



**Indiana State Board of Education  
Strategic Planning Committee  
Business Meeting**

October 9, 2013  
2:30-4:00 PM  
Senate Chambers, State House  
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

Strategic Planning Committee Chair Dan Elsener called the meeting to order at 2:32 p.m.

Mr. Elsener welcomed members to the first meeting of the new Committee and asked the State Board of Education (“Board”) Director, Anne Davis, to take roll call. All six Committee members were present: Superintendent Glenda Ritz, Mr. Elsener, Dr. Brad Oliver, Mrs. Sarah O’Brien, Mr. B.J. Watts and Dr. David Freitas. Per the Board’s electronic meeting participation policy, adopted at the October 2, 2013, Board meeting, Dr. Freitas joined the meeting via telephone.

Mr. Elsener provided an overview of the importance of strategic planning in an effective organization, citing a moral obligation to serve all of Indiana’s students by establishing goals and objectives to address current and future education needs. Mr. Elsener stated the end goal of the Committee meeting today was to select a consultant to assist the full Board in developing and adopting a strategic plan with clear goals and objectives by early 2014. He noted his eagerness to embark upon the planning work and expressed his appreciation for each member’s service to the Committee.

Mr. Elsener asked Claire Fiddian-Green, Special Assistant to Governor Pence for Education Innovation and Technical Advisor to the Board, to introduce the four consulting groups invited to present planning proposals to the Committee.

Ms. Fiddian-Green provided a brief description of the process used for soliciting proposals, as well as the process by which representatives from each of the four consulting firms would make a presentation to the Committee and subsequently respond to member questions. She noted the consultants would present to the Committee in alphabetical order.

Mr. Rick Rozzelle with CELT (Connecting Educational Leadership and Technology) described CELT’s extensive work with state boards of education, state education agencies (SEAs), and large local educational agencies (LEAs) nation-wide. He explained CELT’s sole focus is education. Mr. Rozzelle noted CELT is viewed as a national thought leader with very experienced staff. Mr. Rozzelle explained that CELT develops balanced scorecards with leading and lagging indicators, and they would leave Indiana with a set of tools and processes, including how to monitor the plan’s implementation.

He closed his presentation by stating that the differentiators of CELT are that they do leadership and technology equally well.

Mr. Elsener asked Committee members if they had any questions for Mr. Rozelle. Ms. O'Brien inquired about the process for engaging community stakeholders and whether activity related to that process was part of the proposed budget. Mr. Rozelle indicated CELT has the experience and ability to conduct forums, including large groups, effectively, and they would take direction from the Committee in terms of what type of meeting and which stakeholder groups. Mr. Rozelle explained the proposed budget was mainly to work with the Committee directly, but CELT will do whatever work the Committee wants as part of the project. Dr. Oliver asked for detail as to how the balanced scorecard will support the strategic plan. Mr. Rozelle explained that it puts the essence of strategies and outcomes in the public eye in a clear way, and the leading and lagging indicators allow the Board to keep track of progress. Mr. Rozelle clarified that a strategic plan is not a document, but a process, and as such it's meant to be revised as it is implemented. Mr. Elsener noted the Board is driving a strategic plan, but they need an efficient process to get input from K-12 educators, higher education representatives, and other community voices. Mr. Rozelle noted CELT works with other agencies to develop P-20 systems to determine what to measure, and CELT is very comfortable with looking at how individual organizations contribute to an overall system. Mr. Rozelle noted CELT's work in Delaware, and how the strategic plan became a guiding tool for the overall K-12 system. He explained that local districts rolled out the balanced scorecard indicators for consistency. He explained that for that state, the systemic-level work focused resources, including funding, and made for a clear statewide picture. No additional questions were posed by Committee members.

