



**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 18-19, 2011
Special Board Meeting – Board Retreat
Boise, ID**

A special Board meeting of the State Board of Education was held May 18-19, 2011. It originated from Boise State University, Stueckle Sky Center, in Boise Idaho. Board President Richard Westerberg presided and called the meeting to order at 8:00 a.m. A roll call of members was taken.

Present:

Richard Westerberg, President
Don Soltman, Secretary
Emma Atchley
Bill Goesling

Ken Edmunds, Vice President
Rod Lewis
Milford Terrell - jointed at 9:50 am
Tom Luna – joined at 8:30 am

AGENDA APPROVAL

M/S (Edmunds/Goesling): A motion to approve the agenda as posted. Motion carried unanimously.

STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (Open Meeting)

8:00 a.m. Alt-ISAT – Proficiency Level Achievement Scores and Temporary/Proposed rule IDAPA 08.02.03.004.07 (incorporation by reference)

Carissa Miller, with the Department of Education, presented the temporary and proposed rule changes to IDAPA 08.01.03. The Board originally approved temporary changes to this section of rule in 2010 setting levels for Reading and Language Usage. Those changes are coming forward now as Proposed Rule changes. Additionally, the rule includes a fourth level of complexity required by the new math standards.

The Department received positive feed from educators around the state regarding the proposed rule changes.

M/S (Edmunds/Atchley): To approve the Proficiency Level Achievement Scores and Performance Level Descriptors for the Idaho Standards Achievement Tests-Alternate in Reading, Language Usage, Mathematics and Science.

M/S (Edmunds/Atchley): To approve the temporary and proposed rule IDAPA 08.02.03.004.07, Rules Governing Thoroughness, Incorporation by Reference, The Idaho Alternative Assessment Extended Achievement Standards.

EXECUTIVE SESSION (Closed to the Public)

M/S (Edmunds/Atchley): A motion to enter into executive session at 8:06 a.m. pursuant to Idaho Code Section 67-2345(1)(b), which permits an executive session for the purposes of evaluating, dismissing or disciplining of, or to hear complaints or charges brought against, a public officer, employee, staff member or individual agent, or public school student. This executive session will be utilized to evaluate the presidents of Idaho's state higher education institutions and its executive director.

M/S (Edmunds/Soltman) A motion to go out of executive session at 12:40 p.m. Motion carried unanimously.

BOARD RETREAT (Open Meeting)

The Board convened for regular business on May 18, 2011 for discussion of Higher Education issues, including system governance, facilitated by Dr. Tom Meredith from the Association of Governing Boards (AGB). President Westerberg called the meeting to order at 1:12 p.m.

President Westerberg turned the floor over to Executive Director Mike Rush who introduced AGB guest speaker Dr. Tom Meredith, pointing out his extensive background.

Dr. Meredith facilitated the discussion, thanking the Board for the invitation and participation in this meeting. To start, Dr. Meredith pointed out to the Board the materials given to them which were compiled from the meeting two years ago. He did not go through them, but suggested reflection of where the Board was at that time. Dr. Meredith went on to ask the Board what they would like to accomplish and speak about today and identified bullet points from each Board member.

The Board members identified the following bullet points for discussion:

- Governance
- Value of higher education

- Systems approach
- Relationships between Executive Director, Board and institution presidents i.e., tension free relationships
- Board's role as education advocates
- Public v. private funding for education. Funding mechanism for state universities.
- The role of research as it relates to education
- How to better serve our institutions as Board members and role with K-12

The Board discussed each of the bullet points identified, starting with governance, where Dr. Meredith pointed out the basic format of a board organization chart which included the state, the system and the institutions. Dr. Meredith emphasized that as a board gets ready to make decisions, it should be every board's first priority to ask "what's best for the state." Dr. Meredith further engaged discussion on "what are the things the institutions should be doing?" Overall, institutions should be assisting with the State's economic development. Additionally, the Board and institutions have a responsibility to help beyond their borders (i.e., nationally, globally). Together, the group identified the following bullet points institutions should be focused on:

Institutions:

- Economic development
- Responsibility to help beyond borders
- Research
- Degrees (quality & credentials)
- Service

President Kustra commented that often, service is the first to suffer with all the pressures faculty are under. Dr. Meredith commented that reward drives behavior and that the institutions should know what their reward structure looks like. He further stated that the Board needs to hold the presidents accountable for outcomes, but they also need to know the incentive process.

