



**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 MEETING
SPECIAL MEETING
November 9, 2009
Stueckle Sky Center, Skyline Room
Boise State University
Boise, Idaho**

9:00 a.m. (MST)

A special meeting of the State Board of Education was held November 9, 2009 in Boise, Idaho at the Stueckle Sky Center Skyline Room at Boise State University. Board President Paul Agidius presided.

Present:

Paul Agidius, President
Ken Edmunds, Secretary
Emma Atchley
Rod Lewis

Richard Westerberg, Vice President
Don Soltman
Milford Terrell

Absent:

Tom Luna

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m. Board President Agidius introduced the agenda. Mr. Agidius extended the thanks and appreciation of the Board to Boise State University for hosting the meeting.

BOARDWORK

1. Agenda Approval

M/S (Terrell/Westerberg): To approve the agenda as submitted. Motion carried unanimously.

PLANNING, POLICY & GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

1. Strategic Planning

a. Welcome and Overview

Board member Terrell presented this item. He introduced Sarah Borden to facilitate the strategic planning session.

Ms. Borden reviewed the agenda for the strategic planning session, discussed the ground rules, and summarized how the process would work for this portion of the meeting. She referred the Board to the agenda materials.

Ms. Borden asked for input from the Board and the representatives from the colleges, universities, and agencies in terms of their understanding of the purpose of strategic planning. Board member Edmunds indicated that the state and the education community want strategic direction. The strategic plan will also improve coordination and communication between the Board and the Department of Education. Board member Atchley observed that the strategic plan helps the Board to direct resources. Executive Director Mike Rush explained that the strategic plan will help Board staff know where to focus their attention, time, and resources in terms of staff effort. It also helps Board staff know what actions the Board wants staff to help institutions and agencies implement. The strategic plan lets the institutions and agencies know what the Board expects from them. It also helps them to draft their own strategic plans. Board member Westerberg agreed that the strategic plan should define where the Board wants to go, determine the speed of the march, and the direction to take to get there.

Dr. Kustra of Boise State University explained that a serious strategic planning effort will help the Board to do long-range planning in terms of how the state's universities and colleges are going to provide education across the state. He indicated that in the past, a lot of the planning was done in smaller increments, but a strategic plan that is long-range will look at the bigger picture. In the end, it will also help the Board track the resources statewide and account for how they are spent and hopefully get out of the regionalism approach to planning.

Board member Westerberg raised a question as to how specific the Board's strategic plan will be in terms of speaking to the goal and the role of instruction in the state of Idaho. Ms. Borden clarified that it seemed that what was said was that the Board should look at the macro level not the little details.

Board member Edmunds asked if the Board wanted to do more than to patch, or if it has the resources and political will power to do more than patch. Ms. Borden said that was a critical question. She asked the Board if it was tweaking what it already has, or if it is starting to build something new. Dr. Doug Baker of UI said that it made sense to see how much pruning actually needs to be done versus cutting down the tree altogether. He asked about the challenges the state faces, and how the education system is currently structured to meet those needs. He asked if the state needed to turn the little dial or the big dial to meet

those needs. He agreed that what President Kustra said makes a lot of sense in terms of looking at the big picture.

b. Education in Context

Dr. Rush presented the Education in Context piece to the audience. This was followed by input and discussion from the Board and other participants. Dr. Kustra noted that the IPEDS data is not reliable in terms of trying to track what is going on in Idaho. Others agreed that IPEDS fails to track a large number of students.

Dr. Baker pointed out that the U.S. education system suffers the same problem that Idaho does, which is that it depends very much on state funding. What has happened over time is that as the economy struggles, state funds for education have been chipped away in order to take care of other needs. Dr. Baker explained that the opposite is true in other countries. Those countries view education as more valuable and have directed more and more money into education over the years. As a result, their education systems are growing at a phenomenal rate. He suggested that Idaho needs to consider raising revenue another way.

Ms. Borden noted that these are major issues and asked institutions for input as to what they are currently doing to grapple with the cuts. The representatives from the colleges and universities agreed that they have had to limit program offerings, not fill vacant positions, eliminate course offerings, and in some cases combine colleges or divisions. It was explained that some of the institutions do charge professional fees to professional students to help address the financial need. All of the institutions and agencies have had to do more with much less.

