



**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
January 26, 2009
J.R. Williams Building, East Conference Room
700 W. State Street
Boise, Idaho**

A regular meeting of the State Board of Education was held January 26, 2009 in Boise, Idaho in the East Conference Room of the J.R. Williams Building, 700 West State Street.

Present:

Milford Terrell, President	Paul Agidius, Vice President
Sue Thilo, Secretary	Richard Westerberg
Kenneth Edmunds	Rod Lewis
Blake Hall	Tom Luna, State Superintendent

The Board convened at 9:10 a.m. with President Milford Terrell presiding. He recognized Representative Gibbs from the House Education Committee who was in the audience.

1. Agenda

M/S (Lewis/Edmunds): To accept the agenda as presented with the exception of item 2 of Section I of the Business Affairs and Human Resources agenda, which has been pulled. Motion carried unanimously.

Board President Terrell took time to recognize the colleges and universities for their good work this year. He noted that Idaho State University has a record enrollment this year and Boise State University has awarded \$25,000 in scholarships to high school students to help pay for concurrent classes this year.

AUDIT COMMITTEE

1. Presentation of Annual Financial Audit of the Colleges and Universities

M/S (Lewis/Thilo): To accept from the Audit Committee the Fiscal Year 2008 financial audit reports for Boise State University, Idaho State University, University of Idaho, Lewis-Clark State College, and Eastern Idaho Technical College, as presented by Moss Adams, LLP. Motion carried unanimously.

Board member Lewis presented this item. He introduced Mary Case and Scott Simpson of Moss Adams, LLP to give a report on the audit.

Mary Case summarized the process undertaken by Moss Adams, LLP in conducting the audit of the institutions. She indicated that they had found clean financial statements for all of the institutions this year. There was a delay in finalizing the report due to a change in the reporting methods used by the Idaho State University foundation. Ms. Case reported that Moss Adams, LLP had met with the Board's audit committee last week to go over everything in detail.

Scott Simpson reviewed the internal controls and findings for the Board. A handout was provided to the Board members with the details of the report. Mr. Simpson clarified that a materiality threshold was met in conducting the audit to make sure the financial statements were presented in accordance with general accounting principles.

Mr. Simpson discussed the required communications with the Audit Committee. He noted that it is each institution's responsibility to prepare the financial statements and be sure they are complete. If there are any audit adjustments, Moss Adams, LLP is required to report those. If there are any disagreements with management, those are reported to the Board. Any consultations with other accountants, on the part of the institutions, are required to be reported by Moss Adams, LLP. All the audits went smoothly this year.

Mary Case noted that this past year, there was a suite of standards imposed on the audit board that were greater than before. As a result, the institutions were required to document their internal controls. She commended the institutions for their cooperation.

Board member Lewis thanked Moss Adams, LLP for their presentation. He followed up by reporting on the work of the Board's Audit Committee. The Audit Committee is making good progress and its professional members are highly qualified for the assignment. The Audit Committee would like to have the internal auditors of the institutions report to the Audit Committee on a regular basis in order to have a current grasp of the details and be able to address concerns sooner. The Audit Committee wants to improve the coordination between the foundations and the Board so it's considering having the foundation auditors also report to the Audit Committee. The Audit Committee is concerned about the timing of the financial statements so, as a result, is considering asking for quarterly reports from the institutions. Mr. Lewis indicated that the State Controller's Office is requesting all information be provided to them under one standard. As a result, the Board has requested that the foundations and institutions provide the Board all of their information according to the State Controllers request.

Board member Lewis pointed out that the primary function of the Audit Committee is to look at quality controls, procedures, etc. He noted that the Board's Business Affairs and Human Resources (BAHR) Committee has the responsibility to review the institutions' financial statements. The Audit Committee believes it is important that it has access to that information as well, so it will begin to meet on a quarterly basis with BAHR in order to review the financial statements and have open discussions as a Board.

Mr. Lewis indicated the Audit Committee will request the institutional Finance Vice Presidents bring the Board updates as to how they have, and will continue to handle their responses to the audit findings. Board member Edmunds noted that it is essential to have more timely information from the institutions in order to address issues on a timely basis.

