University of Idaho
2012-2013 FACULTY SENATE AGENDA

Meeting #17

3:30 p.m. - Tuesday, February 12, 2013
Brink Hall Faculty Lounge
IWC Room 390 – Boise
213 – Coeur d’Alene
TAB 321B IF4 – Idaho Falls

Order of Business

I. Call to Order.

II. Minutes.
   • Minutes of the 2012-13 Faculty Senate Meeting #16, February 5, 2013

III. Chair’s Report.

IV. Provost’s Report.

V. Committee Reports.

   University Budget and Finance Committee (Budwig, Morra)

VI. Other Announcements and Communications.

   • Faculty Textbook Adoption Process (Bales)
   • Complete College Idaho – (Selena Grace, Chief Academic Officer, SBOE)

VII. Special Orders.

VIII. Unfinished Business and General Orders.

IX. New Business.

X. Adjournment.

Professor Kenton Bird, Chair 2012-2013, Faculty Senate

Attachments: Minutes of 2012-2013 FS Meeting #16
Textbook Brochure & 2008 Higher Ed Opportunity Act
Complete College Idaho
Present: Aiken, Baillargeon, Baker (w/o vote), Bird (Chair), Budwig (Boise), Dodd, Eckwright (w/o vote), Flores, Frey, Garrison, Goddard, Hartzell, Hasko, Hopper, Karsky, Kitchel, Manic (Idaho Falls), Miller, Morra, Ostrom, Pendegraft, Qualls, Safaii, Smith, Strawn, Teal Absent: Kennelly, Stuntzner, Ytreberg Guests: 11

A quorum being present, Senate Chair Bird called the meeting to order at 3:34pm.

Chair Bird welcomed four teachers and their escort from the College of Telecommunications at Chongqing University of Posts and Telecommunications (Yitong College) in China. Guests Li Jing, Li Dan, Chen Nanyan, Diao Yangbi and their escort Zhou Yali are observers at today’s meeting.

Minutes: It was moved and seconded (Garrison, Baillargeon) to approve the minutes of meeting #15. Motion carried with three abstentions.

Chair’s Report. The Chair reported on the following items:

- Senate leadership met last week with Ron Smith, Vice-President for Finance and Administration, Greg Walters, Executive Director of Human Resources (HR), representatives of the benefits and retirement offices, and three former members of the Senate, including two past chairs, to discuss issues associated with the Optional Retirement Plan (ORP) and the Public Employees Retirement System (PERSI) as a follow-up to a 2009 Faculty Senate resolution. U-Idaho currently pays a subsidy to PERSI on behalf of UI employees who are not eligible for PERSI and who are enrolled in the ORP. Corrective action will require an act of the legislature. We will report in more detail at a future meeting.
- Chair Bird will attend the Teaching and Advising Committee (TAC) Thursday to request reconsideration of the plus-minus system of grading that was passed by the faculty in 2005 but disapproved by then-President White. A plus-minus grading system provides faculty with additional precision in assigning final course grades and this subject was raised at the August senate retreat. Please send comments regarding merits and drawbacks of this proposal to Chair Bird: kbird@uidaho.edu
- Grades: please use the Early Warning function to post grades for first-year students who are not making satisfactory progress in their classes. Posting these grades will help advisers identify students who may benefit from an early contact to improve their performance before the close of the semester. The deadline for posting grades is Monday, February 11. For more information: http://www.uidaho.edu/registrar/faculty/grades
- The deadline for nominations for Distinguished University Professor award is Friday, February 8. Faculty members who have attained the rank of professor and have served at the University of Idaho a minimum of seven years are eligible for consideration. For more information: http://www.uidaho.edu/provost/policyguidelines/distinguishedprofessor
- Next week at senate Selena Grace, chief academic officer for the State Board of Education, will give an extended presentation about the Complete College Idaho (CCI) program. Please review the extended handouts regarding CCI prior to the senate meeting.
- Senate leadership’s faculty dialogue will be held again on Friday, February 8 at Nectar in downtown Moscow. This is an informal, off-the-record, no-agenda session. A topic for this week’s dialogue is the ongoing ORP/PERSI subsidy.
Provost’s Report. Provost Baker seconded Chair Bird’s “welcome” to senate’s visitors from China and then reported on the following items:

- Ron Smith and Dan Ewart, ITS Executive Director/CIO, are working on a proposal for revamping the video system across the university. Mr. Ewart is also chairing the two committees: one that is examining ways to streamline the hiring process at U-Idaho; and a second committee looking at collecting and utilizing post-graduation student data. Parents of prospective students and legislators ask questions about placement rates and post-graduation success. We currently collect that data in a haphazard fashion and we would like to figure out a more cohesive system.
- The data collection phase of the reclassification study has been completed and HR staff will review the data over the next few months before presenting a rough draft of findings.
- Provost Baker attended the Complete College America (CCA) which is the national version of the Complete College Idaho (CCI) program. This program reviews K-20 and examines what we need to do to enable students to complete high school and be prepared for college.
- University of Idaho’s award-winning Lionel Hampton Jazz Festival will be held February 20-23 and all are encouraged to attend. John Clayton, the festival’s artistic director, won three awards in Jazz Times magazine readers’ poll: best arranger, best big band (Clayton-Hamilton Orchestra) and best album (Clayton Brothers). [N.B. For a full list of winners, see: http://jazztimes.com/articles/67120-jazztimes-2012-readers-poll-results]

Sabbatical Leave Evaluation Committee (SLEC). The initial cohort of sabbatical leaves for 2013-2014 was approved by senate in August 2012. This list is the second cohort for 2013-2014 and includes both full-year and semester sabbaticals. This item comes as a seconded motion from the SLEC. Motion carried.

FS-13-034: UCC-13-056 – Regulation J-3. Chair Bird invited Andrew Brewick, Director of University Advising Services, Professor Rodney Frey, Director of General Education, and Dwaine Hubbard, Assistant Registrar, to provide a brief summary of the proposed changes to this regulation. While the proposed changes appear in the senate packet along with admission standards, those admission standards are found in a different section of the actual general catalog. There are no proposed changes to admission standards language. Mr. Brewick explained that Regulation J-3 deals with subject requirements under the core curriculum and particularly with how we treat first-year students with fewer than 14 transcripted credits. Regulation J now uses the same first-year language as Regulation L, which seeks to clarify the inherent developmental difference between straight-from-high school students and transfer students. The term “first-year student” now applies to all incoming students with fewer than fourteen transferable credits earned after high school graduation. Advanced placement (AP) and dual credits earned during high school will continue to apply to general education and major requirements; however, they will not be considered when deciding a student’s core curriculum. All first-year students will have the opportunity to engage in our University of Idaho general education curriculum, instead of completing the State Board of Education (SBOE) core. SBOE core will continue to accommodate incoming students with fourteen or more transferable credits earned after high school. This regulation change is fully supported by the University Committee on General Education and the University Curriculum Committee (UCC). These changes also address suggestions put forward by the summer 2010 committee on general education. Mr. Brewick feels this change will not have any impact on U-Idaho’s ability to recruit students. Professor Frey added his support for the proposed change as this will clarify which students come to U-Idaho under the institutional core and which students may use the SBOE core.

A senator observed that the past practice of allowing a student entering U-Idaho with one credit, for example, to be permitted to enroll under the SBOE core was not reasonable and did not support general education goals. Under the proposed changes, however, students who complete AP, dual enrollment or other college credits while in high school cannot apply those credits toward enrolling under the SBOE core; but students transferring from other colleges or universities with 14 or more transferable credits will be able to choose the SBOE core. This puts U-Idaho in the position of accepting the “intellectual maturity” of students who complete 14 credits at another institution but we do not grant that same recognition to high school
students who have completed college credits while in high school. Professor Frey responded that proposed changes to Regulation J-3 do not imply that AP credits are inferior to transfer credits. Rather, these proposed changes recognize that transfer students coming from other state institutions have had some general education curriculum that was part of their experience and for that reason they may continue on with the SBOE core rather than with the U-Idaho core. While some of their credits may be counted toward U-Idaho general education, high school students who take AP courses or other college credit do not receive general education training. Another senator added that available feedback indicates that students who have gone through the University of Idaho core possess a higher level of skills than those who do not complete the U-Idaho core.