Ms. Borden asked the group to think about the intervention needed to turn this around. She encouraged the group to look at doing things differently. Dr. Robin Dodson of ISU suggested that there were influential people who may need to be brought into the discussion at some point down the road, but there was agreement that the Board needed to start the process and have something to take to those other people.

c. Foundational Work

Ms. Borden referred to the agenda materials and discussed the strategic plan hierarchy. She pointed out that the link between the current conditions and the Board's future vision is the strategic plan. Everything needs to point towards the vision. Board member Don Soltman noted that the vision statement needs to be a constant. And, Board President Agidius emphasized that if the effort stops with the vision statement, then the effort is a waste of time. Ms. Borden observed that once the strategic plan is completed, a communication strategy needs to be put into place to get the word to those influential people mentioned earlier.

There was discussion about the vision statement. It was noted that the current vision and mission statements were drafted about a year ago. Ms. Borden emphasized that a strong vision statement needs to convey clearly where the Board wants to go. It doesn't have to be long or wordy, but it does need to inspire the uninformed reader to look at what it represents. She suggested that the newest vision statement didn't offer enough to an

uninformed reader. She asked the Board to compare it with the vision statement from 2009-2013.

Board member Atchley noted that an education system has a product at the end and agreed the previous vision statement gives a better picture of what that product should look like. Board President Agidius noted that the current vision statement is where the Board wants to be while the previous one is more about how to get there.

Board member Lewis noted that both vision statements focused on the individual or the system. He raised a point about what exactly the Board wants to accomplish. Is it talking about what it wants to do as a system to help individuals achieve a particular end, or is it talking about the capabilities it wants to provide to individuals? Is it trying to drive economic well-being of the state, or is it trying to help individuals so that they attain an education level that allows them to compete in the global economy? Does the Board want to better the economy or the individual? What is the responsibility of the Board?

Dr. Baker pointed out that all the colleges of the state are accredited through the Northwest Commission and the Commission requests program assessments, not individual assessments.

Ms. Borden referred to the 2009-2013 vision statement and wrote down the concepts it points to for the Board to consider. Those concepts include: access and a seamless system that results in a well-informed citizenry which affects the economy and the quality of life. Board member Lewis added that one of the concepts is that Idaho's students be competitive in a global economy.

Ms. Borden reiterated that the Board needs to remember who the audience is in terms of the vision statement. If the vision statement is too vague, it's hard to communicate what it means. Board member Westerberg emphasized that a simple statement keeps it from getting too unwieldy. Ms. Borden suggested that a tag line could be followed by a longer statement that spells it out a little more clearly.

In referring to the vision statement for 2009-2013, Board member Lewis noted that the term well-informed or well-educated is not clearly defined. He asked how the Board would measure that.

Dr. Sona Andrews of Boise State College asked how Idaho's vision or mission statements distinguish us from other states. She suggested having both the vision and mission statement use the word "Idaho". Ms. Borden reminded the Board again that to inspire people to get involved and to come along, the vision statement needs to appeal to the curiosity. Dr. Baker referred to Washington's vision and mission statements and read portions for the benefit of the Board so they could have an idea of what other states had crafted.

Ms. Borden again asked what the vision is for Idaho's education system. To get the discussion started, she asked the participants to write a statement to share with the group to get ideas from them for the group to consider and to share those statements out loud. She made a list of the common themes which came out of this exercise. They included:

competitive, access, seamless, relevance, globally competitive, highly educated workforce, lifelong, innovative, sustainability of the system, creation of knowledge that impacts the quality of life in a region or in the state (the creation of knowledge that creates a new industry through research or discoveries done by the institutions that moves the state forward), and maximizing potential.

Based on the discussion and the common themes that were identified, Ms. Borden asked the Board for permission to use the 2009-2013 statement as a starting point, then to add in the other key concepts, and also to include a tag line that further defines the vision statement. The Board agreed and urged that the tag line be short and not be a map of how to get there. Board President Agidius reiterated that the tag line needs to be broad and not cater to just one view or interest area.

Ms. Borden discussed values and how a point in the vision can be demonstrated. Dr. Baker referred back to what Washington had put together and noted that it had listed out a series of steps, each one building on the other. He suggested that the Board may want to look at that information. It is available online.

There was more discussion and Ms. Borden listed some other values that might be considered, including: accountability, responsibility, communication, innovation, cooperation, leadership/advocacy, respect, and efficiency. Those values help to further define the mission.

d. Review and Development of Goals and Objectives

The discussion turned to performance measures and goals. Ms. Borden referred to the agenda materials and reviewed existing goals from three different entities.

