

Minutes
State Board of Education
Monday, January 23, 2006

The Arizona State Board of Education held its regular meeting at the Arizona Department of Education, 1535 West Jefferson, Room 417, Phoenix, Arizona. The meeting was called to order at 9:00 AM.

Members Present

Mr. Jesse Ary
Dr. Vicki Balentine
Dr. Michael Crow
Dr. Matthew Diethelm
Mr. Bill Estes
Ms. JoAnne Hilde
Superintendent Tom Horne
Ms. Joanne Kramer
Dr. Karen Nicodemus
Ms. Cecilia Owen

Members Absent

Ms. Anita Mendoza

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE AND MOMENT OF SILENCE

1. **PRESENTATION OF CANDIDATES AND ELECTION OF STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION OFFICERS IN ACCORDANCE WITH R7-2-101 FOR 2006**

Mr. Yanez, Executive Director, State Board of Education, announced that, by written ballot, Ms. Hilde has been elected as President and Dr. Nicodemus as Vice President of the State Board of Education for the 2006 year.

Ms. Hilde thanked Dr. Diethelm and fellow Board members and noted that she has been mentored during the last three years by the Department and others outside the Department and pledged to do her best to meet expectations. Ms. Hilde urged members to keep in touch with her regarding any issues of concern.

Ms. Hilde presented Dr. Diethelm with a gift of appreciation for his service and thanked him for his contribution to the work of the Board.

2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

- A. December 5, 2005
- B. December 22, 2005 Special Session
- C. December 27, 2005 Special Session
- D. December 5, 2005 Executive Session
- E. December 27, 2005 Executive Session

Motion by Ms. Kramer and seconded by Dr. Nicodemus to approve minutes for Items 2A, 2B, 2C, and 2E as submitted. Minutes for Item 2D were not submitted today. *Motion passes.*

3. **BUSINESS REPORTS**

- A. President's Report

As outgoing president, Dr. Diethelm emphasized the goals that the Board has been and should continue looking at to continue improving education in Arizona:

- Setting high expectations for all students
 - Graduation requirements
 - Utilizing data

- Require quality teachers
 - Work on continual improvement
 - Certification/re-certification and endorsement requirements
 - Develop teachers and help them improve
- Extra effort to assist children who are behind for any reason

Ms. Owen arrived at 9:10AM

B. Superintendent's Report

Superintendent Horne thanked Dr. Diethelm for his open mindedness, civility, and dignity as President of the State Board of Education and noted that he favored Dr. Diethelm being re-appointed to the State Board for another term.

Mr. Horne noted that Ms. Joanne Phillips' Exceptional Student Services Division put on a conference regarding Special Education issues and recruitment. He also noted that Ms. Phyllis Schwartz' School Effectiveness Division sponsored a two-day Best Practices conference entitled "Determined to Succeed" which was well attended.

C. Board Member Reports

Dr. Nicodemus attended an Early Childhood Study Group with NASBE and offered copies of a presentation entitled "Leaving too many children behind" by Dr. Harold Hodgkinson, which was presented at the conference. She noted that there will be some implications in the future on children ages 5 and under and that discussions about the importance of teacher interaction, how to narrow the gap, etc., were included at the conference. Dr. Nicodemus suggested that the Board have a presentation from "First Things First" on this subject, also.

Ms. Hilde asked the two new State Board members to introduce themselves:

Dr. Vicki Balentine, Superintendent, Amphitheater Public Schools, noted that many decisions at the school and district level are necessary to make a difference and the work of the State Board will be an important factor in these decisions.

Mr. Bill Estes, Jr., stated that he has been in the real estate business since 1963 and recently has been more involved in Pima County with business and education. He noted that he believes education is very important and is happy to be involved.

D. Director's Report, Including Discussion and Possible Legal Action

1. Revised Procedures for Presentation of Recommendations from the Professional Practices Advisory Committee

Mr. Yanez, Executive Director, State Board of Education, reviewed the following criteria that have been used for placing items from the PPAC on the Consent or the General Session Agendas:

- Presently all recommendations not contested are presented on the Consent Agenda
- Negotiated settlements or disciplinary actions that are not contested are placed on the Consent Agenda
- Recommendations for approval are placed on the Consent Agenda

Mr. Yanez noted that in working with the Investigative Unit staff and the Attorney General's Office, the following recommendations/changes are being brought forward to be effective beginning with the February 2006 State Board meeting:

- Regardless of the PPAC's recommendations certain types of allegations will come on the General Session Agenda
 - Any incident or allegation involving serious injury or death
 - Any incident or allegation involving any type of sexual offense
 - Any incident or allegation where the victim is a minor

In addition, Mr. Yanez stated that members can request any item to be pulled from the Consent Agenda for further discussion/clarification.

Further discussion ensued regarding the following concerns:

- There has been some discussion regarding split decisions
 - The findings form was modified to include the clarifying policies
- Concern when PPAC decides not to take any action
 - Was addressed with PPAC and those cases will remain with the PPAC until a tie is broken and will come to the Board with a recommendation
- Rationale for recommendations will be clear to the Board
 - All elements of each case will be looked at and included in rationale forwarded to the State Board including
 - Extent of criminal record
 - Length of time since most recent offense
 - Degree to which the applicant participated in the offense
 - Any applicable mitigating circumstances
 - Extent of the person's rehabilitation

Mr. Yanez added that the goal is to provide a more clear understanding of the PPAC's rationale.

2. Legislative Update

Mr. Yanez gave a brief update regarding some of the activities at the Legislature:

- The state is under a 15-day window to comply with a court order to avoid sanctions in the *Flores* matter
 - Recommendations were forwarded to each member of the Legislature and the Governor
- There are two identical bills in the House and Senate
 - Requires district/charters to submit applications to the Department for ELL funding
 - Department would weigh those applications and appropriate funding
 - Board's recommendation was to identify a specific commitment for each ELL student
- Legislation would create a new task force with Best Practice models for ELL instruction
 - Board's recommendation was to delegate those items to the State Board
- Legislation would remove the State Board's authority regarding student assessment for ELLs

Superintendent Horne clarified that responsibility for the assessment is proposed as a matter of conforming with the Consent Decree entered into several years ago which specifies that the Department would be responsible for this activity. Mr. Horne stated this was not a matter of policy change.