This item comes as a seconded motion from the UCC. Motion carried with 16 in favor, 4 against and one abstention (Senator Kitchel).

Chair Bird then invited Chris Cooney, Senior Director of Marketing for University Communications and Marketing (UCM), to speak about internal and external communication strategies. Mr. Cooney referred senators to the Communications Quick Reference Guide and also provided the following information:

- University communications manages the university’s reputation from a communications standpoint.
- The organization includes public relations, communications and media relations.
- The organization has two leadership vacancies which may contribute to some of the current disconnects.
- Other U-Idaho organizations work closely with marketing for:
  - fund-raising
  - alumni communications
  - external marketing and direct marketing to students
  - internal communications
  - presidential communications (Brett Morris)
  - web communications (Josh Paulsen)
  - creative services (Cindy Johnson) which includes photographers, videographers, print services and the copy centers.
- University calendar:
  - Communications and Marketing implemented a campus-wide calendar last year using Trumba
  - Used by more than 100 institutions nationwide and is highly recommended
  - Previous calendaring system received approximately 80 visitors per week; current calendar receives about 3,000 visitors per day
  - Open system, anyone can contribute to it
  - Provides events months in advance
  - Allows for links to events, photos and video
  - Moderated by 10 web coordinators in colleges, units and one center
  - Would like to expand web coordinators because it adds to the quality of the process
- Today’s Register:
  - Provides information to the campus community statewide
  - Recent upgrade added links to provide today’s events, the next day’s events and the entire week’s events

Mr. Cooney responded as follows to senators’ questions and comments:

- The amount of information sent to the all-faculty routing list is oppressive. I respectfully suggest that only two people at the university be permitted to send items via the all faculty-list, the Provost and the faculty secretary. Chuck Lanham, ITS, manages the all-faculty list, as well as the all-U-Idaho, all-staff and all-students lists. Whoever is the gatekeeper for these lists should be someone who is a subject-matter expert and able to recognize what is beneficial.
Perhaps the Communications Quick Reference Guide could be sent to all U-Idaho units via email or provided to faculty and staff through an internal newsletter? Good suggestion.

Are there restrictions against permitting an announcement to be made in both Today’s Register and on the calendar? Last fall we were told we could not include an announcement for the University Faculty Meeting (UFM) in Today’s Register because we had already put the item on the calendar. There is no policy against having an item listed in both places. There is limited space in Today’s Register and Amanda Cairo, UCM staff member, exercises some degree of editorial judgment in deciding what to include.

Chair Bird remarked that we are eager to have a quorum for our April 30 UFM and we welcome Mr. Cooney’s suggestions as to how we can make the faculty aware of the stakes involved at the UFM. Dean Aiken added that the UFM is an important part of shared governance and someone not involved with it may view it as just another meeting. It is important to get faculty to attend the meeting and anything Mr. Cooney could do to ensure the meeting is announced as fully as possible is appreciated. Mr. Cooney allowed that he could put in a “good word” for ensuring the UFM is widely announced and he encouraged senators with questions or concerns to contact him at any time.

FS-13-031: APM 45.22. Eligibility, Competency and Effort Requirements for PIs, Co-PI and PDs. Chair Bird invited Casey Inge, Associate General Counsel/Special Assistant to the Vice-President for Research and Economic Development (VPR), to speak about the changes to the Administrative Procedures Manual (APM). Mr. Inge reported that the changes will provide flexibility to allow individuals who are not U-Idaho faculty to serve as PIs or Co-PIs on sponsored research projects. For example, this change will allow a faculty member who has engaged in a research project to continue with the project even after reaching emeritus status.

Mr. Inge responded as follows to senators’ questions and comments:

Could this change serve as a deterrent to emeritus faculty who might be offended by this stipulation? Also, what would happen in the event that there was no faculty member at U-Idaho that is in their discipline and has their expertise? Other universities are struggling with this issue, too, because emeritus faculty present some challenges, i.e., they use university resources and the university must train them properly. In the event that there is no faculty member in their particular discipline at U-Idaho we would quickly move to another approach. The idea is to allow flexibility that we did not have previously.

What happens if someone not otherwise affiliated with U-Idaho asks to be a PI on a project funded through a U-Idaho unit? This is an unlikely situation since there is not an established relationship nor is there a track record. There has to be a track record or some university-recognized standing that serves as the basis for making this waiver.

This change to the APM was submitted by the VPR and reviewed by General Counsel and it comes to senate as an informational item. Changes to the APM do not require senate approval, but senate reserves the right to request revisions to APM changes. Senators had no further comments.

Adjournment: It was moved and seconded (Miller, Pendegraft) to adjourn at 4:30pm. Approved unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Gail Z. Eckwright
Faculty Secretary and Secretary to Faculty Senate
VandalStore

- Improving Faculty adoptions to increase value to students.
- A.k.a. Containing student costs with the timely flow of information.
VandalStore

As an example:
100 student class and a title with used and new availability. Used retail price $50 and New retail price $100.

Order 100 books 6 weeks prior to classes

Order 100 books 2 weeks prior to classes

Receive:
60 used
40 New
Avg cost of book per student:
$70.00

Receive:
20 used
80 New
Avg cost of book per student:
$90.00

Classes Begin

Avg cost per student can be 28.5% higher or more when ordered later

Avg cost per student can be 28.5% higher or more when ordered later
Receive: 60 used
40 New
Avg cost of book per student:
$70.00

Receive: 20 used
80 New
Avg cost of book per student:
$90.00

Avg cost can be 28.5% more per student when ordered later

Another way to look at this; 40 happier students were able to purchase used materials.

Early textbook adoptions also assure students get the best prices at buyback and the most value on textbook rentals.

Timely textbook adoptions help us control student costs and drive value.
What we are doing to drive value for students and assist faculty.

- We always look for used first in printed textbooks.
- Increasing the rental program. Rentals save students an additional 25-40% off new and used prices. Low upfront cost and ease. No guess work about a book’s value at buyback.
- We offer all options a student may desire when ever possible; print, buy or rent, digital.
- We offer students a cash buyback program year around.
- We’ve always kept margins lower than the industry. VandalStore 23%. Industry 35%.
- We’ll work with faculty to help find best solutions for their needs.
- We’ve recently reorganized our operation to assign liaisons to the buying team who will have more focus on faculty needs.
The 2008 HEOA - Some Pertinent Provisions

SEC. 112. TEXTBOOK INFORMATION. (Creates a new section #133, in the HEA)

“(d) PROVISION OF ISBN COLLEGE TEXTBOOK INFORMATION IN COURSE SCHEDULES.—To the maximum extent practicable, each institution of higher education receiving Federal financial assistance shall—

“(1) disclose, on the institution’s Internet course schedule and in a manner of the institution’s choosing, the International Standard Book Number and retail price information of required and recommended college textbooks and supplemental materials for each course listed in the institution’s course schedule used for preregistration and registration purposes...

“(e) AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION FOR COLLEGE BOOKSTORES.—
An institution of higher education receiving Federal financial assistance shall make available to a college bookstore that is operated by, or in a contractual relationship or otherwise affiliated with, the institution, as soon as is practicable upon the request of such college bookstore, the most accurate information available regarding—

“(1) the institution’s course schedule for the subsequent academic period; and
“(2) for each course or class offered by the institution for the subsequent academic period—
“(A) the information required by subsection (d)(1) for each college textbook or supplemental material required or recommended for such course or class;
“(B) the number of students enrolled in such course or class; and
“(C) the maximum student enrollment for such course or class.
What we’d like to encourage:

Verbiage in the FSH that clearly states the need for deadlines to be met per the HEOA act.