The first set of goals came out of CAAP. Sona Andrews provided more details as to how CAAP arrived at the goals and objectives it did. She noted that the foundational principles that CAAP identified included the need to: (1) educate more citizens and students; (2) motivate students; (3) increase access to education; (4) increase success rates for emerging citizens; (5) recruit more and better prepare educators; and (6) increase collaboration between all players. Based on these needs, CAAP came up with the four goals.

The next set of goals came from the State Department of Education. Luci Willits of SDE presented them and discussed the steps SDE went through to come up with its mission, vision, and goals. She indicated that the SDE wanted to make sure that the goals were global yet specific. She explained that the action plan that came out of the goals defines and outlines how the goals are met. Accountability is a key point in all the goals and the strategies. She recommended that the Board look at the Department's webpage to see their strategies and performance measures because they clearly define the responsibilities of the Department.

The next set of goals the Board reviewed came from the Education Alliance of Idaho. It was noted that members from the education community served on the EAI committee. Board member Lewis pointed out that EAI has been offering to give input and to engage in

a dialog with the Board for several years. He suggested that the Board needs to take the initiative now and make sure to include the EAI in its discussions.

As a side note, an action item for the Board to follow up on is deciding out how to get a partnership going with EAI.

Ms. Borden asked the Board if any of the goals just presented might be ones the Board would like to build on. There was discussion about incorporating the various goals or ideas into the Board's plan. Board member Soltman liked the work that CAAP did. Board member Westerberg concurred and suggested that those goals could be adapted to fit the broader system.

There was a general acceptance of that idea. It will address the common themes identified by the Board: competitive, access, seamless, relevance, globally competitive, highly educated workforce, lifelong, innovative, sustainability of the system, creation of knowledge that impacts the quality of life in a region or in the state (the creation of knowledge that creates a new industry through research or discoveries done by the institutions that moves the state forward), and maximizing potential.

It was agreed that the CAAP goals did not conflict with the SDE or EAI goals. It was agreed to take the four goals and adapt them to the K-20 system. Dr. Baker noted that there is a need to address how the longitudinal data system fits into the SBOE plan. The Board agreed to come back to this item.

The Board agreed that having the performance measures and strategies is essential. Sona Andrews encouraged the Board not to start with the measures, but rather to think about what is important in the bigger sense and then figure out how to measure it. If it turns out to not be measureable, then it needs to go away.

The Board began to work through the goals and objectives that came from CAAP. Ideas were suggested as the goals and objectives were adapted to fit the Board's plan.

Under goal 1 the Board agreed that objective (b) should read "quality instruction and learning".

Dr. Rush noted that the goal that seems to be missing from the CAAP goals is similar to the EAI goal of transparent accountability. Other Board members agreed that would be a good goal and to use the language of EAI.

Board member Lewis suggested that there be a goal to read "highly educated citizenry" or an objective that incorporates that idea which is visible.

It was suggested that Goal 1 could be written to say "provide a well educated citizenry." This will convey the point or concept that the goal is to increase the level of education, not just the quality of education. Also, "higher level of educational attainment" will be added as an objective (e) to Goal 1.

In respect to Goal 2, it was suggested objective (a) should read: “An environment in which critical thinking at the individual and system level, innovation, and creativity can thrive”.

In respect to Goal 3, it was suggested that another objective should be “relevant educational programs.”

In respect to Goal 4, it needs to be expanded to include all of K-20, not just higher education. It was suggested that this goal might be where there is mention about building a stronger economy. Another objective was added (c) to read “economic development.”

It was agreed to create Goal 5 (using EAI goal 1) and have it read “Transparent Accountability.” It was agreed to add the following objectives: (a) Robust metrics and a system to implement them (to evaluate where we are going); (b) integrated statewide data system K-20 and beyond; (c) continuous improvement. It was pointed out that under this goal should be a place to tie funding to outcomes, for example, another objective which would read: and (d) budget process tied to strategic plan outcomes.

e. Next Steps

1. EAI Collaboration – There was discussion about how best to achieve an open and ongoing collaborative effort with EAI. Board President Agidius will meet with the Governor related to this. It was suggested that one of the Board's existing committees invite EAI to meet with them on a quarterly basis and also to invite other Board members to attend as well. The Board and its staff will follow up on this.

2. Vision, Values Draft Plan – Board staff, with input from Sarah Borden, will complete this task. Tracie Bent will be the contact person at the Board office. There was discussion about timelines for finalizing the strategic plan. It was noted that the Board has to abide by the DFM due dates as do the institutions and agencies. Also, there needs to be a process for reviewing successive drafts. The Board and its staff will follow up on this.

