



**INDIANA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION**  
STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

February 6, 2014  
9:10 AM

Indiana Government Center South – Auditorium  
402 West Washington Street  
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

State Board of Education Members

Present: Superintendent Glenda Ritz (Board chair), Mr. Dan Elsener (committee chair), Dr. David Freitas, Ms. Sarah O'Brien, and Dr. Brad Oliver

Absent: Mr. B.J. Watts

Board Staff Member: Anne Davis

CELT: Chris Craig, Harvey Perkins

The meeting was called to order at 9:14 a.m. by Chairperson Dan Elsener with five Strategic Planning Committee members present. Mr. Elsener stated that Mr. B.J. Watts was unable to attend due to the recent winter storm and resulting ice in Mr. Watts' part of the state. Mr. Elsener asked for approval of the January 15, 2014, Strategic Planning meeting minutes. Dr. Freitas moved to approve the minutes. Mrs. O'Brien seconded. The minutes were approved unanimously by voice vote. The meeting was facilitated by Chris Craig and Harvey Perkins of the Center for Education Leadership and Technology ("CELT"), the Committee's strategic planning consulting firm.

Mr. Craig provided a review of the overall strategic planning process, and complimented Indiana for undertaking such an aggressive timeline for the creation of its strategic plan for k-12 education. Mr. Craig addressed the issue of consensus in terms of the decision-making process. He offered that consensus during this process means that everyone is heard, and while there may be differences, decisions must be made so that the work can move forward. Mr. Craig asked if the Committee members could agree to his statement, and they stated their agreement. Mr. Craig explained that in the strategic planning process, the executive leadership



of an organization crafts the mission, vision and goals. He added that while the process of establishing the mission, vision and goals are the responsibility of the executive leadership, the overall strategic plan cannot be effective without the involvement of other people in developing objectives, strategies, and measures. Mr. Craig stated the importance of having the right people with the right skills involved in these steps. He explained the need for the experts involved in the process to come from two different areas: experts about the organization and experts in the content. Mr. Craig noted the Department of Education (Department) experts will have expertise in particular areas, but the process will also require other individuals outside the Department who have additional needed skills. Mr. Craig added that having State Board staff involved in the process will be an important part of the Goal Teams, as there will be many details and State Board staff can help keep track of all the moving pieces.

Mr. Craig summarized the Committee's previous work regarding the development of a mission, vision, and goals independent of each other. He explained the next step will be to move towards synergy and determining if the mission, vision, and goals provide the forward-moving trajectory that the organization wants. The Committee members discussed the mission and vision statements and had consensus for acceptance. Committee members then transitioned to the goal statements, and reviewed the categories established previously: student achievement, human capital, and stakeholder involvement and support. The Committee members discussed the concept of leading and lagging indicators, and how the information gathered will monitor growth and improvement. The Committee members and Mr. Craig engaged in a conversation about the appropriate level of detail that should be included in a goal statement. There was additional discussion about whether a goal should be so specific that it includes details over which the Board does not have authority. The Committee agreed that that priorities of the strategic plan should be clear indicators of the priorities for k-12 education in Indiana, and as such will help schools to know where to focus their priorities. Committee members commented on the importance of local control and the need for local school districts to take what they see as appropriate action to get results. The Committee discussed the importance of stating the goals in such a manner that the general population understands their meaning. Mr. Craig stated that until the Committee gets to the level of identifying objectives, the Committee won't know if the current phrasing of the goal is "right". He added that when the Committee looks how a goal will be measured, it will help to clarify if the goal statement has captured what the Committee intended.

The Committee determined that accessibility, achievement, and accountability would be components of each goal. Mr. Perkins facilitated discussion around the three goals as the



Committee worked to come to consensus on the appropriate wording to capture their intended meaning. The Committee agreed to the following revised goals:

- Goal 1: Ensure all students in Indiana learn.
- Goal 2: Provide the highest quality educational leaders.
- Goal 3: Increase the involvement and support of stakeholders.

Committee members stated that it was critical to capture that “educational leaders” includes teachers, principals, and superintendents. Mr. Perkins transitioned the Committee to begin thinking about “what” will be done related to each goal, and not moving too quickly to “how” it will be done. Mr. Perkins explained that strategic planning committees often jump to the “how” part too quickly. He cautioned the Committee to hold back and instead try to think about what should be measured under each area. The Committee recapped their mutual understanding of the current goals and the desire to make them clear and understandable to educators and the general public alike. They also restated the intent of including accessibility, achievement, and accountability as a component of each goal.

Mr. Perkins transitioned to an activity around the development of objectives. He explained the purpose of the activity was to get the Committee members used to reading good objectives. Mr. Perkins asked Committee members to individually scan over the criteria for a good objective that he had just provided. He then allotted time for the Committee members to individually complete the activity. After Committee members completed the activity, Mr. Perkins asked for Members to share with the group. Mr. Perkins reiterated that the goal of the activity was to make sure that the Committee has a clear understanding of how to write objectives correctly, so that they minimize the need to rewrite them after the initial draft.

Mr. Craig introduced an activity in developing SMART objectives. He explained the process and reviewed the five components of a SMART objective. Mr. Craig explained that 20 minutes would be provided to begin working on the student learning goal. He asked the Committee to try to develop up to three quality SMART objectives during that time that they can use in the plan. He explained that if the Committee could develop a few SMART objectives during this initial working time, it would provide them good exemplars to work from for the remainder of the day. Mr. Craig and Mr. Perkins facilitated the process and recorded the SMART objectives for the group.

The Committee continued to work on objectives when it reconvened in the afternoon. Committee members added objectives, while Mr. Craig recorded them for the group and Mr.



Perkins provided clarification to any questions. The Committee discussed and generated objectives for each goal over the next hour.

Mr. Craig summarized what the Committee had accomplished over the course of the day. He explained the next steps in the strategic planning process and stated CELT will send a balanced scorecard format for the Committee to review. Mr. Perkins and Mr. Craig both commented on how quickly the Committee is working and their level of engagement in the process. They also noted the quality of the product being created by the Committee. Mr. Perkins provided an overview of the constituent sessions that he and Mr. Craig would be facilitating the next day. He explained the format for the constituent sessions and shared the questions that would be posed of the participants.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:34 p.m.