



**STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
TRUSTEES OF BOISE STATE UNIVERSITY
TRUSTEES OF IDAHO STATE UNIVERSITY
TRUSTEES OF LEWIS-CLARK STATE COLLEGE
BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO
STATE BOARD FOR PROFESSIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION
TRUSTEES FOR THE IDAHO SCHOOL FOR THE DEAF AND THE BLIND**

**APPROVED MINUTES
STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
May 10-11, 2007
Sun Valley Room, Harrison Plaza Suites, Boise, Idaho**

A special meeting of the State Board of Education was held May 10-11, 2007 in the Sun Valley Room of the Harrison Plaza Suites in Boise, Idaho. Board President Milford Terrell presided.

Present:

Milford Terrell, President
Blake Hall
Laird Stone
Tom Luna, State Superintendent

Paul Agidius, Vice President
Rod Lewis
Richard Westerberg

Absent: Sue Thilo

EXECUTIVE SESSION

M/S (Westerberg/Stone): To move into Executive Session, pursuant to Idaho Code Section 67-2345(1), at 8:00 a.m., on May 10, 2007. A roll call vote was taken; motion carried unanimously.

M/S (Lewis/Agidius): To go out of Executive Session at 7:30 p.m., and adjourn for the evening. Motion carried unanimously.

In executive session, the Board did one or more of the following: (a) considered hiring a public officer, employee, staff member or individual agent; (b) considered the evaluation, dismissal or disciplining of, or complaints or charges brought against a public officer, employee, staff member of individual agent, or public school student; (c) conducted deliberations concerning labor negotiation or to acquire an interest in real property which is not owned by a public agency; (d) considered records that are exempt from public inspection; (e) considered preliminary negotiations involving matters of trade or commerce in which the governing body is in competition with governing bodies in other states or nations; (f) considered and advised its legal representatives in pending litigation or where there is a general public awareness of probable litigation.

OPEN SESSION

The Board reconvened at 8:13 a.m. on Friday, May 11, 2007 for the Open Session portion of the meeting. Board Vice President Agidius opened the meeting. Board President Terrell and State Superintendent Luna joined the meeting in progress.

Stuart Tennant of the Board Office introduced Dr. Sandra Elman, President of the Northwest Commission for Colleges and Universities (NWCCU), to discuss the regional accreditation process and various federal initiatives. Dr. Elman urged the Board to look at the planning and governance standards because they are germane to the work of the Board and the institution presidents. She explained that Idaho's governance system allows the State Board of Education to ensure that colleges and universities meet accreditation standards. She encouraged the Board to consider the national trends along with issues related to growth and economic development as it goes through the strategic planning process.

Board member Stone asked about the Board's role in the accreditation process. Dr. Elman pointed out that the Board should be very involved in the institution's self-study process, in the review of the institution's self-study report, and during the institution's meeting with the evaluation team. She indicated that when the Commission meets with the institutional president regarding accreditation, the Board doesn't need to be present unless there is an adverse condition or specific need to address.

Board member Lewis asked about changes at the federal level. Dr. Elman reported that the Commission is in the process of negotiated rule making with the U.S. Department of Education and discussed three areas where the rule changes would have significant impact. One is in the area of data collection and analysis related to student outcomes; another is in the area of credit transfer; a third is in the area of public disclosure. Dr. Elman explained that limited resources could shift the data collection responsibility from the Commission to the institutions which may create issues as to how the data is collected and analyzed. It also raises questions about who sets the benchmarks and how the Commission will hold the institutions accountable. Dr. Elman indicated that the negotiated rulemaking committee must decide to either accept or reject the whole package put before them by the Secretary of Education which means there are no easy answers.

Board member Hall asked Dr. Elman how a governing board should properly operate. Dr. Elman indicated that a governing board should work with each institution individually and respectively, to ensure that each institution's mission, vision, and educational objectives are fulfilled. She explained that a governing board should ensure that each institution has the necessary financial resources. Board member Hall pointed out that the State Board of Education is able to set fees and tuition and to make recommendations to the Legislature related to funding needs for the institutions. He discussed the Board's responsibility to ensure adequate funding while at the same time maintaining accessibility and affordability. Dr. Elman conceded it is a balancing act.

Board Vice President Agidius asked how the Commission would accredit a new community college. Dr. Elman said that usually the new community college would ask the Commission to meet with the institution to start working on the application process. Another approach she mentioned was from Oregon where two new institutions remained under the umbrella of the host college during the initial stages of application and prior to becoming a full-fledged candidate for accreditation.