Work with the provost office to communicate those deadlines on an annual basis.
**HEOA 2008**

**Table of Information for College Bookstores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose and Intent</th>
<th>Text is self explanatory – This bill affects every college in the USA that receives any federal funds. (almost everyone)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definitions.</td>
<td>Carefully read about “Bundle” and “Integrated Book”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Publisher Requirements. | 1. Must be sure faculty & other adopters on campus are aware of net price, copyright date history, and alternate formats and net prices of those alternates, if any  
2. Bundles must be available in parts, each separately priced, except for integrated textbooks (read the definition of bundles) |
| Course Schedules   | To the maximum extent practicable:  
1. ISBN and Retail Price must be listed on the college’s internet course schedule or linked from the schedule to another appropriate web site such as the bookstore.  
2. If ISBN is not known the author, title, and copyright date must be posted.  
3. If the college determines this information is not available or posting this information is not practical, then the college must post “to be determined” for any such affected course. |
| Information for College Bookstores | All colleges must supply this information to their bookstore (s):  
1. The course schedule for the next term  
2. The adoption information.  
3. The number of students enrolled  
4. The maximum student enrollment for such course or class. |
| Additional Information | An institution disclosing the information required by subsection (d)(1) is encouraged to disseminate to students information regarding—  
1. Available programs for renting textbooks or for purchasing used textbooks;  
2. Available guaranteed textbook buy-back programs;  
3. Any available institutional alternative content delivery programs; or  
4. Other available cost-saving strategies. |
| GAO Report         | The GAO report must examine and report on:  
1. The availability of textbook information on course schedules.  
2. Have Publishers made pricing information available to faculty.  
3. The use of bundles  
4. The implementation of this law by colleges and the costs and benefits to the institutions and students for doing so. |
| Rule of Construction | Institutional Autonomy and Faculty Academic Freedom to choose books remains unimpeded by this law. |
| No Regulatory Authority | The Education Department may NOT promulgate any regulations regarding this law as it applies to textbooks. What is written is to be interpreted just as it is written. |
| Effective Date     | July 1, 2010 (The effective date applies to this section only) |

This table was prepared by CACS to inform members about a federal law. It is not a legal opinion.
HEOA 2008

SEC. 112. TEXTBOOK INFORMATION. (Creates a new section #133, in the HEA)

“(a) PURPOSE AND INTENT.—The purpose of this section is to ensure that students have access to affordable course materials by decreasing costs to students and enhancing transparency and disclosure with respect to the selection, purchase, sale, and use of course materials. It is the intent of this section to encourage all of the involved parties, including faculty, students, administrators, institutions of higher education, bookstores, distributors, and publishers, to work together to identify ways to decrease the cost of college textbooks and supplemental materials for students while supporting the academic freedom of faculty members to select high quality course materials for students.

“(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

‘‘(1) BUNDLE.—The term ‘bundle’ means one or more college textbooks or other supplemental materials that may be packaged together to be sold as course materials for one price.

‘‘(2) COLLEGE TEXTBOOK.—The term ‘college textbook’ means a textbook or a set of textbooks, used for, or in conjunction with, a course in postsecondary education at an institution of higher education.

‘‘(3) COURSE SCHEDULE.—The term ‘course schedule’ means a listing of the courses or classes offered by an institution of higher education for an academic period, as defined by the institution.

‘‘(4) CUSTOM TEXTBOOK.—The term ‘custom textbook’—

‘‘(A) means a college textbook that is compiled by a publisher at the direction of a faculty member or other person or adopting entity in charge of selecting course materials at an institution of higher education; and

‘‘(B) may include, alone or in combination, items such as selections from original instructor materials, previously copyrighted publisher materials, copyrighted third-party works, and elements unique to a specific institution, such as commemorative editions.

‘‘(5) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—The term ‘institution of higher education’ has the meaning given the term in section 102.

‘‘(6) INTEGRATED TEXTBOOK.—The term ‘integrated textbook’ means a college textbook that is—

‘‘(A) combined with materials developed by a third party and that, by third-party contractual agreement, may not be offered by publishers separately from the college textbook with which the materials are combined; or

‘‘(B) combined with other materials that are so interrelated with the content of the college textbook that the separation of the college textbook from the other materials would render the college textbook unusable for its intended purpose.

‘‘(7) PUBLISHER.—The term ‘publisher’ means a publisher of college textbooks or supplemental materials involved in or affecting interstate commerce.

‘‘(8) SUBSTANTIAL CONTENT.—The term ‘substantial content’ means parts of a college textbook such as new chapters, new material covering additional eras of time, new themes, or new subject matter.

‘‘(9) SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIAL.—The term ‘supplemental material’ means educational material developed to accompany a college textbook that—

‘‘(A) may include printed materials, computer disks, website access, and electronically distributed materials; and

‘‘(B) is not being used as a component of an integrated textbook.
HEOA 2008

“(c) PUBLISHER REQUIREMENTS.—

“(1) COLLEGE TEXTBOOK PRICING INFORMATION.—When a publisher provides a faculty member or other person or adopting entity in charge of selecting course materials at an institution of higher education receiving Federal financial assistance with information regarding a college textbook or supplemental material, the publisher shall include, with any such information and in writing (which may include electronic communications), the following:

“(A) The price at which the publisher would make the college textbook or supplemental material available to the bookstore on the campus of, or otherwise associated with, such institution of higher education and, if available, the price at which the publisher makes the college textbook or supplemental material available to the public.

“(B) The copyright dates of the three previous editions of such college textbook, if any.

“(C) A description of the substantial content revisions made between the current edition of the college textbook or supplemental material and the previous edition, if any.

“(D) (i) Whether the college textbook or supplemental material is available in any other format, including paperback and unbound; and

(ii) for each other format of the college textbook or supplemental material, the price at which the publisher would make the college textbook or supplemental material in the other format available to the bookstore on the campus of, or otherwise associated with, such institution of higher education and, if available, the price at which the publisher makes such other format of the college textbook or supplemental material available to the public.

“(2) UNBUNDLING OF COLLEGE TEXTBOOKS FROM SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS.—A publisher that sells a college textbook and any supplemental material accompanying such college textbook as a single bundle shall also make available the college textbook and each supplemental material as separate and unbundled items, each separately priced.

“(3) CUSTOM TEXTBOOKS.—To the maximum extent practicable, a publisher shall provide the information required under this subsection with respect to the development and provision of custom textbooks.

“(d) PROVISION OF ISBN COLLEGE TEXTBOOK INFORMATION IN COURSE SCHEDULES.—To the maximum extent practicable, each institution of higher education receiving Federal financial assistance shall—

“(1) disclose, on the institution’s Internet course schedule and in a manner of the institution’s choosing, the International Standard Book Number and retail price information of required and recommended college textbooks and supplemental materials for each course listed in the institution’s course schedule used for preregistration and registration purposes, except that—

“(A) if the International Standard Book Number is not available for such college textbook or supplemental material, then the institution shall include in the Internet course schedule the author, title, publisher, and copyright date for such college textbook or supplemental material; and

“(B) if the institution determines that the disclosure of the information described in this subsection is not practicable for a college textbook or supplemental material, then the institution shall so indicate by placing the designation ‘To Be Determined’ in lieu of the information required under this subsection; and

“(2) if applicable, include on the institution’s written course schedule a notice that textbook information is available on the institution’s Internet course schedule, and the Internet address for such schedule.
HEOA 2008

“(e) AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION FOR COLLEGE BOOKSTORES.— An institution of higher education receiving Federal financial assistance shall make available to a college bookstore that is operated by, or in a contractual relationship or otherwise affiliated with, the institution, as soon as is practicable upon the request of such college bookstore, the most accurate information available regarding—

‘‘(1) the institution’s course schedule for the subsequent academic period; and
‘‘(2) for each course or class offered by the institution for the subsequent academic period—

‘‘(A) the information required by subsection (d)(1) for each college textbook or supplemental material required or recommended for such course or class;
‘‘(B) the number of students enrolled in such course or class; and
‘‘(C) the maximum student enrollment for such course or class.