Board member Edmunds asked Moss Adams, LLP if the Board is where it needs to be with the foundations. Mary Case indicated that the Board is going in the right direction and continuing in that direction is prudent. He asked about the segregation of duties between the foundations and the institutions. Ms. Case indicated that there is a level of cross over taking place between the University of Idaho and its foundation which needs to be addressed. She noted that there is cross over between Idaho State University and its foundation as well, but the accounts are segregated so it's not the same concern. This is the same at Boise State University. Mr. Edmunds asked if the Board needs to do more and if the foundation agreements are adequate. Ms. Case said the Board has more work to do in that area. Ms. Case commended the Board for strengthening the Audit Committee to the degree it has over the past few years. It is a strong committee and a good example to the institutions.

At this time, Board President Terrell took time to commend Lewis-Clark State College Baseball Coach Ed Cheff who was named the winner of the American Baseball Coaches' Association's 2009 Lefty Gomez Award for his lifetime contributions to amateur baseball. Coach Cheff received the award at the ABCA's annual convention awards dinner held on January 3, 2009. Mr. Terrell reported that Coach Cheff also received the ABCA's NAIA Region I Coach of the Year award for 2008.

Board President Terrell also acknowledged Wayne Hammond and Joyce McRoberts from the Governor's Office.

PLANNING, POLICY, AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

1. Medical Education Study – Findings and Recommendations

By unanimous consent, the Board agreed to delay item one until later in the agenda. It was so moved.

2. Governor's Office Education Related Legislation

M/S (Hall/Agidius): To support the Governor's proposed Education Reorganization Legislation and to direct the Executive Director to work with the Governor's staff to make any additional revisions as necessary. Motion carried unanimously.

Board member Hall presented this item. An update of the Governor's Education Reorganization Package was provided by Wayne Hammond. During discussion of the various items, it was indicated that Board members should work with Executive Director Mike Rush and provide comments to him to finalize the wording of the legislation.

Board member Lewis noted that he is in agreement with the direction being taken. He went on to refer to a couple of items so that the Board staff would be familiar with his concerns. One had to do with school district boundaries (SB 1010) and the remaining references to the SBOE. He suggested that it would be helpful to make sure that gets reviewed.

Mr. Lewis asked about the changes with respect to the proprietary schools (SB 1012). Executive Director Rush provided detail. He pointed out that since proprietary schools are not accredited, they have not gone through the rigorous controls that accredited institutions have.

Therefore, the legislation has more stringent requirements for the registration of proprietary schools.

Mr. Lewis asked about the legislation to transfer Motorcycle Training to Idaho State University. Dr. Rush provided an explanation. Board member Hall asked Dr. Rush to look at this piece of legislation and determine if the Division of Professional-Technical Education is the appropriate agency to take this program.

Board member Agidius asked if the Board office will have enough staff to handle the responsibilities they are charged with. Dr. Rush indicated that while all of the Board office staff have heavy workloads, these moves will not impact the Board office staff.

Board member Westerberg asked about the financial and staffing impact of these moves. Wayne Hammond indicated that information is available and that he would provide a handout to the Board.

Board member Lewis discussed the transfer of assessment and wondered if there would be funding for a person in the Board office to handle the duties related to accountability. Wayne Hammond indicated that the Governor's budget does provide for an FTE and funds to remain at the Board office for this responsibility.

State Superintendent Luna noted that several editorials in the newspaper have suggested that these changes are politically motivated. He urged people to understand that these changes will allow programs to run better and be more efficient. Mr. Hammond agreed that this reorganization is intended to put responsibilities in a place where they best fit and can be effectively run.

Eastern Idaho Technical College Screening Committee Update

M/S (Hall/Westerberg): To accept the recommendation of the Eastern Idaho Technical College screening committee to appoint Burton Waite as the President, at an annual salary of \$115,000 and a car allowance of \$7,200 annually, effective immediately. Motion carried unanimously.

At this time Board member Hall reported on the results of the screening committee process for a new President of Eastern Idaho Technical College. He indicated that Mr. Burton Waite had been selected and introduced Mr. Waite to the audience. Mr. Hall noted that this item was posted to the Board agenda last week. Board President Terrell congratulated Mr. Waite on his appointment.