Regarding the rationale as to why the Legislature would require a grant process versus funding and creating a task force versus delegating the responsibility to the State Board, Mr. Yanez explained:

- Funding
 - There is not a universally accepted cost study to assist in determining funding
 - Possible way to determine funding is on a district-by-district basis where they submit applications and the Department evaluates and determines the allocation amount
- Task force
 - There has been very little shared regarding formation of a task force
 - He attended one public hearing
 - Mr. Yanez explained to the Legislative Appropriations Committee that the State

Board does not see a need to create a new task force in addition to the State Board. Mr. Horne noted that this proposal passed legislation last year and stated that members of the task force should be experts on ELL programs who would develop models for schools to follow. Ms. Hilde stated that no criteria were listed around qualifications rather than the issue.

Mr. Yanez referred to HB 2357 regarding the receivership legislation which was passed last year and utilized in the Colorado City matter, noting that another bill will expand reasons a school district could be placed into receivership. The State Board has the option of conducting a full hearing before this body or using the Office of Administrative Hearings. The recent case that was heard would have been quite costly and the Board does not have funds to support this.

Ms. Owen asked about the task force responsibilities and make-up of the task force and Mr. Yanez responded:

- o It would have many responsibilities including developing and adopting Best Practice models for ELLs
- o Original make-up has been somewhat modified and will include appointees by the Speaker of the House, President of the Senate, Governor plus two additional members

Superintendent Horne added that the task force would have the final say and make the final decisions.

Mr. Owen asked what authority the State Board had procedurally that would be lost and Mr. Yanez stated that the ELL proficiency test would be removed from the responsibility of the State Board and the Superintendent of Public Instruction would choose the test. Mr. Horne stated that he did not seek this legislation but that it came from the legal counsel of the legislature as the consent decree specified that the Department would have this responsibility.

Item 7N was discussed at this point in the meeting beginning at 9:40AM.

The Board began with Item 4 when it reconvened after lunch at 12:37PM.

4. CONSENT ITEMS

- A. Consideration to Approve Contract Abstracts
- B. Consideration to Approve Recommendations for Structured English Immersion Endorsements Curricular Framework
- C. Consideration to Budget and Accumulate in the Unrestricted Capital Section for FY 05-06 For the Following School Districts:
 - 1. Chinle Unified School District
 - 2. Whiteriver Unified School District
- D. Quarterly Update Regarding IDEAL
- E. Consideration to Appoint Members to the Performance Based Compensation Task Force Pursuant to A.R.S. § 15-920.01
- F. Consideration to Accept the Recommendations of the Professional Practices Advisory Committee and Accept the Proposed Negotiated Settlement Agreement and Place A Letter of Censure in the Permanent Certification File for The Following Individual:
 - 1. Timothy Smith, Case No. C-2005-073
- G. Consideration to Accept the Automatic and Permanent Revocation, Pursuant to A.R.S. §15-550, of the Following Certification Cases:
 - 1. Neil Lichter, Case No. C-2005-081
- H. Consideration to Accept the Recommendations of the Professional Practices Advisory Committee and Approve Certification for the Following Individuals:
 - 1. Deanna Bazzanella, Case No. C-2005-091R

2. Michael Coleman, Case No. C-2004-196R
3. Anna Houston, Case No. C-2005-136R
4. Clayton Thompson, Case No. C-2005-167R

Ms. Hilde noted that Items 4D and 4E will be pulled to be continued until the February 2006 meeting. Dr. Nicodemus requested that Item 4H1 be pulled for further discussion/clarification. Motion to approve the Consent Agenda with the exception of Items 4D, 4E and 4H1 by Mr. Estes and seconded by Dr. Diethelm. *Motion passes.*

Motion by Mr. Estes and seconded by Mr. Ary to move Items 4D and 4E to the February 2006 meeting. *Motion passes.*

Item 4H1: Dr. Nicodemus asked for clarification on the PPAC vote record and Ms. Rachell Tucker, Chief Investigator, Investigative Unit, State Board of Education, clarified that the PPAC vote was 5-1. Motion by Dr. Nicodemus to accept the recommendation of the PPAC and grant Ms. Bazzanella's application for certification. Seconded by Ms. Owen. *Motion passes.*

5. CALL TO THE PUBLIC

No additional requests were received at this time.

6. SPECIAL PRESENTATION OF NATIONAL BOARD CERTIFIED TEACHERS

Ms. Jan Amator, Deputy Associate Superintendent for Highly Qualified Professionals, Academic Achievement, Arizona Department of Education, presented Arizona's newest group of National Board Certified Teachers, 34 this year bringing our total to 277 out of approximately 51,000 working teachers in Arizona. Ms. Amator noted that the National Board promotes rigorous and high standards and works to elevate the teaching profession. She added that the certification process is rigorous, is grounded in research and is equivalent to an extra month of instruction. Ms. Amator introduced each teacher and the Superintendent expressed gratitude on behalf of the State Board to the teachers.

7. GENERAL SESSION

A. Consideration to Accept the Recommendations of the Professional Practices Advisory Committee and Deny Certification for the Following Individuals:

1. George Butler, Case No. C-2005-108R

Ms. Rachell Tucker, Chief Investigator, Investigative Unit, State Board of Education, noted that Mr. George Butler asked for a continuance due to an inability to travel at this time. Motion by Mr. Estes to table this item until February 27, 2006 State Board meeting and seconded by Dr. Diethelm. *Motion passes.*

2. Robert Jeffrey Russ, Case No. C-2005-050R

Ms. Rachell Tucker, Chief Investigator, Investigative Unit, State Board of Education, presented the background information as provided in the materials packet.

Mr. Russ addressed the State Board stating that the only thing he falsified was a letter when he was applying for a job to LaConnor School District. He noted that he resigned after being asked about this by the school. He added that there were items in his record in Washington State that he was unaware of and that Alaska did not have a system in place to review these items and therefore he did not have an opportunity to respond. Mr. Russ noted that part of his problem at that time was substance abuse and that he has been clean and sober for 25 years. Mr. Russ addressed the aggravating factors noted by the PPAC and stated that he just wants a substitute license as he lives in Arizona part-time. He argued that during the period of time lapsed between these incidents he re-established himself in his communities and has recommendations from them. Mr. Russ also noted that he has worked in a private prison system in the substance abuse area.