“(f) ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.—An institution disclosing the information required by subsection (d)(1) is encouraged to disseminate to students information regarding—

‘‘(1) available institutional programs for renting textbooks or for purchasing used textbooks;
‘‘(2) available institutional guaranteed textbook buy-back programs;
‘‘(3) available institutional alternative content delivery programs; or
‘‘(4) other available institutional cost-saving strategies.

“(g) GAO REPORT.—Not later than July 1, 2013, the Comptroller General of the United States shall report to the authorizing committees on the implementation of this section by institutions of higher education, college bookstores, and publishers. The report shall particularly examine—

‘‘(1) the availability of college textbook information on course schedules;
‘‘(2) the provision of pricing information to faculty of institutions of higher education by publishers;
‘‘(3) the use of bundled and unbundled material in the college textbook marketplace, including the adoption of unbundled materials by faculty and the use of integrated textbooks by publishers; and
‘‘(4) the implementation of this section by institutions of higher education, including the costs and benefits to such institutions and to students.

“(h) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to supersede the institutional autonomy or academic freedom of instructors involved in the selection of college textbooks, supplemental materials, and other classroom materials.

“(i) NO REGULATORY AUTHORITY.—The Secretary shall not promulgate regulations with respect to this section.’’.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on July 1, 2010.

The Higher Education Act (HEA) was originally passed in 1965. The act is subject to reauthorization periodically. The Higher Education Opportunity Act (HEOA) of 2008 is the most recent reauthorization. Section 112 is one of the Amendments in HEOA and is now Section 133 of the HEA.
Complete College Idaho
A Plan for Growing Talent to Fuel Innovation and Economic Growth in the Gem State

June 2012
Introduction

Idaho is at the crossroads. The choices we make today are the foundation that will shape the future for our children and grandchildren. College access without success is an empty promise, and a missed opportunity with economic consequences. It is time to tie access to completion for the benefit of our students. The choices are not easy, but doing nothing is not an option.

Basic facts about economic success in the 21st century economy should drive our decisions. Close to two-thirds of the projected workforce of 2020 are already out of elementary and secondary education. Following current trends, this nation will fall short an expected one million college graduates needed in the workforce by 2025. We know that postsecondary education enhances personal income. Those with some college have a median income 23% higher over their lifetimes; those with an associate’s degree, 28% higher; and those with a baccalaureate degree, 61% higher. In 2011, the rate of unemployment for individuals 25 and older without a college degree was 9.4% compared to 4.3% for those with a 4-year degree.¹

The Office of Performance Evaluations (OPE) recently concluded a study on reducing barriers to postsecondary education. In their report to the Idaho Legislature, OPE states, “The long-term benefits of increasing educational attainment levels of Idahoans will directly impact the creation of new businesses ... [and] the economic and social well-being of the state.”²

In addition to the basic skills necessary to be productive, 21st century employees must possess high-level critical thinking and problem solving skills. Maximizing all of these skills to drive innovation and job creation will be critical to Idaho’s prosperity.

As society becomes increasingly reliant on information and technology, our educational and career planning mechanisms must adjust. The current workforce is mismatched to the needs of employers now and moving forward.

¹ http://www.bls.gov/cps/cpsaat07.pdf
While the skills gap phenomenon is a national one, it is particularly problematic in Idaho. A recent study issued by the International Monetary Fund showed that Idaho is in the most critical quartile of all states relative to the skills mismatch.\textsuperscript{3} That challenge is ongoing. Georgetown University’s Center for Education and the Workforce has estimated that by 2018, 61% of Idaho jobs will require some form of postsecondary credential, and by 2020 63% will require a certificate or degree.\textsuperscript{4} Similarly Idaho has identified that 35% of Idahoans have a postsecondary certificate, associate degree, or higher.

The Board recognizes there must be a skilled workforce to meet the projected need. In 2010, the Board set an attainment goal that 60% of Idahoans, age 25 to 34, have a postsecondary degree or certificate by 2020. This will require a focus not only on increasing the number of students who complete college, but also on maximizing students’ abilities and potential for success in the workforce.

Nearly all young adults recognize the value of college but many lack a clear understanding of the link between education and careers. Helping students gain an understanding of this link is critical, especially for those students from low-income families. Poverty is a significant barrier to education. Completion rates by income show a stark reality: young people from high-income families complete college at a 60% rate; those from low income families complete at a 7% rate. This disparity does not exist because young people from higher income families are smarter or more talented – they are simply afforded more opportunities. This should be a significant concern for Idaho because the primary source of new students is from traditionally underrepresented and underserved populations such as Latinos, Native Americans, and first-generation families with low income. The 2010 U.S. Census identified that 11% of the state’s population was Latino with a median age of 23, compared to 35 for White non-Hispanics.\textsuperscript{5, 6}

This generation is at risk of being the first in our country’s history to be less educated than their parents. There is an ever growing population of non-traditional, first generation, and low-income students who are forced to work more hours than students of prior generations. They are underprepared for college and forced into remedial courses that slow their progress and force them deeper into debt where most lose momentum and simply give up. Students are overwhelmed by too many choices with little structure, leading to wasted semesters and years.

\textsuperscript{4} Georgetown University Center on Education and the Workforce: http://cew.georgetown.edu/jobs2018/
\textsuperscript{6} U.S. Census Bureau, 2006-2010 American Community Survey. www.census.gov/acs
To encourage access and completion involves demystifying the college going process and experience. Ensuring there is alignment between secondary graduation requirements and postsecondary expectations so that students are ready for the rigor and expectations of college are integral to completion, which includes the development of a statewide model for assessment of college and career readiness. The transition from secondary to postsecondary education opportunities must be clear and straightforward, by simplifying and streamlining the college admissions process. And, transfer processes between colleges must be understandable and attainable.

Partnerships among education, non-profits, and business and industry are also necessary in creating a college going culture and providing the means to increase educational attainment. Commitments must be mutual and ongoing and will require significant engagement.

The state has committed to a bold agenda to transform our talent base by efficiently and effectively increasing the number of citizens with postsecondary degrees and certificates. To meet this commitment, a diverse partnership of individuals, businesses, institutions, and policymakers developed a statewide plan to achieve Idaho’s education goal. This plan mirrors Governor Otter’s commitment to a unified job creation and growth strategy, which has resulted in a focused vision for Idaho and its educational system.

The Board recognizes that all levels of education beyond high school are beneficial. The Board’s definition of college includes certificates and credentials of program completion as well as Associate’s and Bachelor’s degrees. Idaho’s public postsecondary institutions need to produce annually as many as 20,000 degrees and certificates by 2020.
This Complete College Idaho Plan proposes focus on improving educational attainment in a way that is responsive to the needs of business and those who will hire the workforce of the future. From this plan, our state can build a system in which students graduate with the knowledge and skills that maximize their potential for success in the workforce while providing business with the necessary talent needed to thrive. The proposed strategies in this plan will aid in meeting the goal that 60% of Idahoans 25 to 34 have a postsecondary degree or certificate by 2020. By meeting this goal, Idaho will be internationally recognized for the quality of talent, knowledge and skills of its workforce, and by the ability of its higher education system to prepare citizens to meet and exceed the needs of business, industry, and society.

The Board, institution presidents, and other key leaders in Idaho stand united with Governor Otter in growing the economy through innovation and talent, creating the foundation for Idaho’s future success. Idaho joined the Complete College America (CCA) Alliance of States and the National Governors Association Complete to Compete, to become a recognized leader in talent creation.

**KEY STRATEGIES:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRengthen the Pipeline</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Ensure College and Career Readiness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop Intentional Advising Along the K-20 Continuum that Links Education with Careers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Support Accelerated High School to Postsecondary and Career Pathways</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transform RemEdiatIOn</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Clarify and Implement College and Career Readiness Education and Assessments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop a Statewide Model for Transformation of Remedial Placement and Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide three options: Co-requisite model, Emporium model, or Accelerated model</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure for Success</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Communicate Strong, Clear, and Guaranteed Statewide Articulation and Transfer Options</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reward Progress &amp; Completion</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Establish Metrics and Accountability Tied to Institutional Mission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Recognize and Reward Performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Redesign the State’s Current Offerings of Financial Support for Postsecondary Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leverage Partnerships</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Strengthen Collaborations Between Education and Business/Industry Partners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• College Access Network</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• STEM Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In conjunction with each key strategy listed above are a number of initiatives that may be implemented at either the state level or the institution/agency level. For example, adopting the Common Core State Standards is a way the state is supporting the strategy “Strengthen the Pipeline.” An institution and local education agency may support that strategy using collaboration to prepare students for college and career through the development of a college
mentoring program employing recent college graduates. Further narrative on the statewide initiatives to support the key strategies is presented below.