3. Additional Legislative Items

Item C – Optional Retirement Plan – Deferred Compensation

M/S (Hall/Agidius): To authorize Board staff to continue work on legislation allowing for the establishment of a deferred compensation plan for certain employees of Idaho's public postsecondary institutions, and to approve the draft legislation submitted, pending further review on the question of whether specific legislation authorizing such deferred compensation plans is necessary. The Executive Director may make revisions as necessary to comply with applicable tax laws. Board staff will continue to coordinate

with the Governor's legislative process with respect to this legislation. Motion carried unanimously.

Item D – Concurrent Resolution – Research Dairy

M/S (Hall/Agidius): To authorize the University of Idaho to submit a concurrent resolution to authorize the Building Authority to work with and enter into contract with the University of Idaho, either for itself or in conjunction with the Department of Agriculture and the Land Board, for financing and development of the Research Dairy Project as long as such contracting to be done is in compliance with the policies of the State Board of Education and that neither the Building Authority nor the University of Idaho move beyond the approved planning phase without any such agreements being approved by the State Board of Education.

Substitute M/S (Hall/Westerberg): To postpone Item D until the February meeting. Motion carried unanimously.

Board member Hall asked for discussion of Item D – Concurrent Resolution – Research Dairy, to clarify where the funds for the project will come from. Lloyd Mues of the University of Idaho responded to the Board's inquiries. After lengthy discussion, the Board agreed to postpone this item until the February meeting when University of Idaho staff can be present to give additional details and explanation. Board member Edmunds clarified that the University of Idaho already has the Board's permission to engage in planning efforts.

At this time the Board took up item one of the PPGAC agenda.

1. Medical Education Study – Findings and Recommendations

M/S (Hall/Westerberg): To approve the Report of Findings and Recommendations of the State Board of Education Medical Education Study Committee contained in Attachment 1, and to direct that the Report be forwarded to the Governor and the Legislature.

Substitute M/S (Edmunds/Thilo): Move to delete recommendation number 5 from Attachment 1 and renumber items 6-11 to read items 5-10. And, in doing so, to approve the Report of Findings and Recommendations of the State Board of Education Medical Education Study Committee contained in Attachment 1, and to direct that the Report be forwarded to the Governor and the Legislature. A roll call vote was taken; motion passed 6-2 (Hall and Westerberg voted Nay).

Board member Hall introduced this item and summarized the work that had been done. Mike Killworth of the Board office provided additional details. He distributed handouts to the Board for their information. Mr. Killworth pointed out that the Board's committee was different from two other committees conducting reviews of medical education in Idaho. He noted that the other two committees were the Governor's Select Committee for Healthcare and the Legislative Interim Committee for Medical Education.

Mr. Killworth discussed the work and the goals of the committee. He noted that key staff persons for the Legislative and the Governor's committees were invited, and did attend the Board's committee meetings. Mr. Killworth reported on the committee's findings and recommendations. It was noted that the recommendations provided in the Board agenda

included a recommendation (#5) that was not developed by the Board's committee, but added afterwards at the request of a committee member. It is the same recommendation proposed by the Legislative Medical Education Committee.

Board member Thilo thanked Mr. Killworth for his strong staff support to the Board committee. She also thanked Matt Freeman of the Legislative Services Office for providing continuity between the committees. Ms. Thilo pointed out that she served on the Board committee and also the Legislative Interim Committee which was helpful and meaningful. Ms. Thilo noted that the Board committee benefited from the inclusion of the two family practice doctors who joined them at the table. She explained that a great deal of research was available to support the Board committee's findings. Ms. Thilo expressed serious concern about altering the original recommendations of the Board's Committee which were straightforward, across-the-board, and transparent. She cautioned the Board, as they look at the amended recommendations, to be aware that the Board's committee was very much in support of a collaborative approach incorporating the best practices and best minds available as opposed to expending resources for individual programs. The Board's committee was concerned that if the approach became competitive or regionally motivated, it would create conflict and division. These are the things the Board committee wants to avoid.

Board member Westerberg noted that he viewed the recommendation in question as an opportunity for the Board to look at models and business plans without having to fund them. He indicated that he didn't believe there would be conflict as a result.

