised when the Advanced Opportunities program was brought forward, and those concerns turned out to be unfounded.
DISCUSSION: **Sebastian Griffin**, Student, Nampa High School said the student who takes advantage of this legislation would be more highly motivated and mature. They have had help from their parents and are preparing for the next phase in their education.

**Senator Crabtree** said he isn’t as concerned about those who are emotionally ready. He stated he is concerned about the student who graduates early and doesn’t have any post-secondary plans.

**Mr. Griffin** replied the most important component of the proposed legislation is that it allows more options for students. He said he is not sure how many students will take advantage of the early graduation flexibility.

**Senator Den Hartog** asked had this been in place when he was a high school sophomore how would he have structured his course load. **Mr. Griffin** replied he would have taken the senior required classes early and taken more dual credits.

**Senator Lent** said from his experience as a school board trustee, the students who applied for early graduation were those that were mature and motivated to begin their post-secondary careers. They exhibited a great deal of self-direction which is a maturity factor.

TESTIMONY: **Kari Overall**, President, IEA, reported the IEA resolutions and belief statements which support the expansion of graduation, the promotion of options for students, and the creation of partnerships with colleges, alternative schools, and vocational career and technical programs. She stated the IEA also believes every student should earn a high school diploma or its equivalent. She detailed the concerns regarding minimum achievement scores, student development, high stakes tests, and collaboration of parents and educators. She said on behalf of the members of the IEA, please consider those concerns when taking into account **S 1060**.

DISCUSSION: **Vice Chairman Thayn** said the proposed legislation calls for a notation on the student's diploma. He asked if the Committee thought this would be necessary or would it lead to some type of discrimination to the students who did not receive a traditional diploma.

**Senator Buckner-Webb** asked if other measurements in key educational areas would be a consideration. **Vice Chairman Thayn** replied students must have a 3.5 grade point average (GPA) to be eligible.

MOTION: **Senator Den Hartog** moved to send **S 1060** to the 14th Order of Business for a possible amendment. **Senator Buckner-Webb** seconded the motion. The motion passed by **voice vote**.

**S 1105**

**Vice Chairman Thayn** presented **S 1105**, Relating to Education; Advanced Opportunities (AO) for Career Technical Education (CTE). The purpose of the proposed legislation is to expand AO to CTE courses. He stated there has been a desire from the SBE, school superintendents, educators, and others to use the AO money for CTE courses. He said the AO money pays for the CTE exams, but not the coursework. He said it is his hope with the proposed legislation that CTE coursework will be brought up to the level of academics.

**Vice Chairman Thayn** detailed the efforts with the Division of CTE, SBE, State Department of Education (SDE), Idaho Workforce Development Council (IWDC), Idaho Digital Learning Academy (IDLA), and the six technical state colleges to bring **S 1105** forward. He walked the Committee through the proposed legislation. He highlighted the financial requirements, required age for students to participate, and industry recognized certificates.
TESTIMONY: Representative Kerby said he has been working to expand CTE programs for about 20 years. He said finding equipment and certified teachers creates a barrier for many schools, especially the rural schools. This proposed legislation gives students the opportunity to have a viable career while staying in their community. Representative Kerby explained the work of SDE in the expansion of CTE and AO. He said they worked to avoid any barriers for students.

Senator Lent asked if the money for this program would come from current allocations. Representative Kerby replied in the negative. He said it would be new monies.

Wendi Secrist, Executive Director, IWDC, spoke in support of S 1105. She stated this is an opportunity to provide equity and nontraditional pathways to careers. She stated this bill provides a driving educational force through apprenticeship programs. She reported the barriers industries incur when trying to begin apprenticeship programs. The proposed legislation addresses access for students to go on.

Chairman Mortimer asked if the apprenticeships are run through a college or a registered business. Ms. Secrist said a registered apprenticeship must begin with an employer and then becomes a partnership between the postsecondary education providers in the area. She gave an example of how the program would work.

Trent Clark, Chairman, IWDC, spoke in support of S 1105. He told the Committee about the post-secondary scholarship offerings from his employer, Bayer, to rural students. He stated the proposed legislation helps all students in the state be prepared for a career.

Todd Swartz, Executive Vice President and Academic Officer, College of Southern Idaho, spoke in favor of S 1105. He stated the proposed legislation opens many doors for student success. It also allows the workforce training centers to demonstrate how they can help students.

MOTION: Senator Lent moved to send S 1105 to the floor with a do pass recommendation. Senator Buckner-Webb seconded the motion. The motion passed by voice vote.

PAGE GRADUATION: Chairman Mortimer thanked Olivia Love for her service to the Committee. Ms. Love took the podium and reported her plans for the next year and expressed her appreciation for the opportunity to serve.

ADJOURNED: There being no further business at this time, Chairman Mortimer adjourned the meeting at 4:45 p.m.

Senator Dean M. Mortimer  
Chair

LeAnn Mohr  
Secretary
FOR THE RECORD, MY NAME IS KARI OVERALL AND I AM THE PRESIDENT OF THE IDAHO EDUCATION ASSOCIATION. I AM HERE TODAY ON BEHALF OF THE IDAHO EDUCATION ASSOCIATION MEMBERS ACROSS THE STATE TO TESTIFY ON SB 1060.

THE IDAHO EDUCATION ASSOCIATION SUPPORTS THE EXPANSION OF GRADUATION AND PROMOTION OPTIONS FOR STUDENTS AND THE CREATION OF PARTNERSHIPS WITH COLLEGES, ALTERNATIVE SCHOOLS, AND VOCATIONAL, CAREER, AND TECHNICAL PROGRAMS. WE ALSO BELIEVE STATES AND LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS SHOULD EMPLOY MULTIPLE OPTIONS IN DETERMINING GRADUATION AND PROMOTION REQUIREMENTS. (TAKEN FROM RESOLUTION A 5.7)

IN ADDITION, THE IDAHO EDUCATION ASSOCIATION SUPPORTS THE CONCEPT OF A HIGH SCHOOL EDUCATION FOR ALL AND WE BELIEVE EVERY STUDENT SHOULD EARN A HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA OR ITS EQUIVALENT. WE ALSO BELIEVE IN THE VALUE OF ACADEMIC PREPARATION, SCHOOL ATTENDANCE, AND SOCIAL INTERACTION FOR MEETING THE REQUIREMENTS OF HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION.

WE RECOGNIZE THAT IN SOME Instances THE USE OF HIGH SCHOOL EQUIVALENCY TESTS IS ACCEPTABLE WHEN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE STUDENTS ARE SERVED. HOWEVER, WE BELIEVE THAT ANY STATE OR DISTRICT PLAN TO USE EQUIVALENCY TESTING AS THE BASIS FOR QUALIFICATION FOR A HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA SHOULD BE DEVELOPED COOPERATIVELY BY CLASSROOM TEACHERS, ADMINISTRATORS, AND GOVERNING BOARDS. THE PLAN SHOULD INCLUDE PROVISIONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE LOCAL SCHOOL FACULTY. RECOMMENDATIONS SHOULD BE BASED, AS A MINIMUM, UPON ACHIEVEMENT RECORD, ABILITY, AND AGE AND SHOULD BE DEVELOPMENTALLY APPROPRIATE FOR THE STUDENT, NOT SIMPLY BASED ON ONE TEST SCORE.

THE IEA IS CONCERNED ABOUT THE FOCUS ON THE TEST RESULT AS THE SOLE MEASURE OF STUDENT READINESS FOR COLLEGE. THE IEA OPPOSES THE USE OF STANDARDIZED TESTS WHEN THEY ARE USED AS THE SOLE CRITERIA USED FOR HIGH-STAKES DECISION MAKING. DECISIONS MADE ABOUT STUDENT
PLACEMENT AND GRADUATION SHOULD BE MADE WITH EDUCATORS AND BASED ON MULTIPLE FACTORS NOT A SINGLE ASSESSMENT ON ONE DAY.

THE IEA BELIEVES THIS PROPOSAL IS A GOOD START BUT HAS THE POTENTIAL TO BE A BETTER BILL IF MORE FULLY DEVELOPED. ANY PLAN FOR HIGH SCHOOL SCHEDULE FLEXIBILITY SHOULD INCLUDE EDUCATOR INPUT ON INDIVIDUAL STUDENT PERFORMANCE, MULTIPLE MEASURERS OF PERFORMANCE WITH DECREASED EMPHASIS ON ONE TEST, AND OPTIONS FOR STUDENTS WHO STRUGGLE WITH STANDARDIZED ASSESSMENTS.

ON BEHALF OF THE MEMBERS OF THE IDAHO EDUCATION ASSOCIATION, I ASK YOU TO CONSIDER OUR CONCERNS ABOUT SB 1060.

THANK YOU AND I WILL STAND FOR QUESTIONS.
Testimony for Charter School Administrator SB1058

Rob Winslow

Idaho Association of School Administrators (superintendents, principals, special education directors in charter schools and school districts)

I. The members of IASA are supportive of the current Idaho alternate routes to administrative certification built on a teacher certificate. We do not support the proposed alternate route to administrative certification in SB1058.

Increasing student achievement is the primary focus of schools. Research supports that teachers have the most influence on increasing student achievement at schools and that principals have the second most influence. Teachers in Idaho must have a teaching certificate. All school administrators must also have a teaching certificate and an administrative endorsement. For the past 10 years I have been an adjunct professor in the BSU principal preparation program with teachers from charter schools and school districts.

II. Principal Preparation Programs have the following components:

- **Instructional Leadership**- curriculum, assessment literacy, professional development for teachers, data analysis and technology integration
- **School Management**- organizational skills in the operations of the school
- **Teacher Supervision**- intensive training in the Danielson Framework for evaluations, hours and hours of practice observing teachers, collecting evidence and rating teachers in each component in the 4 domains: Planning and Preparation, Classroom Environment, Instruction, and Professional Responsibilities
- **Legal and Ethical Issues**- student and staff legal rights and responsibilities, educator ethics
- **School Finance**- an understanding of the state funding formula and school budgeting and application
• **Special Education**- principals must be able to lead and implement a successful school special education program

• **Community Relations and Engagement**- involving parents in the educational process

• **School Safety and Security**- collaborating with local law enforcement and implementing comprehensive safety/security plans and drills

• **School Culture**- leading and modeling a positive climate for student achievement and staff collaboration

• **Internship**- 250 hours with a mentor principal

• **Teaching (counseling or pupil personnel)**- 4 years of experience before you can be certified as an administrator

III. Principals for charter schools and school districts, with experience from other states, come to Idaho and become certificated through the current processes. We, as an association believe principals should have a teaching background before becoming a school administrator. Thank you for the opportunity to testify.
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CONVENED: Chairman Mortimer called the Education Committee (Committee) to order at 3:04 p.m. He opened with a reading from the book, A Heap O' Living Along Life's Highway, by Eager A. Guest, "One Kindly Deed."

PAGE WELCOME: Taylor McMullin, Meridian Idaho, introduced herself to the Committee. She said she is a senior at Rocky Mountain High School and is being sponsored by Senator Winder. She stated she will be attending Boise State University with the intention to study biology and ecology.

HCR 6 Representative John McCrostie presented HJR 6, Concurrent Resolution: Music in Our Schools Month. He said he would like the legislature to recognize the importance of music in Idaho schools and recognize the month of March as Music in Our Schools month. He spoke about his experience as a music teacher and being involved as a member in the Idaho Music Educators Association. He said he is bringing this resolution forward because of his concern that music may not have as high of a priority in education as the STEM curriculum. He detailed how music education helps students learn other subjects through patterning, tempo and other techniques.

TESTIMONY: Erin Paradise, K-5 Educator, Valley View School District, Caldwell, explained how music benefits the learning in other educational subjects. She said students with music education score higher in math and English. They have a greater ability for abstract reasoning and stronger listening and memory skills. In Idaho, music is celebrated because it offers students opportunities that might not otherwise exist, such as traveling across the nation to compete or having the opportunity to meet renowned composers and performers. She spoke about music's cross cultural reach, from movies to weddings, to a variety of diverse cultures. Ms. Paradise encourage the Committee to send HCR 6 to the floor with a do pass recommendation.

Jeff Davis, Idaho Music Educators Association, Boise, spoke in support of HCR 6. He said the power of music connects people to one another and helps to develop creativity in students. He stated a well rounded education includes the arts, of which music is central. Mr. Davis said HCR 6 recognizes the miraculous work of music educators working in Idaho schools as they enrich the lives of students with the transcendent beauty of music. The resolution demonstrates a profound understanding that education is not just about creating productive citizens. It is also about helping shape better people. He urged the Committee to send HCR 6 to the floor with a do pass recommendation.
Sherri Ybarra, Superintendent of Public Instruction, State Department of Education (SDE), spoke in support of HCR 6. She said music is an excellent example of mastery based education. A student must exhibit knowledge of the material in front of them before they can move to the next level. She said music is a cultural and the SDE supports the subjects in the arts. Superintendent Ybarra stated her excitement in support of HCR 6.

Representative McCrostie thanked those who testified and asked that HCR 6 be sent to the floor with a do pass recommendation.

MOTION: Senator Ward-Engelking moved to send HCR 6 to the floor with a do pass recommendation. Senator Buckner-Webb seconded the motion. The motion passed by voice vote.

S 1057 Superintendent Ybarra presented S 1057, Relating to Education; Continuous Improvement Plans. She said the proposed legislation is a compromise on how to streamline and eliminate duplicate reporting. The specific recommendation was the ability for the report card to include the measures and effectiveness that is required in the continuous improvement plan, the literacy plan, and the college and career advising plan, and to link that information to the report card. Superintendent Ybarra explained the removal of the specific metrics and the requirement of school districts to link to the SDE report card. She asked Marilyn Whitney, Deputy Superintendent Communications and Policy, SDE, to walk the Committee through the proposed legislation.

Ms. Whitney said the changes to S 1057 include deleting out dated references and updating to the current practices.

Vice Chairman Thayn asked how many years of data are available on the report card. Ms. Whitney replied three years of data, unless the assessment is new. The intent is to have three years of rolling data on the report card site.

Superintendent Ybarra said the proposed legislation is to reduce the paperwork burdens on school districts. She emphasized accountability is not reduced. The data is in one place and easily accessible to understand schools' progression.

TESTIMONY: Rod Gramer, President, Idaho Businesses for Education (IBE), spoke in support of S 1057. Reporting requirements have been burdensome for districts. The proposed legislation allows continuous improvement plans to be current in order to help school districts meet their goals.

Quinn Perry, Policy and Government Affairs Officer, Idaho School Boards Association (ISBA), spoke in support of S 1057. She said the ISBA membership passed a resolution in November 2018, to support efforts to remove redundant report requirement and simplify the continuous improvement plan.

Mike Kecker, Chief Communications and Legislative Affairs Officer, State Board of Education (SBE), spoke in support of S 1057. He said the SBE Board voted unanimously in support of S 1057.

MOTION: Senator Crabtree moved to send S 1057 to the floor with a do pass recommendation. Senator Lent seconded the motion. The motion passed by voice vote.

PRESENTATION: Karen Echeverria, Executive Director, Idaho School Boards Association, said the ISBA is here for the annual presentation to the Committee. She introduced Jennifer Parkins, President, ISBA.
Ms. Parkins, School Board Trustee, Genesee, presented K-3 Literacy. She said she will be addressing the ISBA resolutions related to funding all day kindergarten and funding early childhood education programs. She stated ISBA is in support of the Governor's Office recommendation to increase K-3 literacy dollars. She said there are many Local Education Agencies (LEA) that use local levy dollars to accomplish some form of all day kindergarten and early childhood education. She detailed the benefits of these programs for schools, families, and society.

Ms. Parkins spoke about the success of Genesee's literacy program. She explained how Genesee used literacy dollars to provide literacy interventions to students in K-3 along with the technology to allow the district educators to test students in small groups. She detailed the fall reading test scores and the current test score increases. She stated Genesee believes preschool and full day kindergarten builds a strong foundation for the youngest learners. She encouraged the Legislature to consider allowing state funds to support those programs.

Wally Hedrick, President-Elect, ISBA, Meridian Technical Charter High School (Meridian Tech) Board President spoke about Mastery Based Learning (Mastery). He said there are two truisms in education; 1.) One size does not fit all in education; and 2.) Local governance is the key to tailoring successful educational programs. He said his presentation about Mastery is from one school's perspective; Meridian Tech. He said Meridian Tech moved to Mastery to achieve deeper learning and find a way to help the students learn better and faster; Mastery benefited students and staff. Mr. Hedrick stated some subjects modify better to the Mastery methods. He said the students still needed to be guided and directed by teacher instruction, deadlines were also imperative. The student who were self-starters and goal oriented performed better under the Mastery model. He said for the underachieving student finding one subject they could focus on helped them to achieve at Meridian Tech.

Vice Chairman Thayn asked which type of subjects do not work well in the Mastery format. Mr. Hedrick replied the more abstract the subject the more difficult it is for the teacher to determine if the student has mastered the subject. He said those courses with a more defined outcome, such as science or math, seem to have worked better in Mastery.

Ken Hart, Second Vice Chair, ISBA, Nez Perce School Board Trustee's Chairman, presented Health Insurance. He said while all the schools in the state operate under the same charter, they all operate differently. Every year boards negotiate with teachers about salaries and health insurance. He stated 85 percent of their district funds extend to those two issues and in each district, the health insurance coverage and costs are different. Mr. Hart stated the biggest impact on their funding is the annual increase in health insurance premiums. He reported the increase in the 2020 appropriation which included discretionary health insurance funding.

Mr. Hart explained the program Nez Perce has implemented to control costs and the health insurance program they are operating under. He said because of the insurance program costs, they have had to reduce the coverage for the family members of their staff. Mr. Hart emphasized the need to be able to have the freedom to negotiate the best plan that will meet the financial and health needs of their employees.

In response to questions from the Committee, Ms. Parkins said the community is in favor of the pre-school program so it is funded by parents, and if they cannot pay, the money comes from the supplemental levies. She explained the literacy programs that are used to help students in K-3 grades to read.
Committee members discussed the work of the Public Schools Funding Formula, emphasizing the priority of local control. Board members were thanked for their commitment and work in their local districts. Funding concerns of Career Technical Education and rural school facilities were addressed.

**RECORDING LINK:** To hear the complete presentation from the ISBA, go to: https://legislature.idaho.gov/sessioninfo/2019/standingcommittees/SEDU/.

**ADJOURNED:** There being no further business at this time, **Chairman Mortimer** adjourned the meeting at 4:27 p.m.
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Senator Dean M. Mortimer
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LeAnn Mohr
Secretary
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CONVENED: Chairman Mortimer called the Education Committee (Committee) to order at 3:07 p.m.

S 1104 Senator Anthon presented S 1104, Relating to Education; Professional Development. He explained he is bringing the proposed legislation forward because two of his constituents were having difficulties getting recertified as public school teachers, yet they have vast experience in the instruction of pedagogy coursework at the university level. Senator Anthon explained how other professionals, such as accountants or lawyers, teach coursework in their area of expertise to their peers, and those credit hours are applied towards their recertification. Through his research he found there are no such provisions for educators.

Senator Athon walked the Committee through the proposed legislation. He said after S 1104 was drafted, it was found to have a language problem and he addressed where the proposed amendment should be inserted into the proposed legislation. He said he is looking to the Committee to make sure this legislation addresses the intent.

DISCUSSION: Senator Woodward asked if the intent of the proposed legislation is for a person who teaches professional development or pedagogy course to obtain recertification. Senator Anthon replied in the affirmative.

Senator Winder asked if a candidate teaching a non-continuing accreditation courses would receive the credits. Senator Anthon replied there will be negotiated rulemaking to determine the sideboards and to ensure the correct credits are applied to the correct requirements.

Senator Woodward asked if educators must have continuous education to remain certified. Senator Anthon replied in the affirmative.

TESTIMONY: Kari Overall, President, Idaho Education Association (IEA), spoke in support of S 1104. She said the IEA believes professional development is necessary throughout the career of an educator. It is recognized that knowledge and skills are acquired and gained through experience and through continuing education. She stated the appreciation of the flexibility for educators to obtain the credits. She encouraged the Committee to send S 1104 to the amending order.
DISCUSSION: Senator Ward-Engelking moved to send S 1104 to the 14th Order of Business for possible amendment. Senator Lent seconded the motion. The motion passed by voice vote.

S 1108 Sherri Ybarra, Superintendent of Public Instruction, State Department of Education (SDE), presented S 1108, Relating to Driver Training; Scholarships and Grants. She said the proposed legislation increases the reimbursement of funds to school districts to administer the driver training programs. She stated the reimbursement rate has not changed since 1996. She said the fees from driver's licenses go to an account the balance of which has grown as Idaho's population has grown. She reported the balance to be over $4 million and the proposed increase in reimbursement would gradually draw down the balance but would still ensure the account to be solvent.

Marilyn Whitney, Deputy Superintendent, Communications and Policy, SDE, walked the Committee through the proposed legislation. She said S 1108 increases the reimbursement rate to schools, provides a need based scholarship for students enrolling in driver's education, and a competitive grant for school districts that are struggling to afford to maintain the driver's education program.

DISCUSSION: Vice Chairman Thayn asked how the scholarships are awarded. Ms. Whitney replied the scholarship will be need based and in the criteria is in the process of being developed.

Senator Den Hartog asked if the reason for the increase of the reimbursement is because the costs have escalated, or is it to draw down the driver's education foundation. Superintendent Ybarra explained the difference in student fees versus the cost of the program. She stated student fees do not cover those costs.

Senator Ward-Engelking asked if there is a cap to the number of awarded scholarships. Superintendent Ybarra replied to maintain the balance in the foundation account, 10 percent has been set aside for the awards.

Senator Woodward asked for clarification regarding the fees charged to the student and the reimbursement from the State. Superintendent Ybarra said the cost to deliver driver's education to the student is approximately $330. She explained what the student pays for the course and what the State is currently reimbursing, thereby leaving a shortfall.

Senator Ward-Engelking reported the success of the driver's education rewarding program in Boise's alternative high school.

MOTION: Senator Ward-Engelking moved to send S 1108 to the floor with a do pass recommendation. Senator Woodward seconded the motion. The motion passed by voice vote.

S 1059 Superintendent Ybarra presented S 1059, Relating to Education; Mastery-Based Education (Mastery). She said S 1059 allows the SDE to expand Mastery and lift the incubator to allow additional school districts and charters to join and participate in the Mastery Network (Network). The proposed legislation details the Network's current purpose. It allows the SDE to continue to provide startup funding to districts and schools that have applied and been selected to receive grants available through appropriation. Superintendent Ybarra detailed the provisions for school districts or charter schools to join the Network and reported out the program expenditures.
DISCUSSION: Vice Chairman Thayn asked how the Mastery funding is flowing. Superintendent Ybarra explained the funding component. She said the goal is for a district to be self-sufficient and then expand to fund other districts.

Ms. Whitney explained the current appropriation allocation. She stated the funding has only been available for two years. The original funding was only for the initial 20 incubators.

Senator Ward-Engelking asked if it accomplishes anything to remove the Mastery cap if the funds are not appropriated. Ms. Whitney replied in the affirmative. She stated lifting the cap allows other districts to participate in Mastery. There is no specific dollar amount except as the legislature would appropriate.

Senator Lent asked if it is possible for a district to fund Mastery. Ms. Whitney replied any district or charter school can participate in the Network even if they are not receiving funding.

Kelly Brady, Director of Mastery Based Education, SDE, reported to the Committee the number of schools that have participated in the Network. She spoke to the work that those schools have accomplished and said the Mastery momentum is moving across the state. Ms. Brady detailed the tools from the SDE that are available to districts and charter schools exploring the possibility of implementing Mastery.

TESTIMONY: Rod Gramer, President, Idaho Business for Education (IBE), spoke in support of S 1059. He stated Mastery was a key recommendation from the Governor's Task Force for Education. IBE endorses the continued movement of Mastery and with the removal of the cap, more schools and more students will benefit.

Mike Keckler, Chief Communications and Legislative Affairs Officer, State Board of Education (SBE), said last week the SBE Board voted unanimously to support S 1059. He detailed the research which supports the Mastery benefits to students and recounted the tools which are available for districts and charter schools when working to implement the program.

Superintendent Ybarra thanked the legislature for all the support they have given to Mastery.

Vice Chairman Thayn complimented the SDE for this effort. He stated the future of education belongs to this Mastery model. He emphasized the efforts of implementing it organically is making Mastery more attractive. He said Mastery is the right direction for education and would like more money appropriated to the program. He stated he is glad the incubator cap is being removed.

MOTION: Vice Chairman Thayn moved to send S 1059 to the floor with a do pass recommendation. Senator Lent seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION: Senator Lent praised the Mastery movement. He said this type of education brings effectiveness back into the efficiency model. Educators and parents are understanding this model and are excited about it.

The motion moved to send S 1059 to the floor with a do pass recommendation passed by voice vote.
MINUTES APPROVAL: Senator Lent moved to approve the Minutes of January 21, 2019. Senator Buckner-Webb seconded the motion. The motion passed by voice vote.

Senator Crabtree moved to approve the Minutes of January 22, 2019. Senator Ward-Engelking seconded the motion. The motion passed by voice vote.

Senator Woodward moved to approve the Minutes of January 23, 2019. Senator Crabtree seconded the motion. The motion passed by voice vote.

ADJOURNED: There being no further business at this time, Chairman Mortimer adjourned the meeting at 4:02 p.m.

___________________________  __________________________
Senator Dean M. Mortimer     LeAnn Mohr
Chair                         Secretary
If you have written testimony, please provide a copy of it along with the name of the person or organization responsible to the committee secretary to ensure accuracy of records.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>PRESENTER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Docket No.</td>
<td>Rules Governing Thoroughness; Required Instruction</td>
<td>Vice Chairman Thayn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08-0203-1803</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISCUSSION:

Matt Freeman, Executive Director, State Board of Education (SBE), stated only six credits of math are required and it is highly recommended that two of those credits be taken in the student's senior year for a better transition into post-secondary education.

