

**Minutes
State Board of Education
Monday, September 24, 2012**

The Arizona State Board of Education held a regular meeting at the Arizona Department of Education, 1535 West Jefferson Street, Room 417, Phoenix, Arizona. The meeting was called to order at 9:02 am.

PERSON
RESPONSIBLE

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE AND MOMENT OF SILENCE

ROLL CALL

Members Present:

Ms. Hamilton
Ms. Klein
Mr. Jacks
Mr. Miller
Ms. Ortiz-Parsons
Dr. Rottweiler
Vice President Tyree
President Molera

Members Absent:

Dr. Hart
Superintendent Huppenthal
Mr. Moore

PERSON
RESPONSIBLE

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE AND MOMENT OF SILENCE

ROLL CALL

1. BUSINESS REPORTS

A. President's Report

President Molera, Ms. Klein and Mr. Moore will serve on the nominating committee to prepare a slate of candidates for 2013 Board year.

Mr. Molera

President Molera spoke about the opportunity to attend meetings, summits and discussion regarding common core, cut scores and PARCC assessments. We will continue to appeal to education leadership across the state in giving the kind of input we need to make the decisions on how this place out. Mr. Molera stated that decisions will be made with input from the field. There needs to be a discussion. The board members that have worked on those tasks forces, Mr. Miller and Mr. Jacks, have been very aggressive in trying to get that input from the field. But if folks don't come forward it's hard to get that communication that we need in order to make in depth decisions. He would like the Board to make a decision by the end of the year regarding cut scores. The graduation requirements are very critical. Whether the assessment is the be all, end all for graduation. PARCC will have end of course assessments. The board needs to have in-depth discussions in order to make decisions on how will affect our accountability and how kids reach those high standards. Mr. Molera does not want to drop the standards lower so it's easier for kids to jump over the bar. Mr. Molera stated that he wants to maintain a structure that is meaningful that really gets kids there.

B. Superintendent's Report

Supt. Huppenthal

C. Board Member Reports

D. Director's Report

Mr. Yanez

Task force that is looking at PARCC transition items have met twice and will meet again today at 1:30. Mr. Miller & Mr. Jacks are on the committee. Hope to have some recommendations for the board by next meeting. Items 2A & 4G be tabled until the October meeting.

2. CONSENT AGENDA

A. Consideration to approve Arizona State Board of Education minutes for August 27, 2012

Mr. Yanez

B. Consideration to approve the contract abstract for Arizona Mathematics and Science Partnership (MSP) Subgrant Awards

Ms. Welborn

C. Consideration to approve trainers for the full Structured English Immersion Endorsement

Ms. Hrabluk

D. Consideration to permanently revoke any and all teaching certificates held by the following individuals, pursuant to A.R.S. § 15-550:

Mr. Easaw

1. David W. Curtis, Jr.
2. Brian Richard Bizzell

E. Consideration to appoint the following individuals to the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP)

Ms. Denning

1. Kim Peaslee
2. Christopher Tiffany
3. Ashlee Hafner
4. Robert Hill
5. Diane Bruening
6. Nancy Williams

F. Consideration to approve the Mesa Unified School District's Career Ladder program for fiscal year 2012-2013

Dr. Butterfield

G. Update regarding the use of Arts Integration as a school reform model

Ms. Konitzer

President Molera had a conflict of interest with one of the consent Items and handed the gavel over to Vice President Tyree. Mr. Miller made a motion to approve Consent agenda with the exception of Item 2A. Dr. Rottweiler seconded the motion. Consent agenda passed unanimously. President Molera abstained.

3. CALL TO THE PUBLIC

No call to the public

4. GENERAL SESSION

- A. Presentation from the Governor's Office of Education Innovation regarding the Arizona Ready Report Card

Ms. Gau

Ms. Gau presented the AZ Ready reform goals. She specifically addressed goals related to high school graduation. Community colleges have created their own matrix. She showed data to Board reflecting K-6 and discussed the projected improvement as well as data for third grade reading by county; data graduation rates for 2009-2011. She presented additional information pertaining to the AZ READY website.