3. Other -- Board member Edmunds suggested that the Board have a timeline for the other things they need to accomplish, such as roles and missions, so that it doesn't lose sight of those other things. Ms. Borden suggested that the Board needs to let the institutions know what the priorities are. It was suggested that when there is a next meeting, who to invite who wasn't at today's meeting.

2. Pending Rule – Docket 47-0101-0901 - Idaho Division of Vocational Rehabilitation Appeals Process

M/S (Terrell/Soltman): To approve the Pending Rule Docket 47.01.01.0901 – Rules of the Idaho Division of Vocational Rehabilitation as submitted. Motion carried unanimously.

3. Pending Rule – Docket 08-0104-0901 – Residency Classification

M/S (Terrell/Soltman): To approve the Pending Rule Governing Residency Classification, Docket 08-0104-0901, as submitted. Motion carried unanimously.

Board staff explained that if an individual leaves the state for educational purposes and then wants to return to Idaho, this would allow them to do that. Before, if they left the state for educational purposes and then returned, they would no longer consider a resident for tuition purposes.

4. Pending Rule – Docket 08-0114-0901- Rural Physicians Incentive Fund

Board member Edmunds abstained from discussion and voting on this item. Board member Lewis referred to the statement on page 5 of tab 4 – Section 016.01.a, and suggested that it wasn't clear what the intent was. The Board agreed to postpone this item until the end of the day in order to clear up the language in that section.

By unanimous consent this item was postponed until later in the agenda.

5. Amend Temporary/Pending Rule – Docket 08-0111-0901 - Proprietary/ Postsecondary School Registration

M/S (Terrell/Westerberg): To approve the Amended Temporary and Pending Rule – Docket 08.01.11.0901, Registration of Postsecondary Education Institutions and Proprietary Schools, as submitted. Motion carried 6-0 (Agidius absent during the vote)

Board staff reported that there had been public hearings and it was recognized there was a need to revisit the surety bond formula. The changes are reflected in the language of this rule.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

State Superintendent Luna was unable to be at the meeting due to a death in the family. Luci Willits of the Department took his place and presented the items of the Board's agenda for the benefit of the Board.

1. Pending Rule – Docket 08-0203-0903 - Middle Level Credit Requirements

M/S (Soltman/Terrell): To approve pending rule with changes Docket 08-0203-903, Rules Governing Thoroughness, Middle Level Credit Requirements as submitted. Motion carried unanimously.

2. Pending Rule - Docket 08-0202-0904 - Incorporation By Reference, Idaho Standards for the Initial Certification of Professional School Personnel

M/S (Soltman/Atchley): To approve the pending rule Docket 08-0202-0904, Rules Governing Uniformity, Incorporation by Reference- Online Teacher Endorsement.

3. Temporary and Pending Rule – Docket 08-0202-0905 - Incorporation by Reference, Idaho Operating Procedures for Public Driver Education Programs

M/S (Soltman/Edmunds): To approve the Idaho Operating Procedures for Public Driver Education Programs. Motion carried unanimously.

Nick Smith from the Department indicated that the public comments that were received were primarily geared towards private drivers' education businesses being able to contract with the schools, and the qualifications of those instructors. The rule, as it is now written, allows any private instructor that is licensed through the Bureau of Occupational Licensing to be approved. The only additional requirement is that they must have a background check and fingerprinting.

M/S (Soltman/Westerberg): To approve the temporary and pending rule change to IDAPA 08.02.02.004 and 08.02.02.230, Rules Governing Uniformity Motion carried unanimously.

4. Pending Rule - Docket 08-0202-0906 - Idaho Educator Credential

M/S (Soltman/Westerberg): To approve pending rule Docket 08-0202-906, Rules Governing Uniformity, Idaho Educator Credential as submitted. Motion carried unanimously.

5. Pending Rule - Docket 08-0202-0907 - Consulting Teacher Endorsement

M/S (Soltman/Edmunds): To approve the pending rule Docket 08-0202-907, Rules Governing Uniformity – Consulting Teacher Endorsements. Motion carried unanimously.

6. Pending Rule - Docket 08-0203-0905 - High School Graduation Requirements

M/S (Soltman/Westerberg): To approve pending rule with changes to Docket 08-0203-905 High School Graduation Requirements as submitted. Motion carried unanimously.