Senator Woodward inquired about the history regarding the two of the six credit hours being in the senior year of high school. Mr. Freeman replied the SBE was trying to achieve more rigor so that they are prepared for college for a seamless transition. He noted there is a significant number of students taking four years of math. The findings reveal they are receiving higher grades in their junior and senior years resulting in lower college remediation rates.

Senator Winder asked if the rule is in line with the legislation. Chairman Mortimer replied the requirements were added in rule, which may not have been the intent of the legislation, but it is within the SBE’s scope.

Vice Chairman Thayn said the House Education Committee believed the legislation required the removal of the senior math requirement.
Senator Lent said he would like to address this situation as a former school board member and as a director of industry training. He said industry leaders have indicated the importance of having rigor in the school system. He expressed his disappointment that the trend is moving away from that and spoke about the STEM meeting he attended which encouraged more rigor. He said reducing the math requirement creates one more barrier for students in the next step of their educational and career journey. **Senator Lent** spoke about how young people directly out of secondary school were unable to pass the industry tests for entry level positions. He stated the more course work requirements are reduced, the faster Idaho students fall behind. He said he strongly believes this rule should remain.

**Vice Chairman Thayn** said the legislature has been working on giving students more flexibility with their course loads. He explained the reason that senior math was required was because of senior slump. He believes the Advanced Opportunities program with dual credits has eliminated the senior slump.

**Chairman Mortimer** asked how S 1266 was considered in this section of the rule. **Mr. Freemen** replied S 1266 removed the math requirement in the senior year in statute, but it did not require the SBE to remove it from rule. He read Governor Otter's transmittal letter to the Senate which stated he would have vetoed S 1266 except that the math requirement for graduation would remain in effect by administrative rule.

**Senator Woodward** noted there is great substance to the continuation of learning. He detailed the progression of math learning and how math builds upon itself. He said there is value to having math in the senior year of high school.

**Vice Chairman Thayn** addressed the House Education Committee's decision to reject Subsection 04.; Senior Project.

**Senator Lent** said the issues are with the words "analyze, synthesize, and evaluate information." He noted as a former school board member, the discussion was about the importance of the senior project. He detailed Bloom's Taxonomy of learning and correlated to the capstone of the senior project. He stated the purpose of the senior project is for the student to demonstrate a higher order of knowledge in both written and oral learning. He said the project is of such value in our educational system. He supports the rule as written.

**MOTION:** Senators Lent moved to stand with the Committee's original decision to accept Docket No. 08-0203-1803. **Senator Mortimer** seconded the motion. The motion passed by voice vote.

**PASSED THE GAVEL:** Vice Chairman Thayn passed the gavel to Chairman Mortimer.

**ADJOURNED:** There being no further business at this time, **Chairman Mortimer** adjourned the meeting at 3:42 p.m.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>PRESENTER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S 1061</td>
<td>Relating to Education; School Levies</td>
<td>Vice Chairman Thayn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation:</td>
<td>Every Student Succeeds Act</td>
<td>Sherri Ybarra, Superintendent of Public Instruction, State Department of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minutes Approval:</td>
<td>Approval of the Minutes from January 24, 2019</td>
<td>Senator Woodward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approval of the Minutes from January 28, 2019</td>
<td>Senator Winder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approval of the Minutes from January 29, 2019</td>
<td>Senator Thayn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approval of the Minutes from January 30, 2019</td>
<td>Senator Crabtree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CONVENED: Chairman Mortimer called the meeting of the Senate Education Committee (Committee) to order at 3:04 p.m. Chairman Mortimer stated Vice Chairman Thayn was going to gather additional information regarding S 1061, therefore, the presentation would be moved to the top of the agenda.

PRESENTATION: Sherri Ybarra, Superintendent of Public Instruction, State Department of Education (SDE), provided a brief overview of the updates to the State's Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) comprehensive plan. She reported the work the SDE has done with the following partnerships: the Accountability and Oversight Committee (AOC), educators, parents, stakeholders, and legislators, to create a new State accountability system for grades K-12. She praised the collaboration which lead to the successful approval of ESSA.

Superintendent Ybarra noted last fall, staff gathered feedback and analyzed the functionality of the new accountability system. The analysis identified areas of the plan where additional information and updates would improve the system to better serve schools and students. She reported a comprehensive list of recommendations were presented to the State Board of Education's Board in January, along with the AOC's annual report. Ms. Ybarra introduced Karlynn Laraway, Director, Assessment and Accountability, SDE, to continue the presentation.

Karlynn Laraway went over some of the changes addressed in the ESSA comprehensive plan. She reported in March 2018, after extensive stakeholder engagement, the U.S. Department of Education approved Idaho's plan and in August 2018, the SDE implemented the plan. She said schools were identified using multiple measures of key performance indicators and noted the system was designed to identify schools in the most need of support which included those schools with achievement gaps in the "at risk" population. Additionally, schools with top performance, those in the 90th percentile, and those that meet or exceed annual achievement goals, were also recognized. She reported the number of schools that were identified with achievement gaps of 35 percentage points or greater in student group performance and said the system also identifies or recognizes schools for top performance.
**Ms. Laraway** reported on the progress of English Language Learners (ELLs). She disclosed during data analysis, areas of the plan were identified where clarification and improvement of the system would better meet the needs of the schools and students (Attachment 1).

**DISCUSSION:**

Chairman Mortimer mentioned the ESSA is a governing document. During the summer there was a special committee that met regarding education and the U. S. plan. He praised this committee. He noted there were some changes made and the plan was submitted and approved. The first amendment to this plan is now being done.

Senator Buckner-Webb and Ms. Laraway discussed the number of students who were included in the calculations. Ms. Laraway explained the relationship to the ELL’s language proficiency assessment and whether a student can speak and communicate in English.

Vice Chairman Thayn asked if the data which stands out relates to the areas of low income students. Ms. Laraway replied in the affirmative. She said in reviewing the achievement gaps, students in the ELL groups, students with disabilities, and some of the racial subgroup populations, have a far greater achievement gap than those students who are considered economically disadvantaged.

Vice Chairman Thayn and Ms. Laraway discussed how informing school districts, in particular special educators and ELL support staff, might identify strategies to meet student needs.

Ms. Laraway mentioned there are conversations occurring around understanding data literacy, what the data says, and what the next actionable steps are that need to be taken.

Superintendent Ybarra thanked the ISDE team for their hard work and the Committee for the opportunity to share the information.

**S 1061**

Vice Chairman Thayn presented S 1061, Relating to Education; School Levies. He explained the purpose of the proposed legislation is to make it easier for school districts that have passed a levy for at least seven consecutive years, to place the levy on the ballot to allow voters to extend the levy length from three to ten years without going back to the voters every year. There is no fiscal impact to the General Fund, but there may be some minimal local impact.

Vice Chairman Thayn detailed the changes and explained there are some amendments to the current proposed legislation that will need to be added. Vice Chairman Thayn explained the two amendments to Committee.

**DISCUSSION:**

Senator Lent and Vice Chairman Thayn discussed the legislation and stated it was not a permanent solution. They acknowledged the way the amendment as written will make those levies which have been in place for a period of time become permanent.
Senator Woodward stated currently in code, if a levy extends for seven consecutive years, voters can be asked to place and pay for a levy for an indefinite period of time. He stated the proposed legislation extends the levy time from three to ten years, but the amendment will potentially change the time from three to five years. He stated he did not see any reason to reduce the time to five years.

Vice Chairman Thayn reported he had received several emails about reducing the time. One good thing about the amendment is the voters, working through the trustees, would have the option of reducing the time and omitting the cost of extra elections. Vice Chairman Thayn indicated Idaho Code § 34-106 outlines the role of school board trustees regarding levies. He stated the amendment in the proposed legislation is a trade-off.

Senator Woodward asked if this would affect the new funding formula. Vice Chairman Thayn replied in the negative. Vice Chairman Thayn reported there are a total of 68 school districts with supplemental levies.

TESTIMONY: Quinn Perry, Policy and Government Affairs Director, Idaho School Boards Association (ISBA), spoke in support of S 1061. She remarked the vast majority of school districts have supplemental levies. She said most of the supplemental levies are used for day-to-day operating expenses. She stated the amount and percent of levies vary from district to district; if one were to fail, it would be devastating to the district.

Harold Ott, Art Director, Idaho Rural Schools (IRS) and the Idaho Association of School Administrators (IASA), spoke in support of S 1061. He said the bill provides more security and dependability for the local district in developing budgets. He stated it was essential the districts with permanent levies are grandfathered.

DISCUSSION: Vice Chairman Thayn asked the Committee to send the S 1061 to the 14th Order of Business.

MOTION: Senator Lent moved to send S 1061 to the 14th Order of Business for possible amendment. Senator Ward-Engelking seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION: The Committee discussed the two separate amendments. Senator Crabtree remarked the grandfather clause is important and was in support of that amendment. He stated he would not support the other amendment. Senator Woodward indicated ten years is a very appropriate time frame and would like to see that remain in the proposed legislation. Senator Ward-Engelking stated she is agreement with the proposed legislation.

VOICE VOTE: The motion to send to the 14th Order of Business carried by voice vote.
Senator Woodward moved to approve the Minutes of January 24, 2019. Vice Chairman Thayn seconded the motion. The motion carried by voice vote.

Senator Winder moved to approve the Minutes of January 28, 2019. Vice Chairman Thayn seconded the motion. The motion carried by voice vote.

Vice Chairman Thayn moved to approve the Minutes of January 29, 2019. Senator Winder seconded the motion. The motion carried by voice vote.

Senator Crabtree moved to approve the Minutes of January 30, 2019. Senator Winder seconded the motion. The motion carried by voice vote.

There being no further business at this time, Chairman Mortimer adjourned the meeting at 3:59 p.m.

___________________________
Senator Dean M. Mortimer
Chair

___________________________
LeAnn Mohr
Secretary

___________________________
Linda Kambeitz
Assistant Secretary
ESSA Update
Background

- March 2018 - US Department of Education Approved Idaho’s plan
- August 2018 - SDE implemented plan and identified schools under the new accountability system
Idaho’s New Accountability System

The system was designed to:
• Identify schools with low achievement and low or no growth in achievement for support and technical assistance
• Identify schools with graduation rates below 67 percent averaged over 3 years
• Identify schools with achievement gaps in at risk populations
• Recognize schools for top performance and reaching interim progress goals
## Identification of Schools For Improvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identification category</th>
<th># of K-8 schools identified</th>
<th># of high schools identified</th>
<th># of alternative high schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSI Up</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSI Grad</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Consistently Underperforming Subgroups

Targeted Support and Improvement

• 247 Schools identified for at least one subgroup gap
• Achievement gap of 35 points for 3 consecutive years
• The most frequent groups identified were students with disabilities and English learners
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th># of K-8 schools identified</th>
<th># of high schools identified</th>
<th># of alternative high schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schools meeting 2018 goal in ELA (58.2%)</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools meeting 2018 goal in Math (48.1%)</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools meeting 2018 Graduation Rate Goal (82.2%)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools meeting 2018 goal in English Language Learner growth to proficiency (51.46%)</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluation inspires amendments

• Analysis and review of the accountability system, feedback from the field and observations by our team, identified areas of the plan to clarify and improve the system

• Accountability Oversight Committee Report submitted to the State Board of Education in December 2018
Stakeholder engagement

• Consultation with educators to identify changes
• In person and remote meetings
• Public comment period January 17 – February 1, 2019
• State Board of Education approved amendments
• Briefed Governor Little
Summary of Amendments

• English Learners
  • Proficiency on ACCESS
  • Progress toward English Language Proficiency
• Comprehensive Support and Improvement
  • All Schools - CSI Underperforming
  • Alternative Schools - CSI low grad rate
• 5 Year Grad Rate
• Targeted support and improvement
English Learners

• Proficiency and Statewide Exit Criteria based on ACCESS assessment
  • Assessed in Reading, Writing, Speaking, Listening
  • Receive a scale score and overall composite value (1-6) and scale score and achievement score for each subtest.
English Learners – Exit Criteria

• Previous exit criteria
  • 2016 - 5.0 overall and 5.0 in each domain
  • *2017 and 2018 - 5.0 overall and 4.0 in each domain

Amended Plan (2019)
4.2 Overall and 3.5 in Reading, Writing and Listening
English Learners Progress Toward Proficiency

- English Learners Progress toward English Language Proficiency
  - Previous metric – 7 year trajectory

Amended Plan (2019)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Starting Level</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5-1.9</td>
<td>2.0-2.9</td>
<td>3.0-3.5</td>
<td>3.6-4.1</td>
<td>4.2+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5-2.9</td>
<td>3.0-3.5</td>
<td>3.6-4.1</td>
<td>4.2+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0-3.5</td>
<td>3.6-4.1</td>
<td>4.2+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0-4.1</td>
<td>4.2+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>students are considered proficient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>students are considered proficient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
English Learners Interim & Long Term Goals

• English Learners
  • Updated Interim and Long Term Goals for students making progress toward English language proficiency

Amended Plan: 2018 Baseline with goals through 2023
Reduce the number of students not making progress by 1/3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018 Baseline</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>74.07%</td>
<td>75.80%</td>
<td>77.53%</td>
<td>79.26%</td>
<td>80.98%</td>
<td>82.71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comprehensive Support and Improvement

• CSI Identification
  • Schools performance in ELA, Math, ELA Growth, Math Growth, Graduation Rate and EL Growth to Proficiency
  • N-Size 20
  • Large schools - 2018 performance
  • Small schools (less than 20 students in 2018) combined 2016, 2017 and 2018
### Amended Plan

School Performance is a 3 year average in metrics for all schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3 Year Average</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># Proficient</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>67.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Tested</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>+122</td>
<td>+128</td>
<td>=380</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example: Large School Performance for ELA assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3 Year Average</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># Proficient</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Tested</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Includes All Schools

• CSI Identification
  • Inclusion of small schools and K-2 schools in accountability system

Example: School C with less than 20 students after three years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3 Year Average</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># Proficient</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Tested</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amended Plan: Documents the Qualitative Review Process for schools with less than 20 or serving students not assessed
5 Year Grad Rate

• 5 Year Grad Rate
  • Calculated for the first time for the Class of 2017
  • Established baseline and long term/interim progress goals

Amended Plan (2021)
Identify Alternative Schools for CSI-Grad using 5 year grad rate
Targeted Support and Improvement

• 247 Schools identified for at least one subgroup gap
• Achievement gap of 35 points for 3 consecutive years
• The most frequent groups identified were students with disabilities and English learners
Excluding Schools Making Interim Progress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example School</th>
<th>Students with Disabilities</th>
<th>Non Disabled Peers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELA proficiency</td>
<td>32.10%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math proficiency</td>
<td>28.60%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Amended Plan (2021)**
Exclude schools making interim progress goals for the appropriate subgroup and metric
Next Steps

• March 1: Amended plan due to US Department of Education
• March – June: US Department of Education Review
• August 2019: Implement changes*
Questions

Karlynn Laraway | Director, Assessment & Accountability
208 332 6976
klaraway@sde.idaho.gov
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CONVENE: Chairman Mortimer called the Education Committee (Committee) to order at 3:09 p.m. He opened with a reading from the book, A Heap O 'Living Along Life's Highway, by Eager A. Guest, "Doctor's Waiting Room."

H 153 Greg Wilson, Senior Policy Advisor for Education, Office of the Governor, presented H 153, Relating to Education; Career Ladder. He explained the proposed legislation addresses the starting pay for teachers and it is the desire to encourage teachers to stay in Idaho. He explained the challenges of recruiting and retaining teachers and reported the hiring statistics that plague Idaho school districts. Mr. Wilson reported the costs incurred to districts due to the loss of seasoned teachers to those border communities that have higher pay rates.

Mr. Wilson walked the Committee through the proposed legislation. He detailed the increase in teacher pay for starting teachers as well as those teachers on the residency rung of the Career Ladder. He spoke to the fiscal impact to the State and the Governor's vision for elevating the teaching profession.

TESTIMONY: Kari Overall, President, Idaho Education Association, spoke in support of H 153. She expressed the IEA's appreciation to the commitment to the teaching profession. She said Idaho has a higher than national average attrition rate for educators. It is the hope, with the passage of the proposed legislation, to aid in the solution to recruit and retain educators (Attachment 1).

Rod Gramer, President, Idaho Business for Education (IBE), spoke in support of H 153. He said it is in line with what the Governor's Task Force for Education recommended and is in line with the current work for the new public school funding formula.

Quinn Perry, Policy and Government Affairs Director, Idaho School Boards Association (ISBA), spoke in support of H 153. She reported the loss of several talented teachers to schools in neighboring states with higher salaries. She believes the salary increase will encourage the recruitment and retention rates of teachers (Attachment 2).

DISCUSSION: Senator Den Hartog said starting salaries are important in any profession. She asked if pay is tied to the lack of retention or are there other factors. Mr. Wilson replied because retention rates are so low, there is a lack in mentoring programs. He stated a salary increase for starting teachers is a priority for the Governor's Office.

MOTION: Senator Ward-Engelking moved to send H 153 to the floor with a do pass recommendation. Senator Lent seconded the motion. The motion passed by voice vote.
PRESENTATION: **Tracie Bent**, Chief Planning and Policy Officer, State Board of Education (SBE), presented Next Steps and Career Information System Clarifications. She is before the Committee today to address the Next Steps Idaho (Next Steps) and Career Information System (CSI) and how they tie in with the SBE's Guided Pathways at the K-12 level for post-secondary advising in academic and career technical education.

**Ms. Bent** explained how students can maneuver in the CSI program. They can perform assessments based on their interest areas to review the education level required and what jobs are available. The other option with the CSI program is for the student who has already selected their career path and can build out their educational path. She stated this tool is available to every student in Idaho and provides as much information as a student would need.

In response to questions from the Committee, **Ms. Bent** explained how the SBE and the State Department of Education (SDE) have combined efforts to reach out to area districts and schools to provide training and resources to school counselors in order to get the information to students. She explained the tracking of the site visits and how there has been an increase in visits from outside of the state. **Ms. Bent** spoke about teachers inquiring how to use CSI for classroom curricula and using social media to expand CSI awareness. She did note that parental involvement is low.

PRESENTATION: **Dr. Randall Brumfield**, Chief Academic Officer, SBE, presented Postsecondary Student Success Strategies. He shared with the Committee what the state's institutions in the last five years have accomplished to improve student success with developing implementation strategies to help progress them towards degree completion. Those areas are as follows: 1.) Initiated timely completion campaigns; 2.) Created institutional incentives for 30-credit enrollment; 3.) Scaled hybrid remedial-credit bearing courses; 4.) Guaranteed students access to gateway English and math courses; 5.) Developed and published clear term-by-term on-time academic maps for each program of study; and 6.) Implemented an 'early alert' system.

**Dr. Brumfield** highlighted the areas of progression which once only showed flat or marginal improvements. Those areas of improvement are: 1.) Full-time freshman in grade point averages (GPA); 2.) Institution retention rates; 3.) Freshman math scores; 4.) Credit hour completion; 5.) Associate degree completion; and 6.) Progress to a subsequent second year. **Dr. Brumfield** said that some of those increases could be due to the increase of dual credits or better preparation in high school.

**Dr. Brumfield** said the State's community colleges award associate degrees at a rate that's comparable to the national rate. However, for the four year institutions, the on-time completion for a bachelor degree is 16 percent below the national average and 17 percent below the national average for completing in six years. He stated there is work in supporting adult learners and some institutions across the state are still working to put specific accommodations in place to support adult learners. He said this includes offering time compressed courses, consistent delivery of courses, and year round and specific programs that support the academic and non-academic needs of adult student populations. He asserted that adult learners are essential to fill the workforce needs.
In addressing the initiatives to be implemented Dr. Brumfield stated there are areas that need to be examined. He detailed the following initiatives: Math pathways; Think 30 messaging; Statewide student degree audit and analytics system; Experience based learning options; Statewide articulation credits for prior learning; Common course numbering; Course and degree requirement crosswalks for military experience; Regional libraries to deliver outreach; and Support to prospective adult learners, and an open resource textbook library (affordable textbooks) (Attachment 3). In conclusion, Dr. Brumfield said some progress have been achieved in the effort to pursue continuous improvements across the system. The SBE is working with all eight of the institutions to achieve academic and student services practices.

Regarding questions from the Committee, Dr. Brumfield reported the 30 credit completion rate for freshman and gateway math and English courses. He said there has been no tracking done to determine the remedial students’ school districts. He said student successes directly correlate to degree completion.

Ms. Bent spoke to the Committee about the SBE’s ongoing strategic plan, which is working to address the dramatic changes that are occurring in higher education. The SBE is focusing on how to achieve the "go on" and completion rates set.

RECORDING LINK: To hear the complete presentation regarding Next Steps and CIS Clarifications, and Postsecondary Student Success Strategies, go to: https://legislature.idaho.gov/sessioninfo/2019/standingcommittees/SEDU/

ADJOURNED: There being no further business at this time, Chairman Mortimer adjourned the meeting at 4:24 p.m.
FOR THE RECORD, MY NAME IS KARI OVERALL AND I AM THE PRESIDENT OF THE IDAHO EDUCATION ASSOCIATION. I AM HERE TODAY ON BEHALF OF THE IDAHO EDUCATION ASSOCIATION MEMBERS ACROSS THE STATE TO TESTIFY ON HB 153.

THE IEA URGES YOUR SUPPORT ON THIS IMPORTANT BILL. WE APPRECIATE THE COMMITMENT BY THE IDAHO LEGISLATURE TO INCREASE TEACHERS SALARIES THE LAST FIVE YEARS. THE ORIGINAL GOVERNOR’S TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATION CALLED FOR A STARTING TEACHER SALARY OF $40,000. THIS BILL MAKES THAT RECOMMENDATION A REALITY.

THE PIPELINE REPORT DONE BY THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION ILLUSTRATES IDAHO HAS ONE OF THE HIGHEST ATTRITION RATES OF TEACHERS IN THE COUNTRY. SCHOOL DISTRICTS ACROSS THE STATE CONTINUE TO STRUGGLE TO RECRUIT AND RETAIN EDUCATORS. THIS BILL SEeks BRINGS ONE SOLUTION TO HELP SOLVE THIS ONGOING PROBLEM.

WE LOOK FORWARD TO THIS SUMMER’S GOVERNOR’S TASK FORCE TO CONTINUE THE CONVERSATION FOR ADDITIONAL SOLUTIONS TO THE TEACHER RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION DISCUSSION TO FIND ADDITIONAL SOLUTIONS.

ON BEHALF OF THE MEMBERS OF THE IDAHO EDUCATION ASSOCIATION, I ASK YOU TO SUPPORT HB 153.

THANK YOU AND I WILL STAND FOR QUESTIONS.
Thank you Mister Chairman and committee,

My name is Quinn Perry and I’m the Policy and Government Affairs Director for the Idaho School Boards Association. We are supportive of House Bill 153.

As you know, we had trustees in town a few weeks ago and I would like to share a few brief remarks from some of our school districts who border Washington and Oregon.

Fruitland, for instance, is only separated from Oregon by a bridge. Last year they lost several of their brightest teachers in hard-to-fill positions, to jobs in Oregon that pay many thousands more per year and that include district-paid health insurance for the entire family.

Then, up north, the Post Falls School Board received a tearful resignation of one of their most accomplished teachers who was able to see a $30,000 salary increase by making the thirty-minute drive to District 81 in Spokane.

We are fully cognizant that the state does not have the resources to compete with Washington, Oregon, or Wyoming but ISBA believes raising the minimum to $40,000 is an absolute step in the right direction moving forward.

That is all I have mister chairman and I’m happy to stand for questions.
POSTSECONDARY STUDENT SUCCESS STRATEGIES
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Education Committee
March 4, 2019

Randall Brumfield, EdD
Chief Academic Officer
In the last five years, more than half of institutions have...

• Initiated timely completion campaigns
• Created institutional incentives for 30-credit enrollment.
• Scaled hybrid remedial-credit bearing courses (corequisite courses) to serve at least half of students in need of additional support.
• Guaranteed students will have access to gateway English and math courses during the first year of enrollment.
• Developed and published clear term-by-term on-time academic maps for each program of study.
• Implemented an ‘early alert’ system.
FIRST YEAR FULL-TIME FRESHMEN GPA

Source: Office of State Board of Education, report to the Idaho Legislature and State Board of Education (2017-18)
RETENTION RATE AT FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

Source: Office of State Board of Education, report to the Idaho Legislature and State Board of Education (2017-18) and National Center for Education Statistics (2016 cohort data)
% FIRST TIME, FULL-TIME STUDENTS COMPLETING COLLEGE ALGEBRA WITH A C- OR HIGHER ON FIRST ATTEMPT

- 2014: 59.9%
- 2015: 62.5%
- 2016: 63.7%

Source: Office of State Board of Education, report to the Idaho Legislature and State Board of Education (2017-18)
Associate’s Degree Graduation Rates at CC’s

Source: Office of State Board of Education, report to the Idaho Legislature and State Board of Education (2017-18)
Progress Achieved

• 3% increase has been achieved for two-year grad rates and 4% increase in three-year grad rates since implementation at community colleges.

• Retention rates at four-year institutions have increased by 13%.

• Freshman year GPA has improved from 2.74 to 2.87.

• Average credit hours earned in the freshmen year has increased.

• Overall performance in Freshman English and Algebra courses have improved.

Source: Office of State Board of Education, report to the Idaho Legislature and State Board of Education (2017-18)
Persistent Issues

- 20% of all college students completed 30 credits. (26% at four-year institutions.)

