



**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**

**APPROVED MINUTES
STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
May 15-16, 2013
Special Board Meeting – Board Retreat
Boise, ID**

A special Board meeting of the State Board of Education was held May 15-16, 2013. It originated from the Skyline Room of the Stueckle Sky Center at Boise State University, in Boise Idaho. Board President Don Soltman presided and called the meeting to order at 8:00 a.m. A roll call of members was taken.

Present:

Don Soltman, President
Emma Atchley, Vice President
Rod Lewis, Secretary (arrived late)
Ken Edmunds

Richard Westerberg
Bill Goesling
Milford Terrell
Tom Luna

AGENDA APPROVAL

M/S (Atchley/Goesling): To approve the agenda as posted. The motion carried unanimously.

CONSENT

M/S (Terrell/Goesling): To approve the consent agenda as posted. The motion carried unanimously.

BAHR – Section I – Human Resources

1. Compensation Adjustments for Agency Heads of the State Board of Education

BOARD ACTION

By unanimous consent to approve a \$1,000 bonus for FY 2013, and effective April 28, 2013 an increase in annual salary for Don Alveshere as Administrator of the

Division of Vocational Rehabilitation consistent with the Division's compensation plan as approved by DFM and based on the most current performance evaluation.

By unanimous consent to approve a \$800 bonus for FY 2013, and effective FY 2014 an increase in annual salary for Todd Schwarz as Administrator of the Division of Professional-Technical Education consistent with the Division's compensation plan as approved by DFM and based on the most current performance evaluation.

BAHR – Section II – Finance

2. Boise State University – Purchase of Personal Property

BOARD ACTION

By unanimous consent to approve the request by Boise State University to acquire and install a video board for Bronco Stadium for a cost not to exceed \$2 million and to authorize the vice president for finance and administration (or her designee) to execute all necessary documents for such acquisition and installation.

3. University of Idaho – Purchase of Personal Property

BOARD ACTION

By unanimous consent to approve the request by the University of Idaho for authority to purchase and install a new scoreboard system for the Kibbie-ASUI Activity Center, as per the specifications set out in Attachment 1, at a total cost of \$1,151,858, and to authorize the vice president for finance and administration (or his designee) to execute all necessary documents for such acquisition and installation.

BUSINESS AFFAIRS AND HUMAN RESOURCES (BAHR) – Section II Finance

1. University of Idaho – Building Renovation

Ron Smith from the University of Idaho provided a report on the proposed building renovation of the Education building at the University of Idaho for the Board members. The College of Education building is a 62,700 square foot building constructed in 1968. This building was a feature in the Joint Finance-Appropriations Committee (JFAC) and Permanent Building Fund Advisory Council (PBFAC) visits last summer. The University and the Division of Public Works (DPW) collaborated in joint funding of an in-depth survey of the asbestos within the building during 2012. The study revealed that the asbestos coating was largely intact, but that it has begun deteriorating. The expected

cost to remove the contamination was estimated to be in excess of \$2.25M. That estimate was for removal and abatement alone and did not include project A/E fees or Industrial Hygienist fees, contingencies and/or replacement materials or systems. The current condition of the building includes many issues including necessary asbestos abatement, deteriorating exterior brick masonry, deteriorating building exterior surfaces, and an outdated HVAC system. Additionally, the University and DPW attempted to replace the failing roof on the building with directed Alteration and Repair allocations funded in FY 2003 and implemented in 2004. However, the application of the new roof insulation caused the asbestos fire-proofing to come loose and the application of the new roof was halted. In lieu of that, the existing roof was top coated with a sealer as a temporary solution. This left the roof without sufficient slope and the sealer application is now failing.

Given the above background and circumstances the University is ready to proceed with an alternative approach. For FY 2014 the State of Idaho appropriated \$3.75M to the University for the purpose of addressing deferred maintenance needs, and was partially the result of a summer tour of campus by JFAC where this need was described. By leveraging the State of Idaho appropriations with University resources they are asking for approval for a \$14.5M project to address all of the needs described for the College of Education building. The immediate fiscal impact is about \$400,000 overall project funding would be about \$5 million from the state. They do have the money available and believe this would be a good investment for the university. The total planning time is one year for planning and two years for construction. Mr. Terrell indicated this item would come forward for further discussion and discovery at the June meeting. Mr. Freeman clarified that this item was brought forward as an information item at this meeting as a timing issue and that once the Board approves it, it will move forward.