Dr. Nicodemus commended Mr. Russ's sobriety and asked about a discrepancy on a statement signed by Mr. Russ in 2005 which looks like a misrepresentation of his work history. Mr. Russ responded that he was at the Little Red River School until the beginning of 2005 and that he left due to nepotism. Ms. Owen asked Mr. Russ if he was there for two full years as the information indicates employment at the Little Red River School Board of Education from August 25-December 17, 2004, or 3.5 months. Dr. Nicodemus added that there is a disconnect in this record and what Mr. Russ has stated. Mr. Russ responded that he included the information from Little Red so the Board would have the exact dates and times.

Motion by Dr. Nicodemus to accept the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law and recommendation of the PPAC to deny certification for Mr. Robert Russ. Seconded by Ms. Owen. *Motion passes.*

3. Stephen Stanzione, Case No. C-2001-046R

Ms. Rachell Tucker, Chief Investigator, Investigative Unit, State Board of Education, presented the background information as provided in the materials packet.

Motion by Mr. Estes and seconded by Dr. Balentine to approve the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and recommendation of the PPAC and deny certification for Mr. Stephen Stanzione.

Motion passes.

Dr. Nicodemus asked about the timeline in investigating these cases and Mr. Yanez responded that additional allegations surfaced which called for a new investigation at the time Mr. Stanzione applied for re-certification.

B. Consideration to Accept the Recommendations of the Professional Practices Advisory Committee and Revoke the Teaching Credentials for the following Individuals:

1. Judith DeHavilland, Case No. C-2001-64

Ms. Rachell Tucker, Chief Investigator, Investigative Unit, State Board of Education, presented background information as provided in the materials packet.

Motion by Dr. Diethelm to approve the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and accept the recommendation of the PPAC and revoke the teaching credentials held by Ms. Judith DeHavilland. Seconded by Ms. Kramer. *Motion passes.*

2. John Wheeler, Case No. C-2000-01

Ms. Tucker, Chief Investigator, Investigative Unit, State Board of Education, presented the background information as provided in the materials packet.

Motion by Ms. Owen to approve the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and recommendations of the PPAC and revoke the teaching credentials held by Mr. John Wheeler. Seconded by Mr. Ary. *Motion passes.*

C. Consideration to Accept the Recommendations of the Professional Practices Advisory Committee and Reject the Proposed Negotiated Settlement Agreement for the Following Individual:

1. Lorraine Misquez, Case No. C-2005-124

Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03 (A) (3) and (4), the Board May Vote to Go into Executive Session for Consultation And Legal Advice and/or for Instructing the Board's Attorneys Regarding the Board's Position Pertaining to this Matter

Ms. Rachell Tucker, Chief Investigator, Investigative Unit, State Board of Education, presented the background information as provided in the materials packet.

Motion by Dr. Diethelm and seconded by Ms. Kramer that the State Board go into Executive Session for Consultation and Legal Advice and/or for instructing the Board's Attorneys Regarding the Board's Position Pertaining to this Matter. *Motion passes.*

The Board went into Executive Session at 1:15PM. Motion to reconvene in Open Session by Dr. Diethelm and seconded by Mr. Estes. Board reconvened at 1:30PM.

Motion by Dr. Nicodemus to accept the settlement agreement brought to the Board and that the Board at a future meeting have a dialogue with the PPAC or representatives of the PPAC regarding future appropriate actions that might be taken related to similar matters. Seconded by Dr. Diethelm. *Motion passes.*

D. Presentation, Discussion and Consideration to Endorse Graduation Goals Proposed by the Center for the Future of Arizona

Mr. Vince Yanez, Executive Director, Arizona State Board of Education, presented the background information regarding Dr. Sybil Francis' previous presentation in this matter, noting that today's submission is to present the Center's Endorsement Form for the State Board's support. Dr. Balentine stated that she has no problem endorsing this proposal.

Motion by Dr. Diethelm and seconded by Ms. Kramer to endorse the graduation goals presented by the Center for the Future of Arizona. Dr. Diethelm noted that he is totally in sync with graduation goals but not at the expense of a poorer education or lowering expectations. Dr. Nicodemus asked that outcomes of the results and research be reported to the State Board on an ongoing basis. *Motion passes.*

E. Presentation, Discussion and Consideration to Accept The School Improvement Plans from the Following Charter Schools:

1. Desert Pointe Academy, First year
2. DINE Southwest High School, 1st
3. La Puerta High School, 1st
4. Ombudsman Learning Center-Northwest
5. Terra Nova Academy, 1st
6. Vechij Himdag MashchamakuD, 1st

Mr. Lee McIlroy, Research Analyst, Arizona State Board for Charter Schools, presented the background information as provided in the materials packet. Mr. McIlroy noted that the schools listed have submitted School Improvement Plans with the exception of Ombudsman Learning Center-Northwest which has just transferred to the Charter Board and should not be included in today's list.

Motion by Dr. Diethelm to accept the School Improvement Plans from the following schools:

1. Desert Pointe Academy, First year
2. DINE Southwest High School, 1st
3. La Puerta High School, 1st
4. Terra Nova Academy, 1st
5. Vechij Himdag MashchamakuD, 1st

Seconded by Mr. Estes. *Motion passes.*

F. Presentation, Discussion and Consideration to Approve Withholding Classroom Site Funds from the Following Charter Schools for Late Submission of FY '05 Audit:

1. Mesa Arts Academy

Ms. Kristen Jordison, Executive Director, Arizona State Board for Charter Schools, stated that the

Mesa Arts Academy has submitted its audit which was received after the deadline date requested that no action to be taken today.

G. Presentation, Discussion and Consideration of AIMS Reciprocity Policy as Prescribed in A.R.S. § 15-701.01 (A)

Ms. Ruth Solomon, Associate Superintendent for Education Policy, Arizona Department of Education, presented the background information as provided in the materials packet.

Dr. Nicodemus asked about the NAEP results being utilized and how it is aligned and Ms. Solomon stated that the Superintendent requested the NAEP results be used and that the tests used by other states within NCLB guidelines are accepted. Ms. Solomon added that for this to be accepted by NCLB, students have to be tested in the areas of Mathematics and Reading with Science testing beginning in 2008.

Motion by Dr. Balentine and seconded by Mr. Estes to approve the AIMS reciprocity policy as presented. *Motion passes.*

Ms. Hilde suggested that a simplistic template/form be created for students to utilize this provision and get a clear understanding of what is required of them.