Board member Hall agreed that there was no intention to create a competitive situation. Rather it is an attempt to solicit information and identify the information that is being solicited. He suggested this is a useful approach and process. It is not politically motivated. Mr. Hall noted that the Legislature's and the Governor's committees both agreed this approach should be part of the process. Mr. Hall noted that recommendations do state that the Board will oversee and provide approval.

Board member Lewis noted that the report from the Board's committee refers repeatedly to comments from a number of different entities that point to a desire for a collaborative approach from all stakeholders. The original recommendations put forward by the Board are based on the Board committee's findings. He noted that the Board committee's findings and recommendations were a result of a great deal of research, homework, and investigation being done by its members. He pointed out that it is logical to assume that the Legislature's and the Governor's committees would arrive at different recommendations than the Board's committee just as a matter of course. He recommended that the Board respect the work of its committee.

Board member Hall argued for retaining item five as put forward by the Legislative committee. Board President Terrell emphasized that the Board's committee had spent sufficient and thorough time in deliberating all the findings and facts pertaining to each recommendation. Board member Thilo reiterated that the committee met a number of times before coming to any conclusions. In addition, a number of documents and materials were provided to the committee as research. She noted that a good deal of time was spent prior to deciding on the final set of recommendations.

Board member Lewis emphasized that there are different sets of policy makers and each set is tasked to come up with findings and a view. The outcome of the Board's work is what is being discussed today. It is not the Board's intent to speak against the findings of other groups.

Board member Westerberg suggested that there is no downside to leaving item 5 in as is. It allows for validated information being put together for the Board's benefit without cost to the Board. Board member Edmunds suggested that any planning effort uses the time and talent of state paid employees at the institutions so there is a cost.

Board member Edmunds put forward a substitute motion to stay with the original recommendations made by the Board's Committee.

At this time the Board returned to item 3 of the Planning, Policy, and Governmental Affairs (PPGAC) agenda in order to allow further discussion of the additional legislative issues. Board member Thilo indicated that she is pleased to see the Residency Determination for Tuition Purposes back on the legislative docket. She urged that Legislature develop language that will correct unintended consequences.

Referring to page 7 of item 3 of the PPGAC agenda, Board member Lewis asked for clarification of the meaning of "second degree" in the language under point number eight. Board member Hall indicated that it is a legal term defined in probate code. Board member Lewis raised a question about taking the prohibition that far. Board member Hall suggested that Board members look at that definition in the probate code for their own understanding. It was questioned whether this language would prevent the Board from making its own determination in Board policy as to what it can require of the institutions.

4. 2010-2014 Strategic Plan Direction

Board member Hall introduced this item. He noted that the intent at this point is to make the Board aware of the staff efforts under way to assist the Board with its strategic planning efforts. Dr. Rush provided background information. He noted that the original strategic planning process occurred too late in the year to fit with the Board's planning calendar. An attempt has been made to change that. The next step is to give the Board a preview prior to February when this will come before the Board.

Board member Hall indicated that the Board requires the institutions to provide the Board with their five-year plan. He suggested that there needs to be a better understanding between the Board and the institutions just what those five-year plans entail or are to be used for. He asked the Board, as they go through the strategic planning process, to be mindful of the need to clarify that point.

Board member Edmunds expressed concern that there is too much competition in the state for limited dollars. He suggested exploring that issue more fully as part of the strategic plan. He would like to better understand the role of the Board in regards to K-12.

Board member Westerberg pointed out that the mission and vision statements are quite a bit different than in the past. He urged the Board members to speak up if they have issues because when the strategic plan is finished it will be more concrete in terms of performance measures.

The question arose as to whether enough time has been given to overhauling the Board's strategic plan. Board President Terrell agreed that more time needs to be spent on the plan to be sure it fits with what the Governor has directed the Board to do in terms of reorganization. A

meeting will be arranged prior to the February meeting to continue the work of strategic planning.

President Vailas of Idaho State University was invited to speak. He agreed that the institution's plans should align with the Board's plan. He suggested that there needs to be clarification regarding the role of the Board's plan in terms of the economic development goals of the state. In addition, it needs to be determined if the time spent by the institutions in creating their plans is a good use of resources. Board President Terrell directed staff to go back to see what the Board has already approved from the institution plans.