- B. Presentation, discussion and consideration to terminate the receivership for the Peach Springs Unified School District pursuant to A.R.S § 15-103(J)

Mr. Yanez

Mr. Yanez stated that Peach Springs Unified School District has been in receivership since July 2007. The district was experiencing financial difficult. He spoke of the four criteria that have to be met for a least one year and all of those have been met in this case. Mr. John White of Veridus Consulting spoke. He stated Veridus Consulting has cleaned up finances aspects of the district, implemented accounting controls, closed the high school, renegotiated the loan on the high school, implemented financial responsibility and put a new administration in place. These people will help oversee the district and will operate the District in a financial way once the keys are handed over to the District. The district has operated within their budget for the last five years. For the last 4 years the District has had excess budget capacity. The district has the ability to pay its own debt. This district is no longer engaged in mismanagement.

Mr. Miller asked what the district is going to be using the High School facility for. There are no classes held there but the elementary students uses building for recreation, ball fields, track fields, etc. Utilization is around 20%.

Vice President Tyree made a motion to terminate the receivership for the Peach Springs Unified School District, in accordance with A.R.S § 15-103(J). Ms. Ortiz-Parson seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

- C. Presentation and discussion regarding proposed achievement levels for the following assessments related to Board Examination Systems and the Grand Canyon Diploma:

Dr. Francis
Dr. Burke

1. ACT Quality Core Biology
2. Cambridge IGCSE Biology
3. ACT Quality Core U.S. History
4. Cambridge IGCSE World History

AGENDA

ARIZONA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

September 24, 2012

Page 4

Dr. Francis spoke regarding the implementation of the Move On When Ready initiative. The Arizona Move On When Ready (MOWR) initiative is a high school education reform designed to increase student academic achievement to national and international levels, and to prepare all students for college and careers. The Move On When Ready legislation passed in 2010 and 2011 provide a framework for an education model that enables students to advance in their educational career based on demonstrated learning instead of seat time. Key provisions include the establishment of the Grand Canyon High School Diploma, a performance-based high school diploma available to students who demonstrate they are college and career ready, and the implementation of Board Examination Systems, which are coherent and aligned instructional systems set to national and internationally benchmarked academic standards that are designed to prepare students for success in college and careers. The first Grand Canyon High School Diplomas may be awarded as early as the 2012-2013 academic years. This new model of high school education is based on a performance based model in which we prepare students to college ready level based on their mastery of material. There are 30 schools now involved throughout the state and approximately 10,000 students who have been exposed to this college ready curriculum. Move on When Ready is completely aligned to the common core. In order to earn a Grand Canyon Diploma, students must meet college ready benchmarks in all their assessments not just English and Math. Arizona is the leading state in regard to the number of students involved in this program. Amanda Burke spoke how each of the task force arrived to their conclusions and talked about the ACT Quality Core and presented a PowerPoint presentation. Ms. Klein asked about scores and grades and wants to be sure that the kids are going to be ready to perform based on those scores. Ms. Burke spoke about Cambridge scores and how they relate to Grand Canyon scores. Cambridge considers a C level as a very strong level and solid work and performance at the C level would allow students the ability to move toward college ready. VP Tyree asked about the number of students involved and on track to begin community college level participation. Ms. Burke stated there is no data yet to show but the schools are moving forward and most of the schools are doing this. This is not about moving kids through school quickly. Ms. Burke stated that she does not believe a large number of sophomores will graduate early. The ultimate objective is by the time the student graduates, whether it is 4 years or less, is that students are college ready. We are asking the board to take action in October going to continue with similar types of work Mr. Rottweiler what is going to be the plan to revisit these test scores. Dr. Burk stated we are tracking scores and tracking students and have already started discussions with AZ Board of Regents to do this and will be happy to report back to you. President Molera stated he is very happy about the no fee contract and is very impressed about the types of school that are included in this model. There are schools across the state with varying degrees of social economic type students that are doing quite well and we are happy they can compete as long as they are afforded the opportunity.