- 40% of part-time and full-time degree-seeking freshmen completed a gateway Math course in the first two years.

- 29% of total students in FY2017 needing remediation passed a subsequent credit-bearing Math course with a C- or higher in the first or second year.

- 70% of all full-time, first-time students returned for the second year. (75% at four-year institutions.)

Source: Idaho data provided by Office of State Board of Education; U.S. data provided by U.S. Dept. of Ed. National Center on Education Statistics (2019)
% FIRST TIME, FULL-TIME STUDENTS COMPLETING QUANTITATIVE REASONING OR STATISTICS WITH A “C-” OR HIGHER ON FIRST ATTEMPT

Source: Office of State Board of Education, report to the Idaho Legislature and State Board of Education (2017-18)
2018 Baccalaureate and Associate’s Completion Rates (100% and 150% Time Needed to Completion)

Source: Idaho data provided by Office of State Board of Education; U.S. data provided by U.S. Dept. of Ed. National Center on Education Statistics (2019)
• Of the nearly 6,500 Idaho students who graduate from high school and enroll full-time at a baccalaureate-granting institution, **almost 4,000 will not graduate in six years.**

• Using the averaged grad rates from 2013-2016, approximately **83.7% of first-time, full-time freshmen will not graduate within four years** from the institution they initially enrolled in.

• **9% of FTFT freshmen will graduate within two-years** from an Idaho community college (2013-16 rates), compared to 13% nationally.

Source: Office of State Board of Education; U.S. Department of Education (IPEDS)
For Adult Learners, less than half of Idaho’s institutions...

- Have redesigned the term structure to allow for accelerated (shorter-term) courses.
- Created consistent year round schedules.
- Created one or more separate programs that serve adult learners.
Current Initiatives

• Clear secondary-to-postsecondary math pathways and alignment of appropriate Math requirements to degree programs.

• Ensuring students have option to choose corequisite remediation courses.

• Integration of “Think 30” messaging into State Board of Education and college communication.
Additional Efforts

• Development of statewide 'focus field' framework.

• Nearing posting for Statewide Student Degree Audit and Analytics System, which will help dual credit and transfer students.

• Experience-based learning option within general education framework or early in college curriculum.

• Statewide articulation for credit for prior learning.
... and a few more.

- **Common Course Numbering** beginning in Fall 2019.

- Clear and consistent articulation for credit for Advanced Placement (AP) and College Level Examination Program (CLEP).

- Course and degree requirement “crosswalks” for military experience.

- Pilot partnership with regional libraries to deliver outreach and support to prospective adult learners.

- Development of an **Open Resource Textbook Library**.
Summary

- Some progress has been achieved, but more work is needed.
- Aside from meeting goals, this effort is also about pursuing continuous improvement across the system.
- Call for a ‘system-wide’ approach to collaboration and partnership across institutions, for both academic and student services practices.
- A completion effort, this is.
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CONVENED: Chairman Mortimer called the Education Committee (Committee) to order at 3:01 p.m.
PRESENTATION: Dr. Demaree Michelau, President, Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE), presented WICHE and Idaho; Partners Since 1953. She said today’s presentation will include the overview of WICHE, the highlight of key areas of partnership, and where Idaho belongs in the context of the region. She said Idaho joined WICHE in 1953 and works with a variety of other states and territories to deliver its mission. She said WICHE’s role in the region is to promote access and excellence in higher education for all citizens of the West.

WICHE has a 48-member commission and Dr. Michelau said two Commissioners are from Idaho; Rick Aman, President, College of Eastern Idaho; and Matt Freeman, Executive Director, State Board of Education. She said WICHE commissioners provide strategic direction for the organization, govern the work, and approve the work plan. She explained in detail the four programmatic units of work WICHE performs: 1.) Programs and Services; 2.) Policy Analysis and Research; 3.) Behavioral Health Program; and 4.) Cooperation for Education Technologies.

Dr. Michelau showed the Committee Idaho's placement in the context of all the WICHE participants. She detailed the following areas: high school graduates by race/ethnicity, undergraduate enrollment by institution, resident tuition and fees, student debt burden, levels of education, and postsecondary educational attainment (Attachment 1).

In response to questions, Dr. Michelau said the drop in the forecasted enrollment is due to a lower birth rate during the 2009 recession. She said WICHE has three ongoing projects and detailed for the Committee the following: 1.) Recognition of Learning; 2.) Closing Postsecondary Attainment Gaps; and 3.) Behavioral Health Internships.

Chairman Mortimer thanked Dr. Michelau for the WICHE update.
To hear the complete WICHE presentation, go to: https://legislature.idaho.gov/sessioninfo/2019/standingcommittees/SEDU/.

There being no further business at this time, Chairman Mortimer adjourned the meeting at 3:34 p.m.

_______________________________________________________________
Senator Dean M. Mortimer
Chair

_______________________________________________________________
LeAnn Mohr
Secretary
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Today’s Agenda

- Overview of WICHE
- Highlight Key Areas of Partnership
- Idaho in the Context of the West
The Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education - WICHE

- An interstate compact formed 65 years ago
- Idaho joined in 1953
- Codified in state law
WICHE’s Role in the Region

- Promotes access and excellence in higher education for all citizens of the West through:
  - Regional collaboration
  - Resource sharing
  - Sound public policy
  - Innovation
WICHE Commission

- Governed by a 48-member Commission
  - Rick Aman
    
    President, College of Eastern Idaho
  - Matt Freeman
    
    Executive Director, Office of the State Board of Education
  - Vacancy
WICHE’s Programmatic Units

- Programs and Services
- Policy Analysis and Research
- Behavioral Health Program
- WCET – WICHE Cooperative for Educational Technologies
Key Areas of Partnership
WICHE’s Student Access Programs

Western Undergraduate Exchange (WUE)

Western Regional Graduate Program (WRGP)

Professional Student Exchange Program (PSEP)
WUE students pay up to 150% of resident tuition

- 162 institutions across the region participate
- AY 2018 enrollment: 40,487; savings = $380.5 M
- 6 Idaho colleges/universities enrolled 3,042 students (AY 2018)
- 1,896 Idaho residents are using WUE to study in another WICHE state (AY 2018)
- No money exchanged between states

Greater options for students
Campuses gain marginal revenues
Builds local workforces
WUE Enrollment from Elsewhere

Idaho institutions enrolled 3,042 WUE students from other WICHE states and territories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4-Year</th>
<th>2-Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boise State U. ...................1,995</td>
<td>College of Southern Idaho .......... 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho State U. .....................129</td>
<td>North Idaho College ........................99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis-Clark State College ........37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Idaho ........................722</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Where Idaho Students Go

- WA: 782
- OR: 111
- ID: 1,896
- CA: 27
- NV: 32
- UT: 203
- AZ: 90
- NM: 10
- MT: 326
- WY: 99
- ND: 50
- SD: 15
- CNMI: 0
- Guam: 0

WUE Student Distribution from Idaho
Western Regional Graduate Program (WRGP)

- Students pay *resident* tuition for Master’s, Doctorates, Graduate Certificates
- AY 2018: 1,478 enrolled, saved $22.7 M
- 59 universities participate
- Programs no longer need to be distinctive
  - 70% increase in programs under the new model: From 420 to 700+
- Idaho institutions enrolled 66 students through WRGP
- No money exchanged across states

Fill excess capacity | Keep programs robust & viable | Avoid duplication of unique programs | Diversify enrollment
Policy Analysis and Research

- Key Initiatives
  - Knocking at the College Door
  - WICHE Task Force on Closing Postsecondary Attainment Gaps
  - Multistate Longitudinal Data Exchange
  - Recognition of Learning
- Data and Policy Resources
- Technical Assistance
WCET – WICHE Cooperative for Educational Technologies

*the leader in the practice, policy, & advocacy of technology-enhanced learning in higher education*

- Boise State University
- College of Eastern Idaho
- Idaho State University
- Lewis-Clark State College
- University of Idaho
Cyber Initiative

- Training for senior, non-technical leaders in network and data protection and incident response (U.S. Department of Homeland Security)
Idaho in the Context of the West
High School Graduates in Idaho by Race/Ethnicity, 2000-01 to 2012-13 (Actual); 2013-14 to 2031-32 (Projected)

Idaho Undergraduate Enrollment by Institution Type, 2007-2017 (With Percent of Total Enrollment)

Source: IPEDS Fall Enrollment Survey 2007-2017
## Resident Undergraduate Tuition and Fees
### Four-Year Institutions (2008-09 – 2018-19)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2018-19</th>
<th>10-YR % Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>$6,789</td>
<td>$11,372</td>
<td>+68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>$6,962</td>
<td>$11,073</td>
<td>+59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>$7,001</td>
<td>$10,727</td>
<td>+53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>$7,684</td>
<td>$10,597</td>
<td>+38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>$7,741</td>
<td>$9,887</td>
<td>+28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>$6,390</td>
<td>$9,638</td>
<td>+51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WICHE</td>
<td>$6,527</td>
<td>$9,518</td>
<td>+46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>$7,150</td>
<td>$8,951</td>
<td>+25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>$7,353</td>
<td>$8,649</td>
<td>+18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>$5,744</td>
<td>$7,746</td>
<td>+35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>$5,390</td>
<td>$7,689</td>
<td>+43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>$5,569</td>
<td>$7,583</td>
<td>+36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>$5,346</td>
<td>$7,132</td>
<td>+33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>$6,868</td>
<td>$7,064</td>
<td>+3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>$6,448</td>
<td>$7,020</td>
<td>+9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>$5,126</td>
<td>$6,956</td>
<td>+36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>$4,372</td>
<td>$5,400</td>
<td>+24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: WICHE Tuition and Fees, 2018, [http://www.wiche.edu/pub/tf](http://www.wiche.edu/pub/tf)
Resident Undergraduate Tuition and Fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2018-19</th>
<th>10-YR % Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH DAKOTA</td>
<td>$4,902</td>
<td>$7,046</td>
<td>+44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OREGON</td>
<td>$3,954</td>
<td>$5,353</td>
<td>+35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH DAKOTA</td>
<td>$4,669</td>
<td>$4,811</td>
<td>+3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLORADO</td>
<td>$3,156</td>
<td>$4,659</td>
<td>+48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASHINGTON</td>
<td>$3,541</td>
<td>$4,435</td>
<td>+25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDAHO</td>
<td>$2,701</td>
<td>$4,201</td>
<td>+56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM. NO. MARIANAS</td>
<td>$4,093</td>
<td>$4,038</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONTANA</td>
<td>$3,806</td>
<td>$3,950</td>
<td>+4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAWAII</td>
<td>$2,646</td>
<td>$3,921</td>
<td>+48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WICHE w/o CA</td>
<td>$2,960</td>
<td>$3,870</td>
<td>+31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTAH</td>
<td>$3,125</td>
<td>$3,822</td>
<td>+22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEVADA</td>
<td>$2,318</td>
<td>$3,393</td>
<td>+46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WYOMING</td>
<td>$2,430</td>
<td>$3,246</td>
<td>+34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARIZONA</td>
<td>$2,250</td>
<td>$2,621</td>
<td>+16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WICHE</td>
<td>$1,422</td>
<td>$2,224</td>
<td>+56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW MEXICO</td>
<td>$1,325</td>
<td>$1,762</td>
<td>+33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALIFORNIA</td>
<td>$724</td>
<td>$1,380</td>
<td>+90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Debt Burden

Percent of Class of 2017 Bachelor's Recipients with Debt

Adapted from The Institute for College Access and Success, “Project on Student Debt,” https://ticas.org/posd/home.
Debt Burden
Average Loan Amount for Bachelor's Recipients, 2007 vs. 2017

Public FTE Enrollment, Educational Appropriation and Total Revenue per FTE, WICHE Region, Fiscal 2000-2017

Public FTE Enrollment, Educational Appropriation and Total Revenue per FTE, Idaho, Fiscal 2000-2017

Levels of Education for Idaho Residents, Aged 25-64, 2007 and 2017

- Less Than High School: 10% (2007), 9% (2017)
- High School Graduate (includes equivalency): 29% (2007), 28% (2017)
- Some College, No Degree: 26% (2007), 26% (2017)
- Associate: 10% (2007), 11% (2017)
- Bachelor's: 18% (2007), 19% (2017)
- Graduate/Professional: 8% (2007), 8% (2017)

Postsecondary Educational Attainment, Associate’s Degree and Above, Adults Aged 25-64 (2017)

- Colorado: 51%
- North Dakota: 48%
- Washington: 47%
- Utah: 45%
- Hawaii: 45%
- Oregon: 44%
- Montana: 43%
- WICHE: 42%
- United States: 42%
- California: 42%
- South Dakota: 41%
- Wyoming: 39%
- Arizona: 39%
- Alaska: 38%
- Idaho: 38%
- New Mexico: 35%
- Nevada: 33%

Source: U.S. Census, American FactFinder Table 15002, 2017.
Postsecondary Educational Attainment, Associate’s Degree and Above, Adults Aged 25-64, 2007-2017

Postsecondary Educational Attainment, Associate’s Degree and Above, By Race/Ethnicity, Adults Aged 25-64 (2016)

Contact Information

Demarée Michelau
President
Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education

dmichelau@wiche.edu
303.541.0201
www.wiche.edu
If you have written testimony, please provide a copy of it along with the name of the person or organization responsible to the committee secretary to ensure accuracy of records.
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CONVENED: Chairman Mortimer called the Education Committee (Committee) to order at 3:03 p.m.

RS 27013C1 Senator Winder presented RS 27013C1, Relating to Charter Schools; Facilities. He said funding for charter schools has been an ongoing issue. He stated this proposed legislation sets up a funding program for charter schools which will lower interest rates, thereby increasing funds available for the classroom.

Senator Ward-Engelking asked if this will create a separate fund in the State Treasurer's Office. Senator Winder replied that is yet to be determined.

Chairman Mortimer explained that before the charter school could bond they would need to have 12 months' worth of bond payments deposited with the Treasurer. There would be no impact to the General Fund.

MOTION: Senator Winder asked for unanimous consent to send RS 27013C1 to the State Affairs Committee for a print hearing. There were no objections.

RS 27075 Senator Lent presented RS 27075, Relating to Education; Superintendent and Chief Administrator Evaluations. He said this is to bring some clarity and consistency to the annual evaluation for superintendents and chief administrators. The proposed legislation will provide flexibility to customize the evaluations, and with work from the State Board of Education (SBE0), will bring some consistency as those individuals work with their respective board of trustees. This is to simplify the process.

MOTION: Senator Lent asked for unanimous consent to send RS 27075 to the State Affairs Committee for a print hearing. There were no objections.

H 150 Senator Lent presented H 150 Relating to Open Meetings; Executive Sessions. He asked Karen Echeverria, Executive Director, Idaho School Boards Association, to explain the proposed legislation.

Ms. Echeverria said H 150 addresses executive sessions for school board (Board) meetings. The proposed legislation asks for an exemption from the two-thirds majority that is necessary to move into executive session when the Board has enough vacancies that they cannot meet the two-thirds requirement. She emphasized that H 150 only addresses vacancies and not absences and defined what constituted a vacancy. She recounted the instances in which Boards, because of vacancies, were unable to address personnel matters.

MOTION: Senator Lent moved to send H 150 to the floor with a do pass recommendation. Senator Den Hartog seconded the motion. The motion passed by voice vote.
S 1106

Suzanne Budge, SBS Associates, LLC, on behalf of Idaho Technical Career School (ITCA), presented S 1106, Relating to Public Charter Schools; Funding for Career Technical Education (CTE). She said the proposed legislation is to bring the language up to date with what is currently being practiced. Ms. Budge explained the difficulties in getting qualified instructors for the rural schools and how online CTE coursework will benefit. She stated this is a pathway for students who are not college bound, and will align education to the demands of industry.

Ms. Budge said industry required certifications are what drive the CTE curriculum. She emphasized that not all the coursework will be provided online. There would be provisions for the coursework which would require hands-on demonstrations.

Ms. Budge explained the amendments that will need to be made to the proposed legislation. She stated the amendments better define who is providing the online coursework as well as the parameters of the coursework.

DISCUSSION:

Senators Ward-Engelking and Buckner-Webb discussed the concerns regarding "face-to-face" learning for CTE coursework. Ms. Budge assured them that the industry drives the certification. If there is to be "face-to-face" demonstrations of knowledge, that will be done. That is also the reason for the amendment.

Senator Lent asked who is making the decision for how the certification is obtained. Ms. Budge replied the industries develop the standards for certification.

Vice Chairman Thayn clarified that it is the industry which drives the standards and that determines the type of training a student would receive. He said when State money is being spent, the Division of CTE should have some type of role.

Senator Lent expressed his concern regarding the blended model for course delivery. He stated online course delivery does not work for all CTE courses. Proficiency is the end result in the CTE coursework and there must be oversite to ensure that is met. Ms. Budge replied the goal for CTE online is to reach proficiency and certification.

Kerry Wysocki, Board Chairman, ITCA, and General Manager of Northwest Machining and Manufacturing, Inc, explained the history and the board make-up of ITCA. He said ITCA was solely established to help students learn and to give them some CTE opportunities for a stable career. He said all the career pathways they offer are designed and capable of being taught online. ITCA understands its limitations and only offers those courses that can be completed online.

Monti Pittman, Head of School, ITCA, said he worked in CTE for several years prior to moving into virtual education. He stated the technical skill assessment that ITCA created is based on Idaho’s CTE standards from business, industry, and educational collaboration. He said he would like ITCA to meet those same standards. He explained the desire to receive equal State funding for ITCA.

Senator Lent asked if he knew the cost ITCA incurred when the school was implemented. Mr. Pittman replied it would be the same as a brick and mortar school. He explained the curriculum and educator costs. The ITCA students are required to learn from Idaho certified teachers.

Senator Lent asked if any of the ITCA courses are blended. Mr. Pittman replied in the negative. He said the current curriculum matches the industry requirements. He explained the industry's desire for employees who can learn by a remote method, which is the way online schools deliver.

TESTIMONY:

Wayne Hammon, CEO, Idaho Associated General Contractors (IAGC), spoke in favor of S 1106. He said many elements in CTE training can be delivered virtually and detailed those elements. He stated there will never be a point where every skill that workers need will be delivered virtually, nor does the IAGC want that type of practicum.
DISCUSSION: **Senator Ward-Engelking** inquired about Idaho Digital Learning Academy's (IDLA) blended learning.

**Dr. Sherawn Reberry**, Director of Education Programs, IDLA, said IDLA offers blended programs, however, not in CTE.

**TESTIMONY:** **Anthony Jefferies**, Senior High School Student, Nampa, Idaho and Future Farmers of America (FFA) member, spoke against **S 1106**. He explained the importance of his hands-on learning and reported the various opportunities he has had with the organization.

**John Eaton**, Vice President, Idaho Association of Commerce and Industry (IACI), spoke in favor of **S 1106**. He stated IACI has a very strong interest in workforce development in Idaho and believes that removing silos will lead to more career opportunities for Idaho students. He said many businesses and industries engage in online training for their employees, so it is important that students learn how to navigate online training through online learning. He spoke about the merits of a Texas university's online model and how Idaho can be in the forefront on this type of education. He did caution that online learning is not for every industry.

**Daelas Zieber**, Student, Nampa High School, spoke against **S 1106**. She explained her successes in her hands-on agriculture classes. She said in elementary school, it was difficult for her to be in front of the class, but with coaching and practice, she is now able to speak in public. She cautioned that online learning would remove opportunities for the hands-on experience.

**Benjamin Kelly**, Food Producers of Idaho, spoke in favor of **S 1106**. He said agriculture provides many job opportunities, in fact one out of three people work in some type of industry related to agriculture. He emphasized the need for many types of learning; blended, online, and hands-on.

**Dwight Johnson**, State Administrator, Division of CTE (Division), said SBE Board has not been able to meet to review this legislation and does not have an official stance on the legislation. Therefore, as a sector of the SBE, the Division does not have an official position. He said he has been given permission to talk about significant concerns regarding the proposed legislation.

**Mr. Johnson** explained the critical components of CTE coursework and emphasized it is more than hands-on, it is about learning to work, interact, and display professionalism in the workplace. He said the intent of the current language in **S 1106** is confusing. He explained how CTE standards are driven by input from industry and the facility of secondary and postsecondary education levels, often without an online component. He stated the current language does not allow a blended model. If this were to go to the amending order, **Mr. Johnson** hoped CTE could work with the authors to ensure that the language would meet standards.

DISCUSSION: **Senator Den Hartog** stated there are many ways in which people can receive their education and CTE can diversify and expand into a non-traditional education program. She asked if the Division believes there are CTE online pathways. **Mr. Johnson** replied in the affirmative. He stated the Division would like to ensure quality control in the implementation of online education.

**Senator Lent** stated he has spent the past 20 years as a technical manager and managed over 200 online training courses. He said he is 100 percent in favor of making **S 1106** work; it is the right thing to do.

**MOTION:** **Senator Lent** moved to send **S 1106** to the 14th Order of Business for possible amendment. **Vice Chairman Thayn** seconded the motion.
Vice Chairman Thayn indicated he would like to work with Mr. Johnson to resolve the concerns. This is an important policy decision as to how online learning should expand.

The motion passed by voice vote.

ADJOURNED: There being no further business at this time, Chairman Mortimer adjourned the meeting at 4:14 p.m.
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CONVENED: Chairman Mortimer called the Education Committee (Committee) to order at 2:04 p.m.

Senator Winder opened with a reading from the book, A Heap O 'Living Along Life's Highway, by Eager A. Guest, "The Safe Golfer."

H 93 Senator Lent introduced Blake Youde, Teach for America (TFA), to present H 93, Relating to Education; Nontraditional Educator Preparation.

Mr. Youde detailed the teacher shortage in Idaho and said H 93 is to help recruit, retain, and train teachers, with the goal for them to supply hard-to-fill teaching positions. He stated this is not a State driven program, instead it allows school districts, at the local level, to enter into agreements with teacher recruitment/preparation organizations to fulfill those positions. Mr. Youde explained the funding component would come from the State Department of Education (SDE) and would be a 100 percent matching fund grant. He noted there is also the possibility for funding eligibility with the U.S. Department of Education.

DISCUSSION: Senator Ward-Engelking asked if there has been discussion as to how to recruit, retain, and train teachers using a State program rather than organizations such as TFA. Mr. Youde replied TFA is the only organization in Idaho that is currently doing this type of work. He stated the colleges and universities are working to get teachers trained but they are unable to fulfill the needs. He stated the retention trend of teachers in TFA is higher. He said the proposed legislation is about moving teachers into the classroom.

Chairman Mortimer asked if there is a limit to the amount of money approved for any specific teacher. Mr. Youde replied in the negative. He explained the recruitment and training process before a teacher is placed into a classroom. He said TFA's cost per teacher is approximately $12,500.

Chairman Mortimer asked for more explanation regarding the costs to the districts and to the State. Mr. Youde explained the matching fund requirement and how the local school districts apply to the SDE for the funds.
TESTIMONY: Christine Ketterling, Federal Program and Curriculum Director, Homedale School District, explained that her district is the sixth most impoverished in the state. She explained the hiring process and difficulty the district has in filling its teaching positions. She explained the partnership the district has with TFA and how those hard-to-fill positions have been filled with teachers trained from TFA. Ms. Ketterling reported the impact TFA teachers have had on the community and how their ability to process data has helped other teachers to implement programs for growth. She stated the teachers make a two-year commitment to the school district they are serving. She addressed the ability of a district to void a contract if necessary.

Michael Jacobsen, Superintendent, Swan Falls, Idaho, said there are five people in his district who received their certification through a nontraditional route. He explained his experience with TFA and stated the instruction and training helped him to be a better teacher and administrator. He said he uses the TFA as a foundation for innovative teaching.

DISCUSSION: Vice Chairman Thayn asked what the costs of TFA are to the state. Mr. Jacobsen said currently he believes the cost to the State is minimal because of matching funding. He explained the training programs TFA teachers go to during the summer months. He said those costs are covered by TFA and the benefits are experienced in the classrooms. He reminded the Committee that TFA is a tool to recruit teachers and in Idaho they are only focusing on recruitment in the Treasure Valley.

TESTIMONY: Tony Ashton, Executive Director, TFA, said if the proposed legislation is approved and the money appropriated to this program, TFA and other institutions that qualify would apply for funding through the SDE. Those funds received from the SDE would only be used for the recruitment, selection, and training of TFA teachers. He said the amount allocated would be based upon the total number of teachers enrolled, and on the requirements/needs of the district.

Senator Den Hartog asked what it costs to recruit and train a teacher in TFA. Mr. Ashton replied approximately $40,000 per teacher for the two-year commitment. Those costs include recruitment, selection, training, certification, and credentialing.

Vice Chairman Thayn asked how much of the $40,000 is funded by the State. Mr. Ashton replied the proposed legislation is written so the State would pay half of the costs.

DISCUSSION: Chairman Mortimer asked for more clarification regarding the program's funding. Mr. Youde replied the proposed legislation asks for one-to-one matching funds. If it costs $20,000 a year to support a TFA teacher, it would cost the State $10,000 per year. He explained the one-to-one match is to encourage other teacher training organizations to come to Idaho to help recruit and train new teachers.

Chairman Mortimer said the proposed legislation does not address what agency is to disperse the funds and if there is a yearly limit to the fund amount.

Mr. Youde thanked the Committee for the time to review the proposed legislation. He stated the key to H 93 is to help get qualified teachers into the classrooms to turn out high-quality students.

Senator Lent said this is a good piece of legislation to benefit our students, yet there is some uncertainty and lack of clarity in H 93 as to how the funding will take place.

MOTION: Senator Lent moved to send H 93 to the 14th Order of Business for possible amendment. Senator Crabtree seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION: Senator Den Hartog asked what the amendment would be.