The Board members entered into Executive Session at 8:20 a.m.

EXECUTIVE SESSION (Closed to the Public)

M/S (Atchley/Goesling): To meet in executive session to evaluate the presidents of Idaho's state higher education institutions and its executive director, pursuant to Idaho Code Section 67-2345(1)(b). A roll call vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously. Mr. Lewis arrived after the start of executive session.

M/S (Soltman/Westerberg): To go out of executive session at 12:35 p.m. The motion carried unanimously.

BOARD RETREAT (Open Meeting)

The Board convened for regular business at 1:12 p.m. on Wednesday, May 15, 2013 for discussion of higher education issues, including program evaluation and review. Ms. Selena Grace introduced Dr. Robert C. Dickeson. Dr. Dickeson provided a presentation on setting priorities for future direction in Idaho. To start, he asked the Board members and institution representatives to identify three of the most significant needs of the Idaho

system. The Board members wrote down their answers and returned them to Dr. Dickeson. He identified key issues for today's discussion that included defining prioritization, is it applicable to Idaho colleges and universities, the benefits and pitfalls of it, and how we can make metrics work for better administration.

Dr. Dickeson asked the question of why there is a need to set priorities and reallocate resources. He identified several external factors affecting Idaho such as accountability, the influence of national reports, pressures on accrediting agencies to prove outcomes commensurate with investments in higher education, national goals for increased productivity, and others. He pointed out that Idaho has felt the result of the impact on endowment return, the impact on tuition-setting and affordability, the impact on bond ratings and so forth. He identified Moody's five key factors of 2013 which included depressed family incomes and net worth, that all revenue sources are strained, the rising student debt and default situation, public and political scrutiny (more regulations), and the need for strong leadership and better governance.

Dr. Dickeson discussed Idaho's demographics and that college-going rates and per-capita personal income in Idaho are low. He discussed changing public attitudes toward higher education that include: students have to borrow too much to pay for their education, many qualified people don't have the opportunity to get a higher education, college prices are growing faster than other things, and other similar attitudes evident today about higher education. He discussed how institutions are at systemic risk, adding that there are roughly 80% identified in that category which is depicted by massive structural budget cuts, personnel issues, deteriorating physical plants, declining in gift income, inadequate endowments and unsustainable discounting. The demand for quality is also a factor affecting Idaho, and certain reports reflect poorly on the quality of higher education. Additionally, there is a pace of technological change that institutions are dealing with. Dr. Dickeson summarized internal forces as well that are at work which include current budget pressures, future fiscal stability, reinvestment to seize opportunities, achievement of strategic directions and all with an attempt in mind at striking the right balance among all institutions in the system.

Dr. Dickeson paused for a moment about his observations of Idaho's higher education system and reviewed the elements of the 2013-2017 Strategic Plan. He commented on the achievements of strategic directions within the Complete College Idaho plan, but offered some constructive criticism by pointing out that there is no mention or discussion in the plan on where the resources will come from and how it will be funded. He discussed changes in integrated planning and why treating these elements in isolation is not sustainable. Moving on, he turned the discussion to how education boards reconcile all these forces. He suggested integrating planning efforts, making institutional missions operational, focusing realistically on resources and reallocating resources from lower to higher priorities.

Dr. Dickeson asked the familiar question of where will the resources come from? He answered by saying from tuition, gifts and grants, auxiliary, endowment, appropriations, licensing revenue and the like. He also encouraged the Board members to ask how

much was left from budget-cutting from last year. However, he pointed out that the most likely source for needed resources is the reallocation of existing resources. He said over 700 campuses in the country also have this issue. Dr. Dickeson paused at this point for questions.

Mr. Soltman asked about reallocation by closing a college. Dr. Dickeson responded that those are tough but necessary decisions that are for the good of the whole. Mr. Edmunds asked what the priority is for a state system, considering use of taxpayer dollars. Dr. Dickeson responded that the question of what programs to reallocate requires a process and a hard look at criteria. As public institutions there is a need to be motivated by what is best for the people such as jobs, teaching critical thinking, teaching values, of discovery (research role), and economic impact. The challenge is to figure out where the duplication and redundancy is and be careful of those decisions and their ripple effect. For instance at the undergraduate level, there may be necessary duplication and redundancy, but for the graduate and professional level, those duplications may require some decisions.