H. Presentation, Discussion and Consideration to Approve Proposed Modifications to the Required Format for Posting AIMS Scores on High School Transcripts Pursuant to A.R.S. § 15-743 (F)

Ms. Ruth Solomon, Associate Superintendent for Education Policy, Arizona Department of Education, presented the background information as provided in the materials packet, stating that they are recommending adding the scale score to the transcript posting.

Dr. Nicodemus noted that previous discussions questioned why labels needed to be included in the information on transcripts. Dr. Diethelm noted that “exceeds” was listed in order to assist the student in qualifying for scholarships.

Ms. Solomon added that with augmentation a student does not have to “meet” but can still graduate, so this can also be an indication that the student has met the requirements.

Ms. Owen commented that “exceeds” would be used for all the reasons recalled by Dr. Diethelm but that she thought the Board was clear about no other need to distinguish. Ms. Solomon responded that there were other reasons that schools wanted this on the transcripts.

Dr. Balentine asked for information regarding the following:

- Critical reason for this being approved today
- Further understanding regarding how this is put on the transcript and what is required at the school level
- Concern about identifying the special groups that would be identified by this listing
- The legal ramifications

Ms. Jennifer Pollock, Assistant Attorney General, Arizona Attorney General’s Office, noted that the Attorney General’s Office has reviewed adding the exit exam on a transcript but a review of the total scoring on the transcript has not been done.

Dr. Diethelm noted that the Department has addressed the issue of Special Education students’ listings, which would follow the student’s IEP. In addition, Dr. Diethelm noted that he sees no difference in this and the letter grades on transcripts. Ms. Solomon clarified that a student is not identified in a particular class of students but the only indication will be that the student graduated using alternative criteria.

Mr. Ary stated that he hoped this is not a gradual effort to create more mundane ways to place stigmas on high school graduates. Ms. Solomon noted that the state does not grant diplomas and the format for diplomas is entirely up to the schools/districts.

Dr. Nicodemus noted that we have not fully tested AIMS and what it fully means and that there could be unintended consequences.

Ms. Owen commented that ACT and SAT tests can be re-taken to improve scores and asked why it is practical to list the AIMS “meets” and “approaches” scores on transcripts.

Ms. Solomon noted that there is time for further discussion as there is not urgency in this matter. She added that Assessment Department personnel could meet with Board representation for further clarification, as well. Motion to table this item by Dr. Balentine and seconded by Mr. Estes. *Motion passes.*

Ms. Hilde urged members to send their questions to Mr. Yanez, who can gather the information for members.

I. Update Regarding the Arizona High School Renewal and Improvement Initiative

Dr. Karen Butterfield, Associate Superintendent, Academic Achievement, Arizona Department of Education, presented the background information via PowerPoint presentation provided in the materials packet for further details.

Ms. Maxine Daly, Deputy Associate Superintendent, Innovative and Exemplary Programs, Academic Achievement Division, Arizona Department of Education, introduced Mr. Bob Coccagna, Director of Dropout Prevention and High School Renewal, Academic Achievement Division, Arizona Department of Education, and reported on the high school summits via a PowerPoint presentation included in the materials packet.

Ms. Hilde asked members to contact Mr. Yanez or Dr. Butterfield’s office/staff regarding any questions they may have.

The Board moved to Item 70 at this time to accommodate the travel schedules of the presenters.

J. Presentation and Discussion Regarding the AIMS High School Tutoring Guides. Discussion May Include, but is Not Limited to, Updated Study Guides Based on Fall 2005 Test Results, Statewide Training and Data Regarding Student Usage

Dr. Karen Butterfield, Associate Superintendent, Academic Achievement, Arizona Department of Education, presented the background information as provided in the materials packet. She noted that this effort has provided an additional tool for students and teachers and has made a difference.

Ms. Tina Snowden, The Grow Network/McGraw-Hill, presented information regarding the results to date of the study guides. Please see the presentation provided in the materials packet.

Dr. Nicodemus asked for further information regarding how the resources are being used and Mr. Estes asked if there was data as to the numbers of people who have actually used the web site. Ms. Snowden responded that they have information regarding whether the web usage is just hits, complete or partial downloads, etc. She noted that approximately 35,000 should utilize guides but they have noted that some schools are downloading just an outline.

Ms. Kramer asked if the Department could conduct a formal survey of districts regarding their usage. Dr. Butterfield reported that one teacher stated they had better resources and did not use the study guides and that some students still felt that this was personal and took it seriously.

Mr. Ary asked what assurance the Department has that everything possible has been done to get the study guides into the hands of the 18,000+ students in Arizona that may not graduate. Dr. Butterfield responded that it has been advertised via web, letter, emails, etc. In addition, an AIMS hotline link is available and getting hits.

Ms. Margaret Garcia Dugan added that in conversations with her colleagues she has been told that many students will graduate from high school either through augmentation or tutoring.

Ms. Tisha Pryor, The Grow Network/McGraw-Hill, completed the presentation with the remainder of the PowerPoint presentation, noting that there is not a comparison group in Arizona but within this state they can compare results within a random sample of students.

- K. Presentation, Discussion and Consideration to Determine Non-Compliance with the USFR for Failing to Correct Deficiencies and to Withhold State Funds Pursuant to A.R.S. §15-272(B) for the Following:
1. Nazlini Community Junior High School
 2. Red Mesa Unified School District
 3. Sterling Academy of Mathematics and Science
DBA Bright Ideas Charter School
 4. Window Rock Unified School District

Mr. Chad Sampson, Assistant Attorney General, Attorney General's Office, in response to a question posed at the last State Board meeting noted the Auditor General's procedure for notification in non-compliance issues:

- A letter is sent to each district governing board which includes letters addressed to each governing board member in an effort to disseminate information to all board members
- The Auditor General's Office does not have the manpower to maintain a detailed database of all district board members' addresses so personal letters are included in the packet that is mailed to the district office with the understanding that the district office will distribute the letters to the board members as indicated

Mr. Sampson presented the information included in the materials packet regarding the schools/districts found to be out of compliance by the Arizona Auditor General:

- Red Mesa Unified School District

Mr. Willie Bean, Superintendent, Nazlini Community Junior High School, and Mr. Stewart Waite, Business Manager, Nazlini Community Junior High School, noted that they are working together to clean up the school, provide equipment for students and add to the professional development programs for teachers. Mr. Waite stated that they are hopeful to have the current audits submitted on time and that Heinfeld and Meech is assisting in this process.