Vice Chairman Thayn suggested they add a statement which would address the costs.
VOICE VOTE: The motion to send H 93 to the 14th Order of Business for possible amendment passed by voice vote.

MINUTES APPROVAL: Senator Crabtree moved to approve the Minutes of January 31, 2019. Vice Chairman Thayn seconded the motion. The motion passed by voice vote.

Senator Winder moved to approve the Minutes of February 4, 2019. Senator Den Hartog seconded the motion. The motion passed by voice vote.

Senator Den Hartog moved to approve the Minutes of February 5, 2019. Senator Winder seconded the motion. The motion passed by voice vote.

Senator Lent moved to approve the Minutes of February 6, 2019. Senator Buckner-Webb seconded the motion. The motion passed by voice vote.

ADJOURNED: There being no further business at this time, Chairman Mortimer adjourned the meeting at 3:01 p.m.
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CONVENED: Chairman Mortimer called the meeting of the Senate Education Committee (Committee) to order at 2:10 p.m.

S 1180 Relating to Public Charter School; Facilities Program. Senator Winder said this proposed legislation has been worked on for a couple of years. He introduced Emily McClure, Idaho Charter School Network, to present S 1180. Ms. McClure testified in support of this bill and emphasized that charter schools are public schools and not funded by local bonds or levies. Charter schools are entirely dependent on State General Fund dollars to buy, lease, or improve facilities. Charter schools are organized under the Non-Profit Corporation Act, and there is some question as to whether they can receive the same benefit of the full faith and credit of the State of Idaho.

Ms. McClure noted there are two states that have created a financing tool called a "moral obligation" which allows charter schools to obtain lower interest rates on bonds. She reported this bill would help maximize state funding by creating a similar financing tool to help seasoned charter schools secure lower interest rates on bonds, thus allowing more taxpayer dollars to actually stay in the classroom working for children. Ms. McClure reported the overarching goal of this bill is to give bondholders and trustees the comfort that their investment will be safe if they enter into a bond deal with a qualified public charter school, which will then result in increasing competition and the offering of lower interest rates.

Ms. McClure explained the four elements contained in the financing tool: 1.) A stringent eligibility; 2.) A deposit of 12-months principal; 3.) A front-end intercept; and 4.) A separate fund is established to address missed payments. Ms. McClure walked the Committee through the proposed legislation section by section. She stated this program is for charter schools that have stable academic records and strong finances.
DISCUSSION: Senator Den Hartog asked what a school could save in interest payments. Ms. McClure noted credit rates vary from 2 to 3 percent, which is the equivalent of four teachers.

Chairman Mortimer said there are bond levy limitations in the proposed legislation. He asked if there is a limit on bonds that could be issued. Ms. McClure detailed the facts and figures of the total public school population as opposed to the charter school population. She reported approximately 7 percent of students attend charter schools. Ms. McClure detailed the amount of dollars that could be redirected from interest payments to teachers salaries.

TESTIMONY: Keith Donnahue, Doctor of Education (Ed.D), Executive Director, Sage International School, addressed Senator Den Hartog's question relating to interest savings. After consulting with experts and doing an analysis, he projected a savings of interest of $240,000 per year for the next 30 years, which will have a significant impact.

Christian Anderson, Vice President of Public Finance, Zion's Bank, testified in support of this bill. He explained his work with school districts throughout the state on bond issues as a financial adviser and detailed the underwriting process. He stated the Public Charter School Facilities Program will provide a more level playing field for Idaho's charter schools, substantially reducing insurance costs and interest rates, which will provide a more competitive field of potential underwriters and service providers. Mr. Anderson indicated the program is expected to qualify for an investment-grade credit rating, resulting in millions of dollars in savings. These savings then can be invested into the classroom.

DISCUSSION: Senator Winder mentioned he looked at the last few schools that pledged their buildings as collateral. In 2015, financing was done through the Idaho Housing and Finance Association (IHFA) to pay for long-term projects. The fees for underwriting were between 1.5 and 2 percent. This program is not expected to rate as high as the School Loan Guarantee Program. There are substantial savings.

Senator Lent inquired if this bill applied to refinancing. Mr. Anderson answered in the affirmative.

TESTIMONY: Julie Ellsworth, Idaho State Treasurer, said she called on the Credit Rating Enhancement Committee to better understand the proposed legislation. She stated her office will not take a position on S 1180. She cautioned the bill writer that there is a moral obligation that exists in bonding.

DISCUSSION: Senator Winder stated that North Star Public Charter School in West Ada County was penalized because they used the conventional financing market and school property as collateral. He stated he was in support of reducing costs for charter schools and returning money to the classroom.

MOTION: Senator Den Hartog moved to send S 1180 to the floor with a do pass recommendation. Senator Bucker-Webb seconded the motion. The motion passed by voice vote.
PRESENTATION: Margie Gonzalez, Executive Director, Idaho Commission on Hispanic Affairs (ICHA), presented with an update of ICHA. She noted the Hispanic population in Idaho has grown by 15 percent versus the non-Hispanic population that grew at 4 percent. Ms. Gonzalez remarked in the 2015-2016 school year, there were over 51,000 Hispanic students, who made up approximately 18 percent of the total student enrollment of K-12. She highlighted the Hispanic population by school district and reported North Idaho is experiencing an increase in the Hispanic population and detailed the counties with the most growth. Ms. Gonzalez pointed out there is a kindergarten gap for children who are unprepared to attend school and as the year progresses, the gap increases (Attachment 1).

DISCUSSION: Chairman Mortimer asked how the ICHA is reaching out to their service areas. Ms. Gonzalez outlined a number of programs, such as Parents As Partners, which help parents understand their role and responsibility in education. She stated there is also a strong partnership with the State Department of Education (SDE). She noted the ICHA works very closely with the statewide institutions to address student recruitment and retention. She spoke about the growing Hispanic youth program that started with 50 students 12 years ago. She reported there are now over 3,500 students in the program. She said the institutions work with these students to provide scholarships and in the past year, over $400,000 in scholarships awarded from Boise State University and the College of Southern Idaho.

PRESENTATION: Christina Nava, Doctor of Education (Ed.D), Director, English Language Learners (ELL), SDE, presented the SDE ELL update. She defined what it means to be classified as an ELL student and outlined the six levels of English Language Proficiency. She noted the ELL population is growing statewide. She explained the test for proficiency is more rigid and the majority of ELL students reside in grades K-3, and Region 3 (Southwest Idaho) is the largest population where most students are enrolling in schools (Attachment 2).

DISCUSSION: Senator Den Hartog asked how many different languages are spoken in that area. Dr. Nava remarked there are 134 languages spoken, with Spanish being the primary language; the other languages in that area include Arabic, Swahili, and Russian. Dr. Nava stated ELLs are still learning English, resulting in lower testing scores because of the language barriers. As students become more proficient in English, their test scores become higher. Their graduation rate is 75.2 percent versus 79 percent for the general public. Once a student acquires the English language, they do better.

Vice Chairman Thayn asked if they have data regarding those students who do not go on to post-secondary education. Dr. Nava stated most care for their families and work. Some lack motivation and some do not think college is for them.

Senator Winder asked if there is a cost breakout of the total cost to educate an ELL versus a non-ELL. Dr. Nava stated she would get an answer for that question.
PRESENTATION: Dr. Nava explained the funding received for ELLs and detailed how it is being used to hire staff and provide professional development. She spoke about the variety of grants from the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) and the funding dollars which allowed the partnership with Imagine Learning. She said Title III funding is part of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and outlined how it is to help ensure that ELLs attain EL Proficiency and meet state academic standards. Dr. Nava said there is an EL Management System, which was developed to help educators eliminate unnecessary testing and provide quicker instructional support for students and the inclusion of strategy training. She detailed the support districts and schools receive from the Title III consortium. Dr. Nava outlined effective language programs that are being utilized in the schools throughout the state.

Sherri Ybarra, State Superintendent, SDE, reported there is work to be done with the ELL students. They are making gains and have all of the support necessary to move forward.

NOTE: To hear the complete presentation regarding Idaho Commission of Hispanic Affairs and English Language Learners, go to: https://legislature.idaho.gov/sessioninfo/2019/standingcommittees/SEDU/

ADJOURNED: There being no further business at this time, Chairman Mortimer adjourned the meeting at 3:04 p.m.
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IDAHO’S HISPANIC POPULATION IS GROWING

Between 2010 and 2015, Idaho’s Hispanic population grew by 15%, compared to 4% among non-Hispanics.
Idaho Public Schools

Hispanic students make up a growing share of enrollment in Idaho's schools and universities:

In the 2015–16 school year, 51,308 Hispanic students made up 18% of total public K–12 enrollment. This is an increase from 2010–11, when 45,084 Hispanic students made up 16% of total enrollment.

Percent of Hispanic and non-Hispanic Idahoans by 5-year age groups, 2016

Hispanic students make up 18 percent of total public K-12 enrollment.
Percent Hispanic by School District, 2015–16

- Districts with at least 50% Hispanic students are located in both rural and urban areas: Wilder (71%), Caldwell (61%), Aberdeen (61%), Wendell (60%), Heritage Community Charter (52%), and Jerome Joint (51%).
- In Northern Idaho we have a growing Hispanic student population where Plummer–Worley School District make up 13%.

Top ten school districts with highest percentage of Hispanic Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2009-2010</th>
<th>2015-2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wilder</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caldwell</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murtaugh Joint</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark County</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glens Ferry</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoshone Joint</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendell</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minidoka County Joint</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerome Joint</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: [Link](http://idsa.idaho.gov/k12statistics/student_ethnicity.html)
Non–Hispanic Students Outperform Hispanic Students on Both K–12 Achievement Tests

Idaho Reading Indicator K–3 (%), Fall 2015 and Spring

Hispanics

Non–Hispanics

Hispanics Make up a Small Share of Public School Personnel

During the 2015–16 school year, Idaho public schools employed 433 Hispanics who made up just 2% of all employees. These Hispanic employees included:

- 209 elementary school teachers (2% of all elementary teachers)
- 182 secondary school teachers (2%)
- 10 elementary school principals (3%)
- 10 school counselors (1%)
- 4 school nurses (3%)
- 4 employees in technology services (3%)
- 3 social workers (6%)
- 2 superintendents (1%)

There were zero Hispanic assistant superintendents, secondary school principals, audiologists, or occupational or physical therapists.
English Learners

Districts with the high percentages of ELs:

- Wendell (29%)
- Shoshone (27%)
- America Falls (23%)
- Valley (19%)
- Jerome (18%)
- Blaine (18%)
- Aberdeen (17%)

Thank you on behalf of the Idaho Commission of Hispanic Affairs

Source: Idaho Department of Education
Who is an English Learner?

K-12 student

Primary language is not English and

English skills are not sufficient to be successful in the classroom.
Six Levels of English Language Proficiency

- Students scoring between 1.0 - 1.9 are considered high-level learners.
- Students at levels 2.0 - 2.9 are considered proficient in English.
- Students at levels 3.0 - 3.9 are considered advanced learners.
- Students at levels 4.0 - 4.9 are considered advanced learners.
- Students at levels 5.0 - 5.9 are considered advanced learners.
- Students at levels 6.0 are considered native speakers.
assessment is too high.
Exit criteria for the new
assessments (WIDA - ACCESS)
language proficiency
Idaho changed English
Identifying students uniformly
Surveys have helped in
Statewide Home Language

Why are Idaho's EL numbers growing?
How are EL distributed over grade levels?

48% of English Learners are in K-3
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Percent of EL Population</th>
<th>Number of ELs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
<td>10088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>5105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>2858</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where are English Learners?
What languages do students speak?

Other languages include:

Russian

134 different languages reported for English learners

81% speak Spanish as primary language.
How are English Learners performing compared to other students?
Graduation within 1 year of.

Go-on Rate 2017
Grad Rate 2017
Spring IRF 2018
Fall IRF 2017

How are English learners performing compared to other students? (cont.)
What is Idaho doing to help English learners and what more can be done?
Federal Title III Funding - $2.1 million
State EL Curriculum - Image Learning - $2.2 million
State EL Enhancement Grants - $450,000
State EL Funding - $4.3 million

What is Idaho doing to help ELs?
State English Learner Funding FY 17 & 18
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EL Grant Project</th>
<th>Grant Award</th>
<th>LEA</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Twin Falls - Rock Creek (441)</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twin Falls - ID Partners (441)</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payette Joint (371)</td>
<td>$83,750</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nampa (131)</td>
<td>$83,750</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerome Joint (261)</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meridian Joint (002)</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerome Joint (261)</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Community Charter (481)</td>
<td>$83,750</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emmett Independent (001)</td>
<td>$83,750</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boise Independent (001)</td>
<td>$83,750</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackfoot (055)</td>
<td>$83,750</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

State EL Enhancement Grants
used this instructional tool. 

Over 10,000 students have

using the curriculum 

79 Districts & charters are 

State EL Curriculum – Imagine Learning
Federal Funding in Millions for English Learners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2012</th>
<th>FY 2013</th>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017</th>
<th>FY 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$2.1</td>
<td>$2.1</td>
<td>$2.0</td>
<td>$1.9</td>
<td>$1.9</td>
<td>$2.1</td>
<td>$2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student Leadership Institute
Statewide Title III Consortium
Go-to-Strategies Training
English Learner Management System (ELMS)
EL Advisory Committee
EL/MIgrant Department

What is the SDLE doing to help ELs?
And others

Technology

Advanced Opportunities

Special Education

Assessment & Accountability

Certification

Federal Programs

Who do we collaborate within the SDI to help
Training EL teachers/staff and General Education teachers on how to help their English Learners and implementing effective language programs.

What are schools doing to help ELs?
1. Priorities align with SDE goals 1, 2, 3

2. Recruit EL teachers

3. Expand regional coaching support to meet the needs of teachers in rural schools with English learners

Top Priorities for Improving EL Programs
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CONVENED: Chairman Mortimer called the Education Committee (Committee) to order at 2:02 p.m.

MINUTES APPROVAL: Senator Ward-Engelking moved to approve the Minutes of February 7, 2019. Vice Chairman Thayn seconded the motion. The motion passed by voice vote.

Senator Buckner-Webb moved to approve the Minutes of February 11, 2019. Senator Ward-Engelking seconded the motion. The motion passed by voice vote.

Senator Lent moved to approve the Minutes of February 12, 2019. Senator Den Hartog seconded the motion. The motion passed by voice vote.

INFORMATION SESSION: Chairman Mortimer said today they will be discussing some of the questions posed to the Committee regarding the draft of the Public Schools Funding Formula. He welcomed Michael Griffiths, Senior Finance Analyst, Education Commission of the States, Robyn Lockett, Principal Budget and Policy Analyst, Legislative Services Office (LSO), Elizabeth Bowen, Senior Legislative Research Analyst, LSO, Tracie Bent, Chief Planning and Policy Officer, State Board of Education (SBE), Marilyn Whitney, Deputy Superintendent, Communications and Policy, State Department of Education (SDE), and Tim Hill, Associate Deputy Superintendent of Finance, SDE. He said they are here to address any questions from the Committee.

Chairman Mortimer set forth the parameters for the information session and welcomed Senator Den Hartog to lead the discussion.

PRESENTATION: Senator Den Hartog thanked Committee members, the interim committee, and the stakeholders for giving their time and expertise to help in the drafting process.

Chairman Mortimer said the definitions that will be reviewed today in the proposed legislation are from collaborative work with the SDE and SBE.

Ms. Bent reviewed for the Committee the definition of economically disadvantaged and explained the four areas of which a student could qualify if they are in the existing programs at the State and Federal level. She said typically students are identified at the beginning of the school year but identification can happen anytime during the school year.

Senator Den Hartog clarified the definitions of the Local Education Agency (LEA) and Local Salary Schedule in the proposed legislation. She explained the applicability of the specific section and how it aligns with Idaho Code. Senator Den Hartog then explained the definitions of remote schools, special education, hold harmless, and continuous improvement plan. She asked Ms. Lockett to address Student Based Foundation Funding.
Ms. Lockett explained to the Committee, by using the funding formula tool, how the per student base amount is determined. She said each student is equal to one unweighted count. She noted that number can be adjusted upward if the student qualifies for some of the other weights. Ms. Lockett walked the Committee through each of the weighted line items in the funding formula tool. She demonstrated how the model can adjust accordingly with the insertion of a variety of weight scenarios.

Mr. Griffith demonstrated for the Committee through the budget tool how the weights adjusted as other specific weights are determined. He stated using the tool projects future funding estimations.

Mr. Hill explained how the funding is allocated at six different times to school districts and detailed the specific calculations used to determine the correct amounts.

DISCUSSION: Committee members asked questions regarding special education formulation, salary schedules, Career Ladder, hold harmless calculations, Career Technical Education, and enrollment formulas. All questions were answered to the satisfaction of the Senators.

RECORDING LINK: To hear the complete Public School Funding Formula information session, go to; https://legislature.idaho.gov/sessioninfo/2019/standingcommittees/SEDU/.

ADJOURNED: There being no further business at this time, Chairman Mortimer adjourned the meeting at 3:33 p.m.
AGENDA
SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE
2:00 P.M.
Lincoln Auditorium
Monday, March 18, 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>PRESENTER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| S 1196  | Relating to Education; Public School Funding Formula | Chairman Mortimer  
Senator Den Hartog |

If you have written testimony, please provide a copy of it along with the name of the person or organization responsible to the committee secretary to ensure accuracy of records.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS
Chairman Mortimer  
Vice Chairman Thayn  
Sen Winder  
Sen Den Hartog  
Sen Crabtree

COMMITTEE SECRETARY
LeAnn Mohr  
Room: WW39  
Phone: 332-1321  
email: sedu@senate.idaho.gov
DATE: Monday, March 18, 2019
TIME: 2:00 P.M.
PLACE: Lincoln Auditorium
MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Mortimer, Vice Chairman Thayn, Senators Winder, Den Hartog, Crabtree, Woodward, Lent, and Ward-Engelking
ABSENT/EXCUSED: Senator Buckner-Webb

NOTE: The sign-in sheet, testimonies and other related materials will be retained with the minutes in the committee's office until the end of the session and will then be located on file with the minutes in the Legislative Services Library.

CONVENED: Chairman Mortimer called the Education Committee (Committee) to order at 2:03 p.m. He opened with a reading from the book, A Heap O 'Living Along Life's Highway, by Eager A. Guest, "Difficulties."

S 1196 Chairman Mortimer welcomed the audience and stated this is a listening session. He said there will not be vote today on S 1196.

Senator Den Hartog presented S 1196, Relating to Education; Public School Funding Formula. She said the overarching goal and objective of the Public School Funding Formula was to focus on student needs. In drafting the proposed legislation, the goal was to allocate additional resources to the students who need it the most. There is less emphasis on inputs and more on outcomes.

Senator Den Hartog said the current model, which was designed over 25 years ago, does not meet the educational delivery needs for students and/or schools. She walked the Committee through S 1196 and explained the items the proposed legislation will address: student weighting by grade levels, remote schools, small schools, enrollment, Career Ladder, and local salary schedules. She said there is a four-year transition period and explained the reasons for a first year side-by-side comparison. She emphasized the need for additional clarity will come from negotiated rulemaking (Attachment 1).

TESTIMONY: Sherri Ybarra, Superintendent of Public Instruction, State Department of Education (SDE), spoke in opposition to S 1196. She emphasized the need for more time to better understand the legislation; it is not well understood by those in the field. She listed the SDE’s concerns. She asked the Committee to continue to work on the proposed legislation (Attachment 2).

Tim Hill, Deputy Superintendent of Finance, SDE, spoke in opposition to S 1196. He said his role in the Superintendent's office is to provide the data to ensure the policy outcomes. He explained the two areas of concern with the proposed legislation: 1.) Enrollment dates used for the payments; and 2.) Career Ladder average appropriated salaries (Attachment 3).

Harold Ott, Director of Idaho Rural Schools, and Idaho Association of School Administrators (ISAS), spoke in opposition to S 1196. He said the brevity of the proposed legislation is concerning. School superintendents are bothered by the inability to forecast budgets, programs, and staffing with reasonable accuracy. He said there is still much work to be done. He asked the Committee to hold S 1196 (Attachment 4).
Karen Echeverria, Executive Director, Idaho School Boards Association (ISBA), spoke in opposition to S 1196. She stated the concerns are as follows: the overall process to write the legislation, Interim Committee recommendations versus the proposed legislation, alternative schools, experienced teachers’ allocations, technology dollars, and others (Attachment 5).

DISCUSSION:
Senator Winder said the Interim Committee spent many years in the process with many hours of listening to develop a report for the Germaine Committee. He stated to now criticize the Interim Committee for not listening and/or not including stakeholders is not in the spirit of what was accomplished. He believed the Committees made a strong effort to include everybody to develop the funding formula.

TESTIMONY:
Blake Youde, Idaho Charter School Network, spoke in support of S 1196. He stated the Public School Funding Formula provides flexibility and innovation. Education is evolving and the proposed legislation works with the changes (Attachment 6).

Kari Overall, President, Idaho Education Association (IEA), spoke in opposition to S 1196. She detailed the inadequate funding component for teacher salaries and cautioned the Committee to move slower (Attachment 7).

Rod Gramer, President, Idaho Business for Education (IBE), spoke in opposition to S 1196. He listed the areas of concern, which included the following: 1.) little accountability or reporting for how funding is allocated; 2.) incompatibility with the Career Ladder; 3.) inclusion of wealth adjustments; and 4.) voluntary enrollment cap. He asked that the Committee takes more time to develop the funding formula (Attachment 8).

The following School Superintendents and Administrators spoke in opposition to S 1196:

Scott Woolstehumne, Superintendent, Bonneville School District (Attachment 9)
Jonathan Gillin, Chief Financial Officer, West Ada School District (Attachment 10)
Lisa Sexton, Assistant Superintendent, Lakeland Joint School District (Attachment 11)
James Gilbert, Superintendent, Mountain Home School District (Attachment 12)
Byron Stutzman, Superintendent, Freemont County (Attachment 13)
Pat Charlton, Superintendent, Valley View School District
David Sotutu, Superintendent, New Plymouth School District (Attachment 14)
Randy Dewey, Finance Director, Nampa School District (Attachment 15)
Paula Kellerer, Superintendent, Nampa School District
Jeff Dillion, Superintendent, Wilder School District (Attachment 16)
April Burton, Business Manager, Caldwell School District (Attachment 17)
Dr. Shalene French, Superintendent, Caldwell (Attachment 18)
Shawn Tiegs, Superintendent, Nezperce School District (Attachment 19)
Gwen Carol Holms, Superintendent, Blaine County School District (Attachment 20)
Wendy Johnson, Superintendent, Kuna School District (Attachment 21)
Mandy Simpson, Trustee, Nampa School District (Attachment 22)

The concerns they addressed were inaccurate data for projecting funding, the Career Ladder, confusion with discretionary fund allocations, inadequate funding for alternative schools and transportation, Advanced Opportunities being negatively impacted, lack of equability, the need to be consistent with federal definitions, and whether the base funding is enough to provide equal education to all students.

Senator Winder said he appreciated all the input today. He stated there is no need to rush this legislation and that the legislature is working diligently to provide funding for schools. He emphasized the goal of the funding formula is to provide adequate funds to promote student learning.
Chairman Mortimer thanked all those who came to testify. He stated the Committee has received much additional information that will need to be considered.

RECORDING LINK: To hear the complete Public School Funding Formula hearing, go to; https://legislature.idaho.gov/sessioninfo/2019/standingcommittees/SEDU/.

ADJOURNED: There being no further business at this time, Chairman Mortimer adjourned the meeting at 3:54 p.m.

___________________________ ___________________________
Senator Dean M. Mortimer LeAnn Mohr
Chair Secretary
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Public School Funding Formula SB1196
Overarching Goals & Objectives

- Focus on student needs
  - Allocate additional resources to students that need it the most
  - Less emphasis on inputs
  - More emphasis on outcomes

- Grant spending flexibility at the local level
  - Empower the professional educators and administrators to determine the programs and plans necessary to achieve student growth and achievement

- Simplify state distribution to school districts
  - Fewer line items
## Paradigm Shift

### Current
- Resource based allocation model focused on inputs
- Current funding model was originally developed in 1994, and over the years over 63 line items were added/changed/removed to model to address various issues

### Future
- Student based model focused on outcomes.
- Allows for much greater flexibility at the local level to determine need and allocate necessary resources.
- No use it or lose it.
- Greater adaptability for future changes.
Why Now?

- Current model is not meeting the needs of today’s students.
- Educational delivery methods have changed.
- Mobile Student Population.
- Building on success of Career Ladder with focus on ensuring the professionals in the classroom and in the individual buildings can make decisions to serve their students.
- There is no one size fits all for Idaho’s schools.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>English / Language Arts</th>
<th>Math</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Time to Chart a New Course
Process

- Three Years of Interim Committee meetings gathering stakeholder input
- 14 Funding Formula Panels were conducted in every state region
  - Mix of teachers, specialists, technology directors, principals, school board members, school business officials, superintendents and charter school administrators. Each of these meetings was a three-hour facilitated discussion, where six to 12 district professionals shared what is working for their districts, what is not working and what issues are most important to them.
  - 110 total participants
  - 17 teachers
  - 10 principals
  - 9 Board members
  - 40 Superintendents
  - 29 School Business Officials
  - 20 Charter School Representatives
  - 5 Special Programs, CTE, Special Education
Public Input meetings in every State Region

- Region 1: 93
- Region 2: 26
- Region 3: 70
- Region 4: 47
- Region 5: 55
- Region 6: 49

699 Survey Responses

- 95% of survey respondents do not think the funding formula works well for Idaho.
- 75% of survey respondents do not think the current funding formula provides enough flexibility to districts.
Process

- In-Person Meetings with state-level groups and entities that work in education
  - Idaho Association of School Administrators
  - Idaho Department of Education
  - Idaho Education Association
  - Idaho School Boards Association
  - Idaho Charter School Network
  - Idaho Association of School Business Officials
  - Idaho State Board of Education
  - Idaho Business for Education
  - Idaho legislative staff
  - Office of the Governor of Idaho
Process

- After the release of the draft legislation, legislators and stakeholders met for over 3 weeks to discuss and negotiate particular technical and substantive issues with the draft legislation.