Next, Ms. Fiddian-Green introduced Ms. Julie Whitman and Ms. Tracy Butler, representing Indiana Youth Institute ("IYI"). Ms. Whitman explained IYI is a statewide nonprofit focusing on the healthy development of youth, stating that IYI supports those entities that serve youth and works on at the community level. She noted that IYI is nonpartisan and Bill Stanczykiewicz, IYI's CEO, sits on the Education Roundtable. Ms. Whitman described IYI's experience with scorecards, and she provided IYI's organizational dashboard as an example. Ms. Whitman shared a list of past IYI clients to the Committee. Ms. Butler expressed the essential need of a strategic plan for the Board will be based on the Board's input and IYI will customize their approach. It was explained that four planning meetings will be conducted: the first will be to clarify the planning process and review data describing the state of education in Indiana, and to identify key priorities; the second would be to review research data; the third and fourth would be for additional planning and review of plan elements. IYI said up to 6 key stakeholder interviews plus an online survey to engage with the community would be conducted. The option of a community forum was also offered. Mr. Elsener called for questions or comments from the Committee.

Dr. Oliver referenced the working hours described in the proposal and asked what happens if work goes beyond the estimated number of hours. Ms. Whitman stated that if it's due to IYI's delay, there is no charge; however, a contract addendum would be

required if it was because the Board wished IYI to do more work or extend the project hours. Mr. Elsener referenced the Board's responsibility to oversee a multi-billion dollar K-12 operation and noted that IYI's largest client organization is DuFour, which is smaller in size. He then asked if IYI had completed similar strategic planning and balanced scorecard work with large and complex organizations. Ms. Whitman stated IYI has worked with DOE on projects previously, as well on a \$1M+ project for the Commission for Higher Education related to college mentoring, although she added that was a different type of initiative. Mr. Elsener asked IYI to elaborate on its balanced scorecard work, and Ms. Whitman referenced launching an alumni network and creating a dashboard for that project. Dr. Oliver complimented IYI's work on evaluation but stated his unfamiliarity with their work related to strategic planning. Discussion took place between Dr. Oliver and Ms. Whitman about engaging stakeholders in the planning process. Ms. Whitman referenced the plan needing to align with other state agencies' strategic priorities and goals as it's developed. No additional questions were posed by Committee members.

Ms. Fiddian-Green then introduced Kris Amundson, Executive Director for the National Association of State Boards of Education (NASBE), who was presenting via telephone. Ms. Amundson joined NASBE in this role about four months prior. Ms. Amundson indicated NASBE is the only national organization that exists for one purpose only: to serve and give voice to the nation's state boards of education. She explained that NASBE has the unique opportunity to give professional development and training to state boards, and cited recent work with particular states. Ms. Amundson indicated that NASBE can gather and share information, assist with analysis, help set priorities, and provide feedback loops. She explained that NASBE assists with planning, and can provide ongoing support after the strategic planning is done. Ms. Amundson stated that NASBE can facilitate conversations and assist the Board in reaching consensus. She committed NASBE to working closely with the Committee, Board, Board staff, and the Department of Education (DOE) staff. Ms. Amundson said her time would be provided as a result of Indiana's membership in NASBE, and the other individual included in the proposal is a former chief state school officer from Georgia who has also served as a member of a state board. Mr. Elsener called for questions or comments from the Committee.

Ms. O'Brien asked how, as members of NASBE, what Ms. Amundson had described would be different than what Indiana is entitled to through its existing NASBE membership. Ms. Amundson explained states are entitled to one visit per year, which would be a quarter of what is being requested in the proposal. She explained that states often engage NASBE every two years for a two-day planning retreat. Mr. B.J. Watts inquired as to what state-specific professional development for Indiana would look like. Ms. Amundson indicated it would be whatever the Board requested; the cost of her ongoing onsite visits to Indiana would only be travel, as Indiana's NASBE membership would cover her time. No additional questions were posed by Committee members.

