

## Why a Board Oversight Framework?

### Basic premises:

1. A vast spectrum of public education stakeholders exists, each with an individual perspective and understanding of the many different public education programs.
2. Legislative statutes are sometimes unclear as to who is responsible for enforcing directives, e.g. local control vs. USBE oversight. (Pgs. 28-29, [ULAG's Performance Audit of Public Education's Governance Structure](#))
3. Legislative statutes and administrative rules are drafted as unique programs without common basic structures making them difficult to understand quickly or compare. As a result:
  - a. Not all staff understand and navigate each program; and
  - b. Within USBE, many staff are siloed in sections and there are challenges with program overlap between sections. (Pg. 4, [Performance Audit of Public Education Reporting Requirements](#))
4. No tool is available to compare and contrast public education programs based on common characteristics.

### Resulting problems:

1. There is little to no transparency and understanding among stakeholders regarding proposed or existing USBE oversight and implementation of any given program. Little trust exists among education stakeholders of different organizations.
2. Time and money are wasted because of the disconnect or overlap regarding how USBE will oversee or is overseeing a program based on legal requirements, resources, and risk. Realization of disconnect is delayed and programs become entrenched. Problem solving is reactive and usually long overdue before it begins. Case study: TSSA (See pgs. 11-12 [OSA Minimum School Program Limited Review](#)); see also pgs. 29-31, [ULAG's Performance Audit of Public Education's Governance Structure](#), describing the disconnect as friction caused by statutory overlap.
3. Education stakeholders over-rely on reports to gain transparency on the back end instead of the front end. Reports overburden LEAs and are often ineffective. Case studies: Assurances Document and [ULAG's Performance Audit of Public Education Reporting Requirements](#).

### How the Framework will help:

1. The Framework will increase transparency by creating a language/paradigm that communicates basic oversight characteristics about each program and thereby allows comparisons among all programs.
2. Stakeholders across the public education spectrum will have more productive conversations about oversight of programs. These conversations will be easier to facilitate when programs are proposed instead of after they are entrenched, supporting proactive problem-solving.
3. USBE staff in different sections will be able to work together more efficiently, resulting in more efficient communication with LEAs.
4. LEAs will better understand which programs are intentionally under local control.
5. Reports and assurances document will be more intentional, reflecting the need for data or information instead of a need for transparency. The framework will show what monitoring is already happening, enabling more educated decisions about where more or less monitoring should take place.
6. Legislative and rule drafting will reflect the common understanding of the framework, leading to greater clarity and better oversight. Programs will have more common basic structures making them easier to oversee, implement, and compare.
7. Trust among stakeholders will increase, leading to earlier collaborative efforts on programs and further reducing later problems and conflict.