- Over 15 hours of meetings with approximately 15 to 20 people each meeting.

- Dozens of changes were incorporated into the bill based on the suggestions and feedback provided by stakeholder groups.
  - Multiple Definitions
  - Payment schedule
  - Enrollment Counts
  - Teacher Contracts
  - Flexibility in Local Salary Schedules
Student Based Foundation Funding

- Base amount of funding for every Idaho student (Section 4, P.7)
- What’s included in the base funding amount?
  - Salaries, Salary-Based Apportionments (Admin., Classified)
  - Benefits Obligation
  - Employer's Benefit Obligation (Admin., Classified)
  - Professional Development
  - College and Career Advisors and Student Mentors
  - IT Staffing
  - Literacy Intervention
  - Content and Curriculum
  - Math and Science Requirements
  - Remediation/Waiver (Non-Title I)
  - Limited English Proficient
  - Student Achievement Assessments
  - Math Initiative
Special Programs/Line Items
Section 6, P. 8

- Transportation Support Program
- Border District allowance
- Exceptional child contract allowance
- Bond levy equalization support program
- Safe environment support program
- Advanced opportunities
- National Board Certification, Teacher additional education attainment (BA+24), etc.
- School District facilities funds
- Charter school facilities funds
- Master Educator Premiums
- Leadership Premiums
- Mastery-based education
- Classroom technology
- Continuous Improvement Plans
- Support for schools with special conditions
Student Weights
Student Weights
Section 7, P.9

- **Economically disadvantaged**—10% weight
  - 4 ways to qualify. Definition Section 2, P.4

- **English Language Learner**—10% weight
  - Existing definition used elsewhere in code. Section 4, P.5

- **Special Education**—10% weight
  - Existing definition used in IDAPA Rule. Section 4, P.5

- **Gifted & Talented**—2% weight
  - Existing definition used in code. Section 4, P.5

- **Grade weight**
  - K-3 students—10%
  - 9-12 students—10%
School or District Weights Section 7, P. 10

Remote School Weight

- 30 or fewer students
- 31-164 students
- 165-329 students

Small School Weight—Reflects current policy

- K-3
  - 30 or fewer students
  - 31-164 students
  - 165-329 students
- Grades 9-12
  - 30 or fewer students
  - 31-164 students
  - 165-329 students
## Enrollment vs. ADA

### 4 Student Enrollment Count Periods (Section 8, P.11)

- First Day of October
- First Day of December
- First Day of February
- First Day of April

### Payment Schedule (Section 10, P.12)

- August 15—30%, based on prior year
- October 15—20%, based on prior year
- December 15—20%, based on October weighted student enrollment
- February 15—15%, based on average October & December weighted student enrollment
- April 15—15%, based on average October, December, & February weighted student enrollment
- June 15—reconciliation payment based on average of all 4 enrollment counts
Career Ladder & Local Salary Schedules

- Career Ladder (Section 2, P.4 and Section 15, P.15)
  - Residency and Professional Endorsement based on combination of experience and performance.
  - LEA’s submit annual report to the state to determine placement of instructional or pupil service staff on the career ladder.

- Local Salary Schedules (Section 2, P.5 and Section 15, P.15)
  - Residency 1 and Professional 1 have required minimum salaries
  - Each LEA can create their own local salary schedule. No requirement to conform local salary schedule to state career ladder schedule.

- Based on the reports provided by LEA’s, the legislature will annually identify the percentage of the foundation amount per student associated with the state career ladder schedule.
Transition Period

Section 5, P.8

- Year 1 (2019-2020 School Year)
  - Run new funding model side by side with existing funding model
  - Rule making for additional clarity regarding enrollment counts
- Year 2 (2020-2021 School Year)
  - Hold Harmless + 2% Hold positive
  - 7.5% cap on annual increase
    - 7.5% cap does not apply to enrollment growth
- Year 3 (2021-2022 School Year)
  - Hold Harmless + 2% Hold positive
  - 7.5% cap on annual increase
    - 7.5% cap does not apply to enrollment growth
- Year 4 (2022-2023 School Year)
  - Hold Harmless + 2% Hold positive
  - 7.5% cap on annual increase
    - 7.5% cap does not apply to enrollment growth
Testimony on Senate Bill 1196 – Public School Funding Formula
March 18, 2019

Good afternoon Mr. Chairman and committee members. For the record, I am Sherri Ybarra, Supt. of Public Instruction. I appreciate this opportunity to comment on Senate Bill 1196.

While I supported the work of the Interim Committee to move to a more student-centered funding formula, the committee did not draft legislation and we did not endorse legislation.

We are still unsure how we would implement the new formula, and we are not sure how it will impact our public schools and students. Simply put, we need more time.

The last major rewrite of the school funding formula took several years and was done in collaboration with district administrators and finance staff who had the opportunity to help develop the formula and understand it before it was implemented. The new formula being proposed in Senate Bill 1196 is not well understood by the field. There have been numerous versions of the spreadsheet and district administrators and school boards have not had an opportunity to work with the new formula.

Beyond the lack of time for those in the field to understand the new formula, I want to reiterate the following concerns, which I shared in the joint House and Senate Education Committee meeting on February 7th.

• The latest model is still using incomplete current year enrollment data and comparing that to the last school year’s full-year data (2017-2018). This, along with including an additional $86 million minimizes the losers.

• The bill contains no off ramps in the event that future revenue does not support ongoing investment to fund the hold harmless provision. We still do not know what happens after three years or if there is a fiscal cliff for any districts.

• While many definitions have been addressed, there is still no provision for at-risk students. Not all at-risk students are considered economically disadvantaged.

• We need to make sure special education students are funded as needed. There is no assurance the new formula will adequately fund these students.

• While the payment schedule has been addressed, there are still concerns about the predictability and stability of the new formula, as my deputy of finance Tim Hill will testify on shortly.
• While the draft bill does recognize additional education attainment – the BA+24 or masters, there is a concern that by not including career ladder rung averages in the model to retain the current career ladder attributes, the new formula will incentivize districts to hire inexperienced or less experienced educators.

• We have heard a lot of discussion this year from legislators about accountability. Senate Bill 1196 does not address academic outcomes that are expected for the additional flexibility in the new formula.

• Superintendents have shared with me that they wanted flexibility to move funding between line items and to have fewer line items. They did not ask to move all the line items into one discretionary fund.

• The current formula funds “phantom students” for those districts or schools with declining enrollments because the 2% floor is on total dollars rather than on a per student basis as the 7.5% cap is.

• We have also heard concerns that the cap of 7.5% may prevent the Department from distributing all of the funds appropriated.

I will close with the question I am asked most frequently from the field. Why the urgency to pass a bill this year when districts have not had sufficient time to study the model and the legislation to analyze the impact?

This is an historical change to how we fund public schools. A new formula will likely be in place until 2050, long after most of us are involved in the education policy arena.

I would ask this committee and the Legislature to give the field and Idaho school boards more time to work with the new formula to better understand its impacts and recommend changes that would correct unintended consequences.

My staff and I remain committed to working on a new school funding formula and the accompanying legislation to ensure it can be implemented to the benefit of the students of Idaho.

Thank you Mr. Chairman, at this time I would like to turn this over to my deputy of finance, Tim Hill.
Mr. Chairman and Committee members,

My role in the Legislative process is to assist the Superintendent of Public instruction in providing policy makers with data and analysis to ensure expected policy outcomes.

I have two items to discuss regarding Senate Bill 1196:

- Enrollment dates used for payments to School Districts and Charter Schools, and
- Career Ladder average appropriated salaries

**Enrollment dates used for payments to School Districts and Charter Schools**

The current Public School Funding Formula calculates each school district’s and charter school’s salary and benefit apportionment based on average daily attendance (ADA) from the first day of school through the first Friday in November. Attendance for the remainder of the school year does not affect salary-based apportionment unless a school district’s or charter school’s best 28 weeks ADA increases by at least 3%. This recent legislation addresses student mobility funding. Salary-based apportionment and related benefits are on average 82% of a school district’s or charter school’s annual operating expenditures. This provision provides school districts and charter schools with funding predictability and stability to meet their instructional and pupil service staff contractual obligations.

Senate Bill 1196 provides that payments are based on the average enrollments as of the first day of October, December, February, and April. Using the higher of the October enrollment or subsequent enrollment averages would retain the funding
predictability and stability that the current Public School Funding Formula provides to school districts and charter schools, so that contractual obligations can be satisfied.

**Career Ladder average appropriated salaries**

The current Public School Funding Formula calculates each school district’s and charter school’s career ladder portion of salary and benefit apportionment based on instructional and pupil service staff’s placement on the residency and professional rungs. Each school district’s and charter school’s instructional and pupil service staff career ladder average (in dollars, weighted by FTE) is used to calculate salary and benefit apportionment. Career ladder salary and benefit apportionment correlates to staff hired. For example, based on the current year’s career ladder base allocation amounts, school districts and charter schools would receive $35,800 for hiring an instructional or pupil service staff placed on the Residency 1 rung, $36,750 for the Residency 2, and so on, with a maximum of $49,401 for the Professional 10 rung. These amounts exclude the Education Allocations for staff with a professional endorsement and a baccalaureate degree and 24 credits or a master’s degree. The current Public School Funding Formula allows school districts and charter schools to hire the best applicant, knowing that they will receive an amount commensurate with that applicant’s placement on the career ladder.

Senate Bill 1196 does not differentiate the base amount per student, removing the correlation between funding and staff hired.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify today.
Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee,

For the record I am Harold Ott, Director of Idaho Rural Schools. Today I am also speaking for the Idaho Association of School Administrators.

We want to acknowledge the three year effort of the interim committee in tackling the daunting task of creating a new funding formula. In addition, we are most appreciative of the efforts made this session by Chairman Mortimer and Chairman Clow to include stakeholders in nearly thirty hours of listening sessions relative to a new funding formula. Progress has been made. Positive changes have been made.

However, while the interim committee has spent three years on the new formula we have not had the formula in bill form for even one complete week. The model for computing the "rollout" revenue has been changing and we still cannot project four years out when the "hold positive" expires. This has caused a great deal of concern for school superintendents. They along with their business officials need to be able to predict revenue with reasonable assurance of accuracy. Budgets, programs, staffing and supplemental levies all hang in the balance. We have polled all six of our regions and the majority of the superintendents indicate they need more time to digest the bill and the model.

Following are specific assertions from the ISSA Board, ISSA Finance Committee and the IASA Legislative Committee:

1) There are still problems with inconsistent data. We recommend use of the 2017-2018 data for accuracy.

2) The "hold positive" provision at 2% is appreciated. However, we are concerned about the possible "cliff" after three years.

3) We support the ability of each LEA to negotiate their own salary schedule from the Career Ladder.

4) In the payment schedule, we appreciate averaging the weighted student enrollment. However, we prefer that districts be able to choose between the October count or the average, whichever is higher. Otherwise districts do not know their revenue until the June payment.

5) We appreciate the language addressing IDLA funding.

6) Alternative school funding has not been addressed.

7) With the numerous changes to technical language in Idaho Code, substantive changes to existing code and the creation of seven new code sections a great deal of time and attention need to be dedicated to avoiding unintended consequences.
8) We understand that enrollment definitions have been directed to the State Board. These definitions have budget impact.

9) We appreciate the education allocation for BA 2/4 & MA.

It has long been a goal to place and maintain a highly effective teacher in every classroom. Certainly experience and training with feedback go a long way toward that effectiveness. Yet this newly proposed formula does not pay districts for those experienced, veteran teachers. In fact, the way the model stands today districts will have to hire inexperienced staff to balance the budget. Tim Hill from the State Department has developed a formula that is directly related to the concept of funding by the student which addresses this concern.

We are pleased that there is an understanding that having the highest possible base funding per student helps ensure that districts can provide a thorough system of education. However, there are still some problems with uniformity depending on size and geographic location in the state. There is far too much dependency on supplemental levies to meet the constitutional requirements of thoroughness and uniformity.

In "no way" do I intend to belittle the formula or the efforts of the interim committee or bill writers. Much improvement has been made since the first draft. Nonetheless, this is still a "work in progress." There is no rush. Let's do it "right" not "almost right." Please hold SB 1196.
Mr. Chair and members of the Committees. For the record, I am Karen Echeverria and I’m the Executive Director of the Idaho School Boards Association. I am here today testifying on behalf of the over 900 school board members who govern all 115 school districts and over 40 charter schools in Idaho.

I want to first thank Chairman Mortimer and Senator Den Hartog for their willingness to listen to our concerns and make amendments to the bill based on those concerns. We do appreciate their efforts and understand their desire to move this issue forward.

While the specific concerns that we provided have been addressed, we continue to have some overarching concerns that I will be discussing:

**Recommendations from the Governor’s K12 Education Task Force**
I want to first talk about Governor Otter’s K12 Education Task Force. We heard many times that the Task Force recommended moving to an enrollment funding model. That is true. They also recommended moving to a career ladder funding model for teacher pay. I was a member of that Task Force and I can tell you that it was never or intent to combine those two recommendations. They were two separate recommendations – one for a career ladder and one for enrollment. My recollection of the enrollment funding was for all the line items that currently exist in law. It was not to have a five year plan for the career ladder and then move it all to enrollment.

But that is not what we have before us today and that is why it has been so difficult to try to jam a square peg (career ladder) into a round hole (enrollment funding). These two concepts are not congruous with each other.

**Process**
Much has been said about the process. We thank and appreciate all the work the Public School Funding Formula Interim Committee did to go out in the field and hear from patrons and tax payers around the state. We believe that was a good start to the process.
However, once those meetings were completed, stakeholders were excluded. While the task force met and began making decisions about weighs, enrollment, what should and should not be included in the formula, stakeholders believe their input was not heard.

That is evidenced by a letter that the Idaho School Boards Association, the Idaho Education Association, and the Idaho Association of School Administrators sent to the Interim Committee on October. The committee took no action on the requests in our letter but instead attached it to their final report. That letter nor its contents have ever been discussed since. I’m guessing that many legislators don’t even know that the letter exists.

The requests we made in that letter are still valid today and what we believe needs to occur with this legislation. I have provided the Committee a copy of that letter.

**PSFF Interim Committee Recommendations v. Legislation**

Many comments have also been made about the legislation drafted by the Interim Committee. My members believe it is important to note that the Interim Committee did not write any legislation. They issued a final report with several recommendations but they did not write any legislation.

At the September 24 meeting, Co-Chair Winder asked that a subcommittee be formed to draft the legislation. Representatives Horman and McCrostie, Senators Den Hartog, Ward Engleking, and Mortimer, and Dr. Clark volunteered to participate in drafting the legislation. The minutes also indicate that the Governor’s Office, State Department of Education, and State Board of Education would also participate in the drafting. All parties were included in the first meeting of drafting the bill. However, after that first meeting, Representative McCrostie, Senator Ward Engleking, and the government agencies were no longer invited to the meetings where draft legislation was being crafted.

It is critically important to note that at no time were the education constituents asked to participate in drafting the language of the first draft of the bill. Those people who will be responsible for implementing the provisions of the bill were excluded from assisting with the original draft. We firmly believe that had we been, this process would have been much smoother.
Specific Issues With the Bill
I would now like to address some issues with the bill that we think still need to be addressed.

Alternative Schools
The Interim Committee had many discussions related to Alternative Schools and how to deal with those students. However, there are no provisions for additional funding for alternative schools.

Allocations for More Experienced Teachers
We know that this is a touchy subject and that the sponsors of the bill have made some concessions related to this issue. However, we believe a more precise system of accounting for more experienced teachers will assist in keeping class sizes down and more experienced teachers in the classroom.

Technology Dollars
As was expressed in the joint letter to the committee and a previous email from ISBA, we believe that technology dollars need to be included in the formula and not kept as a separate line item. It is the only pro-rata line item that is excluded from the formula.

At the September 24 meeting, the committee discussed ISBA’s request but did not take any formal action. During that same meeting, Marilyn Whitney, then from the Governor’s office, noted that Governor Otter’s Task Force recommended adding more dollars to technology and eventually including that in the enrollment funding. Now that we are moving to enrollment funding, that should occur.

We obviously have concerns about any cliff that will occur at the end of three years when the guaranteed funding ends. In addition, we have concerns about the guaranteed 2% increase even if enrollment is declining in any given LEA. If enrollment declines by 15% over a three year period but the LEA has been provided at least at 6% increase, that means they will see a 21% decrease at the end of three years.

Funding Needed to Make This Work
ISBA’s members want to acknowledge and thank the legislature for the significant increases in funding over the last five years that have assisted in moving teacher’s salaries up.
However, we have concerns about funding moving forward. At the Interim Committee’s last meeting held on November 26, Speaker Bedke asked if the career ladder would stay tiered. Michael Griffith, from Education Commission of the States, responded that if the minimum salary schedule is used and updated each year, it would stay close to what it currently is. He noted that nationally salaries are about 60%-65% of school funding, but in Idaho that number is closer to 55%. ECS would expect Idaho to spend $75 million - $150 million more each year on teacher salaries and benefits than it currently does. That is just teacher salaries and none of the other items either out of or in the formula.

That is a significant amount of money and we would ask that the legislature have discussions about the consequences of the funding needed to make this career ladder work.

**Spreadsheet**

We also have some concerns related to the spreadsheet. Many of these come from business managers who have attempted to work with the spreadsheet.

First of all, there are many columns of data that are either locked so that users can’t access them or the data is unnecessary.

A question was asked last week about how an LEA can budget using the current formula. Michael Griffiths suggested that the Budgeting Tool on the spreadsheet could be used. However, anytime data is changed by one LEA, it has an impact on all other LEAs. While and LEA can manipulate their own data, if all the other LEAs are doing the same, it is impossible to know what the outcome will be.

There is a column on the Funding Comparisons Tab entitled “Items Not Included”. This is all of the line items that are outside of the formula. That column shows a 9.1% increase over the current funding. We are unclear how that increased was determined and don’t believe that it is accurate.

As I stated in my original testimony to the joint committees, we all know that this spreadsheet uses averages and not actual numbers. For instance, there is an assumption that the special education population in Idaho is around 6%. However, we don’t know if that is accurate. If it is, we are
certain that it is not evenly distributed among all LEAs. Not every LEA will have a 6% special education population. We understand it is the only way that this spreadsheet could be built knowing what we currently know. However, the spreadsheet could be far more accurate if we had actual counts.

Finally, we need to have a spreadsheet that shows at least three years of data. We need to see what the actual cost will be and what the cliff looks like for many of our LEAs.

**Ask**

In the end, I guess I can use whatever euphemism sounds good – the soup isn’t done cooking yet or the sausage isn’t yet fully made. In the end, my members don’t believe that this legislation isn’t quite ready for prime time. As such, we are going to ask for one thing.

If this legislation is passed in its current form or even an amended form, we would ask that you include a two year delay in actual implementation rather than one. A two year delay will do several things:

First, it will give us all time to address the issues that I have noted. Things like how to fund alternative schools and allowing the policy committees, and not the Interim Committee, to decide how to deal with technology dollars.

Secondly, it will allow the State Board of Education the needed time to draft rules. Rulemaking will be significant and lengthy and should not be rushed. One of the most important parts of this legislation is the definition of enrollment and that will be crafted during the rulemaking process. If we only have a one year implementation, it will be necessary for the Board to draft rules immediately in order for LEAs to know how to begin submitting data, and for the State Department of Education to be prepared to collect the data, during that first shadow year. The shadow year is critical so that special populations can be accurately collected and recorded.

In addition, having a two year implementation will allow the legislature the opportunity to review those rules next legislative session and approve, amend, or reject them before they become permanent. If LEA’s spend a year collecting data under a rule that the legislature then rejects or amends, all the data could be useless.
Finally, delaying implementation will allow Tim Hill at the State Department of Education a year to create a spreadsheet with more accurate data and one that we can all feel comfortable using. That will benefit both LEAs and the legislature when they look at how much will be needed to fund and how many, if any, LEAs will be facing a cliff.

Once all of those things are done, during the second year we will be able to adequately collect data and be fully prepared for implementation the following year.

**Close**

Again, thank you to all of those who have been involved in the drafting of this legislation. We appreciate the many hours of work that have gone into it. We are hoping that we will all come to consensus on a funding formula that is transparent, flexible, equitable, and accountable.

Thank you Mr. Chair and members of the Committee. I stand for questions.
Good afternoon. For the record, I am Blake Youde, representing the Idaho Charter School Network and I am here to comment in regard to Senate Bill 1196.

First of all, on behalf of the charter schools in Idaho, I want to thank you for the opportunity to participate in this three-year process. This is the most involved charter schools have been as a group in major education policy legislation in Idaho. We support this as good first step. Charters have long championed flexibility and local control of education. This bill is that first step. This is complex legislation, and I am sure there are changes that will need to be made before this formula is the vehicle by which public education funding is calculated and distributed. Please be assured we will continue to constructively work with you.

We all know Richard McKenna has a significant issue and needs a fix. We have another school (Elevate Academy in Caldwell) opening next year that will serve mostly at-risk students so this fix is important.

Additionally, there are five new charter schools this year that do not have enough data yet for the modeling. We will really need to watch them during FY 2020 and consider any necessary changes before full implementation in FY 2021.

There is one section in this legislation that we believe is very important and is worthy of more discussion and build-out.

Page 11, lines 1-3, state, "An LEA shall distribute the additional weighted foundation moneys allocated to it for the students identified as economically disadvantaged, ELL, gifted and talented and Special education to the school or district programs in which those students are enrolled."

That small subsection is the door to linking funding to outcomes. Directing weighted student to the specific program serving those students will allow us to see the impact of state dollars on student achievement. This is our opportunity shift the debate away from a variety of adult issues to “how do we build a funding system that allows policymakers, school leaders, teachers, families and tax payers to see how our students are performing and then make changes where necessary to help children succeed in school.” We look forward to working with you to build that accountability system.

Again, thank you for the opportunity to work with you on this important legislation. This is complex legislation and you are to be commended for your continued effort to involve every group. I believe not everyone gets everything they wanted but I’m sure each group is fairly satisfied. Note: If asked about per student funding favoring charter schools:

- 173 LEAs with average per pupil average at $8,856. 49 LEAs above average with only 15 charters above average.
Good afternoon Chairman Mortimer and members of the committee. My name is Kari Overall and I am the President of the Idaho Education Association. I am here representing educators from across the state to provide feedback on SB1196.

We appreciate the opportunity to provide feedback on the proposed legislation. We believe SB1196 is an improvement over the original funding formula draft presented in early February but it still falls short in answering fundamental questions which must be answered to ensure Idaho’s schools are funded by a system which is transparent, stable, predictable, and equitable.

SB1196 does not adequately fund for veteran educators. Idaho is currently 44th in the nation in teacher salary and ranks well below neighboring states. Despite the increases of the last four years in teacher salary from the Career Ladder Legislation, when adjusted for inflation, Idaho teachers have seen a 6.4% decrease in teacher salary. SB1196 removes the indexing provided to districts for hiring more experienced educators. Under the proposed legislation a district where the majority of staff have earned credits and acquired additional experience will receive the same amount of money for those staff as a school district which hires brand new inexperienced educators. Idaho continues to struggle to retain educators beyond the five
year mark. SB1196 will not help districts solve their issues with retaining educators beyond the five year mark.

Educators and districts begin bargaining for the subsequent school year in early spring. If SB1196 is enacted as is, a year from now, educators and districts will be bargaining under a new formula without a robust budgeting tool and without all the pieces of the puzzle necessary to adequately predict how much money is available for salaries. This hinders the ability of districts to recruit and retain quality educators and exacerbates Idaho’s already high attrition rate problem. We believe a more gradual roll out of any new funding formula model is imperative.

Last week stakeholders submitted questions we still had to this committee about SB1196. Many of those questions have yet to be answered. We believe there is no rush nor urgency to get the funding formula redone this legislative session. There is no mandatory time frame and it would be unwise to push a bill through without fully understanding the long term impact on students and school districts. We urge the committee to pull back this bill and continue this work collaboratively with all stakeholders in the same room.

We believe we could begin this process this year by passing legislation which switches from attendance to enrollment. This could be a first step in the process in moving toward a student-centered model. The Interim
Public School Funding Formula Committee cautioned against rushed implementation and emphasized the need to utilize a 3-5 year roll out of this process and ensure that the new policy is done deliberately and with fidelity. By heeding this counsel and utilizing a proven, collaborative method with all voices in the room, we can ensure Idaho’s students and schools are funded by a model which meets the original intent of the public school funding formula interim committee.

Thank you and I will stand for questions.
MR. CHAIRMAN, MY NAME IS ROD GRAMER, PRESIDENT AND CEO OF IDAHO BUSINESS FOR EDUCATION, A GROUP OF MORE THAN 200 BUSINESS LEADERS ACROSS THE STATE. THANK YOU FOR THIS OPPORTUNITY TO TESTIFY ON SENATE BILL 1196. IBE APPLAUDS ALL THE LEGISLATORS WHO HAVE WORKED SO HARD ON
DEVELOPING A NEW FUNDING FORMULA.

THAT SAID, IBE IS CONCERNED ABOUT THIS LEGISLATION FOR SEVERAL REASONS.