Board member Lewis inquired about counsel for Idaho specifically and Dr. Elman expressed her great respect for the Board and its staff given all that they are asked to accomplish and oversee. She suggested the Board may want to consider appointing different sub-groups to work exclusively and separately on higher education and K-12.

STRATEGIC PLANNING

1. 2007 Strategic Plan

Chet Herbst presented a strategic plan development approach and timeline for the State Board of Education to consider. Dr. Herbst noted he was formerly the Director of Planning at Lewis-Clark State College prior to his current position.

2. 2008 Draft Strategic Plan/Working Document

M/S (Stone/Hall): To adopt the recommendations that Chet Herbst presented and form a strategic planning team as recommended. *Motion carried unanimously.*

Dr. Herbst discussed a reality-based approach to strategic planning based on real world calendars, budgeting cycles, and legislative expectations. He noted that in the past those things have been missing from the State Board's planning process. In addition, a lack of coordination between the Board and its subordinate agencies and institutions as far as the strategic planning process, have made the Board's strategic plan less effective.

Dr. Herbst explained that in 2006 the Legislature determined to be more involved in the planning process and wants all plans to be relevant, related, and used for decision making at all levels. He suggested that the State Board of Education and its subordinate entities follow the roadmap provided by the Legislature so that the Board's strategic plan can be anchored to real world timelines, budget cycles, relevant issues, and the Governor's and the Legislature's requests.

Dr. Herbst explained that early discussions with Board staff included a review of statutory guidance as well as a study of other states' planning approaches. It was determined to maintain a link to the previous strategic plan and its four goals while also striving for simplicity and clarity and the use of off-the-shelf resources when possible to support the plan.

Dr. Herbst walked through the skeleton plan for the Board noting it is anchored directly to the state statute. It frames the planning timelines and activities within legislative and accreditation cycles; it clarifies the respective roles of the Board and subordinate entities; and it takes advantage of the institutional manpower and expertise by putting together planning teams to focus on the specific aspects of the plan towards the goal of carrying out the legislation. As a result of this approach, the Board's strategic plan can be used as the basis for relevant decision-making and recommendations that will be forwarded to the Legislature.

Dr. Herbst demonstrated how available data can be easily accessed to underscore the objectives presented in the plan when it is presented to the Legislature. He emphasized that this is the type of information that should be presented year in and out in the strategic plan. As part of the Board's planning cycle, the Board should convene at the end of the legislative session specifically to review the plan and determine what was successful, what needs to continue on, what needs to be changed, and what should be incorporated into the next plan.

Dr. Herbst summarized the committee's recommendations which include organizing and delegating responsibilities for writing the strategic plan; having the strategic plan team flesh out the strategic plan by using an approach that complies with statute; and pursuing training opportunities for all of those working on the strategic plan writing. He indicated that a draft plan would be ready for the Board to review at the August meeting. Following discussion by the Board, it was recommended that Karen Echeverria work with Chet Herbst to put together a planning team to develop a draft plan for the August meeting.

Board member Lewis asked that there be further discussion at some later time on the various points and issues raised by Dr. Elman as part of the process of developing the strategic plan. He noted that the need to focus more adequately on higher education may mean reassigning duties of the Board or the Board staff. Along that same line, he suggested that the Board think in terms of developing more expertise and concentrated training among the Board members.

Board member Hall noted that one of the goals of the long-term strategic plan may be to look at how the Board sets fees each year. He suggested that long-term planning could make it possible to project fees. That, in turn, could help institutions plan for growth, parents plan for costs, and the Legislature better understand what it may need to do to ensure adequate funding of higher education. Board member Stone concurred that incorporating that kind of analysis into the Board's strategic plan process would be beneficial. He pointed out that each institution goes through a planning process already and develops an institutional strategic plan based on anticipated growth and needs.

BUSINESS AFFAIRS AND HUMAN RESOURCES

3. University of Idaho – Tenure Policy Waiver

M/S (Lewis/Stone): To waive application of Board Policy Section II.G.6.i. to allow the University of Idaho to offer a tenured faculty position to the qualified candidate selected by the University for the position of Vice President for Research. Motion carried 6-1 (Hall voted Nay).

Board President Terrell asked about the possibility of looking at the policy itself and making changes so that it is more consistent with other positions. Board member Agidius indicated it would be a good approach and would allow the institutions to recruit more competitively. Board member Hall indicated a discomfort with providing tenure to individuals and that the Board policy should not be changed. Board member Stone noted that the problem with the current policy is that if the institution just changes the position title to Assistant Vice Provost that qualifies it for tenure.