Dr. Dickeson moved on to discuss academic program prioritization. Academic programs are the heart of the institution and drive costs for the entire campus. He pointed out that academic programs have been permitted to grow without regard to their relative worth which creates an unsustainable problem. Most campuses are striving to be all things to all people rather than focusing. There is a growing incongruence between programs and resources and traditional approaches (like across the board cuts) don't work and tend to mediocrity for all programs. Dr. Dickeson commented reallocation is necessary and requires responsible prioritization, but the unfortunate reality is the price of program bloat for all is impoverishment of each.

He indicated that most of the efforts have been to focus on the non-academic side, defer physical plant maintenance, ignore academics as too politically volatile, and make cuts across-the-board. The hardest thing to sell on campus is that not all programs are created equal. Some are more efficient, some are more effective and some are more central to mission. There is a need to focus on programs as a unit of analysis. Dr. Dickeson defined a program as something which consists of any activity or collection of activities that consumes resources (dollars, people, time, space, equipment). In talking about setting academic priorities, he stressed that programs are not departments. Additionally, prioritization should be followed, but it is not review. (Review consists of assuming continuance, is not tied to resource allocation, and is not conducted simultaneously.) He summarized that program prioritization permits analysis focused on pre-selected criteria, concentration on resource development and utilization independent of structure, focus on efficiency and effectiveness, and identifying opportunities to increase revenue, decrease expenses and improve quality.

Dr. Dickeson commented that according to Michael Porter from Harvard Business School a tough decision is what to do, a tougher decision is what not to do, and the toughest decision is what to stop doing.

The next portion of Dr. Dickeson's presentation centered on selecting appropriate criteria. He asked the Board to prepare for a work session based on this information. He identified ten criteria for the Board to consider:

1. History, development and expectations of the program
2. External demand
3. Internal demand
4. Quality of inputs and processes
5. Quality of outcomes
6. Size, scope and productivity
7. Revenue and other resources generated
8. Costs and other expenses
9. Impact, justification and overall essentiality
10. Opportunity analysis

He encouraged discussion on a number of questions such as:

- The most important criteria for the Idaho higher education system.
- Would criteria differ among the institutions?
- What relative weights would you assign to these criteria?
- What sources of data will be used to support the analysis?

The Board members participated in a general discussion to discuss the criteria they felt most important and why. Ms Atchley thought number 5 would be a good place to start. Mr. Westerberg suggested items 7 and 8. Dr. Rush suggested a combination of 2 and 3. Dr. Goesling also suggested 2 and 3, but added number 10 which included a SWOT analysis. There was discussion among the presidents as well about the priorities from the list, of which each suggestion provided good reasoning and feedback.

At this time, Dr. Dickeson requested Board members and presidents and provosts divide into four groups which included two board members per group. They took about 15 minutes to assign a point value (10 points each; 100 total) to the criteria listed. After the group returned, they ranked the criteria. The top three that emerged were:

1. External demand
2. Quality of outcomes
3. Costs and expenses

At this time Dr. Dickeson reported on the needs determined from the exercise at the beginning of the presentation when he asked for identification of the three most significant needs in Idaho's education system. The needs determined were as follows:

1. Funding, resources and sustainability
2. Scholarships and funding or financial aid (and tied with number three in votes)
3. Advocacy by Board, public and legislative understanding
4. Retention, completion and student success (and tied with number five in votes).
5. Greater efficiencies

Dr. Dickeson commented on the importance of process in relation to preparation, design and management, communication planning, data collection, rating, judgment, ranking

and decisions. He stressed leadership as a critical item and that identifying responsible leadership is key. He said where institutions have gone down this road and failed there has not been an alignment in leadership. This leadership includes the Board, the presidents, the provosts and the chief fiscal officers. He clarified that there needs to be an alignment in the Board – and a key question he posed is “Is the Board on board?” He discussed the role of the presidents, provosts and chief financial officers of the institutions as well needing to all be working together with strategies and goals. He discussed leadership and posed a number of questions such as where is the leadership coming from? Who will take on the change functions? What is the communication? Who will be affected? How to concentrate on implementation? Will the reform endure? He stressed that in order for prioritization to work, people must buy in and understand prioritization and that leadership should be the responsibility of the group, not one person, and communication is critical. Additionally, elements should be in place to address rumors before they start.