No action required at this time

D. Presentation and discussion regarding proposal to adopt the National Evaluation Systems (NES) Subject Knowledge Exams for the purpose of meeting the requirements prescribed in A.R.S. § 15-533

Dr. Butterfield

PowerPoint presentation and handouts were given to the board. Dr. Butterfield spoke about the background and many benefits for switching over to NES exams. Rather than revising several exams, we are recommending using National Evaluation Systems (NES) Subject Knowledge Exams. These exams, which are developed by

our testing vendor, are aligned to the national InTASC and Common Core standards; therefore, they also align to Arizona's Professional Teaching and K-12 standards. Additionally, these are the advantages to using the National Evaluation Systems (NES) Subject Knowledge Exams:

- **Computer –Based Test Sites.** This allows applicants to have year-round testing dates by appointment at Pearson VUE Test Centers. Currently there are 13 of these centers in Arizona with additional sites forthcoming, seven centers in our border states, over 200 nationwide, plus selected sites worldwide.
- **Fees:** Computer-Based Subject tests are offered at \$95 per test compared to the current paper based test at \$115 per test.
- **Practice Tests:** The NES Practice Tests provide full-length on-line practice tests; comprehensive feedback on the test-taker performance; interactive diagnostic score reporting; and sample test questions with rationales.
- **Electronic Score Reports:** The applicant will be able to access, download and print the score report at no charge. Score reports will be securely posted for 45 days.
- **Pearson VUE Test Centers:** Applicants can take a virtual tour of the Pearson VUE testing center to get a sense of the environment in which the test will be taken.
- **Results Analyzer:** Higher education will have direct access to candidate test result data.

Candidates currently take two types of assessments: Professional Knowledge Exams (NES) – to assess pedagogy and Subject Knowledge Exams (AEPA) – to assess content competency.

Arizona adopted the NES elementary & secondary Professional Knowledge (PK) exams at the February 2012 State Board of Education meeting. PK exams are:

- Currently being administered and well-received in Arizona
- Administered fully online– no paper-based administrations are offered
- Aligned to the InTASC professional teaching standards (adopted by SBE)

Both the NES and AEPA exams are developed and administered by Pearson. The fees are lower and there is greater accessibility and availability. The exams are required for state certification, are computer based with test taking centers all across the state, 14 specifically, 200 centers nationwide. Todd Peterson spoke about NES Exams Content area and what pass rates will be. Percent of questions that are required to pass the exam was shown on the AEPA to NES comparison slide and are fairly comparable. Implementation will begin March of 2013. Between October and March 2013, rigorous implementation and communications will begin in the field. Beth Discroll spoke about communication with schools and stated the schools are very excited about this and feel comfortable that the content is compliant doesn't equate to a huge shift.

No action required at this time.

- E. Presentation, discussion and consideration to determine non-compliance with the Uniform System for Financial Records (USFR) and to withhold state funds, pursuant to A.R.S. § 15-272(B) for the following districts:

Mr. Ellel

1. Indian Oasis-Baboquivari Unified District No. 40

Mr. Ellel spoke that this is the second time we have brought this before the board for non-compliance. The issue is the same just delayed in receiving their audit for the most recent

fiscal year. They have submitted 2009 and 2010 was just submitted at the very end of August. 2011 which was due in March of this year has not been completed and submitted. Clifton, Larson, Allen is doing the audit. Mr. Ellel has spoken with the managing partner who is doing the audit and he anticipates doing more field work in October and hopefully completing the report by January, 2013. The Board has previously withheld 3% and we are requesting an additional 3% at this time which would be a total of 6% being withheld. If they come into compliance by the end of this fiscal year, June 30, 2013, they would recover all of their funds at that point. Mr. Miller asked with a history going back 5 years of non-compliance with this school district, why are we not doing spot checks or spot audits prior to the end of fiscal year? Time line process has to be higher priority on the Auditor General's office so that another year ticks by and state money is flying out the window. Mr. Ellel stated he is at the Attorney General's office not at the Auditor General's office and he is not sure why they are not choosing to do spot audits. The board has the authority to withhold up to 10% and the Board is free to approve a larger withholding if it feels it would get these districts in compliance in a faster manner. Mr. Yanez spoke regarding the process in addressed Mr. Miller's question. It's a matter of resource issue. The Auditor General's office has to audit 228 school districts and Charter Schools as well. When a school district fails to submit their audit then the Auditor General's office refers them to this board to hopefully encourage them to come into compliance as quickly as possible. There was some communication between Mr. Yanez and their superintendent and they did provide the board with a written response. Mr. Miller stated that withholding 3% is not getting their attention in coming into compliance. Mr. Molera stated that the board can take additional action to withhold additional funds up to 10%. Decision is to whether or not to withhold funds. Connie Roth, Federal Programs Coordinator, spoke that they are in compliance with the 2010 Audit. They have been assured that the firm will be in compliance by March 31, 2013. VP Tyree spoke about a possible penalty that might motivate them to get their audit in compliance. Mr. Ellel stated that may require legislative action.