President Kustra of Boise State University indicated that nationally, those who are recruited and hired for the Vice President of Research positions usually expect and get tenure in the department or area of expertise where they come from. President Vailas of Idaho State University noted that in his experience in other states tenure appointments had to be approved by the board so the tenure issue wasn't a problem. The Board pointed out that in Idaho, the Board does not sign off on tenure, the institution does. President Thomas of Lewis-Clark State College emphasized that quality candidates won't apply for a Vice President of Research position unless it comes with tenure. Board member Lewis suggested changing the policy to make it consistent with other positions.

4. Compensation – Agency Heads

M/S (Westerberg/Stone): To set the annual salary of Dr. Michael Graham, Administrator for the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, at \$92,680.35 effective July 1, 2007.

M/S (Westerberg/Hall): To set the annual salary of Mary Dunne, Director of the Idaho School for the Deaf and the Blind, at \$74,460.00, effective July 1, 2007.

M/S (Westerberg/Ledington): To set the annual salary for Peter Morrill, General Manager of Idaho Public Television, at \$87,346.06, effective July 1, 2007.

M/S (Westerberg/Agidius): To set the salary of Dr. Michael Rush, Administrator of the Division of Professional-Technical Education, at \$98,201.79, effective July 1, 2007.

5. Compensation – Institution Presidents

M/S (Westerberg/Stone): To set the salary of Dr. Arthur Vailas as President of Idaho State University at \$273,000.00, effective July 1, 2007.

M/S (Westerberg/Stone): To set the salary of Dr. Robert Kustra as President of Boise State University at \$282,463.00, effective July 1, 2007.

M/S (Westerberg/Agidius): To set the salary of Dr. Timothy White as President of the University of Idaho at \$291,911.76, effective July 1, 2007.

M/S (Westerberg/Agidius): To set the salary of Dr. Dene Thomas as President of Lewis-Clark State College at \$146,141.14, effective July 1, 2007.

M/S (Westerberg/Hall): To set the salary of William Robertson as President of Eastern Idaho Technical College at \$113,305.50, effective July 1, 2007.

M/S (Westerberg/Hall): To approve a vehicle allowance in lieu of a vehicle for certain institutional presidents at an annual amount of \$7,200.00.

6. Special Meeting for Fee's Discussion

M/S (Agidius/Stone): To set a special Board meeting for Monday, April 7, 2008, for the purposes of conducting fee hearings for the colleges and universities in Boise Idaho.
Motion carried 5-2 (Lewis and Hall voted Nay).

Board President Terrell discussed having a special fee setting meeting. He noted it would make it possible for the Board to concentrate its full attention on this important activity. In addition, participants who only need to attend the regular meeting of the Board wouldn't be inconvenienced in terms of travel and wait-around time. Also, by changing the date and location for 2008, the fee setting session can be held at a different institution.

Board member Hall pointed out that fee setting had taken place at different institutions in the years he's been on the Board and that changing the location for next year's regular meeting was possible. He also suggested adding an additional day to the front or back of the regular meeting

date specifically for fee setting. Board member Lewis agreed it made sense to extend the regular meeting.

Board member Stone noted that if the Board's strategic planning works as anticipated, this may be the only time such a stand-alone time for fee setting may be necessary. Board member Hall reiterated that he favored a separate time for fee setting, but suggested that in terms of travel time and expense it would be better to extend the regular meeting and change the meeting location to facilitate the change of venue.

OTHER BUSINESS

President Kustra sought clarification regarding Board policy in terms of leasing a car. The Board clarified it is not a new policy or a change in policy.

M/S (Lewis/Agidius): To move into Executive Session at 10:53 a.m. *A roll call vote was taken; motion passed unanimously.*

M/S (Lewis/Agidius): To move out of Executive Session and adjourn at 1:00 p.m. *Motion carried unanimously.*

In executive session, the Board did one or more of the following: (a) considered hiring a public officer, employee, staff member or individual agent; (b) considered the evaluation, dismissal or disciplining of, or complaints or charges brought against a public officer, employee, staff member or individual agent, or public school student; (c) conducted deliberations concerning labor negotiation or to acquire an interest in real property which is not owned by a public agency; (d) considered records that are exempt from public inspection; (e) considered preliminary negotiations involving matters of trade or commerce in which the governing body is in competition with governing bodies in other states or nations; (f) considered and advised its legal representatives in pending litigation or where there is a general public awareness of probable litigation.