It was clarified that mastery of subject is determined by local school districts. The districts wanted that flexibility. Nick Smith of the Department also explained that the mastery piece only applies to high school students. The middle school piece allows students to take the class, but there is a clear separation between the middle school students and the high school requirement.

7. Temporary and Pending Rule – Docket 08-020203-0906- Special Education

M/S (Soltman/Atchley): To approve the temporary and pending rule Docket 08-0203-906, Rules Governing Thoroughness – Special Education. Motion carried unanimously.

8. Pending Rule - Docket 08-0203-0907 - K-12 Idaho Content Standards

M/S (Soltman/Atchley): To approve pending rule Docket 08-02023-907, Rules Governing Thoroughness, K-12 Idaho Content Standards as submitted. Motion carried unanimously.

9. Temporary Rule - IDAPA 08.02.03.003.04 - Incorporation by reference, the Limited English Proficiency Program Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOS) and Accountability Procedures

M/S (Soltman/Westerberg): To approve the temporary rule for IDAPA 08.02.03.004.03, Incorporation by Reference -- The Idaho English Language Assessment (IELA) Achievement Standards as submitted. Motion carried unanimously.

10. Temporary Rule - IDAPA 08.02.03.004.04 - Incorporation by Reference- The Idaho English Language Assessment (IELA) Achievement Standards

M/S (Soltman/Westerberg): To approve the temporary rule for IDAPA 08.02.03.004.04, Incorporation by Reference -- The Idaho English Language Assessment (IELA) Achievement Standards as submitted. Motion carried unanimously.

Dr. Carissa Miller of the Department noted that the cut scores are more appropriate now because they identify the student as being more ready to exit the program than previously. It should be an improvement for their educational experience.

11. Temporary Rule - IDAPA 08.02.03.112 - Rules Governing Thoroughness, Accountability

M/S (Soltman/Atchley): To approve the temporary rule for IDAPA 08.02.03.112, Rules Governing Thoroughness, Accountability as submitted. Motion carried unanimously.

Board member Lewis asked about NAPE and how the states rank in terms of their cut scores because Idaho was identified as a state below basic. Dr. Carissa Miller explained that the study was done looking at state standards in terms of the number of proficient students compared to the number of proficient students who took NAPE. Idaho standards are higher than the NAPE standards. The NAPE study does not take that into account because it focuses only on NAPE. Dr. Miller indicated that the study gives a wrong message.

BUSINESS AFFAIRS AND HUMAN RESOURCES

1. Boise State University – Coach Petersen Contract Addendum & Deferred Compensation Plan

M/S (Westerberg/Soltman): To approve the request by Boise State University to amend the Employment Agreement with Chris Petersen, as submitted. Motion carried unanimously.

Board member Westerberg presented this item. Kevin Satterlee discussed the dynamics of the deferred compensation plan for Chris Petersen. He indicated that this addendum allows the University to take advantage of section 457(f), 415(m) or other similar provisions of the IRS

Code that meet certain criteria. The plan that BSU is proposing will allow Coach Petersen to defer more funds. This plan does not apply to any other BSU employee nor does it increase the terms of his contract.

M/S (Westerberg/Soltman): To approve and adopt the Boise State University Section 403(b) Base Plan and the Boise State University Section 415(m) Qualified Governmental Excess Benefit Plan, as submitted, subject to the conditions and limitations set forth below: (1) The Plans are adopted subject to IRS approval; and (2) The Board cannot guarantee the tax consequences of the Plans pending IRS action. The Board authorizes its Executive Director to execute on its behalf applications for IRS Private Letter Rulings with respect to the Plans. Motion carried unanimously.

The Board returned to item 4 of the PPGAC agenda.

4. Pending Rule – Docket 08-0114-0901- Rural Physicians Incentive Fund

M/S (Terrell/Atchley): To approve the motion as amended with clarification of the motion related to the language on tab 4, page 5, Section 016.01.a. Motion carried 6-0 (Edmunds abstained from the vote).

The language in Section 016.01.a was changed in order to clarify its intent. It will read: "Priority selection for physicians who were Idaho resident students and were assessed the rural physician incentive fee and paid into the fund, followed by physicians who were Idaho residents prior to completing medical school out of the state and who did not contribute to the fund, followed by physicians from other states who were not Idaho residents."

OTHER BUSINESS

There being no further business, a motion to adjourn was entertained.

M/S (Terrell/Westerberg): To adjourn the meeting at 4:03 p.m.