

**Item 5:**

**Request to Approve July 22, 2022 Board Meeting Minutes**

**ACTION**

**ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER'S RECOMMENDATION:**

Approve the July 22, 2022 Board meeting minutes.

**STATE BOARD FOR EDUCATOR CERTIFICATION****MEETING AGENDA****JULY 22, 2022 AT 9:00 AM****1701 N. CONGRESS AVE. ROOM 1-104**

The Board will meet in open session and after determining the presence of a quorum, deliberate and possibly take formal action, including emergency action, on any of the following agenda items:

**Moment of Silence****Pledge of Allegiance****1. Call to Order**

The State Board for Educator Certification (SBEC) convened its meeting at 9:03 AM on Friday, July 22, 2022.

Present: Dr. Robert Brescia, Dr. Veronica Galvan, Ms. Bena Glasscock, Mr. Rex Gore, Ms. Julia Dvorak, Ms. Courtney MacDonald, Ms. Cristina Galindo, Dr. Scott Muri, Mr. Andrew Kim, Dr. Andrew Lofters, Ms. Kelvey Oeser, Dr. Alma Rodriguez, Ms. Jean Streepey, Mr. Tommy Coleman, and Mr. Josue Tamarez Torres.

**2. Associate Commissioner's Comments Regarding the SBEC Agenda**

Ms. Garcia thanked the Board for their engagement at the work session on July 21. She reiterated the thoughtful nature of the Board's approach to determining next steps regarding the role and function of a performance assessment for aspiring educators. Ms. Garcia also stated that staff would be responsive to members' requests to hear from additional stakeholders related to edTPA and improving teacher preparation.

**3. Public Comment**

Public Testimony:

Wendy Burk

Melanie Hanes

Robby Hanes

Joe Burk

**CONSENT AGENDA**

Ms. Garcia presented this item to the Board. She explained the purpose and logistics of the consent agenda. The consent agenda took up agenda items 4-6 with no discussion.

**4. Request to Approve April 29, 2022 Board Meeting Minutes**

5. **Adoption of Proposed Amendment to 19 TAC Chapter 232, General Certification Provisions, Subchapter A, Certificate Renewal and Continuing Professional Education Requirements, §232.7, Requirements for Certificate Renewal**
6. **Approval of 2023–2026 Rule Review Plan for State Board for Educator Certification Rules**

**Motion and vote:**

*Motion was made by Mr. Kim to approve the Consent Agenda items 4-6 as presented. Second was made by Ms. MacDonald, and the Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion.*

**DISCUSSION AND ACTION**

7. **Update on Divisions of Educator Preparation, Certification, and Enforcement Department**

Ms. Cook presented updates about the Educator Certification team. She provided an overview of the division's core responsibilities that support issuance of licensure in Texas. Ms. Cook highlighted the significant contributions of her staff in providing exemplary customer service and support; ensuring that certification products are issued in a timely manner; and leading work on certification rules. She highlighted the three Ps of the division's work: people, products, and processes. Ms. Cook shared production statistics from September 2021 through June 2022, emphasizing phone support, help desk tickets, and processing of certificate and renewal applications.

Dr. Olofson presented updates about the Educator Data, Research, and Strategy team. He provided data about the results from the accountability system, certification production related to governor's waivers, highlighted presentations from the division, and gave an overview of the forthcoming EPP dashboards. Dr. Muri asked what has been learned about the impact of policies under the waiver certificates, and Dr. Olofson noted that the division's research showed that teachers who obtained their intern certificate without first passing the exam obtained their standard certificate and were retained at a lower rate than interns who passed the exam before their internship. Dr. Muri noted the number of EPPs that were on lowered statuses in 2018-19, asked if the Board was getting the data needed, and asked about supports available for EPPs. Dr. Olofson noted that in addition to the ASEP data, additional data about EPPs is received and published and the ASEP index system supports further differentiation. He also noted the place of certification exams in the system, and that Dr. Wetherington and Ms. McLoughlin support EPPs to improve. Ms. Oeser asked for clarification about the 2018-19 calculations, the index system, and what indicators will be active in the current year. Dr. Olofson noted that all indicators but the student growth indicator will be turned on in the current year, whereas not all indicators were active in 2018-19, and that the index system was not in place previously. Dr. Lofters asked about the total number of principal surveys that were submitted and completed, and if some EPPs would have no surveys returned. Dr. Olofson provided estimates for the number of surveys, noted that when there is not data for an indicator it is not used, and that staff uses the data from prior years when there is a small group. Dr. Lofters asked about supports for principals, and