Mr. Estes asked for the reason for not getting a report in on time and Mr. Waite explained that the previous person did not do their job and they are now going back to rectify old records.

Mr. Sampson clarified that ten percent is being withheld since last year due to late submission of the '03 audit which has now been received. At this time, the school is before the Board since the '04 audit has not been submitted.

Mr. Waite stated that they are hoping to have the '04 and '05 audits submitted by the deadline and he noted that a 10% withholding is not a significant penalty for the district. Mr. Estes noted that if a 10% withholding is not significant to the school the Board may be wasting its time in imposing a penalty. Dr. Balentine noted that as a superintendent, it is terrifying to think that funds may be withheld as this affects ratings for bonds, cash flow, potential interest charges, etc.

Motion by Dr. Nicodemus to determine that the Red Mesa Unified School District is out of compliance with the USFR and to direct the Superintendent of Public Instruction to withhold 5% of the state funds from the district until the Auditor General reports that the district is in compliance with the USFR. Seconded by Dr. Balentine. *Motion passes.*

Ms. Owen stated that she gives credit to the district for working on building a systemic infrastructure and correcting inherited mistakes. Superintendent Horne asked Mr. Sampson to consider budget implications being added to future legislative proposals.

- Window Rock Unified School District

Ms. Henrietta Keyannie, Business Manager, stated that she has been at the district since September

2005 and that the audit for '03 has just been completed and submitted and the '04 report is currently being finalized by the auditors in St. George, Utah, and the hope is to have it completed by the end of January or the first part of February. She added that the '05 report cannot be completed until the '04 report is finalized as the information carries over from one year to the next. Mr. Sampson stated that if audits are not submitted the withholding will continue until all audits are received. Mr. Sampson argued that even though some of the new employees in a district inherit problems, they have a fiduciary duty to the parents, children and constituents in the district to operate and report according to law.

Mr. Estes noted that unless penalties are significant the schools will not get the reports in on time and that leniency sends the wrong message to those schools that are submitting reports on time.

Dr. Balentine added that superintendents and business managers are very, very concerned about the potential of having any funds withheld and that any per cent withheld makes a huge impact.

Ms. Owen asked how impact aid money can still be used if the school is out of compliance and

Mr. Sampson responded that sometimes the rolling-over account could be used, especially for small and/or rural schools and this may be the reason that the representative from Red Mesa indicated that a 10% withholding would not affect their district.

Mr. Sampson noted that further action against this school could be in June 2006 if all audits are not submitted on time.

Motion by Dr. Diethelm to determine that Window Rock Unified School District is out of compliance with the USFR and to direct the Superintendent of Public Instruction to withhold 10% of state funds from the district until the Auditor General reports that the district is in compliance with the USFR. Seconded by Mr. Estes. *Motion passes. Dr. Nicodemus voted no.*

- Nazlini Community Junior High School, Chartered by Peach Springs Unified School District

Mr. Ronald Arias, Principal, Nazlini Community Junior High School, noted that district personnel is working on the audit and asked for leniency and perhaps a stay of penalties. Mr. Arias provided information from the school's auditors included in the materials packet.

Dr. Gene Thomas, Superintendent, Peach Springs Unified School District, who just took this job six months ago, stated that many of the staff is gone. Dr. Thomas added that many files are missing from hard drives and they are in the process of cleaning up records and supporting Nazlini in getting its house in order, as well.

Dr. Thomas stated that Peach Springs is incapable of supporting the charter organizations that were sponsored by the district in the past and would support the charters being rescinded. He added that schools could opt out of the charter agreement with the district. Ms. Owen asked if the Yavapai County Attorney's Office could assist and Dr. Thomas noted that the district has been advised by the Yavapai County Attorney's Office that it has this option. Mr. Ary asked if there has been a request to the local governing board requesting an opt-out of sponsorship and Dr. Thomas noted that it can be done but is not a top issue at this time.

Ms. Robin Harding, Nazlini Community Junior High School, noted that the junior high school and high school are operated as separate schools and there is no co-mingling of funds.

Mr. Sampson noted that the funds go to Peach Springs, which keeps a percentage for the charter sponsorship and then the remainder goes to Nazlini. Dr. Thomas clarified that Peach Springs actually gets 3% and that Peach Springs cannot cover the salary for someone to manage the Nazlini funding at that rate.

Motion by Dr. Balentine to determine that the Nazlini Community Junior High School is out of compliance with the USFR and to direct the Superintendent of Public Instruction to withhold 10% of state funds from the district until the Auditor General reports that the district is in compliance

with the USFR. Seconded by Mr. Estes. *Motion passes.*

- Sterling Academy of Mathematics and Science DBA Bright Ideas Charter School

Mr. Sampson reiterated the information provided in the materials packet.

Motion by Dr. Diethelm to determine that Sterling Academy of Mathematics and Science DBA Bright Ideas Charter School is out of compliance with the USFR and to direct the Superintendent of Public Instruction to withhold 10% of state funds from the district until the Auditor General reports that the district is in compliance with the USFR. Seconded by Mr. Ary. *Motion passes.*

- L. Presentation, Discussion and Consideration to Initiate the Rulemaking Process for R7-2-615, Regarding School Psychologist Certification

Mr. Vince Yanez, Executive Director, Arizona State Board of Education, noted that this item is the same rule package that was presented previously but due to new legislation the rule making process was changed making it necessary to bring this package back to the Board to proceed.

Motion by Dr. Diethelm to initiate the rulemaking process for R7-2-615 relating to school psychologist certification and that a public hearing be scheduled at the discretion of the Board's Executive Director. Seconded by Ms. Kramer. *Motion passes.*

- M. Presentation, Discussion and Consideration to Close the Rulemaking Record and Adopt Amendments to Board Rule R7-2-405 Regarding Special Education Due Process Standards

Mr. Vince Yanez, Executive Director, Arizona State Board of Education, presented the background information as provided in the materials packet. Mr. Yanez added that the rules presented will be in proper form for technical presentation when they are filed.

Motion by Mr. Kramer to close the rulemaking record and adopt amendments to Board rule R7-2-405 regarding special education due process standards. Seconded by Mr. Ary. *Motion passes.*

- N. Presentation and Discussion Regarding the Augmentation Status of the Stanford English Language Proficiency Test. Discussion May Include, but is not Limited to, Test Development, Standards Setting, Scoring and Compensatory Services. Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03 (A) (3) and (4), the Board May Vote to Go into Executive Session for Consultation and Legal Advice and/or for Instructing the Board's Attorneys Regarding the Board's Position Pertaining to Litigation in Connection with this Matter.