Dr. Meredith then drew out a chart showing where the Board members and presidents thought the major strengths were at each institution:

- UI – Law, Ag, natural resources, architecture, science and technology, business, engineering, basic research, pre-med, music.
- ISU – Health professions, nuclear, education, pharmacy, energy, accounting, professional technical, social work, music.
- BSU – Public administration, engineering and technology, business, nursing, public policy, social work, MFA (arts), environmental, accounting.
- LCSC – Nursing, teaching, native languages, technical (welding), pre-med

Dr. Meredith showed a spreadsheet containing number of degrees awarded at each university by area of major and summarized that it is good to make comparisons of each institution based on what degrees they offer and identify if the needs of the state are being met. He reiterated the point that the overall responsibility is not what is good at the institution, but what is good for the state. Dr. Meredith suggested the universities also look at doing business differently because times are changing.

Board member Tom Luna also encouraged the institutions to look at different ways of doing things because of the constraints they are under, especially financially.

As part of the discussion, Dr. Meredith affirmed that board members should be aware of and concerned with the graduation rates at each institution. Questions that arose for the institutions are: Do you have any measurements in place to track improvement? What does the state need and are you meeting the needs of the state? He emphasized that full circle communication is the key for all stakeholders.

President Kustra commented on graduation rates as a measurement of success, and that boards (i.e., the system) need to be looking at the success rate of an institution not necessarily based on graduation rates because not all of the student body is counted accurately.

Dr. Meredith commented that this is a national challenge that many boards are dealing with. Dr. Meredith suggested using as accurate a counting rate as possible and to take other areas of student success besides graduation rates into consideration. He clarified the important thing is to be able to track progress (i.e., If there is improvement, there should be reward, if there is no improvement, then something needs to change). Dr. Meredith suggested looking at other similar institutions to see if they had encountered the same scenario and possibly using them as a model to obtain new ideas from.

The meeting attendees took a short break and after which regrouped to discuss roles and missions of the institutions. Selena Grace handed out a comprehensive collection of the current roles and missions of the 4 four-year schools. Dr. Meredith suggested the Board identify a plan to utilize this type of information and to start looking seriously at roles and missions. He also mentioned the importance of sequence as it relates to the strategic plan. The state goal needs to be coupled with the role and missions of the institutions. Questions to think about included: Are the roles and missions being followed at the institutions? Do they meet the Board's current expectations? Do they need to be revised? Additionally, the roles and missions should be tied directly to the budget. How are the institutions budgeting to address pieces of the goals identified for this state?

Dr. Meredith also commented on the importance of check points and timelines for the institutional goals. For example: If you have a 60% goal by 2020, where do you plan to be by 2015? Each institution must have goals that align with the system goal. Dr.

Meredith reiterated that the Board has a constitutional obligation to make decisions based on the needs of the state and the citizens of Idaho.

President Kustra asked if there is a template Dr. Meredith would recommend to a board like Idaho's to be used as a process for review? Dr. Meredith said he would send Tracie Bent, Board Office Staff, some materials collected from other states to distribute to the Board members and presidents for review and use.

The group took up discussion on programs at the institutions and Dr. Meredith suggested each institution review its programs and get rid of those that aren't working. Rod Lewis stated there is a program review process, but no process to eliminate programs. Dr. Meredith stated that simply if a program does not meet certain requirements or results, then the program should be eliminated.

With regard to overlapping programs, Dr. Meredith suggested identifying the efficiencies and inefficiencies for each program and region. He suggested that technology would likely be the answer to facilitate statewide shared and overlapped programs.

Dr. Meredith commented that where boards are headed now needs to shift – nationally. Dr. Meredith emphasized the need to think beyond obstacles and think about the big picture. Dr. Rush reinforced the comments of Dr. Meredith and how important it was to not focus on the “why-nots” and look at it from the other end of “how” the tasks before them can be accomplished.

As part of the discussion, Dr. Meredith asked the Board members to think about a list of their top five items they would like to accomplish in the next twelve months for discussion at tomorrow's session.

Board recessed at 5:08 pm.

BOARD RETREAT (Open Meeting)

The Board re-convened for regular business on May 19th at 8:08 a.m. at Boise State University, Stueckle Sky Center in Boise, Idaho, to continue discussion as facilitated by Dr. Tom Meredith from the Association of Governing Boards.