The key strategies and subsequent initiatives are neither exhaustive, nor static. Rather, they are initiatives and best practices currently employed or being implemented within the next one to five years to move Idaho toward the 60% goal. It is anticipated that as 2020 approaches, an increasing number of impactful initiatives will come to light and will further inform this plan and the State Board of Education in its work toward creating a highly-skilled workforce.
STRENGTHEN THE PIPELINE

Strengthening the pipeline is a critical first step to meeting the 60% goal. Historically Idaho has been a state where a high school diploma or less was sufficient to obtain a living wage and often a middle class lifestyle. With the economic, technological, and industrial changes of the 21st century, a high school diploma is no longer enough. A change in the mindset that has been generations in the making must be addressed. Creating a college-going culture is paramount to support this strategy. The work done through the Albertson Foundation’s Go On campaign has made significant strides in establishing a college-going culture in Idaho. Students should be college-ready when they graduate high school; doing so requires that high school curriculum is aligned to first year college courses and that support programs are in place to ensure students make a smooth transition to college.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>Activities to Support Initiative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ensure College and Career Readiness</strong></td>
<td>Increase rigor in secondary school courses to prepare students for postsecondary coursework (Common Core State Standards)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incorporate mandatory college readiness assessments in middle school and junior year of high school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leverage work of the Common Core State Standards to develop and articulate high school to postsecondary standards in English and mathematics – organize faculty to faculty efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work towards recognition of the Smarter Balance Assessment outcomes for students as indicators of threshold for college and career readiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Develop Intentional Advising Along the K-20 Continuum That Links Education With Careers</strong></td>
<td>Integrate Collaborative Counselor Training Initiative into pre-service school counselor and teacher requirements (teachers as advisors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improve direct adult contact with students vis-à-vis counselors (Near Peer Mentoring Program)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support Accelerated High School to Postsecondary and Career Pathways</strong></td>
<td>Increase and improve management and delivery of Tech Prep and Dual Credit programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Evaluate current Tech Prep and Dual Credit policies and practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Revise Tech Prep and Dual Credit policies and practices based on the results of the evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide more 2+2 opportunities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_**Education beyond high school should be the norm, not the exception**_
STATEWIDE INITIATIVES
In 2011, the Board, along with the Governor’s office and the State Department of Education, worked to establish evidence-based Common Core State Standards. Through Idaho’s partnership in the national Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium, these standards seek to address the misalignment of the K-12 education system with international standards and college admission expectations, so that all students are prepared for future opportunities in education, work and life. Content standards outline the knowledge and skills students should attain at each level of their education across different subjects. The Common Core State Standards are aligned with college and workforce expectations, are focused and coherent, include rigorous content, and are internationally benchmarked.

In an effort to keep secondary school counselors abreast of current resources available to them with regard to college access, Idaho has taken advantage of the work done by other states to create a customized facilitated online professional development course focused on college access information for secondary school counselors, college admissions counselors, financial aid administrators, teachers as advisors, and principals. Implemented using College Access Challenge Grant funds, the Collaborative Counselor Training Initiative (CCTI) began training its first cohort March 2012. Currently, CCTI is a stand-alone training course intended to serve as professional development for in-service counseling professionals. Incorporating this information at the pre-service level is key to developing a college- and career-minded cohort of counselors.

The secondary school counselor is the one person who is uniquely positioned to provide significant impact to students. Secondary school counselors carry a lofty responsibility of promoting college aspirations, ensuring that students enroll in the academic classes necessary to be ready for college, guiding students through the admission and financial aid processes, and helping students build the social skills necessary to succeed. This service is especially vital for first generation college students and for students from low-income families. In Idaho, a high school counselor’s ability to succeed in all aspects of this role is hindered by the fact that student to counselor ratios average 443:1. With waning resources and a disproportionate workload, professional development opportunities are limited at best.

A resource for the secondary school counselor is being developed through the Near Peer Mentoring Program. Near Peers are recent college graduates and their mission is to increase the number of students who enter and complete postsecondary education in their respective high schools, with an emphasis on low-income and first generation populations. Mentors seek out and work with high school students who typically “fall through the cracks” and help them plan for some kind of education and training beyond high school. This is a high-touch program where the needs of all students are addressed and served.

---

The acquisition of college credit in high school through Dual Credit and Tech Prep Programs is gaining momentum throughout the state. By participating in these programs students receive high school and college credit simultaneously and at a much reduced cost when compared to a traditional college delivery method. By earning college credit while still in high school, potentially students are preparing themselves for the rigor of college classes and reducing their time to degree completion. While dual credit and tech prep provide some postsecondary opportunities, 2+2 models like the partnership between Idaho State University (ISU) and Renaissance High School (RHS) in Joint School District #2 should be expanded. ISU and RHS offer students the ability to pursue an Associate of Arts in General Studies while simultaneously completing their high school degree requirements.
INSTITUTION/AGENCY INITIATIVES
Accomplishing the 60% goal will require a significant effort by all educational partners with a variety of strategies and initiatives implemented at various levels and complexities. What follows are examples of best practice models being implemented by individual school districts, institutions, state agencies, or other community programs. Based on the success and scalability of the models, the Board may choose to adopt some of these initiatives to implement on a statewide basis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiatives</th>
<th>Activities to Support Initiatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ensure College and Career Readiness</strong></td>
<td>Prepare students for entry into the educational pipeline through early literacy programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implement high school graduation requirements (College Entrance Exams, 3 years of math - mandatory senior year, 3 years of science, senior project)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Develop Intentional Advising Along the K-20 Continuum That Links Education With Careers</strong></td>
<td>Enhance campus advising (e-Advising)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student advising that includes students, parents, and teachers as partners (GEAR UP model)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enhance Career Information System (CIS) capabilities for linking certificates/degrees to professions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase use of CIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implement advisory home room class where teachers are trained to facilitate college and career planning (CCTI, CIS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support Accelerated High School to College and Career Pathways</strong></td>
<td>Increase internship opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide access to take courses at both 2-year and 4-year institutions simultaneously (co-enrollment/co-admission agreements)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TRANSFORM REMEDIATION

Remediation in its current form is ineffective

The problem with remediation starts with the current placement assessments and their failure to provide postsecondary institutions with the appropriate information necessary to determine both a student’s knowledge and abilities. Currently a variety of cut scores are used within and across states, providing no clear expectation of what college readiness really means. Additionally, student scores on current assessments reveal little about actual weaknesses or what help is needed to succeed at the college level.

Beyond placement in remedial classes, a one size fits all approach to remedial instruction, where students must enroll in one or more semesters of remedial instruction, has not proven to be effective. Research from the Community College Research Center has found that most students who require remedial education do not complete their remedial education sequence within one year. Many do not even enroll in a single remedial course.

In Idaho, on average, 41% of all first-time, full-time freshman who have been out of secondary school for less than 12 months were identified as needing remedial services in 2010. What’s more troubling is the disparity in remedial need for students who attend 2-year versus 4-year Idaho postsecondary institutions. For students who enrolled in a 2-year Idaho postsecondary institution, nearly 67% were identified as needing remediation; whereas only 25% were identified for those enrolling in a 4-year institution. One potential reason for this disproportion is that all Idaho 2-year institutions have open-admission policies. Another is that the University of Idaho does not offer remedial math courses to their students.