Mr. Vince Yanez, Executive Director, State Board of Education, noted that staff recommended the Board go into Executive Session for instruction in this matter.

Motion by Dr. Diethelm and seconded by Mr. Ary to go into Executive Session for Consultation and Legal Advice and/or for instructing the Board's Attorneys Regarding the Board's Position Pertaining to Litigation in Connection with this Matter. *Motion passes.*

The Board went into Executive Session at 9:41AM.

Motion to reconvene in Open Session by Dr. Diethelm and seconded by Mr. Estes. The State Board re-convened at 10:20 AM and began with Item 6N.

Mr. Yanez noted that this item has been placed on the agenda for further discussion and noted that the SELP test was adopted for implementation in July 2004. Mr. Yanez stated that the test is currently going through an augmentation process to better align with Arizona standards, and that representatives from Harcourt are present today to assist in the technical aspects. Please see materials in the packet for additional information.

Mr. Mickey Geenen, Measurement Consultant, Harcourt, stated that other Harcourt personnel from San Antonio were also present to assist with any questions the Board may have.

Dr. John Olson, Vice President of Psychometrics/Research Services, Harcourt, gave a historic overview of the SELP test, its selection, what it tests and how:

- Designed to measure student proficiency in the English language in reading, writing, listening, and speaking
- Designed to meet the NCLB standards
- Being used in 9 or 10 states, either off the shelf or augmented to more tightly fit standards
- Students must respond to a number of different types of questions that probe their skills and knowledge in these four areas
- Scores are summarized into a total composite score
- Scores are reported and proficiency levels are set at the total composite score level
- Test is based on national standards for ESL
- Research has gone into the test making sure there is more than adequate validity and reliability
- Ongoing research is being done to make sure the test measures what it is supposed to
- Psychometrically they make sure information/scores are reported correctly and utilized appropriately

Further discussion/questions with responses from Harcourt and/or Ms. Moreno as follows:

Dr. Crow:

- Relationship with Stanford, role of the university in using the term “Stanford”
 - No ongoing relationship with Stanford University
- Relationship between psychometrics as a field and the testing of English proficiency
 - Science is involved in the measurement of people’s knowledge, skills and mental capacity and attributes
 - Part of educational measurement that looks at what and how you measure something
 - Whether the information valid and reliable
- Psychometrics generally looks at intelligence and other variables as opposed to proficiency. What is the relationship between psychometrics as a field and the analysis of testing proficiency in a language
 - Psychometrics has been involved in the measurement analysis and reporting of proficiency for many years
 - TOEFL test is a measurement of English Language proficiency
- If test is passed, is a student proficient in the language?
 - Not totally a psychometric answer to that because there are a lot of other issues included
 - Psychometricians are not necessarily experts in English Language proficiency testing
 - Other people design and develop the types of items needed to measure English Language proficiency and the psychometricians work with them
 - Harcourt’s psychometricians make sure the test is aligned to content standards and has a blueprint specification
- Does Harcourt certify to any entity that there is a particular level of proficiency upon successful completion of the test?
 - Harcourt provides the tool that measures the aspects of proficiency but does not certify
- Which part is the best predictor of educational performance?

- Don't know the answer to that
- Standards are set for performance by the entity using that assessment, i.e., each state sets its own standards of proficiency in any area
- What elements of the test are the best predictors of educational performance?
 - Don't have research on this
- What post-test verification analysis has been done of those who have taken the test, moved through their educational programs, and then tested again
 - Original Stanford ELP test shows a definite difference in reading comprehension
 - Still collecting data as this is relatively new

Dr. Nicodemus:

- Information from other states that have adopted a test and cost involved in moving from off-the-shelf test to augmentation aligning with state standards?
 - List is growing; current users are PA, SD, MS, VA, AZ, WY, WA, MI, and NM has just contracted and NY has a unique assessment system
 - Six started with off-the-shelf and all have gone into an augmentation process to get better state alignment
 - Others immediately had to go into augmentation
 - Cost issues are being determined and developed as it varies from state to state

Superintendent Horne:

- Definition of proficient in SELP
- Four or five districts participated in a meeting along with Mr. Tim Hogan, who has filed the complaint, and they thought the test was too easy and students are being re-classified when they are not proficient. In addition Mr. Horne said that some complained the test was too hard to qualify for a bilingual waiver. Mr. Horne asked Dr. Olson to respond to this criticism and relate it to the averaging of scores
 - Measurement of language proficiency is a continuum so where a student is deemed as "becoming proficient" and "passing", or different levels of English proficiency, must be looked at very carefully
 - Experts looked at items, what was being measured in each area, and determined proficiency for each area
 - Original definition of what has been used is being used in Arizona at this point
 - Others that are using this definition have not indicated that it is too easy
 - With augmentation of SELP in Arizona an additional standard setting will be necessary to make sure the right achievement level is set up
 - Four sub-scores add up to a total score and has a higher reliability
 - SELP looks at the total composite score
 - Compensatory model; same model used in other states
 - Alternate model, Conjunctive, where student has to score proficient in each sub-area
 - Compensatory model thought to be more appropriate and is more commonly used
 - Can't address as to whether enough students are passing
 - Many other tests use compensatory approach, i.e. Stanford Achievement Test
 - The more items the higher the reliability
 - Composite score has a higher reliability and validity

Dr. Nicodemus:

- Reference limited to states currently using tests?
 - Sample of those using the test throughout the nation

- Do states make the determination that tests should continue to be compensatory or conjunctive or is it always a test that has sub-groups but has an overall score
 - Most states like to use compensatory approach and stay with same model
- Does SELP allow for each state to make this decision?
 - Could go in this direction
- Test taking time?
 - Varies in each of the four levels and is approximately 90 minutes

Mr. Kramer:

- Order that tests are given?
 - Oral is suggested to be last as the student is more comfortable with the instructor by that time

Mr. Dwayne Manning, Vice President for Custom Assessments, Harcourt, offered the definition of proficiency from the manual as when a student is proficient enough to participate in regular classes. Mr. Manning noted that they have added that when a student receives an overall score of proficient it means that a student has sufficient language skills to participate in mainstream English speaking classrooms. He added that it does not mean that the student has fully developed English language skills and that the student may still need additional help with participating in mainstream English speaking classrooms. He stated that performance levels with both English speaking and non-English speaking students were also compared in research.