consequences of not submitting the survey. Dr. Olofson noted that staff provides technical support and that the surveys are required in rule, but the Board has not sanctioned principals for not completing surveys in the past. Dr. Brescia asked if there was a goal for the percent of EPPs that are accredited, and how this data has looked over time. Dr. Olofson noted that due to indicators being operationalized only recently there was not clear longitudinal data, that the accountability system provides warnings for programs, and that staff has seen programs improve in the system. Dr. Muri asked about the new dashboards, and how EPPs will be supported in using them. Dr. Olofson stated that part of the dashboard rollout included creating supports for EPPs aligned with other technical assistance and the effective preparation framework. Mr. Kim asked about the ability to differentiate data between certification routes, and how these data are presented to the public. Dr. Olofson stated that the current dashboards allowed for viewing individual programs and certification routes, and that the TEA website does link this information in different places. Dr. Galvan supported the idea of showcasing this information to the public, and Dr. Olofson noted the charge to increase the visibility of data about preparation programs.

Ms. McLoughlin provided an overview of the Educator Standards, Testing, and Preparation Talent Pathways' team charge and associated activities and then turned it over to Dr. Wetherington to share updates for the following teams: test development, testing and administration, and educator preparation. For the team, test development, Dr. Wetherington shared timelines associated with exam development and the exams' operational dates. For the testing and administration team, she identified the total number of exams that had been administered during the 2021-22 academic year and a breakdown of the total number of exams administered for high-profile exams (e.g., Science of Teaching Reading, Principal as Instructional Leader, edTPA). Then, finally for the team, educator preparation, Dr. Wetherington provided an update for the number of educator preparation programs (EPPs) that engaged in a continuing approval review (CAR) during the 2020-21 and 2021-22 academic years and the outcome of their CARs. She also shared the number of certificates (by route) that were issued in 2021-22 and provided an update of the significant milestones that occurred during the 2021-22 academic year (e.g., development of the Effective Preparation Framework). After Dr. Wetherington concluded by sharing the team's updates, Chair Streepey commended staff for planning to meet with EPPs who had received commendations and EPPs that represented the various regions across Texas to garner feedback on the Effective Preparation Framework (EPF). Mr. Gore asked what the protocol was to determine the type of review (i.e., desk or on-site) an EPP would receive for their CAR. Dr. Wetherington explained that EPPs' accreditation statuses were a factor when determining which review the EPP would engage in. Ms. McLoughlin further noted that SBEC's rules include other risk factors (e.g., history of the EPP's compliance, accredited by other organizations, formal complaints against the EPP) that staff must use to determine the type of review an EPP will engage in. Ms. McLoughlin then shared an overview of the talent pathways' team activities during the academic year 2021-22. She first shared the funding that has been used to scale the high-quality residency model across Texas, specifically for LEAs to partner with high-quality EPPs implementing yearlong teacher residencies. Ms. McLoughlin noted that the Talent Pathways' team anticipates this initiative will help prepare 3,000 teachers over the next three years. Ms. McLoughlin also shared how a technical assistance provider was selected to support the more than 100 school districts and their EPP partners, engaged in teacher residencies, to collaborate with one another through a