Discussion:

TD. Tom Meredith started the meeting by commenting on the genuine interest of this Board to accomplish things for this community. Dr. Meredith asked if there was anything from yesterday that needed clarification or further comment.

A list was made of the action items from yesterday and where the group concluded.

1. Board Policy IIIZ – review of graduate programs & identify unnecessary duplication (data, metrics establishment)

2. Program review criteria (new and existing; metrics) – Dr. Meredith to assist here w/supplemental materials.
3. Periodic review of all programs
4. Research – Results driven (jobs, state benefit)
 - a. Collaboration
 - b. Drawing away from under grad
 - c. Future – encouraging institutions
5. Board reports (oral; presentation on value of research)

In regard to items two and three, President Kustra spoke on how important program review is, and he recommended using a consultant to identify the tough questions instead of using the other presidents or CAAP. He strongly recommended using someone with an unbiased approach to both program review and the institutions.

President Westerberg commented the Board needs its own metric to overlay on what the institutions are doing. He asked Staff to come up with a process/metric for the Board to use which satisfies the responsibilities of a governing board, then share it with the institutions for their reaction and feedback on the process. Dr. Meredith mentioned there are some standards available as a template so the Board would not have to create its process from scratch. He indicated he would supply additional information on templates and examples to Staff for distribution to the Board.

Mike Rush commented that there is a process currently in place for review of all technical programs using five criteria that was jointly developed with the institutions.

Emma Atchley commented on the importance of not losing sight of quality programs. She stated that you can have an efficient program that has little quality. What we really want is a quality program with efficiency.

Dr. Meredith emphasized the need to have milestones and be looking five years, ten years, etc., into the future.

Dr. Meredith commented on the topic of research. He shared a chart of local institutions and each of their top areas where they are receiving federal monies. It also identified programs that overlapped for each institution. He suggested gathering data like this and looking at it to determine the overlap and determining if there are other efficiencies or inefficiencies.

On the topic of research, President Westerberg asked for a presentation to be made to the Board to speak to the value of having three research institutions and how they could be managed. Board members agreed. President Westerberg asked for this report to include numbers to quantify and qualify the report. Ken Edmunds will initiate and administer this reporting.

Dr. Meredith asked for items the Board should be focusing on for the next year. The following items were identified:

1. What is good for the state
2. Private and state funding
3. Finalize and implement IIIZ
4. Programmatic review
5. Finalize where we are on research
6. Funding formula
7. Implement legislative changes as related to K-12
8. Implement college access issues (define priorities)
9. Identify unnecessary reports with presidents. Implement delegatory efficiencies
10. Stay focused on 60% goal
11. Repair disconnect between K-12 and Board (reconnect)
12. Longitudinal data system
13. Expansion of K-12 system into Higher Ed

Discussion ensued about how to reconnect with K-12 and focus on those K-12 students moving on to K-16 and K-20. Rod Lewis commented that there needs to be more engagement and involvement to bridge the gap and shortfalls between K-12 and K-20.

Milford Terrell suggested splitting up the Board members to oversee and report on the various progresses of each university. He suggested monthly or bimonthly meetings between board members and presidents, provosts, VPRs, etc. Feedback was not supportive of this because of the amount of time it would take to accomplish this.

In conclusion, Dr. Meredith suggested prioritizing the list they compiled. The Board members concluded that the following list of their top five items was a priority for the next 12 months.

1. Research
2. Funding formula
3. Programmatic review/metric
4. IIIZ (graduate level duplication of programs and measures for efficiency)
5. Reconnect w/ K-12

The discussion was concluded and a short break for lunch was taken. At 1:00 p.m., a motion to enter into executive session was entertained. A roll call of members was taken.

EXECUTIVE SESSION (Closed to the Public)

M/S (Edmunds/Soltman): A motion to enter into executive session at 1:00 p.m. pursuant to Idaho Code Section 67-2345(1)(b), which permits an executive session for the purposes of evaluating, dismissing or disciplining of, or to hear complaints or charges brought against, a public officer, employee, staff member or individual agent, or public school student. This executive session will be

utilized to evaluate the presidents of Idaho's state higher education institutions and its executive director.

M/S (Edmunds /Soltman): To go out of Executive Session at 3:30 p.m. Motion to adjourn at 3:30 p.m. Motion carried unanimously.