Mr. Miller moved to find that the Indian Oasis-Baboquivari Unified School District is in non-compliance with the requirements of the USFR and to withhold an additional 3% of the district's state aid until compliance is verified by the Auditor General. Motion seconded by Mr. Tyree Mr. Yanez reminded the board that this is an additional 3% on top of what is already being withheld right now so there will be a total of 6% withheld. Motion passed unanimously.

2. Topock Elementary School District No. 12

This is the third appearance before the board for determination of non-compliance. Mr. Ellel spoke about issues with their auditor, Larson Allen. They have supplied previous outstanding audit that was due on March, 2012 was just submitted for approval on September 11, 2012. Because the board has previously tabled this issue this would be a 5% withholding. Mr. Yanez stated he did received an email from Kim Conner this morning stating she would be available by phone and she also supplied a letter just this morning

addressing the noncompliance issues. The letter has been included into the record.

Mr. Jacks moved to find that the Topock Elementary School District is in non-compliance with the requirements of the USFR and to withhold 5% of the District's state aid until compliance is verified by the Auditor General. The motion was seconded by Mr. Miller. Motion passed unanimously.

F. Presentation, discussion and consideration to adopt proposed amendment to the Teacher and Principal Evaluation Framework to include performance classifications as prescribed in A.R.S. § 15-203

Mr. Yanez

Mr. Yanez spoke regarding the Teacher and Principal Evaluation Framework and stated this was presented to the board at last meeting. It is an amendment to include four specific performance classifications. Based on the conversation at the board's last meeting there has been one small amendment has been made to the language. It previous referred to at least two classroom observations and that has been amended to simply multiple observations. Aside from that, the item is identical from what you saw at the last meeting. The first part of the Framework deals with the type of academic progress you would accept and the second deals with the type of performance you would expect. Ms. Klein is concerned about long someone can be a developing teacher. Mr. Yanez stated that someone could be developing indefinitely. Ms. Klein asked if a timeline could be put on that. It seems like there should be a time limit that someone should get better, get retrained, redefined or redeployed. Mr. Yanez stated that he thought the board could redefine the framework itself. He would have to get into the statutes a bit more closely to be sure of that. Mr. Molera agreed.

Ms. Klein asked to see the statute right now to know if we would be prohibited from putting something in that says in no instance shall someone be considering developing in excess of a period of a year or two years. Ms. Klein doesn't think the statute should dictate what happens to a teacher in every instance. It should be up to the judgment and wisdom of our school leaders to decide what the consequences are.

Mr. Tyree stated he needed clarification on is the last sentence indicating that the developing classification may be appropriate for new or newly assigned teachers. Is the intent that it only to be used under those circumstances or can a continuing teacher be placed in that category? Seems at least one of the things that can occur is that if you are a new or newly assigned teacher and you don't have continuing status, can we delay putting a new teacher on continuing status until they come out of that status. What is the number of years that you can go without placing them on continuing status? Joe Thomas, VP of the Arizona Education Association, spoke to the Board about AEA's concerns. They don't want an evaluation system that doesn't accurately give teachers the information to become better. If this is an action item today, he asked the board to really look at what they are doing and base it on research if there is research available. What should the state mandate and what should the districts be responsible for. As we roll out the Framework, to put in another mandate might be premature if it's not thought out very well. If you put in a time limit and do that in a responsible fashion, we would like to be part of that discussion as long as it's thought out very, very thoroughly. We would hate to have something put in that might have unintended consequences. The Federal government is the one that says we have to sort teachers in this manner. At the local level and the classroom level, an evaluation lets you

know what kind of job you are doing and you welcome that in way that makes you become a better teacher.