In reaffirming institutional mission, Dr. Dickeson indicated there needs to be operational mission statements and statements of program direction. He commented that the reality is most institutions cannot afford to be what they have become. These statements of mission and program direction need to be about clarity; to correct vague language, to take into account political campus considerations, accreditation issues, and changing purposes. Fundamental tensions include the power of legacy, marketplace realities that force differentiation, reconciling Idaho’s multiple functions, enunciating specific ways to fulfill purposes, etc.

Dr. Dickeson recommended the following focus: *The role and mission should permit only those activities that need to be done and that the institution and its people do well.* He suggested following some key steps that include announcing in advance the specific criteria to be utilized, to involve program faculty and staff in designing additional data formats to fit the criteria, decide what relative weights should be assigned to the criteria, provide data to support the criteria, and to note that data do not substitute for sound judgment. He indicated that there will definitely be a number of issues and questions that surface and provided examples, adding the process is not all about budget issues (i.e., deferred maintenance, etc.). Business as usual will not give the results needed to build our future. The impetus for this should be such that people are incentivized for a variety of reasons to engage and get it done.

There was discussion around issues and how to communicate with the legislature, the Governor and public. The issues also included getting the support of these same individuals and groups, and economic partners in the state. The more opportunities we can create to communicate, the more the chances for success there will be. Involve the presidents, provosts and chief financial officers in the discussions. The discussion also went around where to make the cuts and prioritization of those cuts. Ms. Atchley also commented on the finite resources of the state and that we are not aligning our resources along with our needs as well as we should. The conversation included programs. Mr. Edmunds pointed out that practically every program that comes before the Board gets approved. Dr. Dickeson responded that was not a good way to proceed

and recommended a sunset clause to review programs that may not be as “self sufficient” or successful as the institutions claim the programs are when they introduce them. It was suggested the Board set a target and have an institution by institution prioritization process to figure out how to accomplish that task.

Dr. Dickeson moved on to speak about the case for prioritizing non-academic programs. He commented on a number of reasons to look at non-academic programs including opportunities for cost savings and cost sharing, outsourcing, middle management bulk, technological improvements, and how restructuring and collaboration can improve efficiencies. He introduced ideas for non-academic programs which included 10 criteria.

1. Key objectives and how they are measured
2. Services provided and to which customers
3. Position-by-position analysis
4. Unmet needs and demands
5. Opportunities for collaboration and restructuring
6. Opportunities to share skill sets and resources
7. Opportunities for cross-training
8. Technological improvements that are cost effective
9. Process improvements to streamline operations
10. Outsourcing exploration to improve service and cut costs

Dr. Dickeson discussed implementing necessary program decisions once the process is complete. This may include enrichment or expansion of existing programs, addition of new programs, reduction and/or consolidation of programs, elimination of programs, legal, policy and accreditation implications and maintaining the database for the future.

He provided a prioritization checklist for the Board members which included:

1. Preparation and readiness phase
2. Organizational phase
3. Data collection phase
4. Analysis and assessment phase
5. Decision making phase
6. Implementation phase
7. Evaluation phase

At this time, Dr. Dickeson encouraged discussion for Idaho opportunities and asked a few questions to encourage discussion, such as is there a general education cohesive, is surplus property being used at highest value, are there programs with low or no enrollments, are there opportunities to strengthen and improve learning outcomes, and other opportunities.

Mr. Freeman asked how tenure works within this process. Dr. Dickeson responded that it is not an exercise about faculty assessment, despite the fact that programs and faculty are intertwined; it is a program assessment. He indicated there is a growing program of the law that exists called program exigency and it says that if the program isn't required the faculty in that program isn't either, therefore the taking of tenure is

possible (He did say that legal counsel would need to weigh in on this topic.) He urged taking a look at policy and at tenure and suggested attaching tenure to a program, not to a school. He suggested building in humane policies to assist those displaced and if they may be relocated into areas where they are qualified.