Superintendent Horne:

- Proficiency for ELL students is different than proficiency for AIMS
- Definition of an ELL doesn't assume the student is capable of participating in a class that is given in English

Dr. Crow:

- If a person is "certified" at a certain level of English proficiency to be able to sit and participate in a classroom taught in English then how are those deemed proficient doing in the learning process compared with those already proficient
 - Will provide that information

Mr. Ary:

- Chronology of states participating and how effective and valid the tests are
- Why haven't more states participated?
 - PA, MS, SD were early users
 - Previously worked on development of English Language Proficiency Test and different states have gone different ways
 - Some are using consortia-developed products
 - This is a new area driven by federal legislation
 - Since AZ in 2004, NY, WY, WA, MI have been added
 - Timeline is affected by RFP processes
- Comfortable to say that Harcourt has the best test?
- Can Arizona feel comfortable in believing Harcourt is the best we can get?
 - Looked at how instrument was designed; was Best Practice looked at
 - Looked at how closely test aligns with state standards
 - Looked at underlying psychometric foundation
 - Is it recording scores that the state would like to use

Ms. Irene Moreno, Deputy Associate Superintendent, Academic Achievement Division, English Acquisition Services Unit, Arizona Department of Education, noted that they looked at many tests,

had five providers who responded to the RFP and scored them via a 1000-point rubric and Harcourt was the provider that met most of the requirements in the rubric with a score of 735.

Mr. Manning added the following statements:

- They appreciated the opportunity to present the SELP test augmentation
- It aligns closer with Arizona standards
- Harcourt doesn't make arbitrary decisions
- Their objective is to serve Arizona, the Department and the citizens of Arizona
- They will fulfill their contractual obligations and keep an open process/dialogue to review what is occurring
- They will answer all questions and concerns

Ms. Irene Moreno presented additional background information to benefit the new Board members regarding the development of this process, the RFP process, evaluating and awarding the proposal.

Ms. Moreno pointed out the following:

- The SELP test was the highest in alignment with the standards and now needs to be augmented to achieve a higher level of alignment with the federal requirements
- Standard setting is scheduled for June 2006 to be ready for implementation by August 1, 2006
 - The purpose is not to change the level of difficulty but to achieve a higher level of alignment
- This is the first fiscal year of implementation so data is being collected and analyzed
 - SAIS collects data from the LEAs
- 149 districts/charters take advantage of compensatory education affecting 103,545 K-12 students
 - Approximately 1000 students have been given assessment results of reclassification
- Once a month the practicing ELL professionals meet with representation from 130-150 districts

Dr. Nicodemus:

- Length of contract with Harcourt?
 - Five years with annual renewals
- Considering the merits of compensatory vs. conjunctive?
 - Will be looked at as standard setting is being done
 - Academic performance determines whether student needs to be re-classified

Dr. Diethelm:

- Cut score currently being used is recommended by Harcourt
- Oral test segments are graded by the tester after they have been trained

Ms. Kramer:

- Asked that SAIS numbers be compared with AIMS scores to determine proficiency

Dr. Crow:

- Definition of "fluent" and does it match "proficient"?
 - Believe it does
 - Words used in "off-the-shelf" test and they mean the same
- No prior standards related to proficiency?
 - Correct
- Data on correlation between educational performance in those other states and students being deemed proficient?

- Don't have this. Looked at our English proficiency standards and took directive from the USDOE that we need to have an assessment that correlates to our standards
- Definition of "cut" and continued distaste of the word and its implications and suggested use of a better word
 - Point on the test that divides the various levels of achievement, as pre-emergent, emergent, basic, intermediate and proficient
 - Separates one level from the other

Ms. Owen:

- Looked at Native American and Hispanic ELL students' involvement before there is a statewide implementation?
 - No pilot has been considered or done to date due to time constraints
- What other states have done this?
 - Initially a consortium was put together but it was not successful

Mr. Ary:

- Value in having a single pilot for those populations in our state that have a higher than usual average population?
 - Don't see an advantage but may have been done if time was allowed

Dr. Nicodemus:

- Comfort level of participation of ELL students?
 - Varies from student to student
- How to align with standards without making the test more difficult?
 - Focus is not to make the test more difficult or more easy but to better align with the state standards

Ms. Hilde:

- Is the use of the word "proficient" in the five levels of performance the same definition as "proficient" enough to participate in mainstream classes?
 - Yes, in my mind. Absolutely.
 - Does not mean you are going to score at the top of the class or pass AIMS on the first try
 - Will be those students that come in as native English speakers that are at that level
 - May not have all that is needed to be A-B student, but can participate in mainstream classes
- Are students still being given assistance in the mainstream classroom?
 - Believes the assistance is being provided, specifically with the Structured English Immersion
- Additional resources?
 - There are targeted resources

Ms. Kathi Montoya, Education Program Specialist, English Acquisition Service Unit, Arizona Department of Education, presented the effectiveness of compensatory instruction (sample of six districts) included in the materials packet:

- Amount for ELL as adopted by the State Board of Education
 - Four million available last year and may be ten million this year
- Placed into legislation which was vetoed and no funds set aside for this year
- Carry-over money is still available from last year

- The appropriation for this is embedded in the *Flores* bill that is before the legislature at this time

Other items that were clarified included:

- Monies are applied before ELL is deemed proficient
- State Board rule R7-2-306 (F) (4) states that the ELL shall be provided compensatory instruction to assist them in achieving the Arizona academic standards
- After being re-classified the student may still be eligible for compensatory education if not making sufficient academic progress
- Student is monitored for two years and then may go back into the program if not making sufficient academic progress
- Very seldom that much time lapses before a student's progress is noted
- Reclassification programs for students are noted in the "Additional Programs for ELLs" section of materials
- Students can come in before or after school, during lunch time or other times outside the school day
- Opportunity is there to move back into ELL if needed

Ms. Hilde noted this discussion will be continued at a subsequent meeting and members may refer further questions, requests for statistics, concerns, etc., to Mr. Yanez who can gather information for future discussions.

The Board broke for lunch at 12:00PM and reconvened at 12:37PM

Dr. Crow was not present for the remainder of the meeting.