Remedial need is not only a problem of recent high school graduates. Students who have been away from high school for more than a year will likely need a review of content and skills. For this population of students, 46% were identified by Idaho postsecondary institutions as needing remedial services. For all other returning or transfer students, 36% were identified as needing remedial services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statewide Initiatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initiatives</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarify and Implement College and Career Readiness Education and Assessments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Develop a Statewide Model for Transformation of Remedial Placement and Support | • Complete Institutional Readiness Inventory Evaluation  
• Evaluate efficacy of current student placement and success  
• Determine appropriate mechanisms to assess student readiness for college-level work  
• Articulate content area competencies and student learning outcomes  
• Determine common statewide placement tests and levels (e.g., SAT, ACT) |
STATEWIDE INITIATIVES

As stated under “Strengthen the Pipeline,” the work of the Common Core State Standards seeks to address the misalignment between the K-12 system and the postsecondary system. This activity strives to prepare students for the rigor and expectations of postsecondary education throughout the educational pipeline, thus reducing the need for remediation. The Common Core State Standards serve as the foundation of every other component of raising student achievement. “The cost of unprepared students in postsecondary is a fiscal drain on families, education institutions, and states; as well as an emotional drain on students who believed they were prepared for college. Unfortunately, a high school diploma does not necessarily mean a student is college-ready.”

A central goal of the Common Core State Standards is the establishment of nationally and internationally consistent standards of college- and career-readiness.

While the Common Core State Standards seeks to address the misalignment between K-12 and postsecondary, Idaho must evaluate the use and effectiveness of the current placement policies and practice. College entrance exams (ACT, SAT) and placement exams (COMPASS, ACCUPLACER) are currently used to predict students’ success in gateway and/or remedial college courses. It is apparent that statewide placement levels are not accurate and that additional metrics such as GPAs should be used to determine placement. The Board, in partnership with postsecondary institutions, needs to complete an evaluation of current practices of assessing student placement and success in remedial coursework.

Once a student is placed correctly in the appropriate program, the program must then meet the needs of the student. Various models have been researched. Three options have been identified as effective models in delivering remedial education to students in a shorter amount of time and with greater success than the traditional model. The Co-requisite, the Emporium, and the Accelerated models are recommended models to transform remediation statewide. In order to develop an effective, cohesive remediation model, collection of current data and tracking future data will be critical before implementation begins.

---

STRUCTURE FOR SUCCESS
The transition from 2-year to 4-year institutions is a critical barrier for many students. It has been estimated that nearly 60% of students attend more than one institution during their educational experience. Delivery of education needs to focus on a student-centered approach. One in which a student can opt to take classes that fit into his or her schedule. And one in which credits transfer and courses articulate between schools in a manner that the time to degree is not lengthened, rather it is shortened.

### Statewide Initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiatives</th>
<th>Activities to Support Initiatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Communicate Strong, Clear, and Guaranteed Statewide Articulation and Transfer Options | Create a state-level student success web portal with clearly articulated pathways to certificates/degrees  
                                                                                     - Create a course equivalency guide focused on multi-institution transfer and articulation |
|                                                      | Improve transferability and integration of Professional-Technical Education (PTE) courses into advanced degree requirements |
|                                                      | Establish appropriate policies and procedures that allow for reverse transfer options to students who transferred from a 2-year institution to a 4-year institution prior to earning an associate’s degree |
|                                                      | Reform general education core (LEAP framework) to include revised policies and practice |

STATEWIDE INITIATIVES
There are multiple pathways to degrees, but not a single roadmap to getting there. Students who enroll in the nation’s community colleges in order to save money may end up actually paying more than they should unless they have access to current, accurate information about how courses transfer from one institution to another. They may take the wrong courses for their chosen field of study, take courses that do not transfer at all, or end up in college longer than if they had not transferred, thereby negating any cost savings incurred from enrolling first at a community college. A web portal would provide accurate information about how to apply state transfer and articulation policies to an educational plan; provide tools, services, and resources that facilitate the transfer process; and, give detailed course schedules for programs that directly articulate to partner institutions. A first step in the development of a web portal is the creation of a course equivalency guide. This requires that faculty from both 2-year and 4-year institutions be responsible for developing and maintaining statewide articulation agreements, that articulation

---

agreements accommodate students who have met their general education core requirements prior to having completed an associate’s degree, and articulation agreements are developed for specific program majors. Establishing clear articulation agreements for program majors will also aid in improving transferability and integration of Professional-Technical Education (PTE) courses into advanced degree requirements. With the knowledge that nearly 60% of students attend more than one institution and that higher educational attainment is crucial to the health of Idaho and our nation, one mechanism to ensure students are obtaining a degree when they earn one is reverse credit transfer. Many students enroll in 2-year institutions with the intent of transferring to a 4-year institution. Reverse credit transfer provides a mechanism to award associate’s degrees to students who transfer to a 4-year institution from 2-year institutions prior to having earned an associate’s degree.

In addition to importance of a seamless transfer for students between 2-year and 4-year schools, institutional accountability of student learning outcomes is crucial. Institutional accreditation requires that accountability be focused on providing direct evidence of student academic achievement, centered on broad undergraduate skills like critical thinking, communication, problem-solving, and high quality research. Using the Liberal Education and America’s Promise (LEAP) framework, Idaho’s institutions are looking to reform the general education core to meet the demands for more college-educated workers and more engaged and informed citizens. The LEAP framework emphasizes broad knowledge of the wider world (e.g., science, culture and society) as well as in-depth achievement in a specific program of study. It helps students develop a sense of social responsibility as well as strong intellectual and practical skills that span all areas of study, such as communication, analytical and problem-solving skills, and includes a demonstrated ability to apply knowledge and skills in real-world settings. A goal of reforming the general education core is to create campus-specific programs with clearly articulated student learning outcomes while also ensuring that credits seamlessly transfer among in-state institutions.

---

11 http://www.aacu.org/leap/
INSTITUTION/AGENCY INITIATIVES

Accomplishing the 60% goal will require a significant effort by all educational partners with a variety of strategies and initiatives implemented at varies levels and complexities. What follows are examples of best practice models being implemented by individual school districts, institutions, state agencies, or other community programs. Based on the success and scalability of the models, the Board may choose to adopt some of these initiatives to implement on a statewide basis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiatives</th>
<th>Activities to Support Initiatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Default Program/Curriculum Options</strong></td>
<td>Adopt “block scheduling” model at the undergraduate level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Package Certificates and Degree Programs for Accelerated Completion</strong></td>
<td>Create an affordable, “no-frills” degree option that takes less time and less campus-based resources (Rec. Center, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adult Reintegration/Near Completers</strong></td>
<td>Create a near completer notification system and contact students within a certain number of credits (e.g., 12, 15) of graduation and offer degree audits, counseling, and advising to help them complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Link with employers to offer course schedules compatible with work schedules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identify targeted sectors of industry/business with high need and provide employees with information about the benefits of a certificate/degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost Effective Delivery Option for Students in Eastern Idaho</strong></td>
<td>Expand availability of general education core classes at 2-year tuition rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Early Warning System</strong></td>
<td>Create an early warning system to intervene in a targeted and timely manner when students get off track and/or are struggling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REWARD PROGRESS AND COMPLETION

Idaho’s investment in 4-year public higher education has gone from $285.1M in FY2009 to $209.8M in FY2012. At the same time, the demand for postsecondary education is strong and the need for postsecondary education in today’s global knowledge economy is essential if we wish to remain competitive among industrialized nations. The reality of this situation requires that we use every dollar to maximize operational efficiencies.