Ms. Fiddian-Green introduced the fourth consulting group, Thomas P. Miller and Associates. Mr. Thomas P. Miller introduced Matt Fleck and Lucy Houchin to the

Committee, and indicated Ms. Fleck and Ms. Houchin would discuss principles and values. Mr. Miller explained that his organization is local, located on Meridian street, and the type of work Miller and Associates performs is at the “intersection of education and workforce development.” He stated their focus is on talent/human capital in both a local and national context, stating that those who “get it right” with human capital will thrive, and those who don’t will struggle. Mr. Miller stated their approach to strategic planning is customized for each client, and indicated that because it’s so different for each client examples would not be provided during the presentation. He shared that the company prides itself on actionable plans. He explained they will be measured in data and evidence, and the planning process will involve lots of stakeholder input. He indicated the single most important thing about projects is communication, and as such they will spend much time listening to the Committee, in addition to talking with the Committee. Mr. Miller stated the importance of stakeholder input, noting surveys, interviews, and other activities could be used to get input. He concluded his presentation by commenting on the Governor’s emphasis on career and technical education and noted Miller and Associates believes career readiness is as equally important to college readiness. Mr. Elsener called for questions or comments from the Committee.

Dr. Oliver asked Mr. Miller to describe the “best practices scan” and taking the process to an end product. Mr. Miller stated the plan will not be theirs, but the Board’s. He outlined the need for several iterations of the plan during the process. Ms. Houchin explained the need to understand the Board’s priorities first using the best practices scan, and then outlined that process. Mr. Elsener asked about the project launch, to which Mr. Miller indicated they would sit down with the Board to ensure they understand the intended outcomes from the Board all through the plan and how it would be completed. Ms. Houchin also explained they would work to get up to speed, including research and knowing what the Board wants. Mr. Elsener requested additional information about Miller and Associates’ experience in efficiently gathering information from boards or groups, including if they have templates for that type of work and if they have the ability to synthesize and look for trends. Mr. Miller indicated yes. Ms. Houchin provided clarification that the survey in the planning process will be done using the online tool Survey Monkey, as it would not limit the number of responses and would allow them to get priorities quickly. The presenters indicated a live poll could be done if that were the Board’s preference. Dr. Oliver asked the presenters to explain their experience creating balanced scorecards which used leading and lagging indicators. Mr. Fleck, as part of the presentation team, indicated education is about collecting data, and to the extent they can get it, they can analyze it. Mr. Fleck added that he and another team member not present worked at the DOE during the creation of the previous balanced scorecard, and were familiar with the work. Mr. Miller offered a final point to the presentation, sharing that previously they helped an entity with a strategy that people questioned if it were even achievable. The entity demonstrated “big growth”, and in that particular client’s case, the process gave them a confidence to accomplish what was thought unachievable. No additional questions were posed by Committee members, and the consulting firm presentations concluded.

Mr. Elsener explained to the Committee the next order of business was to select a consultant. He complimented each of the presenters and the strength of all proposals. Mr. Elsener stated he was impressed with aspects of all presentations. He indicated he would offer a statement to start the Committee's discussion. Mr. Elsener stated that CELT would provide a balanced scorecard and referenced that a balanced scorecard is a great management tool, adding it offered the potential for local school boards to model their own strategic plans off of the statewide balanced scorecard indicators. Mr. Elsener suggested it might be worthwhile to combine services from two of the four entities, citing CELT's a rich experience creating balanced scorecards and NASBE's experience with hosting Board retreats and the ability for NASBE to provide ongoing advice following adoption of a final plan. Mr. Elsener stated he was slightly concerned with CELT's price, but that CELT could give Indiana measures as it moves up the path to excellence. Mr. Elsener offered the potential of considering receiving some services from NASBE and some services from CELT. He also suggested Board staff could negotiate the price with CELT.

Dr. Oliver offered his appreciation to Mr. Elsener for the comments and stated he, also, had concerns about CELT's price. Dr. Oliver added his largest concern is about the capacity and demonstrated ability that would be needed to do the work well, explaining that if done correctly this would be a large initiative. Dr. Oliver stated that CELT and Miller and Associates seemed to have the most appropriate levels of capacity and experience, but noted they were both the more expensive proposals.