FIRST, THIS BILL GIVES MAXIMUM AUTONOMY TO SCHOOL DISTRICTS FOR HOW THEY SPEND STATE FUNDS - WHILE AT THE SAME TIME PROVIDING MINIMUM ACCOUNTABILITY FOR HOW THAT MONEY IS SPENT.
SECOND, THIS LEGISLATION DOES NOT ENSURE THAT MONEY FOR READING INTERVENTION, CAREER AND ACADEMIC ADVISING AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACTUALLY REACHES THE STUDENTS AND EDUCATORS WHO NEED IT.

THIRD, THIS BILL WOULD PUT THE LEGISLATURE ON THE HOOK FOR INFUSING ABOUT ONE HUNDRED MILLION
DOLLARS A YEAR INTO THE PUBLIC-SCHOOL BUDGET JUST TO MAKE THIS LEGISLATION WORK. HISTORY SHOWS THAT WHEN THE ECONOMY SLOWS, WHICH IT INEVITABLY DOES, THIS KIND OF INVESTMENT COULD BE UNSUSTAINABLE.

FOURTH, THE TEACHER CAREER LADDER DOESN'T FIT INTO THE FORMULA. THE GOVERNOR'S TASK FORCE ON IMPROVING EDUCATION RECOMMENDED
THAT THE LEGISLATURE CREATE BOTH A TEACHER CAREER LADDER AND AN ENROLLMENT-BASED FUNDING MECHANISM. THE TASK FORCE NEVER INTENDED FOR THESE RECOMMENDATIONS TO BE ROLLED INTO ONE LAW.

FIFTH, THIS LEGISLATION STILL INCLUDES A MECHANISM FOR A DISTRICT WEALTH ADJUSTMENT.
IF THE WEALTH ADJUSTMENT IS TRIGGERED AT SOME FUTURE DATE, IT WOULD HAVE THE UNINTENDED CONSEQUENCE OF DISCOURAGING COMMUNITIES FROM GROWING ECONOMICALLY - LEAST THEIR LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICT LOSES BADLY NEEDED FUNDING.

SIXTH, THIS BILL GIVES PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOLS A FINANCIAL INCENTIVE FOR
REMAINING SMALL, EVEN IN CITIES LIKE BOISE WHERE THEY VOLUNTARILY CAP THEIR ENROLLMENT - UNLIKE TRADITIONAL SMALL SCHOOLS IN PLACES LIKE MURTAUGH, THREE CREEK, HANSEN AND CAMBRIDGE THAT MUST TAKE ANY STUDENT WHO WANTS TO ENROLL.

SEVENTH, WE HAVE ALREADY BEEN TOLD THAT THIS LEGISLATION IS ALIGNED WITH
AN EFFORT TO DIVERT BADLY NEEDED REVENUE FROM OUR PUBLIC SCHOOLS TO HELP SUPPORT PRIVATE SCHOOLS – SOMETHING THIS COMMITTEE DID NOT APPROVE LAST YEAR.

EIGHTH, THE GOVERNOR'S TASK FORCE ON EDUCATION RECOMMENDED UPDATING THE SCHOOL FUNDING FORMULA TO MAKE IT SIMPLIFIER. BUT THIS LEGISLATION MAKES IT
ANYTHING BUT SIMPLE. ALL THE DIALS, WEIGHTS, AND UNINTENDED CONSEQUENCES MAKE IT MORE DIFFICULT TO UNDERSTAND AND TO IMPLEMENT.

MR CHAIRMAN, THIS LEGISLATION REPRESENTS THE BIGGEST CHANGE IN EDUCATION POLICY IN A GENERATION – PERHAPS IN THE HISTORY OF OUR STATE.
IT IS EVIDENT FROM TODAY'S TESTIMONY THAT THIS BILL ISN'T READY FOR PRIME TIME. IT HAS BEEN 24 YEARS SINCE WE UPDATED OUR SCHOOL FUNDING FORMULA SURLY, WE COULD TAKE ANOTHER NINE MONTHS TO CRAFT A BETTER, SIMPLIER, FAIRER, MORE ACCOUNTABLE AND MORE FINANCIALLY SUSTAINABLE BILL.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman
Scott Woolstenhulme, Superintendent of Bonneville School District 93.

Let me begin by thanking those people who have devoted their time and talents to develop this legislation. It has been an incredible amount of work that has resulted in many good ideas to improve our student learning outcomes.

In some aspects, the proposed formula will present new opportunities for school districts to be more flexible in meeting the needs of our students. But I am concerned that it could also set back our progress in key areas.

Over the last few years, we have seen tremendous progress from the legislature in meeting their constitutional responsibility to create a uniform and thorough system of public schools for Idaho students by raising teacher pay, providing increased funding to improve early literacy outcomes, creating college and career advising programs to improve the go-on rate, and providing for teachers' professional learning.

My biggest concern is that the proposed legislation may abandon the progress that we have made. Without dedicated funding, districts may not be able to continue these key programs.

I recently completed my doctorate degree in education technology. The most important thing that I learned in five years of course and dissertation work is that technology has a small effect on student learning but effective instructions has a large
impact. It concerns me that the proposed bill protects funding for classroom technology but not for teacher professional learning when everything we know about improving student learning tells us to do the opposite.

I am also very concerned about the ability of districts to continue programs for students who are academically at-risk. The legislation dedicates funding to programs for students who are identified as English language learners, gifted and talented, or special education. This works well for these programs. But instead of providing funding to programs for at-risk students, the bill dedicates it to economically disadvantaged students when federal Title 1 dollars are already earmarked for them.

The problem is that not all academically at-risk students are economically disadvantaged, and conversely, not all economically disadvantaged students are academically at-risk.

For example, only half of the students in our early reading intervention program are economically disadvantaged. Likewise fewer than 6 in 10 of the students who attend our alternative high school are economically disadvantaged. I am concerned that we will not have sufficient funding to continue to provide intervention programs for at-risk students unless they are specifically identified as a weighted population.

I think it would be wise to take more time to work with key education shareholders to better understand the implications and potential unintended
consequences of the proposal before adopting this landmark change to our public education system.

Thank you.
Chairman, committee members –

Thank you for the opportunity to speak with you today concerning the funding formula and senate bill 1196. I wanted to thank you for taking the time to review this legislation, to learn about how education is funded in Idaho and how this proposed model will provide funding for the schools and charters throughout the state.

While I am grateful for the time you have spent, I cannot support this legislation and the excel spreadsheet that has been developed.

Budget

I heard during a presentation last Thursday that was given my Michael Griffith that the new model provides LEA’s a better tool for budgeting. I respectfully disagree with his statement. Under our current funding model I can calculate what additional students will mean to our district, how much discretionary funding we will receive and also how much we can anticipate in funding for staff. It is our current model that allows me to do this. Under the proposed model budgeting will become immensely more difficult. Due to the floating base, meaning the base changes based on enrollment across the state, appropriation set by the legislature, and students within each of the weightings, I will not be able to truly figure out my revenues until the final payment of the year in June. Because my funding is impacted by both my enrollment, and the enrollment of my peers across the state, I cannot know whether our enrollment growth will be funded completely, and the impact of gained or lost students on our funding streams. This will require us to be more conservative, to push off larger purchases until further on in the year or delay them indefinitely until I can ensure that the funding is available. It will limit our ability to hire teachers and para-professionals, purchase curriculum, and the other necessary supplies our kids need to be successful.

Additionally, the protections that were identified in previous versions of draft legislation, protections that are available in our current funding model, protections that ensure an organization will receive no less funding than what is received in October, are missing from Senate Bill 1196, further making budgeting and the planning for enrollment changes extremely difficult.

During that same presentation I heard discussion from the committee that the changes in the proposed formula would not impact how districts hire teachers. There was a belief and a hope that educational leaders would hire the more experienced teacher, no matter how they are funded. Under our current system that is exactly how decisions are made. The impact the teacher will have on the budget is not a part of the decision-making process, but instead we hire based on what is best for our students. By receiving funding based on the experience level of our teachers, and their placement on the career ladder, we are effectively removing budget from the hiring process. Under this proposed model that will not be the case. While districts and charters will try their best to make decisions based on the needs of their students, there will come a time, perhaps not now, but soon, when a decision will be made not based on the needs of the students but instead the availability of one’s budget.

Spreadsheet
The funding model developed by ECS, the spreadsheet, provides a comparison of 17-18 funding under the current model to effectively 19-20 under the proposed model. In essence we are comparing one year's funding under one model to how it will look more than two years later under a new model. Being displayed this way makes it very difficult for districts to identify whether the formula positively or negatively impacts them. How are we to support or argue this legislation without understanding its impact on our district, and more importantly, our kids.

The excel spreadsheet posted on the web shows that West Ada will have an increase of $11.7 million dollars. Remember though, this increase is over two years. This $11 million dollar increase is effectively a 5.5 percent increase over two years, much less than the eleven plus percent West Ada has enjoyed under the current formula.

What you have heard is that with the hold harmless applied, all districts will receive more funding. While that is true, more funding might not be greater than what we are receiving under the current funding formula. The opportunity cost, the difference in revenues between the current and proposed model could be as much as $8 million dollars annually for West Ada. You won’t see this in the spreadsheet posted on-line, but only through analyzing the effects of the current and proposed model across each year can you see this. Eight million dollars is 4 percent of our budget. Without receiving these funds we can’t hire the approximately 40 more teachers and numerous para-professionals our classrooms need, bring in the best curriculum, and help our students become the leaders of tomorrow we all know and want them to be.

**Next Steps**

As I have said, I am grateful for the countless hours you have put in, and for the time you have spent away from your families working on education funding. It is through your hard work that education funding has taken a prominent role in this legislative session. However, I think we have learned that this model needs time and additional work. I would encourage you to wait, not move forward with legislation that could adversely impact our kids but instead take the time to ensure that the model that we end up adopting will work for all of the children of Idaho like our current one has.

Thank you for your time and for your consideration. I stand for any questions you have.

Respectfully Submitted

Jonathan Gillen
CFO – West Ada School District
Gillen.jonathan@westada.org
208-350-5951
Good Afternoon Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee,

My name is Lisa Sexton. I am the Assistant Superintendent for the Lakeland Jt. School District. It is an honor to be here with you today and be afforded the opportunity to provide input regarding SB1196. While we understand and appreciate your desire to modify the current funding formula in an effort to ensure that students are best supported in their efforts to learn, we have concerns about the current iteration of the new funding formula.

It is difficult for us to accurately identify the impact of the new funding formula because the models compare actual 2017-18 data to incomplete 2018-19 projected data. Instead of using the future projected revenues and student data, we would encourage the committee to use actual fiscal year 2018 funding data and run those numbers through the new model to more accurately identify the impact to our school districts. The budget team for my district has been watching closely as iterations of the original funding formula proposal have been released. Lakeland Jt. School District continues to be one of the districts with the greatest negative financial impact. Estimates from the most recent shared spreadsheet comparing 2018-19 funding to our actual 2018-19 mid-year apportionment report estimates a 4.15% reduction in state funding for our district, which equates to nearly one million dollars or approximately 20 full-time teachers.

We appreciate the stipends for our teachers with 24 credits beyond their bachelor degrees and the stipends for teachers who have earned a Masters degree. However, this proposal takes into account neither education levels (beyond the two stipend steps) nor experience. The impact of this will be additionally difficult for Lakeland because we have a veteran staff that is highly valued. We have been intentional in our efforts to recruit and RETAIN highly qualified staff, which is already difficult due to our proximity to Washington. This bill will punish us for our efforts. Our district office is 8 miles from the East Valley School District in Washington. Our teachers can now earn a significantly larger salary (up to $30,000 per year depending on which step they land on the Washington salary schedule) by crossing the border. Because of the close proximity, they can work in Washington while still enjoying the ability to live in beautiful north Idaho.

We appreciate the ability for districts to work with our LEA’s to decide on a salary schedule that helps us meet our goals. We value local control and would very much like to see the career ladder portion remain part of the funding formula and not a required salary
schedule. Additionally, the inability of districts to separate the dollars appropriated to support salaries and benefits from the “discretionary” dollars will make negotiations difficult at best and could potentially lead to more positional negotiations. We have worked hard in our district to move to interest-based bargaining. Currently our team works well to address common issues. Part of our success has been in being able to identify dollars that are meant for staff salaries and benefits. That will not be the case with this new formula.

One area that does not appear to be addressed in this most current bill is funding for alternative school students. It may be that the authors of this bill believe that these needs are addressed through the identified student weights for economically disadvantaged students, however, not all at-risk students are economically disadvantaged. The lack of funding for this most fragile group will be detrimental to our programs.

We understand and appreciate the efforts of our legislators to create a funding mechanism that more adequately supports our students. However, we cannot support the current bill as the data is not correct and as a result we cannot forecast our budgets accurately. We are opposed to any funding formula which harms any of Idaho’s school districts. We would love to see our legislators take one more year to work the bugs out of this model and make sure the language associated with it has the intended consequences. Thank you for your consideration of our input!
Good afternoon honorable Chairman and Senators.

My name is James Gilbert, I am the superintendent of the Mountain Home School District. I am here today in opposition to the funding bill.

Along with several concerns I have regarding the mechanics of the bill I am also concerned with the process to this point.

Mr. Chairman and committee members it is my belief that there is a serious transparency issue with the Public School Funding Formula bill. The process during the legislative session has been borderline secretive. Last minute meetings, private meetings, meetings with select organizations or groups, and the meetings with select individuals are some of the concerns I have with how this process has worked.

As a superintendent it has become very tedious to track the numerous iterations of the bill on the House side and now in the Senate. Many of these versions have drastically limited the opportunity for the public to even see a bill until the last minute. As someone who has followed this process and understands the bill, I feel I have had to devote significant time each day to stay current so I can advocate for my community. For most Idahoans, devoting the time to do this isn’t possible and I can only imagine how frustrating this must be.

This entire process needs to be transparent and needs to have all stakeholders voices heard. I urge you to delay this bill and to provide the opportunity for more transparency so all stakeholders are involved in creating a bill that is supported by those it impacts and those who will implement it.

Thank you Mr. Chairman for the opportunity to testify today.
Chairman Mortimer and members of the committee,

I am Byron Stutzman. I grew up on the farm and farmed for twenty years in Buhl before becoming an educator, ultimately landing in Saint Anthony as the Fremont County School District superintendent. Thank you for this opportunity to address you on the funding formula legislation, and I appreciate your dedication and desire to do what is right for all public school students in this great state of Idaho.

First, thank you for the 2% “hold positive” provision as Fremont County School District has consistently been the big loser in all configurations of the spreadsheet, anywhere from 8% to 15% depending on the settings of the dials. One of my worries is at the end of the 3 years of hold positive, not only will we be 16.5% behind the districts which gain 7.5% each year, but the districts in the hold positive will have a financial cliff.

Second, while I heard members of the interim committee state the current formula is broken, I don’t believe that to be true. The results of the survey administered by the interim committee shows that to be true, and I remember taking that survey. Yes, I should have thought through that question a bit better, because I answered yes to the question of whether or not I thought the current formula was broken. However, in the comment box, I distinctly remember stating the current formula to be broken because it is underfunded.

There are numerous other issues within this formula which I will let the more intelligent people address, but one thing I would request of you is the highest possible student base funding is provided. While I love to be first in most comparisons, second isn’t all that bad either. Second from the bottom in per student funding is definitely not the spot Idaho should be when funding our children’s and grandchildren’s education. Also, I believe we should eliminate the wealth factor from the formula. Fremont County School District is considered one of the “wealthy” districts by this formula’s definition. However, our median family income is by no means wealthy, and to place our district’s funding onto our patrons would be unconscionable. If you truly believe property tax is a portion of the funding revenue, then reinstitute the 3 mil levy state wide and utilize that revenue to help fund education. We all know how that would fly yet leaving the wealth adjustment in the formula to be leveraged at a later date is doing just that only just to the districts which have high property values. Is this forcing unfair or unequal taxation because of lack of funding?

As you continue to work to improve this legislation toward a win/win solution for all schools, I would ask that we take more time to get this completed correctly. The interim committee has taken 3 years to get us to this point. Let’s don’t rush it just because we want to “get er’ dun.” I definitely don’t want to hear the words of my father when, on the farm growing up, I didn’t do something well. He would say, “Why is there always time to do it over, when we didn’t have time to do it right the first time.” Please take the time to get this right the first time. The students of Idaho deserve the best, and we can give them the best education possible if we do this right the first time.

Again, thank you for allowing me to address the committee, and I stand for questions.
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- I want to **express appreciation** for all of the work that has been done by this committee, the interim committee, other legislators, and stakeholders in regards to this student-based funding formula.

- This version of the model is a significant improvement over the versions that we saw earlier on in the process. I believe that is due to those that have been working on the model taking input from stakeholders.

- We have some **small concerns** regarding the inclusion of the career ladder in the bill.
  - I understand the desire to include the career ladder in the bill due to its popularity and support, but what was so positive about the career ladder is that it **was directly linked to funding and that it projected out 5 years**. This helped districts and teachers know what to expect in the future, but **those factors of the career ladder are not included in this bill**.
  - While we appreciate the ability to negotiate our own salary schedules, as we are currently doing, we are **concerned that mandating the minimum salaries of the first rungs of the resident and professional portions of the career ladder may become unfunded mandates, especially if these teacher-based amounts are raised without making compensating raises to the student-based foundation**.

- **Again, thank you** for all the work that has gone into this arduous process.

- Stand for questions
Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Randy Dewey and I’m the Director of Finance for the Nampa School District.

I’d like to thank you for allowing public input on the funding formula discussion. As you can probably imagine, anytime business managers hear about a change in funding, we tend to want to voice our opinion.

There are many different areas I would like to discuss today but I only have 3 minutes so I’m going to focus on a few areas that I believe need to be highlighted.

- As you are aware, 33-1002B, Special Programs Support, highlights areas in funding that are not included in the funding formula. Examples of this funding are:
  - Transportation
  - Bond levy equalization
  - Advanced opportunities
  - Instructional education allocation
  - Master teacher premiums
  - Leadership premiums
  - Technology.

The current version of the bill does not specify if these funds are included in the 7.5% maximum ceiling. If included, a District runs the risk of reaching the 7.5% max because they hired more teachers, have teachers that received the master teacher premium, had higher attendance, bought busses, or had more students use their advanced opportunity money. Therefore, increases in these areas would effectively reduce the funding a district would otherwise have earned in the funding formula. The current excel model has these funds included in the calculation. I ask that this column be removed entirely out of the model as they shouldn’t influence the discussions on funding increases or hold harmless conversations.

- The bill does not create a funding base per student. The current calculation of the base per student is taking the total amount available to the formula divided by the total estimated enrollment in the State. If enrollment increases faster than the funded amount, the base allocation per student is reduced. In order for Districts to be able to adequately budget, we need to know what the base amount would be, similar to the operational base amount in the current formula. I ask that the State establish a base that is not influenced by the fluctuations of enrollment in the State.

- I’m deeply concerned that the excel model used right now is seriously flawed. It compares funding from 2017-18 to 2018-19 PLUS $86 million which essentially pushes out the comparison to 2019-20. The hold harmless is calculated based on two years data when 33-1002A states the hold harmless is based on only 1 year prior. Many smaller districts, and I believe legislators, will see this gain and believe their district is better off with the proposed funding formula when in reality, they may actually receive less.
I respect the effort of all those that have worked on this. Many have spent countless hours and many hours are still to come. That said, Senate Bill No. 1196 does not meet the needs of students as it is currently written. I respectfully ask that we please “pump the brakes” and not race to vote on this legislation. With more time, I know we can successfully create an updated funding formula that meets the needs of all the students in the State.

Respectfully Submitted

Randy Dewey
Director of Finance
Nampa School District.
Good afternoon chairman Mortimer and members of the committee, for the record, my name is Jeff Dillon, I am the superintendent of school for the Wilder School District.

Let me begin by thanking you for the extra work you have put into this legislation to move us toward an enrollment based funding formula. The ability for a small school district, with minimal staffing, to digest this major shift from ADA to Enrollment for funding is challenging to say the least. As this legislation has progressed over the past week we have become concerned about 2 specific items in the bill that has potential to decrease any funding increase projected in the recently release model.

1 – The term “Enrollment” or “Fractional Enrollment” has yet to be defined
2 – The payment schedule, and the averaging the official weighted student enrollment.

One of the Wilder School District’s biggest challenges is the mobility of our student population. According to our recent data analysis of mobility, which is defined as newly enrolled in the district at the beginning of the school year or sometime throughout the year or the exiting during the school year, we have a three-year average of 38% student mobility K-12.

The Wilder School District is requesting more time to work with our part-time budget consultant, to pin point the full impact of the proposed legislation and therefore determine the potential funding holdbacks that would be required for us to prepare for.

Next, IDLA – Dual Enrollment on our campus using our district provided technology.

Respectfully,

Jeff Dillon
Superintendent of School
Wilder School District
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Chairman Mortimer
Members of the Committee
For the records, I am April Burton, Business Manager of Caldwell School District

My comments today are focused on how “Economically disadvantaged” student is defined. You will find this definition on Page 4, lines 27-42.

You will see a reference in (4)(a) “excluding students who are only eligible through a school’s community eligibility program. This is referred to as CEP.
What is CEP? This federal program is part of the National School Lunch program. It is available to school districts that serve communities where families are experiencing extreme poverty.

So in addition to being low income, these are families in crisis who qualify for assistance programs to provide food, housing and other support. You may know them as SNAP or TANF.

CEP provides a streamlined process for determining student eligibility for the free lunch program by using state provided verification of those families receiving assistance. This is referred to as direct certification. Parents are not required to complete a free and reduced lunch application and the district is prohibited from requesting them to do so.

When a school or district qualifies for CEP, it must provide free meals to all attending students regardless of their family’s income level.

I believe there may be a misconception that all students enrolled in a CEP district would be identified as economically disadvantaged. This is not the case. The percentage of direct certified students is multiplied by a factor determined by the Healthy Hunger Free Kids Act. It is currently 1.6%. For the Caldwell School District, the percent of economically disadvantaged identified students is 74.4% after applying the multiplier. This percentage is consistent with Caldwell’s 10 year average of free and reduced lunch percentages prior to CEP eligibility.

The Federal Programs division of the Idaho State Department of Education uses the CEP percentage in relation to Title I-A funding. The federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act as amended by Every Student Succeeds Act do not eliminate students eligible under CEP.

If the CEP percentage is not allowed, Caldwell School Districts percentage of students identified as economically disadvantaged will be reduced to 46.5% which is not reflective of the demographics of the students. This will negatively impact the services available to the students of Caldwell School District. I am respectfully requesting this exclusion be eliminated from this definition.
3 minutes
N. Shalene French

Chairman Mortimer
Members of the Committee
For the records, I am Dr. Shalene French, Superintendent Caldwell School District. Thank you for the opportunity to speak today.

I am concerned that this legislation doesn’t include a weight for secondary alternative school students. Alternative secondary schools are essential to reach our shared goal for all Idaho students to graduate and to be empowered to make productive post-secondary choices after high school.

It is important that we clearly understand how we, as Idahoans, define an at-risk student. First, an at-risk youth is any secondary student grade six through twelve who has met identified at-risk criteria such as:

a) The student may have repeated at least one grade
b) They may have an absentee rate that is greater than 10% in the preceding semester
c) They may have failed one or more academic subjects in the past year
d) They may be two or more credits behind that rate required to graduate or to move on to the next grade level
e) They may have a documented or a pattern of substance abuse
f) They may be pregnant or a parent
g) They may be an emancipated youth or an unaccompanied youth
h) They may be a previous dropout
i) They may have serious personal, emotional, or medical issues
j) They may have a court or agency referral
k) They may have demonstrated behavior that is detrimental to their academic progress
Please note that an at-risk student is not necessarily an economically disadvantaged student, nor is a student of poverty necessarily an at-risk student. An at-risk student is not necessarily a special education student or an English Language Learner, nor are students with special needs or students learning the English language necessarily at-risk students.

Alternative secondary programs were developed to provide an essential level of support for some of our most vulnerable youth. By definition, alternative secondary programs are those that provide tailored instructional courses and services to eligible at-risk youth to enable them to earn a high school diploma. These services include day-care centers for teen parents staffed by qualified day-care providers. They also include social services such as officers of the court, social workers, counselors and psychologists, all of which is based on student need.

Alternative secondary schools are not open enrollment schools, but schools of necessity created to serve a vulnerable group of adolescents who are worthy of our effort to help them begin to recognize their potential and help them to begin “becoming” contributing citizens of our community and of Idaho.

This legislation is intended to create a new way of funding education based on student needs -- however, the needs of alternative secondary students is absent. Without this component addressed, the work is incomplete, I urge you to hold the bill in committee and allow us an opportunity to work together to address funding to support our at-risk youth.

Thank you Chairman Mortimer and committee members. With that I will stand for questions.
Chairman Mortimer and Senate Education Committee

My name is Shawn Tieg and I am the Superintendent of the Nezperce School District in Nezperce, Idaho.

I want to thank you and the committee for taking the time to listen to me today.

When I was just starting as an administrator, I was dealing with a particularly difficult student, a wise mentor told me... "Remember Shawn... every parent is sending us the best kids that they have." Of course, he meant that the parents are sending the worst and best kids that they have. The highest and lowest academic performers. The best and the worst behaved. In fact, they are sending us all of the kids that they have. Similarly, our school is the best, the worst, the ONLY school our community has.

My plea today as you proceed to consideration of this funding bill is that you don’t forget the little districts like ours and others. We are doing everything we can to keep pace with a rapidly changing state. Nezperce, Idaho... population 453. 140 kids in grades K-12. 2 school buildings, 1 gym and infinite school pride. I am asking that you don’t forget Nezperce and other schools like ours.