Dr. Dickeson moved the discussion to the topic of better metrics and making metrics work for better administration. Dr. Dickeson named some forces behind better metrics such as public policy makers, accreditation agencies, governing boards and higher education managers. He identified eight key changes in metrics.

1. From budgeting as objects of expenditures to budgeting as programs.
2. From seat time to competencies acquired
3. From quality as inputs to quality as outcomes
4. From internal validation (grades) to external validation (national norms)
5. From curriculum as closely-held to curriculum as open and shared
6. From enrollment success to student success
7. From management around administrative structure to
8. From funding needs to funding opportunities

He provided three current examples of metrics in action which included a scoring rubric to assess relative academic program worth, aligning quality with outputs in measuring faculty productivity, and a metric-driven dashboard tied to overall institutional goals. He discussed the scoring rubric example and that it includes ten criteria, has weights established from 0-100 for the criteria, uses a 1, 3, 9 rating, and is ranked by quintiles.

Dr. Dickeson commented on making metrics meaningful and implications for the future which included building and managing new databases, shifting accountability through cost accounting (by program), focusing on IT and IR, strengthening the nexus between the chief academic officer and the chief financial officer, and anticipating new demands rather than reacting to them. He encouraged discussion and next steps, asking if this applicable to Idaho institutions, what are the potential benefits and the potential pitfalls.

In conclusion he recommended that the reallocation of resources is necessary, prioritization of programs is possible, and with courage and leadership institutions can be strengthened.

EXECUTIVE SESSION (Closed to the Public)

M/S (Atchley/Westerberg): To meet in executive session to evaluate the presidents of Idaho's state higher education institutions and its executive director, pursuant to Idaho Code Section 67-2345(1)(b). A roll call vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously.

Thursday, May 16, 2013

BOARD RETREAT (Open Meeting)

Present:

Don Soltman, President
Emma Atchley, Vice President
Rod Lewis, Secretary
Ken Edmunds

Richard Westerberg
Bill Goesling
Milford Terrell
Tom Luna

The Board reconvened for business on May 16th at 8:00 a.m. at the Skyline Room of the Stueckle Sky Center at Boise State University, in Boise Idaho, for discussion of higher education issues, including program evaluation and review and to identify next steps and a timeline.

M/S (Atchley/Goesling): To meet in executive session to evaluate the presidents of Idaho's state higher education institutions and its executive director, pursuant to Idaho Code Section 67-2345(1)(b). A roll call vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously.

M/S (/): To go out of executive session at _____ a.m. The motion carried unanimously.

DISCUSSION:

Ms. Grace recapped that program review was a top five priority from 2011 which was a driving factor for yesterday's presentation. She indicated that implementing III.Z. was also a priority, along with getting that process established and revised. III.Z. provides the Board a current program inventory that includes all programs regardless of degree level and a listing of the proposed programs that the campuses want the Board to approve. It is a five-year plan with three years of detailed information and two years of basic information. Ms. Grace commented that every campus does program review and it is also a requirement of the accreditation process, where each year they must revisit what was provided in the prior year to assess; it points to alignment with their mission and core themes. Ms. Grace reviewed the five standards they are evaluated on and had institution representatives provide some examples of each.

Mr. Freeman commented about his question of how program prioritization can complement or help fulfill the Governor's zero based budgeting (ZBB) mandate. Mr. Freeman provided a status report and indicated the colleges and universities are due to submit their ZBB plan in September, which is not going to happen. Staff met last fall with institution representatives and the Division of Financial Management (DFM) and discussed how to proceed. What was decided was that the institutions would provide a narrative description of their current budget development processes and examples of typical institutions and administrative division in terms of costs. The DFM ZBB coordinator reviewed those materials and his conclusion was that the institutions do a very good job of tying their strategic plan to budget development. He did not see a holistic look at the base and whether there could be reprioritization to address higher

strategic needs. Since then, they have been wrestling with how to address ZBB. In February there was a work session with the presidents, the Vice Presidents of Finance, Provosts, and budget directors, and one thing discussed was that if they could move towards some type of program prioritization that may satisfy DFM.