5. University of Idaho – Student Housing Report

Lloyd Mues discussed this item for the Board. It was noted that the Lewiston Tribune had not reported the story about co-ed housing correctly. He emphasized there is no intention by the University of Idaho for male and female students to share rooms.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

1. Cascade School District #422 Trustee Zone Change

M/S (Luna/Agidius): To approve the adjusted trustee zones for the Cascade School District as submitted. Motion carried unanimously.

State Superintendent Luna presented this item. He referred the Board to the agenda for more detailed information.

2. Dual Credit Legislation

State Superintendent Luna presented this information item. He summarized the work of the task force and the process undertaken to come up with final recommendations. He noted the recommendations will be presented to the Legislature this month. The recommendations include the proposal for a statewide dual credit fee reimbursement. A copy of the draft legislation related to that was provided to the Board in their agenda materials. Mr. Luna noted that the committee that was put together had 24 individuals participating and 16 of those came from the education field.

Board member Hall asked for clarification on the fee. Mr. Luna indicated that the current fee that was agreed upon is \$65 per credit; the state will reimburse \$50 of that fee and the student will pay the rest. He indicated that Board policy will set the per credit fee on an annual basis.

Mr. Hall raised a concern about the significant reduction in dual enrollments at ISU and NIC and asked the institutions to speak to those enrollments. There was discussion between the Board, Board staff, the SDE staff, and the institutions about the accuracy of the numbers and the reliability of 10th day numbers. The numbers in question will be reviewed. Mr. Hall asked that the Board staff and the institutions provide footnotes and explanation for the data they turn in.

There was discussion related to issues raised by the provosts and vice presidents. Dale Bower of the Board office reported that the concerns expressed had to do with the governance role of postsecondary institutions in the area of dual enrollment. Dr. Vailas indicated that the concerns related to a lack of written instructions at the state level as to how the oversight will be executed

by the institutions. He noted that the accrediting bodies have expressed concerns about this as well. He urged the Board to provide a required set of detail that all higher education and secondary education institutions must follow to give assurance to the accrediting bodies that the postsecondary institutions are in compliance.

Board member Lewis asked for clarification related to the comments from the institutions about changing the definition of eligible institutions and also deleting language under the heading of Courses According to Agreements. Dr. Bower indicated that CAAP members felt they wanted something more substantive to accreditation and that it would be meaningful to have those as part of the language of the legislation. As far as proximity of services, it was felt it would be better for the high schools to work with the institution in their region.

State Superintendent Luna reported that the task force had discussed at length the topic of regional monopolies. The task force had agreed that by giving students the option of selecting an institution outside of the region they lived in, students would have a greater opportunity to take the courses they needed or wanted. The task force found that people around the state were in agreement that they didn't want to be limited geographically. Mr. Luna reiterated that half of the task force members were from postsecondary institutions. Everyone except BSU supported the idea of allowing students to work at the institution of their choice to obtain the education they are seeking.

Selena Grace of the Board staff indicated that the biggest concern of the institutions is that high schools will go out and shop for the best deal, thereby pitting the postsecondary institutions against one another. She noted that some institutions are able to provide services or deals that other institutions cannot. State Superintendent Luna reminded the Board that this legislation relates to a scholarship program that allows students to participate in the dual credit opportunities already out there; students who may not be financially able to afford to take the courses otherwise. He urged the Board to base their decision on what is best for the student, not what is good for the bureaucracy. Board member Lewis suggested, on the regional issue, that the Board be involved in the discussion.

At this time, Board member Hall was excused from the remainder of the meeting to attend to other business.

Board President Terrell took the opportunity to commend the University of Idaho for the initiative to take a hard look at cutting and downsizing programs.

3. Teacher Evaluation Legislation

State Superintendent Luna presented this item. He noted that the work of the task force was focused on examining and reviewing current Idaho law relating to teacher performance evaluations, teacher evaluation models, the role of higher education in developing and training Idaho's teachers and administrators, and national trends and practices in teacher supervision and evaluation.