Ultimately, I am here on behalf of the Nezperce students... my kids. Nezperce is a small community, some might call it a village. Our nearest district is 15 miles away and several of our bus routes begin just after 6:00 am to ensure that we are able to get our kids to school on time at 8:00. Our community is committed to it's children. We have demonstrated this commitment by passing a levy, that runs between 15 and 20% of our operating budget, successfully for the last 30+ years. We have had skin in the game for a long time. Like many small, rural school districts we do the very best with the limited resources we have to provide our kids the skills they need to be successful in life. We know that many of these wonderful students will move on to other towns, cities and communities, but we are especially proud of those who come back with skills that can be reinvested back into our town. We are resourceful and we work hard to provide our kids with as many opportunities as we can.

What do we get out of this commitment? Only one of the best performing schools in the state. More than 70% of our kids score proficient of the ELA and Math ISAT tests. Compare that to the State averages. Our kids are perennial challengers for state sports academic championships.
and perform on-par academically with some of the best elite urban charters around the state. 90% of our HS students are involved in extracurricular activities and the vast majority of these students are involved in 3 or more. Our kids rock!

What do we get from the State in return? Quite honestly, this proposed formula would be a punch in the gut. “Awarding” us with flat or shrinking revenues and/or an increased financial reliance on local farmers, ranchers and agricultural support professionals all while large districts and urban charters reap a plentiful harvest.

With a quick search of the internet, I found that the mean average population of the cities in which each of the committee members list as a home address is 101,989. The median is 61,076. In fact, the smallest city, in which one of you lives is Grangeville, Idaho with a population of 3,166 citizens. With all due respect, I don’t know that there is a vision on this committee or in the larger legislative body of what it truly means to be a small rural school district in this state. Nezperce will likely never have a charter or private school. We will likely always be the sole provider of a plentiful OR deficient K-12 education for our town and surrounding agricultural areas. We are the simultaneously the best and only school our community has.

I know that it is tempting to simply state that every child is worth a dollar amount, but in many small districts like ours, this is illogical… At the Nezperce school district, we do not view every child as a dollar amount, we consider the programs that we want to offer. We need a high school, we need a certified English, Math, History, Science, Music, Agriculture, Speech. We need an elementary teacher at every grade level. If this isn’t the best for kids, why is it true in every district where the population base is higher? I am grateful that there are some built in protections for small districts like ours, but they are, quite simply, insufficient.

As a result, I am asking the committee to consider the following:

#1 Is a new formula which sees some districts gaining more than 133% of funding and others seeing cuts up to 7% after 3 years really a fair or good formula? This proposed change would a demonstration of the belief that little districts like mine have been receiving too much money historically. I believe more work can be done to ensure that there is not such a wide disparity of “winners” and “losers.” This is not thorough, this is not uniform.

#2 Would you consider a plan that provides a high school AND elementary school minimum payment for districts such as ours?

#3 After three years, there are no controls on this system. You and I both know that changes in legislation are difficult. Shouldn’t protections be in place to ensure that districts like mine are able to continue to operate beyond a three years window?
#4 Thorough and uniform: If education is best when it is primarily a function of local governance with the financial support of the state, why does this formula clearly pick the financial winners and losers?

#5 Why include a career ladder reference at all if the funding model is not related to where teachers sit on ANY ladder or matrix or grid.

#6 Why include a requirement for CTE Occupational specialists to be paid more, when there are no longer earmarked state funds to provide for this?

There is an axiom in business and engineering that while we all have a desire for good, fast, and cheap, it is never actually possible to get all three characteristics. As a leader of a small district, I would prefer Good and the legislature can pick the second adjective as opposed Fast and Cheap. I know that an interim committee has worked on this for years, but the legislature as a body has not. Please consider holding this bill to provide more time to consider the potential ramifications of a bill that really does create financial winners and losers. Don't hold the little schools back, we are the very “BEST” and only schools our communities have.

Thank you again Chairman Mortimer and this committee for your time and commitment to the State of Idaho and its people and Go Nezperce Indians!
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From: GwenCarol Holmes, Ed.D., Superintendent of the Blaine County School District.

Chairman Mortimer and Members of the Senate Education Committee, I am GwenCarol Holmes, Superintendent of the Blaine County School District.

Thank you for this opportunity to express my views on the proposed Public School Funding Formula.

As I know you are aware, the Idaho Constitution recognizes the importance of education for maintaining a vibrant state and therefore calls for the legislature “to establish and maintain a general, uniform and thorough system of public free common schools.” (Article IX, Section 1) Thank you for your relentless dedication year after year to make this happen for our children.

We work to ensure that every child has the same opportunities by having Idaho Content Standards that guide us in ensuring that children educated in Idaho, whether from the panhandle or the southeast or the southwest or even the central mountains where I live, graduate from our schools having received a uniform and excellent education.

Our children come to school, each one unique and precious, with the expectation, as given to them by our constitution, that each of them will be educated to the same high level regardless of their circumstances. As educators our obligation, and the expectation of Idahoans, is to make it happen for every child. There are no exceptions due to circumstances. This means our education system has to be based on equity, not equality. This is the fundamental priority that needs to be recognized if we expect to create an education system that assures that all students master the standards.

The proposed Public School Funding Formula is a recognition of the need for equity in fulfilling our constitutional obligation of a ‘uniform and thorough system of free public schools.’ The formula recognizes that all children must master the Idaho Content Standards and to do so will require that some children receive additional supports. It provides a base for all students and then additional funds for those children that need more support in achieving the standards.
The three children in this picture all want to watch the ball game. Being able to see over the fence is the minimum standard required. One child can do it on her own. Another child needs some support or a box to stand on. And the third child needs even more supports or two boxes to stand on. However, the end result is that all children get to watch the game.

This proposed funding formula directs our conversation to students. The questions that you must address are, 1) What is a sufficient base amount to provide the education to a “typical” student so that they can reach the standards? The Idaho Content Standards are rigorous and require students to be able to think critically while analyzing and synthesizing information from multiple sources. 2) What is the dollar amount needed to provide those additional supports needed by students who are learning English as a second language? For students with disabilities? For students from poverty or at-risk? For students that have a specific area of giftedness? For students attending small and remote schools? And so on. This conversation is about our children, our children. I welcome that and I applaud and support your efforts.
Chairman Mortimer, Committee members, for the record my name is Wendy Johnson, Superintendent of the Kuna School District. I am also here today as the President of Region III Superintendents.

My message today is to urge you to hold this bill in committee.

The reason is simple -- this formula needs more work.

You should have grave concerns about whether we truly know the impact this formula will have on school districts and charter schools.

It has been a challenge to analyze these changes because the spreadsheets have changed at least six times --- and the last one “Model to Match Senate Bill 1196” is just a few days old.

As we have all become more familiar with the spreadsheets, how they work, and the data sets supporting them --- we have significant concerns.

First, we continue to see spreadsheets that compare 2017-18 data to 2018-19 funding as well as 2017-18 data with future funding scenarios for 2019-20. These inaccurate comparisons are like a high school wrestler wrestling at his 7th grade weight class and being proud for beating everyone.

To really understand what the formula does, it is important to compare the same data set from the same year. For example, when superintendents in our region compared 2017-18 data to 2017-18 funding, 84 districts were “losers” even though the published funding formula that compared 2017-18 data to 2018-19 funding reported only a handful of “losers.”

I’ve also had numerous school districts report to me that the data sets within the formula are also incorrect. For example, superintendents have reported to me that they don’t have any ELL students but 54 students were listed in their school district data sets.
Again, I encourage you to hold this bill in committee and continue to work with stakeholders on this legislation.

Idaho is fortunate that we have time to do this right. We aren’t working under a court-imposed deadline or threatened court action. We have proactively identified a need to update our formula, and we have the time to do it right.

The bill before you isn’t “right” … it isn’t ready … and a bill with known mistakes and errors shouldn’t become law.
Chairman Mortimer

Members of the Senate Education Committee, thank you for the opportunity to speak today.

I am Mandy Simpson and I am a Trustee for the Nampa School District.

SB 1196 is not where it should be. The charges given to the interim committee were to create an enrollment-based funding formula with weights for special student populations.

Using the current numbers and the current formula we are not seeing equity within the local Education Agencies serving students in Nampa.

I am sharing with you a table with the 9 LEA's that serve Nampa Students. You will notice that LEA's w/ higher Free & reduced lunches are funded at lower per pupil rates.
- LEAs that serve a higher percentage of special education students are funded at lower per pupil rates.
- Schools that serve English Language Learners are funded at lower per pupil rates.

Nampa's analysis shows that the weight that is upsetting the equity is the small school factor. We support the small LEA factor for our small rural districts.

These LEAs that serve Nampa students are not rural. Senator Den Hartog spoke to the reason for the small school weight is to help rural schools. She also provided a picture of 3 students and 2 students needing more based on their height. If I were to use a picture to reflect what the current small school weight is doing you have the taller student on the largest step stool.
I encourage you to postpone moving SB1196 forward. As is, it is not meeting the overarching goal to create equity for the students of Idaho based on student needs.

Thank you for your time today.
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CONVENED: Chairman Mortimer called the Education Committee (Committee) to order at 2:02 p.m.

HCR 18 Vice Chairman Thayn presented HCR 18, Stating the Findings of the Legislature and Rejecting a Certain Rule of the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation. He stated this is regarding Docket No. 47-0102-1801. This proposed legislation is to ratify the findings of the House and the Senate in rejecting Section 500., Subsection 03.c.

MOTION: Vice Chairman Thayn moved to send HCR 18 to the floor with a do pass. Senator Winder seconded the motion. The motion passed by voice vote.

PASSED THE GAVEL: Chairman Mortimer passed the gavel to Vice Chairman Thayn.

H 194 On the behalf of Representative Clow, Chairman Mortimer presented H 194, Relating to Public Libraries; Wireless Internet Access. He said in 2011, Chapter 27, Title 33 of Idaho Code was created to address the concerns that minors were gaining access to inappropriate or indecent material through Idaho public libraries. The proposed legislation adds the words: publicly accessible wireless internet access to the current code. This is updating he filtering for public accessible wireless access. Chairman Mortimer said he would like to have H 194 go to the 14th Order of Business for a possible amendment to change the effective date from 2019 to 2020. He explained how libraries can qualify for e-rate money to help offset the cost of the upgrades.

DISCUSSION: Senator Ward-Engelking asked if the funding is to be supplemental. Chairman Mortimer replied that is yet to be determined. Some of the libraries have been receiving e-rate funding. He said extending the deadline out a year allows libraries to have more implementation options.

Senator Woodward asked if there is hardware available for libraries to purchase to make the filtering work. Chairman Mortimer replied each library is unique. He said it is his understanding that some internet providers have filtering services available to their clients.
TESTIMONY: Gretchen Casterotti, Director, Meridian Library, asked to hold H 194 in Committee. She detailed the past filtering process and the associated costs. She addressed the fiscal note in the proposed legislation and stated the costs are higher than projected. She said there is a lack of funds and technical skills to implement the filter. She expressed her concerns about rural libraries being able to facilitate this mandate. She assured the Committee that librarians monitor computer usage and discipline any misuse (Attachment 1).

DISCUSSION: Senator Den Hartog asked if it is her understanding that libraries are required to have a filtering system, and is the to expansion to include wireless filtering. Ms. Casterollili replied in the affirmative. She stated there are costs to install filters and costs to the staff for “whitelisting” specific terminologies.

TESTIMONY: Kate Lovan, Library Director, Middleton, Idaho, representing the Idaho Library Association, explained the proposed legislation would create a hardship for many small and rural libraries. She detailed the work the Middleton library has done to meet the current requirements. She stated it would be a financial burden for many of the libraries. She asked the Committee to hold H 194.

John Watts, representing the Idaho Library Commission, asked the Committee to move with caution on H 194. He said this can be done but not in the current timeframe. He said he has met with a variety of experts on this topic, and they each had a different opinion regarding the costs and the time to implement. He indicated that much of the costs to implement would fall to the individual libraries and not the State. He asked the Committee to adjust the implementation requirements out to 2020, so the libraries have time to research the best options.

Chairman Mortimer closed by thanking the librarians for their diligence in monitoring and filtering computer accesses. He stated the proposed legislation expands the filtering to include wireless internet. The concern that has been expressed is who will pay for the costs. He asked the Committee to extend the deadline to 2020 to give libraries more time to make more informed decisions in implementing the required filtering.

MOTION: Senator Winder moved to send H 194 to the 14th Order of Business for possible amendment. Senator Crabtree seconded the motion.

Senator Ward-Engelking stated her concerns regarding costs and funding. She said technology is changing rapidly and in the near future this may no longer be a concern.

The motion passed by voice vote.

PASSED THE GAVEL: Vice Chairman Thayn passed the gavel to Chairman Mortimer.

PRESENTATION: Laura Jordan, Intern, Boise State University, presented General Education Diploma (GED) Opportunities for Idaho Students. She shared with the Committee the research findings for an educational solution for those Idaho students who disappear from the education system without a high school diploma. She explained to the Committee how Idaho tracks students, the reasons why a student would leave high school, and the operational system of the GED program. The suggested solutions from Ms. Jordan's research include: incentivizing students to take the GED by paying for the exam, requiring the educational institutions to award college credits for scores over 175, and tracking exiting students until the age of 21 (Attachment 2).
In response to questions, Ms. Jordan explained the lack of school cohort information for those taking the GED. She explained the possibility of the community colleges being able to track the exiting students, because those students returning to earn their GED would be more inclined to look there for help.

Chairman Mortimer thanked Ms. Jordan for her research on this subject and stated it is important to address Idaho's drop-out student population and how they can be educated.

ADJOURNED: There being no further business at this time, Chairman Mortimer adjourned the meeting at 2:51 p.m.

________________________________________

Senator Dean M. Mortimer
Chair

________________________________________

LeAnn Mohr
Secretary
My name is Gretchen Caserotti and I’m the library director of the Meridian Library District and I’m here today asking you to hold your vote until HB194 has had sufficient time for review particularly on the fiscal impacts for smaller and rural libraries in the state. As a Library Director who went through the process of installing filters on the entire library network only a few years back I can assure you the direct and indirect costs are substantially higher than this bill’s fiscal note assures and do not end with a one-time installation. For the rural and smaller libraries in the state, even $2,500 can have a decidedly terrible impact on their overall budget forcing them to reallocate critical funds away from important public services and programs or worse yet, possibly remove access altogether from a lack of funds or technical skills on staff to implement such devices. I have deeply held beliefs that information should be freely accessed and that the rules of public decency and decorum are what can successfully be enforced in the public space without costly and imperfect filters.

Filtering programs function in a fairly simple way. Control lists work by either word or site blocking. Only limited staff is available to review sites, focusing almost exclusively on those in English and making subjective judgments about sites that only courts can determine are illegal. Blocking categories do not match a library’s selection criteria, nor are they based on the expertise of professional librarians. Decisions about what users may view are relegated to companies with no public accountability.

While I certainly understand the intent of this bill to attempt to protect minors, it is poorly researched and is ultimately an unfunded mandate.

Since moving here in 2013 I have enjoyed visiting and getting to know the libraries from the more rural areas of our beautiful state. It is truly humbling to see such tiny, underfunded public institutions providing such valuable and needed resources in areas with few community places. I have seen first-hand how few staff are found in these small libraries and from my position working with IT staff in the LYNX consortium, I am aware of how many, even here in the Treasure Valley, have lower proficiency and little IT support (even City libraries) to solve and troubleshoot even the simplest problems such as the orientation of the names on receipt printed hold slips. Adding a new requirement to add filters for these libraries with budgets under $100,000 a year would make providing internet services impossible without additional funding and IT support.

The perception that pornographic materials are a common problem in public libraries is frankly untrue. Spend time in our libraries and I know you’ll see an active learning center, a community center where public decency and civility is expected and enforced. Even WITHOUT filters in place. In my 6 years here in Meridian I can count the number
of times I have suspended a patron's privileges for viewing obscene materials on one hand.

My 8 year old son told me about the older 4th & 5th grade kids on the bus that showed him the video of how babies were made. As much as we want to protect our kids and control the content they are exposed to, at the end of the day, how we ACT and respond when socially inappropriate things happen is what matters. Requiring libraries to install and maintain expensive filtering equipment is NOT going to prevent someone who wants to view that type of material in any place (not just a public library). But what WILL happen is that an employee of the library will stop the behavior and issue a consequence to a violator of library policy which is the revocation of library privileges for a period of time. Because library staff are committed to upholding the principles of access and our social moraes for public decency and being a safe place for children and families.

I ask you to not pass this bill as written and allow for the Idaho Library Community to work with legislators to conduct due diligence in ensuring adequate funding for smaller/rural libraries and the technical support is in place before passing such a measure. No one here would argue that we should ALLOW these behaviors to happen in our public libraries. Indeed, we are swift to address and discipline such behaviors, which are infrequent. But we DO argue that legislation that impacts our state's poor, rural, smaller libraries, should be done with great care, thought, and support, NOT unfunded mandates.

Thank you for your time. I would stand for any questions from the Committee.

(test ran just slightly over 5 minutes)
GED Opportunities for Idaho Students

Laura Jordan
Senate Intern
Research Mission

• To find an education solution for Idaho students who disappear from the education system without a high school diploma

• To understand
  • how our schools track students
  • reasons why one leaves high school
  • the way the GED program operates in Idaho
How Schools Track Students

• All students, at the end of every year, receive an exit code for tracking purposes (e.g. transfer, home-school, medical-leave), from the district where they were last enrolled.

• If the district anticipates the student will be leaving the district, they usually expect to receive some kind of notice about what happened to that student, such as a request for educational records from another school in the state to which the student has moved.

• If they don’t have that record (e.g., not all states have agreements with all other states to exchange educational records), the student remains in their cohort and will appear, at the time of graduation, as a non-graduate.
How Schools Track Students

• Non-graduate numbers show the district does not know, at the time of a student’s cohort graduation date, the final educational outcome of a student.
• Data on these exit codes update multiple times a year as students re-enroll and dis-enroll in schools and adult learning programs.
• If a student never returns to school, there is no further tracking as there is no method to follow them.
Why Students Leave High School

- Exit Code Examples
  - Transfer to another school
  - Transfer out of country
  - Transfer to home schooling
  - Transfer to Adult Education
  - Medical leave/Permanent incapacitation
  - Expelled
  - Migrants
Why Students Leave High School

- Exit Codes of the unknown
  - Unknown
    - No known reason for having left school
    - Has not reappeared in the school system since last reported
  - Confirmed Dropout
    - District is directly informed that the student is disenrolling
    - Remains “dropout” until they re-enroll
### Why Students Leave High School

#### Idaho State Totals by Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confirmed Dropouts</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1150</td>
<td>853</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>929</td>
<td>1235</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: State Department of Education
How the GED Functions in Idaho

• To take the test one must…
  • be 18 years old
  • have parent or guardian signature if under 18
  • be an Idaho resident
  • not be enrolled in a high school
  • not have a high school diploma

• Consists of 4 separate tests
  • Social Studies (75 minutes)
  • Science (95 minutes)
  • Mathematics (120 minutes)
  • Reasoning through Language Arts (155 minutes)
How the GED Functions in Idaho

• Can be taken at one of 30 testing sites throughout Idaho
• Cost is $30 per exam or $120 for all 4
• Minimum score of 145 required to pass each section. Total passing score is 580 or higher.
• Test-takers who score in the GED College Ready + Credit level (175-200) demonstrate some of the skills that are taught in college-level courses and may be eligible for up to 3 credits in Math, 3 credits in Science, 3 credits in Social Studies, and 1 credit in English.
• Adult Learning Centers in Idaho colleges offer free GED assessments, learning materials and practice tests.
# How the GED Functions in Idaho

## GED State Totals by Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Testers</td>
<td>1,023</td>
<td>2,841</td>
<td>3,361</td>
<td>3,582</td>
<td>3,629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passers</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>1,215</td>
<td>2,064</td>
<td>1,975</td>
<td>2,128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass Rate (out of completers)</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Overall Score</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testers Scoring 175+</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GED 175+ Percentage</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: CTE*
Conclusions

• There is no standard or requirement for colleges in Idaho to give College Ready credits when a student earns over 175 on any of the 4 GED tests.

• It costs less to pay for the 4 GED tests than it does to keep a student in high school for a year.

• By incentivizing the GED, Idaho can reduce the number of students that disappear from the education system.
Solutions

- Future Legislation
  - Incentivize the GED by offering to pay for all 4 GED tests when a student can pass a practice test.
  - Require the colleges of Idaho to award college credits to those who score over 175 on the GED tests.
  - Require community colleges to track exiting students until they are 21 years of age and follow up with them once a year.
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CONVENED: Chairman Mortimer called the Education Committee (Committee) to order at 2:01 p.m.

H 120 Representative Ehardt presented H 120, Relating to Sex Education; Revise Provisions Regarding Sex Education. She stated H 120 is addressing parental rights regarding their child's education and emphasized this bill is about consent, not content. She explained the proposed legislation will change the sex education instruction's current "opt-out" option to an "opt-in" option and reported neighboring states and a Treasure Valley school district that has already changed to an "opt-in" alternative.

Representative Ehardt referred to the various Idaho statutes that address parental rights and reported that a specific sex education course, "Reducing the Risk," was taught in some school districts. She said the material discussed was beyond the scope of the State's approved curriculum.

DISCUSSION: Vice Chairman Thayn asked if this proposed legislation were to pass, did she expect the State Board of Education (SBE) to write the rules, like Utah adopted. Representative Ehardt replied what Utah is doing seems to be successful.

Chairman Mortimer said the proposed legislation uses the term "sexuality" three times, yet there is nothing defining the term; H 120 is about sex education and the ability to "opt-in" rather than to "opt-out" a student. He asked if there is a specific reason "sexuality" has been used in the proposed legislation. Representative Ehardt replied in the affirmative. She said sexuality deals with sex education and explained the instances where erotic literature is starting to appear in the literature classes.

Senator Mathias asked if he can't "opt-in" his child into this class unless he has read the curriculum. Representative Ehardt replied the local education agency (LEA) would set the criteria for the "opt-in" alternative.

Senator Mathias asked if there is the obligation for separate lessons for those students who were not "opted-in" to the sex education class. Representative Ehardt replied the LEAs would have a plan in place.

Senator Mathias stated the proposed legislation usage of "shall" adds burden to the LEAs. He would like to see that revised to "may."
TESTIMONY: Quinn Perry, Policy and Government Affairs Director, Idaho School Boards Association (ISBA), spoke in opposition to H 120. She said there are three objections the ISBA has with the proposed legislation: 1.) Conflict with current law; 2.) Practice, local governance; and 3.) Equity. She stated "sexuality" is not defined in Idaho Code, therefore, students would have to be "opted-in" into a variety of other courses to meet the State's graduation requirements. She explained the burden for LEAs to meet Idaho's Code to distribute information about bullying. She said H 120 puts the most at-risk students in greater risk due to lack of parental involvement. She stated the LEAs are cognizant of the sensitive nature surrounding sex education (Attachment 1).

DISCUSSION: Senator Den Hartog asked if this proposed legislation arose due to another State agency circumventing the proposed curriculum in those 17 school districts. Ms. Perry replied ISBA spoke with some of those districts and they assured her that they had followed the current process and protocol.

TESTIMONY: John Paulton, President, Family Policy Alliance of Idaho, spoke in support of H 120. He stated Idaho law states it clearly through code, that parents have the right to direct the upbringing of their children. It is important to protect that right, especially when human reproduction and healthy relationships are being taught. He stated this is not about content, it is about consent.

Donna Yule, President, Southwest Chapter of the National Organization of Women, spoke in opposition to H 120. She stated currently parents who don't want their children to have sex education can "opt-out" of the program. She suggested there is no need to change the current legislation (Attachment 2).

Brandon Durst, Boise, Idaho, spoke in support of H 120. He explained the "opt-in" option is a benefit for joint parenting and it allows both parents to be part of the decision making process. He said working with the schools' information systems could make the "opt-in" process simpler.

Reverend Sara LaWall, Pastor, Boise Unitarian Universalist Fellowship, Boise, spoke in opposition to H 120. She stated she is the primary leader of her child's sex education, yet she understands that she might not be the most effective. She said the information from the public schools is age appropriate and comes from a trusted source. The current system works well.

Joann Wortman, Boise, Idaho, spoke in support of H 120. She stated this is about parental choice.

Lori Gash, Health Coordinator, West Ada School District spoke in opposition to H 120. She cited the statutes that were used in the presentation also address school boards responsibilities. She explained the logical issues for schools when students are "opted-out" of certain curriculum. She expressed her concern for the most vulnerable and at risk students who would not be receiving the additional education. Ms. Gash noted that when bullying and abuse subjects are taught, there is an increase of self-reporting. She stated the West Ada district is sensitive to this subject and parents do have the right to "opt-out" (Attachment 3).

Kari Overall, President, Idaho Education Association (IEA), spoke in opposition to H 120. She said the IEA believes in age appropriate sex education which should include parental orientation. She explained the commitment educators make to teach the standards with fidelity and adhering to their professional standards and code of ethics. She said parents have the right to opt out their children. The IEA believes the current statutes that are in place are sufficient (Attachment 4).
Reverend Marci Glass, Pastor, Southminster Presbyterian Church, spoke in opposition to H 120. She told her personal story of what happens when sex education is not accessible. She said sex education matters because some children don’t hear it best from their parents.

Paul Rolig, Boise, Idaho, spoke in opposition to H 120. He said better sex education programs result in healthier attitudes and fewer unplanned pregnancies. He noted the word "sexuality" in the proposed legislation is a cause for concern. This undefined word may encroach on other education subjects.

Representative Ehardt stood for questions from the Committee.

DISCUSSION: Vice Chairman Thayn asked if "opting-in" to the sex education courses could be regulated by LEAs. Representative Ehardt replied school boards are not aware of what is going on in their schools. "Opting-in" makes parents aware of what is going on their student's classroom.