Students should reap the rewards of their progress as well. The increasing cost of college in conjunction with a high level of poverty is a significant barrier to education. Completion rates by income show that young people from high-income families complete college at a much higher rate than those from low-income families (60% vs. 7% respectively). However, the majority of new students are from families with low incomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statewide Initiatives</th>
<th>Activities to Support Initiative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Establish Metrics and Accountability Tied to</td>
<td>Staff and institutions select three to five CCA common college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Mission</td>
<td>metrics for use as system-wide metrics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutions select three to four indicators or</td>
<td>Institutions select three to four indicators or measures from their</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>measures from their NWCCU Year One Self-Evaluation</td>
<td>NWCCU Year One Self-Evaluation Report Core Themes to be used as their</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Core Themes to be used as their institution-</td>
<td>institution-specific performance metrics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>specific performance metrics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board adopts system-wide and institution-specific</td>
<td>Board adopts system-wide and institution-specific metrics for FY 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>metrics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use FY 2013 as a transitional year for purposes of</td>
<td>Use FY 2013 as a transitional year for purposes of deploying and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deploying and assessing the metrics</td>
<td>assessing the metrics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognize and Reward Performance</td>
<td>Create and adopt methodology for allocating performance funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redesign the State’s Current Offerings of Financial</td>
<td>Submit budget request for performance pool if applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for Postsecondary Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redesign statewide scholarships to enhance student</td>
<td>Redesign statewide scholarships to enhance student access and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>access and completion</td>
<td>completion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STATEWIDE INITIATIVES

Performance-based funding can be used as a strategic incentive for innovation and creativity in resource allocation to improve desired campus outcomes. Specifically, linking a portion of state funding for higher education to performance outcomes could prioritize and focus the use of institutional resources on student success. It is a generally accepted best practice for performance measures to be developed through negotiation and consensus between the governing board and the institutions.

Equally important as the work required for performance based funding, Idaho must redesign statewide scholarship programs to enhance student access and completion. An ad hoc committee of the Board has been created to evaluate the effectiveness of current state
scholarship programs. It is imperative that Idaho ensure state-funded financial support is appropriated to the students with the greatest need and demonstrate ability to succeed. The Board must also monitor the success of scholarship recipients to evaluate the effectiveness of the scholarship programs. Upon completion of the evaluation, the committee will make procedural, policy, and statutory recommendations to the Board as appropriate.
LEVERAGE PARTNERSHIPS

According to the U.S. Department of Education, 45% of students in 4-year institutions work more than 20 hours a week, and among those students attending community colleges that number is 60%. More than a quarter of the nation’s students work more than 35 hours a week, and 23% of all college students have children.\textsuperscript{12, 13} Furthermore, 50% of students who enter a 4-year college do not finish. With these statistics in mind, and in order to meet the 60% attainment goal, higher education needs to work with business and industry to promote postsecondary education in the workplace. Creating class schedules that accommodate work schedules are beneficial to employee and employer alike. Likewise, providing college promotion materials and accommodating student class schedules are ways in which higher education and business and industry may cooperate to move the needle toward 60%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statewide Initiatives</th>
<th>Activities to Support Initiative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strengthen Collaborations Between Education and Business/Industry Partners</td>
<td>Collaboration between education with the business community, non-profit and philanthropic organizations to project and meet workforce requirements and business development opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Access Network</td>
<td>Develop a statewide network that links agencies, organizations, and businesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEM Education</td>
<td>Develop a statewide strategic plan for K-20 STEM education in Idaho</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Collaborative efforts between education and the business community, the Department of Labor, Department of Commerce, non-profit and philanthropic organizations can identify ways to project and meet workforce requirements and business development opportunities. This requires all partners clearly identifying the skills and competencies necessary for a trained workforce.

The development of a College Access Network is an initiative aimed at creating a college-going culture as mentioned under “Strengthen the Pipeline.” Linking agencies, organizations, and businesses to coordinate a network is an essential strategy to building a statewide communication plan, the purpose of which is to provide common information to all Idahoans about the benefits of postsecondary education. Additionally, it will serve as a conduit for communication between entities regarding higher education and access programs.


\textsuperscript{13} U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2008, National Postsecondary Student Aid Study.
The Board convened key stakeholders responsible for **STEM education** at the May 2012 STEM Summit, resulting in the identification of goals and initiatives that will be used to develop a K-20 STEM education plan. A subgroup is working to refine the goals and identify appropriate strategies that will be brought to the Board for approval and implementation.

**INSTITUTION/AGENCY INITIATIVES**

Accomplishing the 60% goal will require a significant effort by all educational partners with a variety of strategies and initiatives implemented at varies levels and complexities. What follows are examples of best practice models being implemented by individual school districts, institutions, state agencies, or other community programs. Based on the success and scalability of the models, the Board may choose to adopt some of these initiatives to implement on a statewide basis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiatives</th>
<th>Activities to Support Initiative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strengthen Collaborations Between Education and Business/Industry Partners</td>
<td>Link with employers to offer course schedules compatible with work schedules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identify targeted sectors of industry/business with high need and provide workers with information about the benefits of a certificate/degree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There is a fundamental overlapping activity central to both General Education and Remediation Reform that will be critical to their implementation and success, and that is bringing together faculty to establish the college and career ready expectations, alignment of content for the transition between K-12 and postsecondary, curriculum for the transformed remedial delivery models, establishment of the content alignment among the public institutions for transferability, and implementation of Common Learning Outcomes using High Impact Practices. While significant groundwork has begun with both task forces, there will be substantial work in the coming year to put to practice and institutionalize recommendations in the coming years. For FY2013 the Chief Academic Officer will commit approximately $378,000 to ensure the two task forces work with institutions regarding the scope and framework for implementation.

October 30-31, 2012 is the Complete College Idaho Conference and these two Initiatives will be highlighted. November 1st will be the General Education Reform Kick-Off.

General Education Reform:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiatives</th>
<th>Activities to Support Initiatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communicate Strong, Clear, and Guaranteed Statewide Articulation and Transfer Options</td>
<td>Create a state-level student success web portal with clearly articulated pathways to certificates/degrees - Create a course equivalency guide focused on multi-institution transfer and articulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve transferability and integration of Professional-Technical Education (PTE) courses into advanced degree requirements</td>
<td>Establish appropriate policies and procedures that allow for reverse transfer options to students who transferred from a 2-year institution to a 4-year institution prior to earning an associate’s degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reform general education core (LEAP framework) to include revised policies and practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Council on Academic Affairs & Programs (CAAP) created a General Education Reform Taskforce, comprised of representatives from all eight public institutions. These representatives consist of Vice Provosts and Deans. CAAP charged the Taskforce with evaluating the benefits of the American Association of Colleges & Universities LEAP Student Learning Outcomes framework and assurance that the integrity of transferability is protected. The Taskforce has held several meetings since winter 2011 and in July 2012 the team came together for a two-day work session in Boise to develop a plan and next steps for general education reform in Idaho. There are two overarching components to General Education reform in Idaho:

1) Create a state-level student success articulation and transfer web portal with clearly articulated pathways to certificates/degrees. One part of the General Education Reform is the development and implantation of a web portal. OSBE is in the process of finalizing
an agreement with Idaho Digital Learning Academy (IDLA) to develop a comprehensive web portal that provides a database of course articulation and transfer plans, tools, resources and services for students to make the transition from any Idaho postsecondary institution to another. IDLA proposes a three phase approach to meet the objective: 1) research and discovery; 2) web portal development, and 3) web portal deployment.

In the research and discovery phase, IDLA will provide a project manager (PM) that will help identify the overarching vision of the portal and help lead a steering committee to define the scope of work, web portal functionality, as well as timeline constraints. Research will be conducted to identify available resource options such as existing and similar portals as well as options for development contractors. The PM will then work with the steering committee to establish the different phases of the project and the anticipated scope of each phase. The scope, timeline and cost of the development and deployment phases of this project will be driven by the results of phase one which will help in determining the scope of the development, design and functionality requirements, timeline restrictions, and budget constraints.

This proposal provides an estimate of costs based on past experience and anticipated scenarios from the scope identified in phase one. This project proposal helps to address a need identified under the Structure for Success strategy of the CCI plan.

Research and Discovery Phase October 2012 – January 2013
Goals:
1. Create the Academic Program Articulation Steering Committee (APASC) to help steer and guide development.
2. Identify monthly meetings and leadership roles within the Committee.
3. Define key monitoring, marketing, and technology visions of the portal.
4. Identify the key goals of each phase and the scope of work and modules that APASC wishes to have developed in the Web Portal.
5. Identify policies that support articulation and propose changes to SBOE in support of APASC vision.
6. Identify a development phases and estimated costs associated with the development plan.
7. Identify resource options for the next phase of the development plan.