Christina Linder of the Department of Education reviewed the recommendations of the task force. She noted that the heart of the task force's work related to the local district evaluation policy. She discussed the portions of the policy where changes had been made. She pointed out that the changes do not require any additional funding.

Mr. Luna reported that the task force was drawn to the work of Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching domains and components of instruction. He pointed out that Dr. Danielson is a nationally recognized expert on school improvement and has authored numerous publications for the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. It was deemed by the task force, early on, that pay-for-performance would be a separate issue from teacher evaluation standards.

Board member Edmunds asked if teacher evaluations will be a good basis for pay-for-performance when that becomes an option. Mr. Luna indicated that pay-for-performance is being worked on in parallel, but not in conjunction with, this effort. He reiterated that the task force didn't view their work in that way.

4. Public Schools Budget

State Superintendent Luna presented this item. He noted he will make his presentation to the Joint Finance and Appropriations Committee on Thursday of this week. His request will be for less than what Public Schools received in FY 2009. He noted that Governor Otter proposed a 5.3% reduction for Public Schools. He presented a list of ideas the Department of Education had solicited as to ways the education budget can be trimmed without impacting student achievement. His goal is to preserve student-teacher contact hours and to preserve those programs that have the most immediate positive impact on student achievement.

Mr. Luna discussed several of the ideas for the benefit of the Board. He noted that if the Board has additional ideas or points that it feels needs to be raised, he would appreciate input.

INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH, AND STUDENT AFFAIRS

1. Approval of the Idaho Accountability Workbook

M/S (Thilo/Agidius): To approve the proposed amendments to the State of Idaho Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook.

Substitute M/S (Lewis/Agidius): To approve the proposed amendments 1 and 2 but not number 3 of the State of Idaho Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook.
Motion carried unanimously.

Board member Thilo presented this item. Board member Lewis asked a question related to AYP and the use of attendance for the third indicator. Margaret Healy of the Board office indicated that middle schools currently have an option as to what indicator they want to use for their third indicator. Having middle schools use attendance as their third indicator would help improve attendance as well as student achievement. Mr. Lewis suggested that attendance is not a sufficient method of measuring achievement. Ms. Healy noted that the accountability is at the school level, not the student level so attendance is one way to hold schools accountable. She noted that schools are still held to the math and reading requirements as their first two indicators.

Mr. Luna asked what schools usually choose as their third indicator. Ms. Healy indicated that most schools have used Language Usage. Mr. Luna noted that because schools receive a majority of their funding based on attendance, they are already focused on that. He indicated that he agreed with Mr. Lewis about not shifting attention away from student achievement.

Mr. Lewis made a substitute motion to approve only amendments one and two. State Superintendent Luna asked if not using attendance as the third indicator will affect the application that is currently before the U.S. Department of Education. Ms. Healy indicated that the Board received permission from the U.S. Department of Education to submit simultaneous applications. She does not anticipate that this will impact the turn around time in their response. Dr. Mike Rush clarified with Mr. Lewis that his motion would include all of the clarifications and editorials related to the motion.

BUSINESS AFFAIRS AND HUMAN RESOURCES – Section I

1. Idaho State University – Appointment of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

M/S (Westerberg/Edmunds): To approve the appointment of Dr. Gary A. Olson to the position of Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, at an annual salary of \$195,000.00. Motion carried unanimously.

Board member Westerberg presented this item. Dr. Vailas introduced the new Provost to the Board.

2. Pulled

BUSINESS AFFAIRS AND HUMAN RESOURCES – Section II

1. Boise State University – Taco Bell Arena – Seat Replacement

M/S (Westerberg/Edmunds): To approve Boise State University's request to replace the platform seating in the Taco Bell Arena at a cost not to exceed \$925,000, to be paid from bond proceeds from the February 2009 bond sale. The University must not proceed with construction of this project prior to Board approval to issue debt. Motion carried unanimously.

Board member Westerberg presented this item. Board member Agidius raised a question about the contingency figures. Stacy Pearson of Boise State University explained that the contingency calculations are based on construction costs. Ms. Pearson indicated that she will correct the mistakes.

2. Office of the State Board of Education – Withdrawal from the Interstate Compact for Education

Board member Westerberg presented this item. There were no questions.

OTHER BUSINESS

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p.m.