Senator Woodward said currently school districts have the option to either have an "opt-out" or an "opt-in" choices. He asked if the intent of the proposed legislation is that districts can only have "opt-in" for students to learn sex education. Representative Ehardt replied in the affirmative. She said the school districts have succinct direction and they can choose the material they would like to have taught.

Senator Woodward said the shift would state that school districts would have no option except to have an "opt-in" process. Representative Ehardt replied in the affirmative.

Senator Ward-Engelking said there are probably other ways to address Representative Ehardt's concerns. She said the fiscal note is incorrect and making a mandatory "opt-in" is unreasonable.

MOTION: Senator Ward-Engelking moved to hold H 120 in Committee. Senator Mathais seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION: Vice Chairman Thayn said he tends to support parents' rights and for many reasons "opt-in" could be a good direction for school districts. He said the one concern he has regards the definition for sexuality. The looseness could exclude anatomy and physiology, biology, and some literature courses from being taught.

Senator Den Hartog said she has struggled with the proposed legislation. She stated she is a strong supporter of parental rights and believes an "opt-in" could be beneficial. She said the problems arose in teaching because another State agency circumvented current statutes and that needs to be addressed. Senator Den Hartog stated that agency bears some responsibility and she has grave concerns regarding the process that was done to get those particular materials into the classroom.

VOICE VOTE: The motion to hold H 120 in Committee passed by voice vote, with Vice Chairman Thayn requesting that he be recorded as voting nay.

ADJOURNED: There being no further business at this time, Chairman Mortimer adjourned the meeting at 3:15 p.m.
Thank you Mister Chairman and committee,

My name is Quinn Perry and I'm the Policy and Government Affairs Director for the Idaho School Boards Association. I'm here today on behalf of the 900 school board members who volunteer their time serving their local school districts and charter schools across the state. We are opposed to House Bill 120 and would ask that you hold it in committee/send it to the 14th order for amendment.

Our objections can be summed up in three points – **its conflict with current law and practice, local governance, and equity.**

One of the largest concerns we have is that “sexuality” is not defined in state code. Offhand, we have thought of various areas of instruction where sexuality as an undefined term could spill into - including Anatomy & Physiology, Biology, History, Literature, and even animal sciences. This means Districts and Schools would be only able to teach many segments of these courses – some of which are required in order to graduate – to students whose parents or guardians explicitly opt their students in.

Another example of conflict is that schools and districts are required to disseminate information on harassment, intimidation and bullying, annually to all school personnel, parents and students. A large component of this information includes sexual harassment or assault prevention and response. Hypothetically, as written, this legislation would prevent that distribution on these extremely important topics unless there was explicit consent from every student’s parent or guardian. These are just a few examples as to why the language of the proposed legislation is particularly broad and could be unintentionally burdensome for our schools and districts.

We really see this as a local governance issue. School boards are duly elected or appointed by their community. If the board, with input from their patrons, felt it was best for their school to offer their sex education courses as an opt-in, they are completely within their right to do that.

I’d also like to point out that parents and guardians have ample opportunities to view any and all instructional materials that their student will see and can request an alternate lesson. But HB 120 is lacking a fiscal note, which will create an unfunded mandate at the local level.
Undoubtedly, an opt-in system is going to cost districts and schools in the areas of alternative classroom space, instruction, and supervision.

Lastly, as a part of ISBA’s vision, we do not believe the proposal before you is equitable because it has the potential of putting our most at-risk students at an even greater risk. Many students are lucky enough to have involved parents or guardians who initiate and have ongoing discussions around sex and reproductive health. Many students, however, are simply not so lucky.

I want to close by saying that schools and districts are extremely cognizant of the sensitive nature surrounding sex education and reproductive health. No district or school desires to cross boundaries, and many districts go beyond what is required to make parents/guardians aware of their parental rights and options.

We ask you to consider our concerns with House Bill 120. Thank you, Mister Chairman, and I’d be happy to stand for questions.
Hello, Chairman Mortimer and members of the committee.

My name is Donna Yule, and I’m the President of the SW Idaho Chapter of the National Organization for Women. I am here to speak in opposition to House Bill 120.

The theme of the 2019 Legislature seems to be Why Fix it if it ain’t broken? This bill is a perfect example. There is nothing wrong with our current system of asking parents who object to sex education for their children to opt out. There is a lot wrong with asking the large percentage of parents who understand and value the importance of sex education to opt in.

Most of NOW’s members are mothers and grandmothers. I raised three sons in Idaho, and I now have five grandchildren, three of whom are attending school in Boise. My guess is that some of you are parents. I remember what it was like when I had three teenage sons in my house, and I see the same thing at my son’s house where he has three teenagers. It is barely controlled chaos.

Asking all those parents to sign yet another form, and one that is unnecessary, and make sure it gets returned to the teacher is just silly. We all know how easy it is for a form to get lost, or not make it home in the first place.

We all know that some parents, even the very best parents, don’t always adequately teach their children about sex. Maybe that is because they are uncomfortable having the discussion, or, more likely, that the sex talk gets lost in the busy schedule of ball games, concerts, and all the other activities kids have.
However, those parents who have a truly held religious belief that leads them to believe sex education is bad, will have no problem remembering to fill out a form for their children to opt out of sex education.

Passage of this bill will mean that many children, those whose parents would have no objection to sex education classes, will be denied sex education simply because this body decided to add another piece of bureaucracy to our already busy lives.

Statistics show that when children have factual sex education, teenage pregnancies and teenage abortions decline. That alone should be enough reason to want all of our Idaho children to have access to a good sex education program.

I ask you to vote against House Bill 120.

Thank you.
March 20, 2019 - HB 120 Talking Points

1. Idaho Code 33-6001 – For large school districts this exceeds “Reasonable accommodation” means the school shall make its best effort to enable a parent or guardian to exercise their rights without substantial impact to staff and resources, including ...  
   - Employee working conditions  
   - Efficient allocation of expenditures  
   - Educational needs of other students  
   - Teacher’s workload

2. Idaho Code 33-1608 – Gives control to the local school board to oversee this area of instruction. We have a very transparent system in West Ada. I have proved a summary of what we do and would be happy to share this with any district who asks.

3. Idaho YRBS Data – According the most recent Idaho Youth Risk Behavior Survey over 35% of our high school students are sexually active. This is self-reported data. Actual percent is much higher.

4. Summary of concerns about new approach –
   - We know from experience that this becomes a very significant logistical issue in our already overcrowded classrooms. This will place undue tracking requirements on our teachers. We have over 3000 students at each grade level.
   - Additionally, this change could potentially prevent student access to our board-approved district curriculum which is based on our legislatively-approved state standards.
   - Change from Opt-Out to Opt-In will limit access to critical health information to all of our student and could potentially target our most vulnerable and most at-risk student who may not have high parent involvement.
   - Concerns that his bill has been written without full knowledge of long-term impacts on our students and our state  
     - The majority of Opt-In States have higher rates of teen births, teen STDs and teen sexual assault
   - Let’s take some more time to learn more about these issues and make a new proposal that involves all stakeholders
   - If we must act this year, I would ask that it remain Opt-Out but perhaps add wording to the bill that would require the following:  
     - Parent preview of content and teaching materials  
     - Opt-Out form to be sent home with all students 2 weeks prior, not simply housed on the website for parents to “find” (this would be a change for our district, but one we would be happy to make)
   - This would allow for more open communication and transparency

5. The West Ada Process – See back of this page
West Ada Process continued...

- 4th Grade Growth and Development Presentations: Signed permission slips are required. Parent preview nights are provided. Students learn information based on their own gender.
- 6th Grade Growth and Development Presentations: Signed permission slips are required. Parent preview nights are provided. Students learn information based on both genders in gender separate presentations.
- 8th Grade Human Sexuality and STD Presentations: During the registration process parents choose which philosophy of health they want their students to take. The differences are articulated within our curriculum. The primary differences between the two levels include methods of preventing pregnancy and STDs beyond abstinence. These methods are addressed in the philosophy 2 classes only. In our district, approximately 2/3 of our parents choose to enroll their students in P2 courses. All instruction centered around reproduction, STDs and methods of preventing both is presented during gender separate presentations. Parents have the opportunity each semester to preview the materials used for instruction and have the choice to opt-out of this presentation.
- High School Health – Used to have multiple levels as well, but we could no longer sustain this approach with scheduling and low numbers in the P1 courses. We now have one level with preview opportunities for parents and an opportunity for parents to opt out.

6. West Ada Health Policy – 602.40 (attached)
7. West Ada Guest Speaker Policy – 1001.20 (attached)
8. West Ada Guest Speaker Request Form (attached)
Good morning Chairman Mortimer and members of the committee. For the record my name is Kari Overall, and I am the President of the Idaho Education Association. I am speaking in opposition to HB120 on behalf of educators across the state.

The IEA believes in age-appropriate sex education. The IEA believes all sex education should include parent orientation and be planned and implemented with careful attention to developmental needs, appropriateness to community settings and values, and respect for individual differences.

The IEA echoes many of the concerns expressed by ISBA including the lack of definition in code for sexuality. A very broad definition of the word “sexuality” would require prior notification for teaching works of literature, some aspects of science including biology, agricultural related courses like animal husbandry, and social sciences including most history and humanities courses. Without a clear definition, we believe this legislation could hinder educator’s ability to teach current Idaho content standards in a variety of subject areas.

We understand that there is a particular interest in being very careful about classes in what we traditionally call “sex education” for young people. We recognize parents currently have the option to “opt out” of traditional sex education classes. Many children in Idaho benefit from the sensitive and careful way our schools and communities introduce students to this important and sensitive topic in life. Parents already have the right to opt their children out of these classes as it stands, and we believe this is sufficient.

We urge you to oppose HB120. Thank you and I will stand for questions.
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CONVENED: Chairman Mortimer called the Education Committee (Committee) to order at 2:07 p.m. He opened with a reading from the book, A Heap O 'Living Along Life's Highway, by Eager A. Guest, "Failures."
MINUTES APPROVAL: Senator Crabtree moved to approve the Minutes of February 13, 2019. Senator Den Hartog second the motion. The motion passed by voice vote.
Senator Ward-Engelking moved to approve the Minutes of February 14, 2019. Senator McCoy second the motion. The motion passed by voice vote.
Senator Den Hartog moved to approve the Minutes of February 20, 2019. Senator Ward-Engelking second the motion. The motion passed by voice vote.
PAGE GRADUATION: Chairman Mortimer thanked Taylor McMullin for her service to the Legislature and asked her to come to the podium to speak about her experience.
Ms. McMullin said she enjoyed her experience as a page and especially liked serving on the Education Committee because it is personally applicable to her. She detailed her plans after her high school graduation.
DISCUSSION: Chairman Mortimer lead the discussion regarding the accomplishments of the Committee for the 2019 legislative session. He addressed the concerns of the Public School Funding Formula and asked the Committee if they could be available, if needed, to meet during the interim to work on future education legislation. The request was met with favor.
ADJOURNED: There being no further business at this time, Chairman Mortimer adjourned the meeting at 2:24 p.m.

___________________________  _______________________
Senator Dean M. Mortimer   LeAnn Mohr
Chair                      Secretary
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CONVENED: Chairman Mortimer called the Education Committee (Committee) to order at 8:01 a.m. He opened with a reading from the book, *A Heap O 'Living Along Life's Highway*, by Eager A. Guest, "Wisdom."

H 293 Senators Lent and Woodward presented H 293, Relating to Education; Public School Funding Formula (PSFF). Senator Lent thanked those who contributed to updating the PSFF. He said the proposed legislation is the building block for the next step in developing a new PSFF. He said H 293 is to determine base definitions for specific educational terminology. These definitions will aid in the collection of data to then better build the PSFF.

Senator Woodward walked the Committee through the proposed updates. He said what seemed to stall the prior PSFF proposed legislation was the lack of current and correct data. There is a need to collect the enrollment data to make better decisions that will lead to child centered funding. He acknowledged the concerns from the stakeholders regarding the pay scale for teachers. He said the intent is to only define the term, not to change the pay scale or to set the Career Ladder.

TESTIMONY: April Burton, Business Manager, Caldwell School District, said the proposed legislation needs to make changes regarding the "economically disadvantaged student." She explained how the district calculates that student from the multiplier provided by the federal government. She explained the importance of the community eligibility program (CEP) and how many districts would be negatively impacted. She asked the Committee to please address the CEP (Attachment 1).

Senator Winder asked if she knew how the multiplier number was derived. Ms. Burton replied it is provided by the federal government. She said she would report back to him how that specific percentage is determined.

Rob Winslow, Executive Director, Idaho Association of School Administrators (IASA), spoke in support of the collection of data and wanting the data to be as accurate as possible. He listed the concerns to the proposed legislation and asked the Committee to consider those through the rulemaking process (Attachment 2).
Matt Compton, Director of Public Policy, Idaho Education Association (IEA), spoke in favor of H 293 and said the proposed legislation is moving to a more equitable per-pupil funding. He asked that a letter be drafted so both sides of the bargaining table can use it to conduct salary negotiations without disruption (Attachment 3).

Quinn Perry, Policy and Government Affairs Director, Idaho School Boards Association (ISBA) stated H 293 is an appropriate step in the switch to a new funding formula. She outlined to the Committee the ISBA's concerns (Attachment 4).

Blake Youde, Idaho Charter Schools Network (ICSN), spoke in support of H 293. He said there is some disappointment that the process only made it this far and detailed how the 25 year old funding formula does not meet the current needs of students. He said the ICSN will work with the Committee in the rulemaking process (Attachment 5).

**DISCUSSION:** Senator Den Hartog emphasized that the proposed legislation's definition for the local salary schedule and gathering data are not anywhere in code. This is not a statute but only a definition.

Senator Woodward explained the determination of the CEP 1.6 multiplier. He stated that the PSFF did not turn out exactly how it was anticipated, but H 293 is the step needed to gather the required data to better fund student enrollment.

Senator Lent, using a football analogy, said while this was not a touchdown, it was a field-goal. He explained that good governance includes good management and good leadership. He said data driven decisions need good data. This proposed legislation will provide good data to develop a better funding formula. He emphasized the need for the momentum to continue.

Chairman Mortimer stated there are some issues with the CPE. He concurred with Senator Lent regarding the need to collect accurate data for making better funding decisions.

Senator Winder explained the Interim PSFF Committee's work. He said once the interim work is completed it is handed off to the Germane Committee to make the final decision. He said throughout the Germane Committee's work it was discovered that the data was incomplete. H 293 offers the opportunity to access the correct data to set the funding policy for the next legislative session. He suggested the Committee play a role in the rulemaking process.

Chairman Mortimer asked Tracie Bent, Chief Planning and Policy Officer, State Board of Education (SBE), to the podium to explain the details and dates of negotiated rulemaking.

Ms. Bent detailed the process the SBE uses for writing rules and named the locations and dates for the meetings. She said she would include Committee members in the email notifications so they could participate in the process.

**MOTION:** Senator Winder moved to send H 293 to the floor with a do pass recommendation. Senator Crabtree seconded the motion.

**DISCUSSION:** Senator Den Hartog expressed her appreciation for the combined work of legislators and stakeholders. She said the tenacity to find a solution is the first step in the process of making changes to the education system. She said this critical juncture in education funding is one part of the puzzle to make education more effective. She said based on the information from the executive summary in the Student Achievement and Accountability Report, it is of upmost importance that improving student education is addressed.
Senator McCoy said it is with better information gathering that better decisions are made. We can work together to better support students, stakeholders, and communities. She said she will be supporting H 293.

**VOICE VOTE:** The motion to send H 293 to the floor with a do pass recommendation passed by voice vote.

**ADJOURNED:** There being no further business at this time, Chairman Mortimer adjourned the meeting at 8:39 p.m.

___________________________
Senator Dean M. Mortimer
Chair

___________________________
LeAnn Mohr
Secretary
April 3, 2019
Senate Education Hearing

Chairman Mortimer
Members of the Committee
For the records, I am April Burton, Business Manager of Caldwell School District

My comments today are focused on how “Economically disadvantaged student” is defined. You will find this definition on Page 2, lines 42 item (8)(a) “Is eligible for a free or reduced-price lunch …… excluding students who are only eligible through a school’s community eligibility program. This is referred to as CEP. CEP is a federal program included in the National School Lunch program. It is available to school districts that serve communities where families are experiencing extreme poverty.

So in addition to being low income, these are families in crisis who qualify for assistance programs to provide food, housing and other support. You may know them as SNAP or TANF.

CEP provides a streamlined process for determining student eligibility for the free lunch program by using state provided verification of those families receiving assistance. This is referred to as direct certification. Parents are not required to complete a free and reduced lunch application and the district is prohibited from requesting them to do so.

When a school or district qualifies for CEP, it must provide free meals to all attending students regardless of their family’s income level.

I believe there may be a misconception that all students enrolled in a CEP district or school would be identified as economically disadvantaged. This is not the case. The percentage, of direct certified students, is multiplied by a factor determined by the Healthy Hunger Free Kids Act. It is currently 1.6%. Direct certification does not capture those students qualifying for reduced-price lunch hence the reason for the multiplier. For the Caldwell School District, the percent of economically disadvantaged identified students is 74.4% after applying the multiplier. This percentage is consistent with Caldwell’s 10 year average of free and reduced lunch percentages prior to CEP eligibility.

The Federal Programs division of the Idaho State Department of Education uses the CEP percentage in relation to Title I-A funding. The federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act as amended by Every Student Succeeds Act do not eliminate students eligible under CEP.

If the CEP percentage is not allowed, Caldwell School Districts percentage of students identified as economically disadvantaged will be reduced to 46.5% which is not reflective of the demographics of the student population. This will negatively impact the services available to the students of Caldwell School District. I am respectfully requesting this exclusion be eliminated from this definition.
Testimony for SBFF Definitions and Reporting HB293

Rob Winslow

Idaho Association of School Administrators (superintendents, principals, special education directors in charter schools and school districts)

We support the collection of data in preparation for a student-based funding formula. Toward that end we want our data to be as accurate as possible. That said, we do have a few concerns.

1. At-risk students- Since many school districts do not have alternative schools for at-risk students, they have not identified any at-risk students.
2. Economically disadvantaged students- Students in community eligibility program schools are excluded. Districts are prohibited from collecting free or reduced-priced applications from the parents of those students. Some districts would lose up to 60% of their economically disadvantaged student count with this definition.
3. Local Salary Schedules- Currently, only the starting minimum salary R1, is required by districts and charters. This would require a minimum salary in the professional endorsement cell, P1.
4. The definitions for enrollment must be completed before data collection to ensure accuracy. (Page 6, lines 17-46)
5. Clarification for beginning dates for financial reporting. Page 7, line 34 states “Beginning in 2020.” Does this mean school year 20-21?
6. Information on Page 7, lines 38-41 are already collected by the SDE.
7. Regarding the expenditure request on Page 7, lines 42-46. We already know that approximately 50% of discretionary spending is for health insurance benefits. Salaries for teachers, pupil personnel, classified, and administrators consume a large share of the remaining 50%. Fixed costs, such as utilities take up the rest of the expenditure. Many districts run supplemental levies. The moneys from the levies are co-mingled with discretionary money and other general fund revenues.

Thank you for the opportunity for input. I will stand for questions.
THANK YOU CHAIRMAN MORTIMER AND MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE. MY NAME IS MATT COMPTON AND I AM THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC POLICY FOR THE IDAHO EDUCATION ASSOCIATION.

FIRST, I WOULD LIKE TO THANK THE SPONSORS OF THE BILL FOR REACHING OUT TO OUR ASSOCIATION AND PROVIDING ASSURANCES THAT ADDRESS OUR CONCERNS WHEN THIS BILL WAS ORIGINALLY INTRODUCED IN THE BODY ACROSS THE ROTUNDA.

THE IEA BELIEVES THAT MOVING TO A MORE EQUITABLE PER-PUPIL FUNDING FORMULA WILL ADDRESS THE SPECIFIC NEEDS OF EACH INDIVIDUAL STUDENT ACROSS THE STATE, WHETHER IT BE ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS, AT-RISK STUDENTS, OR STUDENTS WITH SPECIAL NEEDS. WITH ADEQUATE AND STABLE FUNDING, A STUDENT-CENTERED FUNDING FORMULA HAS THE POTENTIAL TO FUNDAMENTALLY CHANGE THE WAY WE EDUCATE STUDENTS IN OUR STATE.

OUR ORIGINAL CONCERNS WITH HOUSE BILL 293 CENTERED, FUNDAMENTALLY, AROUND THE IDEA THAT LOCAL DISTRICTS AND BARGAINING TEAMS NEED TO HAVE THE FLEXIBILITY TO BUILD LOCAL SALARY SCHEDULES THAT FIT THE SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS FOR EACH INDIVIDUAL DISTRICTS ACROSS IDAHO. SPECIFICALLY, NOW THAT BARGAINING HAS ALREADY STARTED IN MANY DISTRICTS, IT WOULD CAUSE MAJOR DISRUPTIONS IF BOTH SIDES NEEDED TO RETURN TO THE DRAWING BOARD AND DESIGN A TOTALLY NEW LOCAL SALARY SCHEDULE.

AFTER SEVERAL CONVERSATIONS WITH MANY OF YOU ON THIS COMMITTEE, WE ARE CONFIDENT THAT YOUR INTENTIONS ARE TO COLLECT DATA ON HOW MUCH DISTRICTS ARE PAYING TEACHERS AT THE P1 RUNG OF THEIR LOCAL SCHEDULES TO BETTER INFORM THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND ASSIST IN
DISTRIBUTING SALARY ALLOCATIONS WHEN A NEW FUNDING FORMULA IS UNVEILED. THE IEA IS COMMITTED TO WORKING WITH ISBA AND MANY OF YOU ON THIS COMMITTEE TO DRAFT A LETTER BOTH SIDES OF THE BARGAINING TABLE CAN USE TO CONDUCT NEGOTIATIONS WITHOUT INTERUPTION THIS YEAR. WE FEEL THAT STEP WILL ADEQUATELY SATISFY OUR CONCERNS AND WE CAN POSITIVELY SUPPORT HB 293.

THANK YOU FOR THE OPPORTUNITY TO ADDRESS YOUR COMMITTEE MR. CHAIRMAN, I WILL STAND FOR QUESTIONS.
Thank you Mister Chairman and committee, for the record my name is Quinn Perry and I'm the policy and government affairs director for the Idaho School Boards Association.

ISBA thinks that this bill is an appropriate step in switching to a new funding formula and we applaud the ALL the good senators and representatives who have worked on getting something done this year.

However, we'd like to go on record with a few concerns we would like to make the committee aware of so if they become issues that we can hopefully address them as a team in coming years.

Page 1, line 40, it see it appropriate to include the full k-12 population. I know that both Kansas and Colorado, who are on a student-based funding formula and were used as examples thorough the PSFF discussions, track this beginning at kindergarten.

Page 7, October 1 will be considered the first reporting date. Especially for reporting the special populations, October 1 is likely too soon to capture accurate data. Some schools up north don't even start school until after Labor day, and this doesn't give enough time for districts to properly identify students using the specified criteria. We do know there is an assumption that this may capture data from last year, but it does not explicitly say so.

'Same page, line 34, what do you mean when you say 2020? If it's FY2020, then our schools and districts are not prepared to do this. If it's January 1, 2020, then we will have a lot of work to do, but it is doable with a lot of training. Still, it seems to be unclear and we seek your guidance.

Page 7, subsection 2, we're glad to report the discretionary expenditures, and if you did not know every school district and charter school is required to post their expenditures online.

Schools and districts have two “pots” of money they oversee – one that is used only for specific line items, and one that is for discretionary or levy dollars.

Let's say you and your spouse's paychecks go into one account, and you go
to buy groceries using your joint debit card, how do you determine whose paycheck the groceries come out of? We only point this out because the data we are going to get from districts and schools will be widely varied. One may say its salaries and insurance, one may say its building maintenance. That said, we are not opposed to this additional transparency, though it may be more burdensome for our small and rural districts whose business managers may play one or two roles in the district.

Again, lastly, our legal counsel does believe that the definition of salary schedule would require a minimum salary for professional endorsement, but believe if we sought clarification in the statement of purpose and a letter of intent, that we could address that issue.

I believe that is all mister chair, and committee. Thank you and I stand for questions.
Blake Youde...Idaho Charter School Network...H293.

Here on behalf of our member schools and partners with some disappointment. For the past three years, we have worked to do something innovative...develop an enrollment-based funding formula that directs additional resources towards the students that need it most. We were working towards a monumental improvement in how we direct resources to students.

We have a 25-year-old funding formula. It is widely recognized that it needs to be updated to meet the needs of students. Three years ago, we formed an interim committee to tackle this with an Idaho solution. That’s a luxury. Several states have their public school funding formulas rewritten under a court order. Look at the State of Washington.

H293 is a product of our three years of work. It sounds odd to say that, but it is true. Previous efforts this session were derailed not because of issues around student weights, but around issues like renewable contracts, financial emergencies, and whether payments should be made on averages or actual enrollments. Arguably, we took our eye off the ball.

What was consistently heard in all of this was that the data used to make funding models was incorrect. There was concern about accuracy and its impact. I said in testimony that ICSN was concerned and used the phrase “Garbage in, no money out”. The legislature has heard this and drafted H293 to collect a baseline amount of data to help inform decision making when a new draft of an enrollment-based funding formula is developed. This bill starts data driven decision making. That’s a good thing.

At my house, my wife and I debate how laundry and dishes should be done. I usually take the side of “It doesn’t matter how you get there. Just get it done.” Idaho charter schools have long advocated for flexibility if it yields results. Enrollment-based funding with additional resources for students who need it most is a step in that direction. We started this three-years-ago. In the end, it doesn’t matter how we get there, as long as we help our students succeed. H293 is intended to get us there – to get resources to students. We will support you.