Mr. Elsener suggested that a decision should be based on the bidder's capacity, deliverables, and processed process, and questioned if the Board staff could carry out any negotiations on behalf of the Committee. He stated a contract would outline the particulars once determined. Ms. O'Brien brought up the point of NASBE's ability to provide ongoing support and questioned what precisely the follow up would be. Mr. Elsener cited NASBE's expertise with state boards. Mr. Watts offered the option of talking with NASBE initially and then looking to CELT or Miller and Associates to execute the work. Mr. Elsener agreed as to NASBE's level of resources for state boards. Mr. Watts stated that he was in favor of the Board working with NASBE in some capacity on this initiative, although not in the lead.

Superintendent Ritz stated that she shared similar thoughts as Ms. O'Brien, specifically that NASBE is capable of doing the work as they are in the business of state boards. Superintendent Ritz stated she felt NASBE's cost was more reasonable. Mr. Oliver posed the question as to what it is that the Board wishes to have at the end of the planning process, stating that the balanced scorecard would be a useful oversight tool with leading and lagging indicators that would allow the Board to monitor outcomes in real time and adjust as necessary. Mr. Elsener agreed and noted the art and science of strategic planning is ensuring the entity does not get bogged down in so much measuring that it ends up measuring nothing. He stated the importance of considering this point when an organization is so large and sprawling. Mr. Elsener further noted that the Board's collaborators are many, and they are an important part of the work. He then referenced

CELT's third slide and its clear points of emphasis: "what do we want to look like in the future?", "lagging and leading" indicators, and "change things along the way".

Mr. Elsener asked if anyone had additional comments they would like to make. Hearing none, Mr. Elsener suggested Board staff could do some negotiating and refining, then have CELT be the lead consultant and partner with NASBE in the planning work. However, Mr. Elsener stated he would like to get the price lower. He stated that given CELT's national work and many years of experience working with large education institutions, CELT was the better lead consultant option. Ms. Fiddian-Green affirmed that the Board staff could manage negotiations per the Committee's direction. Mr. Elsener then asked other Committee members for their opinions as to his suggestion.

Dr. Oliver stated that, from his perspective, the order of preference would be CELT, Miller and Associates, NASBE, and IYI. Dr. Oliver stated that while initially CELT looks expensive, when considering the larger picture in terms of what is being created, the fact the plan will ultimately guide K-12 activities across the state, and that the plan will be a living document and will be supported by a balanced scorecard, the cost was very reasonable. Dr. Oliver then stated his agreement that Board staff should negotiate with CELT to see if they could lower the cost. Mr. Elsener asked if Dr. Oliver agreed with the idea of NASBE serving as a partner, potentially at the retreat, and to assist with managing to a balanced scorecard. Dr. Oliver confirmed that his motion was to have CELT lead the strategic planning process, subject to Board staff negotiating the cost lower, and that NASBE would serve as a partner during the Board's planning retreat and following adoption of the final strategic plan. Dr. Oliver also suggested that Miller and Associates could be the backup to CELT if the price with CELT could not be negotiated successfully. Mr. Watts asked for clarification of what would transpire if negotiations broke down with CELT. He stated he was comfortable with either CELT or Miller and Associates, but wanted clarification on the motion. Mr. Elsener stated he understood that Miller and Associates would be the back-up if the CELT negotiations were unsuccessful. Ms. O'Brien seconded Dr. Oliver's motion and asked if a time limit could be built in to the negotiation process. Ms. Fiddian-Green indicated completing negotiations and entering into a contract would be a priority given the importance of strategic planning to the Board.

Mr. Elsener acknowledged Dr. Oliver's motion and Ms. O'Brien's second and called for a vote. Ms. Davis took roll call. The motion passed with ayes from Mr. Elsener, Ms. O'Brien, Dr. Oliver, Superintendent Ritz and Mr. Watts. Dr. Freitas abstained due to the poor quality of reception on the phone, although he noted he supported his colleagues' recommendations and the selection of CELT and NASBE.

A motion and second were made to adjourn the meeting, and all members voted in favor. The meeting was adjourned at 3:57 p.m.