With the program assessment, they want the campuses to look at the programs they are offering and identify if that is the best use of resources for each program. Mr. Freeman has been working with staff on review of the accreditation process and has communicated to DFM that while the accreditation process doesn't involve program prioritization, it is a recurrent cycle of looking at what the institution is doing in fulfilling its mission and core themes. One of the criteria the standards require is an allocation of resources to meet the core mission and themes. Mr. Freeman has suggested to DFM that the accreditation cycle could complement ZBB or be a component of the response to ZBB, and the other piece would be program prioritization. Mr. Freeman indicated he and Dr. Rush would be meeting with Ms. Janie Revier and DFM in June to provide a status update on ZBB.

Mr. Freeman indicated the approach to ZBB could be a marriage of accreditation requirements and program review prioritization that may satisfy what they are looking for. He also indicated the Board office intends to ask for an additional year to continue planning on the Governor's request and would submit their ZBB response in September of 2014. Mr. Freeman discussed how unique higher education is in the state agency model and the complexities of it, and the level of scrutiny that comes from accrediting agencies, and that he hoped to impress that to DFM.

Mr. Freeman reminded the Board members that like it or not, we have a Governor's mandate that must be addressed. He added that there is a level of Board interest in pursuing program prioritization and staff believes it could be used to help meet the Governor's requirement. Mr. Terrell recommended the Board talk directly to the Governor to point out how difficult what he is asking for really is for higher education, and it is not a one-size-fits-all situation.

Ms. Atchley asked how the ZBB, accreditation, and program prioritization would work together. She asked if there is a way to leverage accreditation and program prioritization to help the institutions with this process. Mr. Freeman responded that they are separate activities, so program prioritization would not be on an annual cycle. The prioritization will be reflected in the accreditation and annual reports though. Dr. Rush interjected that the accreditation process requires institutions to identify items such as mission and core themes which are precursors to the prioritization process, summarizing that those steps serve in constructing a foundation.

Mr. Westerberg pointed out that this is a rare opportunity where there are three requirement streams that are converging and can be turned to our advantage. He commented the Board has been discussing programmatic review for a long time and felt this is an opportunity to satisfy the requirement for ZBB in a way that is beneficial to the institutions. He felt it makes sense to look at all programs to make sure they still make

sense in the context they were originally introduced. Mr. Edmunds pointed out we must look at prioritization before we look at reallocation. There was further discussion on how to address the Governor's mandate on ZBB. Mr. Lewis asked if staff was suggesting that program prioritization would be a good way to answer DFM. Staff responded in the affirmative. Mr. Lewis asked if the Board has a choice of not submitting a ZBB proposal to the Governor. Staff responded there was no choice unless the Governor was to be addressed directly on the matter with an alternative.

President Soltman recognized Dr. Kustra who offered comment his experiences with ZBB. He provided a bit of history on ZBB and commented that ZBB got a few things done, but that it never succeeded in the way it was hoped to. He indicated it can work in limited circumstances and state governments, but that in the case of higher education he has not seen ZBB actually work. He provided reasons why it didn't work for those systems and reported on the complexity of trying to make it work. He suggested a committee of the Board reporting to the Governor that the Board is coming up with a very thoughtful and comprehensive program review process, and that ZBB may not be the right plan for higher education.

Dr. Rush commented that he feels the Governor has not defined how higher education should implement ZBB, but that he has invited the Board to provide a reasonable proposal that says we will look at our existing programs to evaluate them and reallocate money associated.

There was continued discussion among the group about the Governor's request, program prioritization, and where to start. There was a feeling of a need to establish a goal or goals to describe what the Board wants to accomplish after the prioritization of programs. Mr. Edmunds asked if the comparison is system wide or institution by institution. Mr. Freeman clarified that it will be an institution by institution prioritization. Mr. Lewis added that there needs to be targets for the process that need to be approved by the Board that the institutions can execute on. Then, the Board reviews the process execution to determine how the achievement is going. With regard to prioritization of things other than academics, Mr. Freeman clarified that DFM's expectation would be that the review would be both academic and administrative. The question is whether it is feasible to accomplish that within 12 months.

In regards to timeline, the Board meets again in June and August. Ms. Grace asked if the institutions would be able to return to the June Board meeting with their institution goals and priorities. The next piece would be what the criteria the Board will establish for the institutions to follow. Dr. Schimpf asked if the Board would like established targets from the institutions. Mr. Soltman and other Board members responded the institutions should come to the Board with the established targets, and then the Board would review those targets. There was discussion about a reporting template. The response was that it should be modeled after Dr. Dickeson's example. It was suggested that the Board make a motion based on today's discussion.