- O. Presentation and Discussion Regarding Preliminary Report of the Receiver for the Colorado City Unified School District No. 14. Discussion May Include, but is not Limited to, the District's Financial Condition and Quality of Education, as well as Initial Actions of the Receiver

Mr. Vince Yanez, Executive Director, Arizona State Board of Education, presented the item reminding members that the Board accepted a settlement agreement at the December 2005 meeting which appointed Mr. Peter Davis, Simon Consulting, LLC, as receiver for the Colorado City Unified School District No. 14.

Mr. Peter Davis noted the following actions taken to date:

- All bank accounts frozen
- He is the sole signatory on all the accounts, including the accounts with the County
- All vouchers, invoices, expenditures, requisitions, purchase orders are now approved by Mr. Davis
 - Mr. Davis or his staff has reviewed all of these to verify that they are within the parameters of authorized expenditures of the district and within his developing plan
- Eighteen employees resigned from the school
 - Principal, entire accounting department, all bus drivers except one, head custodian, four of the five kitchen staff including the head of the cafeteria, and head of maintenance
 - These employees have successfully been replaced and are being trained
 - Some employees have stepped up and most have gotten up to speed
 - Ms. Carol Timpson, Interim Business Manager and Principal, has taken on a tremendous load working late at night to bring operations up to speed
 - Financial issues
 - Budget issues

- Day-to-day management
- Accounting department operating now with four staff, instead of nine
 - Purchased an accounting software system for better interface with the County system and create a transparency
 - Mr. Davis can remotely access the accounting system from Phoenix and review expenditures and budgetary needs from day to day
- Assessed assets of school and determined to do the following
 - Sell five vehicles, three buses, and five trailers with no educational impact on the students
 - Dispose of a 60,000 square foot office building that was occupied by fewer than ten employees
 - Annual utility costs of this building was \$70,000
 - Sell a Cessna P210 airplane that is worth approximately \$175,000-\$200,000
 - Cancel 28 cell phone plans leaving 7 cell phones for bus drivers and senior administrators
 - Cancel 52 credit cards and 2 subscriptions to dish networks
 - Continue to investigate and look into other expenditures to stop the cash outflow

Mr. Davis noted that today is the first day of the annual financial audit that Heinfeld and Meech is working on with the district. Mr. Davis added that the school is struggling to get all the information needed for the auditors as many records were seized by the Attorney General's Office when the investigation began last August. In addition, they are working to meet all the requirements related to the 90-day letter from the Auditor General.

Mr. Davis stated that some of the larger financial issues they are dealing with are due to:

- This is the largest property holder in the district not paying property taxes
- Shortfall could be as high as \$850,000 on primary property taxes
- Can obtain loan for primary property taxes to assist in paying taxes
 - Working on application for this request
- Secondary property tax shortfall
 - Bond payment due in June of \$135,000
- Over expenditure due to the State of Arizona for approximately \$360,000
- Investigating raising base pay for teachers, which is now \$17,000, to a level comparable to other districts in the area

Dr. Gary Carlston, Interim Department Head, Utah State University Department of Secondary Education, stated that he was invited to assess the Colorado City situation and visited the district in mid-December and again two weeks ago. The following observations were made in his visits:

- No students were present during the first visit and the next visit was scheduled when students were present
- Judgments of the observers are based on quality indicators of a small, rural school education system
- Talked with some parents, students, etc.
- Were impressed with the teachers' attitudes in an unsettled situation
- Beautiful, modern, well-equipped facility
- The district has elected to use a four-day week
 - Believe the appropriate approval process was followed
 - Rationale is that the fifth day is used for professional development, tutoring, interventions, etc
- Technology use is evident in almost every area

- Most modern new Dell computers, overhead LCD projectors, media center, computers in every classroom
- Intensive professional development program
- Salary issue
 - Title I provides direction in this area and offers some additional salary for teachers that participate in this program
- Students were open in sharing comments with observers and expressed confidence in teachers and programs

Dr. Stephen Laing, Executive Director of Education Programs, Utah State University and Executive Director for the Utah Partnership for Education and Economic Development stated the following concerns noted in his visits to Colorado City USD:

- Low teacher salary making it difficult to recruit and retain
 - Frequently looking for teachers up until the first day of school
- Utilization of available technology not as high as hoped
 - Some teachers don't know how to use the equipment
- Title I collaboration effort requires all staff to utilize technology available
 - Training needed to accomplish this
- Doesn't appear policy that is in place has been followed
 - Need to have an established schedule for providing necessary materials
- Limited classes offered at the high school level
 - Grades 9-12 are quite small
 - 10 students in the 12th grade
- School has well-provisioned distance learning technology that is not being used for distance learning
 - Could be utilized to expand curriculum for secondary students
- Don't participate in competitive sports with other leagues
- A private school in the area, Colorado City Academy, is primarily religious instruction and college preparation courses
- Some problems relate to the small size of the school

It was noted that Mr. Peter Davis will provide a revised budget for this year and a projected budget for the next year in the 120 day report due to the State Board.

Ms. Owen stated that the Coconino County School Superintendent's Office provides professional development and technology assistance to Mohave County, which includes Colorado City USD, and asked for further input regarding specific training that may be needed in the school district.

Mr. Yanez reminded the Board members that Mr. Davis will give a full assessment at the 120-day report at which time the Board will be required to evaluate and approve the plan.

Ms. Owen asked if housing could be provided for teachers in addition to a salary and Mr. Davis noted that some of these details are still being evaluated.

The Board moved to Item 7K at this point to accommodate participants' travel requirements.

P. Presentation, Discussion and Possible Consideration to Approve Proposed Operating Principles and Belief Statements for the State Board of Education

Ms. Hilde noted that these have been in the development process since August and this outline is necessary to allow Board leadership and Mr. Yanez to address the legislature regarding bills being considered.

Dr. Nicodemus offered technical language corrections in item number three making the corrected item read as follows:

We believe in standards based curriculum that is comprehensive, rigorous and relevant. A comprehensive curriculum should at minimum include reading, writing, mathematics, science, social studies, arts and career and technical education. This curriculum must be delivered with appropriate instructional and assessment methods that promote continuous learning and improvement.

Motion by Dr. Diethelm to approve the proposed operating principles and belief statements as presented including the proposed technical changes. Seconded by Mr. Estes. *Motion passes.*

8. ADJOURN

Motion by Mr. Estes and seconded by Ms. Kramer to adjourn. *Motion passes.*
Meeting adjourned at 4:50PM