Janice Palmer representing the School Board's Association stated their districts are ready to adopt and take action to these policies at the local level. If a teacher is struggling you may want to do multiple classroom observations to help that teacher and I think we would agree in concept with that. We do believe the framework should be consistent with statute 15-537 (E) to say at least two classroom observations, instead of having multiple observations. So if a district wants to do more than two, that would be allowable. This would at least provide consistency with how these classifications are dealt with. Mr. Tyree spoke about the discussions he heard at the recent law conference he attended in regard to the lack of understanding as to what the number of observations needs to be. Mr. Miller stated that multiple is more than one and that means at least two. Ms. Palmer stated wording should be consistent with the statute. President Molera stated there are two issues which need to be resolved, one being multiple vs. at least two and the other is to address member Klein's point on the developing. Ms. Klein stated that experienced highly qualified teachers probably don't need multiple observations but you don't want to restrict teachers who are developing who need more observations. Ms. Hamilton stated that both of the areas where it is multiple evaluations or more than one, there are very good teachers out there and it's going to take a while to get all of this straight. Ms. Hamilton stated that she is not sure the board has sufficient information to make this decision at this time. Mr. Yanez spoke about the statutes. There are three existing limitations on what it means to be developing under the law. First is you're not eligible for a continuing status that's linked to developing. Second there are some limitations put on the transfer of teachers that are in one of the lowest two categories. And then there is another section of the statute that basically assigns local governing boards with responsibility determining what consequences are going to be assigned to performance classification. Based on a cursory review he did not see anything else in statute that limits the board's ability to define how many times it is acceptable for a person to be any given classifications. He noted that there could be some contractual issues. Mr. Jacks stated that under the developing category I'm recommending that we leave it the way it is at this point for some of the reasons that Mr. Yanez has indicated. Many of our school districts are trying to move forward with the new system and we really need to get guidance out to them as to what are the final categories.

Mr. Miller made a motion to move "as is" with the change going back from a multiple concept to a definition that is in line with the state statute of at least two. Motion seconded by Ms. Ortiz-Parson. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Klein offered an amendment on the developing teacher and made a motion that we adopt the standards as were presented in Mr. Miller's motion but also add that the developing classifications may be appropriate for new or newly assigned teachers but for all other teachers it be limited to one year. Mr. Miller is concerned about the one year time line and recommended it be two years. Ms. Klein agreed and withdrew her amendment and offered a new amendment with a two year time limit. Mr. Tyree seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

investigations and the Professional Practices Advisory Committee.
The Board may take action to initiate rulemaking procedures for
proposed rule R7-2-205, regarding certification review, suspension
and revocation

Mr. Yanez

Tabled until next meeting

H. Presentation and discussion regarding legislative affairs. Discussion
may include, but is not limited to, Board priorities for the 2013
legislative session.

Mr. Molera
Mr. Yanez

Mr. Yanez spoke to the Board about two proposals that require new language for some discussion and guidance. First, the purpose of the change of the Arizona Learns Enhancement proposal is to assure the academic success of students attending new schools in an F school district.

School districts that have consistently demonstrated an inability to achieve acceptable student outcomes should be subject to state-level interventions when a new school site is opened.

Existing schools in “F” districts receive state intervention and assistance through the standard AZ LEARNS process (A.R.S. § 15-241). However, under this statute newly opened schools in these same districts will receive no state-level assistance.

Due to the established record of poor academic performance in “F” districts the state should require that any new schools be subject to state intervention and/or oversight until the schools demonstrate acceptable levels of achievement.

The Board should pursue legislation to accomplish the following:

- Amend A.R.S. § 15-241 to clarify that the method for determining “F” districts is identical to the existing method for schools (three consecutive “Ds”);
- Provide the Board with the authority to mandate interventions in new schools that are opening in districts that have an “F” classification. This could be accomplished at the school-level (similar to the existing process for “F” schools), or at a district-level through the existing academic receivership statute;
- Include incentives for “A” districts and charters to oversee the management of newly opened schools in “F” districts.

Mr. Molera spoke about creating a system that helps schools that are struggling. This bill would help by getting them the expertise and the leadership and engage the school districts that need the help as we talked about at the June retreat. If we show the principles of what it is we are trying to achieve with this, we can continue to work this with the education and business community that are demanding accountability as well as with the Governor and Legislature so that we can take these principles and turn it into legislation that affect high student achievement.