M/S (Lewis/Terrell): To direct the institutions to institute a prioritization of programs process consistent with Dickeson's prioritization principles and that in the June meeting the institutions identify for the Board the framework and targets associated with such process. I also move to direct the institutions to use a quintile prioritization approach and communicate to the Board the criteria and weighting to be used after consultation with their respective campuses. The motion carried unanimously. There was no further discussion on the topic.

At this time, Ms. Melissa McGrath from the Department of Education provided a presentation to the Board about higher education issues and the common core. She shared a brief video introducing and explaining the common core state standards and how they are important to Idaho. She indicated that all teachers will be required to teach to these new state standards beginning in the next school year. She pointed out the Idaho Core Standards Communications Toolkit which is showcased on the Department's web page and walked through several of its features to illustrate its use. This toolkit can help districts and teachers communicate to parents and community members about the new Idaho state standards. Ms. McGrath described the academic standards and the definition between curriculum and standards, commenting that many people get the two confused. She discussed the core, and discussed the local control of academic standards and adopting curriculum. The state sets academic standards, but local districts have the flexibility to build on the standards. She discussed the need for the standards and used student remediation rates as an example. She discussed working with other states on the common core standards since all states are facing the same challenge. The states have come together based on a memo of understanding (MOU) signed in 2009 to work together and become involved throughout the process of developing common core standards. Ms. McGrath pointed out that the Department has held over 20 public meetings which included comment periods to discuss the standards. She stated that 45 states have now voluntarily adopted these standards, pointing out that it is not a federal mandate.

Ms. McGrath highlighted what is changing. For the English language arts and literacy area, this will consist of challenging students with different types of texts. Evidence from the text must be used in oral presentations or written papers. Increased vocabulary across all grade levels will be emphasized. The emphasis is on critical thinking for students. Moving on to Mathematics, students will work more deeply in fewer topics. Teachers will dig deeper into foundational mathematics so that students understand the meanings behind those formulas and other concepts. They will understand not only how to solve the problem but why it is solved in a certain way. Students will understand why the math works and be asked to talk about and prove their understanding. This will help students to learn critical foundational concepts and problem-solving skills. Students will be asked to use math in real-world situations. Ms. McGrath pointed out that in the beginning, testing scores will go down. She pointed out that Idaho will transition to a new and improved ISAT test. The new test will include several question types, questions that adapt to a student's ability and truly measure academic growth, and a year-end test similar to the ISAT.

Ms. McGrath pointed out what is not changing, starting with state authority. States will still have control over state standards. The state will review and adopt standards in different subject areas on a five-year rotation. They will continue to do the same thing in math and English language arts. Local school districts will still adopt curriculum at the local level. The new Idaho core standards are only for math and English language arts. The new Idaho core standards do include literacy standards for other subject areas, such as science and social studies, but these standards do not change the state standards in these subject areas. There is broad support across the state, in school boards, and in communities for these changes in the Idaho core standards. She also pointed out that Idaho did not change any policies regarding data collection or regarding curriculum adoption. What the state Board and Legislature did was adopt standards which are clearly posted on the Department's web page and in administrative rule. She also addressed myths and facts about the core and encouraged Board members and staff to be familiar with the content on the Department's page in the event they receive questions. She added that the Department is also putting out an informative brochure about the Idaho Core Standards for parents that will be sent out to districts in July distribution. It will also be available to be downloaded from their website.

Mr. Luna directed Board members to contact the Department if they have any questions about the Idaho Core Standards or for more information on the toolkit. He also reminded them that the timeline is also posted on the website. The Board members thanked Ms. McGrath for her thorough and informative presentation.

The Board members entered into Executive Session at 10:15 a.m.

EXECUTIVE SESSION (Closed to the Public)

M/S (A) (Atchley/Westerberg): To meet in executive session to evaluate the presidents of Idaho's state higher education institutions and its executive director, pursuant to Idaho Code Section 67-2345(1)(b). A roll call vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously.

M/S (I): To go out of executive session at _____ a.m. The motion carried unanimously.

M/S (I): To adjourn at ____ p.m. Motion carried unanimously.