Key issues to address include:
- Creation of a leadership structure to guide portal development and activities related to articulation.
- Document the functionality required for web portal.
- Outline the tasks necessary for portal development.
- Establish the required timeline for development.
- Determine an appropriate scope, timeline, and budget available for development.
2) Identify and establish systemwide Common Learning Outcomes. Student learning and assessment are two areas of focus of the accrediting body. The institutions are all at various points in the identification of and implementation of Common Learning Outcomes and assessments to meet their accreditation requirements. The work of this group will establish systemwide Common Learning Outcomes allowing for institutional autonomy in alignment with their Mission and Core Themes. It is anticipated that this would be a phased in approach beginning in year 1 with the mathematics, English, and Communication, the following year would be physical, life, and social sciences, and in year three humanities. This process would be an on-going yearly activity, similar to the K-12 Content standards workgroups, to ensure continued transferability.

The State General Education Reform Taskforce provides the following recommended framework to CAAP. The recommendations are derived from a combination of the AAC&U LEAP framework, Degree Qualifications Profile, Quality Collaboratives Framework, and the Lumina Foundation Tuning America Initiative. Idaho’s public institutions must work collaboratively to re-map general education with new approaches to program design and assessment that address the needs of other stakeholders. This work requires a faculty-driven process that identifies an explicit core of learning outcomes within shared, discipline-specific competency areas. Transferability across institutions is central to general education reform and the establishment of common learning outcomes and competencies. The ability to map and assess learning outcomes and competencies across institutions will play a key role in general education reform. This work should begin with a focus on the core of general education as that is the foundation for all degrees.

Framework Requirements for General Education Reform:

- Identify the core competencies for the different degree levels (A.A./A.S., B.A./B.S., M.A./M.S./M.B.A., etc) and the learning outcomes that derive from those competencies. The foundation of this work should start with the core component of general education to ensure a foundation for transferability. There is no attempt to standardize disciplinary degrees across institutions. The ultimate goal of general education reform is to have an explicit core of learning outcomes across institutions within shared, discipline-specific competency areas. The competencies and learning outcomes make explicit what students will learn and should know and be able to do upon satisfactory completion of a given degree.

This work requires that faculty across institutions and by discipline come together to lead this effort. This work happens in six stages: Define, Map, Consult, Hone, Draft, and Implement.

---

Define the discipline core;
- Map career pathways;
- Consult Stakeholders;
- Hone core competencies and learning outcomes;
- Draft degree specifications; and
- Implement results locally.

- As part of defining the core competencies, disciplines should evaluate how they will incorporate a series of signature High Impact Practices (HIP)\textsuperscript{3} to reinforce core competencies. These HIP include things such as:
  - First Year Seminars and Experiences
  - Common Intellectual Experiences
  - Learning Communities
  - Writing-Intensive Courses
  - Undergraduate Research
  - Collaborative Assignments and Projects
  - Diversity and Global Learning
  - Service Learning and Community-Based Learning
  - Internships
  - Capstone Courses and Projects

- State Board of Education Policies will need to be revised and updated to facilitate transfer and assure achievement of defined core competencies and learning outcomes.

- To ensure continued transferability and alignment across institutions, this work must happen annually. There should be a clear reporting framework for improvement and accountability.\textsuperscript{4}

**Discipline Groups**

The general education reform work should begin with three disciplines, which are central to the core of general education across institutions, and then add a discipline each year for the coming two years. The intent of this work is to engage “in a recursive sequence of definition and revision based on increased awareness of the needs of other stakeholders\textsuperscript{5}.” Representatives from the State General Education Reform Taskforce should help facilitate work done by the faculty discipline groups. There must be a clear expectation about time commitment required (i.e., initial time commitment may be more


\textsuperscript{4} Association of American Colleges and Universities. Quality Collaboratives: Assessing and Reporting Degree Qualifications Profile Competencies in the Context of Transfer.

than the long-term on-going annual commitment). This should be a tool for professional
development opportunities for faculty, may also want to consider if some form of
compensation is possible (i.e., stipend, release time). The kickoff for this work should be
November 1st as a follow-up session to the Complete College Idaho Conference.

Process:

- Provost to identify points of contact to establish representatives by discipline
group. This may include involvement and recommendations from the faculty
senate on each respective campus.
  - Should consist of 1-2 representatives per group, per school. Each
discipline will be co-chaired by a two-year and four-year institutional
representative.
  - Representative should be someone who understands the curriculum, and
is senior enough to understand the context in which the curriculum
operates. They also need the ability to bring the message back to their
own departments.

- Subject areas will be added in yearly increments with discipline groups
meeting on a yearly basis thereafter to evaluate and assess competencies
and learning outcomes alignment. The foundational work begins with the core
of general education and then the work will lead to a discipline focused
process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Communication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Remediation Reform:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transforming Remediation</th>
<th>Activities to Support Initiatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clarify and Implement College and Career Readiness Education and Assessments</td>
<td>Implement Common Core State Standards to address the misalignment between K-12 education and college and career expectations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Develop a Statewide Model for Transformation of Remedial Placement and Support | • Complete Institutional Readiness Inventory Evaluation  
• Evaluate efficacy of current student placement and success  
• Determine appropriate mechanisms to assess student readiness for college-level work  
• Articulate content area competencies and student learning outcomes |
| Provide three options: Co-requisite model, Emporium model, or Accelerated model | Revise policies regarding placement, delivery, and evaluation of remedial services |

The Board’s Chief Academic Officer created a Transforming Remediation Taskforce, comprised of representatives from all eight public institutions. These representatives consist of Provosts, Vice Provosts, Deans, Admission/Placement Representatives and Faculty. The Taskforce traveled to Phoenix in April 2012 as part of Complete College America’s Gateway Course Success Institute. Following the April 2012 meeting, the team came together in June 2012 for a two-day work session in Boise to develop a plan and next steps for transforming remediation in Idaho. There are three key components the Transforming Remediation or subcommittees of faculty will need to work on in order to Transform Remediation in Idaho:

1) Common Core State Standards (CCS) and the work supporting the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC). In the immediacy, this work will require postsecondary faculty and K-12 faculty come together to ensure that the course content taught at the K-12 level is in alignment with postsecondary entrance expectations; this will require training current faculty both in general education and the colleges of education regarding the CCS and SBAC; and this will require that the colleges of education modify the way they educate pre-service teachers, and provide on-going professional development to current teachers.

2) Assessment & Placement. This requires evaluating our current COMPASS and ACCUPLACER tests for content alignment, accuracy of placement and determining a common threshold for placement. This requires working with ACT and College Board as well as the faculty content experts. Will also require a review of the current data for all institutions and a determination of whether our current assessment and placement
practices are ineffective. To accomplish this work it is necessary for faculty who teach both current remedial classes as well as general education core classes from both Math and English to come together in discipline subcommittees to evaluate the most effective and appropriate assessment tools and thresholds for placement into credit bearing courses. There is an important distinction in the primary focus of this work, and that is that the subcommittee’s focus is on assessment tools and recommendations for a common placement threshold for entrance into credit bearing courses and NOT admission thresholds for any institution.

3) Delivery models for remedial education. There are three models proposed for the institutions to select from in the delivery of remedial services. They are the Emporium Model, the Co-Requisite Model, and the Accelerated Model. While some of the institutions have one or more of these models or some variation of the model, there will be significant effort required from faculty and institutional administrative support to change current practice to align with the new models. This requires bringing together faculty on a statewide basis to share best practice, ensure alignment and create synergies for reform. This will also require, depending upon the model, an allocation or reallocation of resources to implement; whether it is more, or reassigned, faculty and, for some institutions, facilities and technology. Institutions have all completed a Draft Readiness Inventory for both Math and English content areas to determine where institutions are at in the “readiness for implementation” process.