Mr. Yanez spoke about the proposal to remedy our issue with the NRT reference test requirement. We have a

summary and a draft proposal which is an amendment to ARS 15-741. The issue has to do with the existing requirement for the board to administer an NRT assessment and how that is going to be difficult when we transition over to PARCC assessment because we won't be able to integrate the two. It's an issue of testing time and it's a cost issue. Once we have to break those two apart, the cost will definitely rise. The change is relatively straight forward. It is simply going into that statute and eliminating that requirement. The only thing to note, when you read the language that is being stricken, it would seem that we are actually starting to limit the kind of data that is going to be available to policy makers. The response to that is the PARCC assessment is going to do all of those things for us so we really are not going to lose the ability to compare ourselves to how other states are doing. On the contrary, when we are administrating the same exact test as half the nation, we will actually have much better data.

Mr. Molera spoke that the NRT was put in place by the voter initiative. There has been precedent, when we implemented AIMS for instance, on how we interpreted that. There was a lot of debate on whether or not it was a strict NRT requirement. One of the things the Board has to do when moving forward when talking with legislators and policy makers is to assure that our intent is not to move away an assessment that would gauge how students are learning but actually enhancing it by moving to PARCC assessment.

Mr. Yanez stated there are two sections of law that reference both a Norm Reference Test and a Nationally Norm Test. When talking with Superintendent Huppenthal and his staff, he believes that the PARCC assessment can serve the purpose of a National Test. This statute 741 is not voter protected so it is more easily dealt with.

Ms. Klein asked about the time of this. Mr. Yanez stated if the Board does not move soon he fears that we will run in to some issues in terms of adding additional costs to what we are already doing. The state will have to basically proceed with the NRT, Stanford 10, still integrated with AIMS in addition to preparing for PARCC. The benefit of doing it now that the NRT is going to fade out in 2014/2015. If AIMS were actually to be continuing past 2014/2015, it would have to be change dramatically and be realigned to common core. These are certain benefits to doing it now even if the transition doesn't happen until 14/15.

Mr. Molera asked if including a statement should be included that says the intent of this board is that this be put into place once PARCC is put in place in 14/15. Mr. Yanez stated he would include that statement.

Mr. Yanez talked about additional items that were holdovers from the Board retreat that the Board will be keeping their eye on. With respect to the restoration of the Adult Education funding, (4.5 million dollars) that is included within the department's proposal so that is something we don't need to take on as the Board's own independent initiative but we can certainly be supportive of as that moves through the process. Regarding PARCC implementation and resource funding, there are two issues. There is an infrastructure issue should the assessments actually be implemented online that would have to be addressed immediately because that is not something we could wait until the following session. The second issue is the cost of the assessments moving forward is going to be greater than what we are doing with AIMS right now. That issue can probably wait until the following session. Mr. Molera asked if we have a ball park of what the infrastructure costs will be. He stated if we need to do this immediately then we will need some kind of Ball Park cost to present to legislature and the Governor's office to start off with as a benchmark, some reasonable estimate as we move forward. We have to look immediately at these infrastructure costs and we need to at least have a discussion in getting more data to move forward regarding the cost. Mr. Yanez stated he will work with Ms. Alley and staff to come up with some sort of estimates on both the infrastructure side and the ongoing administration side. Mr. Molera stated we need to be honest and look at the budget in its entirety if we want meaningful accountability. What do

we need to be successful is very reasonable and very fair.

Mr. Yanez spoke about three other items that were held over from the retreat. These items are restructuring the school calendar, the mathematics surge, and embedding CTE credits for graduation.

Mr. Molera stated the consensus is to move forward. On the imbedded credit issue, as we move to common core, there is going to be a strong need for not just college ready but also career ready and how those to melt together. Looking at the sequence of CTE classes that lead to a student having mastered those skills in those core academic areas is very important but the field needs to do a much better job in getting this board a road map on how to get that done. Mr. Miller agreed and stated this is an issue that impacts 80% of all kids in high school and stated we don't get too focus on just the college ready but not forget about the career ready part.

I. Board comments and future meeting dates. The executive director, presiding officer or a member of the Board may present a brief summary of current events pursuant to A.R.S. § 38-431.02(K), and may discuss future meeting dates and direct staff to place matters on a future agenda. The Board will not discuss or take action on any current event summary

Mr. Molera

None

5. ADJOURN

Ms. Hamilton made a motion to adjourn. Vice President Tyree seconded the motion. Meeting adjourned at 11:15