strong shared governance structure and to identify additional funding, supports, and resources LEAs can use to further incentivize the residency pathway to retain high-quality educators. Ms. McLoughlin then shared an update regarding the principal residency model. She began by noting the resources (e.g., funding, mentorship) that have been allocated to support principal yearlong residencies, and then further identified some noteworthy statistics: (1) the Principal Residency Grant awarded more than 500 principal residents; (2) school districts in 14 regions have committed to partnering with vetted principal programs; (3) more than 70% of principal residents were placed in instructional leadership roles after engaging in the yearlong principal residency; and (4) 19 EPPs have been identified as a vetted residency program for principals. Mr. Gore asked how many individual teachers were able to participate in the residency pathway and receive funding. Ms. McLoughlin noted that approximately 1,000 teacher candidates (in the first year of the residency model being operational) engaged as a resident and received funding. She went on further to share that staff anticipates the number of residents increasing for the 2022-23 academic year and how LEA partners have begun to identify additional funding to support paid teacher residencies when the grant funding expires. Dr. Muri applauded TEA staff's impressive organizational design of the residency pathways to better support the teachers and principals of Texas. Dr. Galvan added the residency webinars provided by staff were insightful and helpful.

Mr. Rodriguez provided updates for FY 2022, on behalf of the Educator Investigations Division. Mr. Rodriguez stated that there had been a significant increase in the number of misconduct reports submitted by school districts, as well reports from DFPS Child Protective Services. Mr. Rodriguez also noted that there had been a steady increase in criminal history hits the division received. As a result of the increases in reporting, the division opened approximately 23% more cases involving allegations of educator misconduct compared to the prior year. Mr. Rodriguez noted that the division continued to support school districts and charter schools by providing training and access to the Fingerprinting, Do Not Hire Registry, and Misconduct Reporting Portal applications. Finally, Mr. Rodriguez reiterated that the division delivered presentations to DFPS, law enforcement, and school districts in an effort to facilitate communication among the agencies and schools.

Ms. Moriaty presented updates for FY 2022 on behalf of SBEC Enforcement. She noted that contract abandonment cases were up significantly in FY 2022 as compared to FY 2021, but only modestly as compared to the first half of FY 2020. She also noted that the increase in contract abandonment cases resulted in an increase in administrative closures and settlements that do not come before the SBEC, as contract abandonments settle and close to good cause at a higher rate than other cases.

The SBEC recessed at 11:08 AM.

The SBEC reconvened at 11:19 AM.

**8. Adoption of Proposed Amendment to 19 TAC Chapter 230, Professional Educator Preparation and Certification, Subchapter E, Educational Aide Certificate, §230.55, Certification Requirements for Educational Aide I**

Ms. Cook presented this item to the Board. She highlighted the Board's support in 2020 to allow the educational aide I certificate to be issued to high school students who qualify for

industry-based certification. Ms. Cook explained that the proposed changes, if supported by the Board, would allow additional Education and Training courses to be adopted into rule to expand the options that high school students can complete to qualify for an industry-based certification. Ms. Cook provided an overview of public comments that came in and explained the need for substitute rule text to ensure that both human growth and development courses adopted by the SBOE would be included in the item update. Superintendent Kim expressed support for use of options such as this to increase the pool of prospective teachers.

There were no additional questions or comments from the Board.

**Motion and vote:**

*Motion was made by Ms. Glasscock to approve for adoption, subject to the State Board of Education (SBOE) review, the proposed amendment to 19 TAC Chapter 230, Professional Educator Preparation and Certification, Subchapter E, Educational Aide Certificate, §230.55, Certification Requirements for Educational Aide I, as presented, with an effective date of 20 days after filing the adoption notice with the Texas Register. Second was made by Mr. Kim, and the Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion.*

**9. Proposed Amendments to 19 TAC Chapter 229, Accountability System for Educator Preparation Programs**

Dr. Olofson presented this item to the Board. He provided background on the accountability system and related processes. He highlighted the changes made since when the Board discussed the item at the April 2022 meeting. These included removing language related to edTPA, updating the definition of “Pedagogy Test,” adding website posting options for sanctioned programs, and including the descriptive language for the innovative EPP commendation category approved by a committee of the Board. Dr. Olofson then described the updates to ASEP indicator 1, including the introduction of the terms “content pedagogy tests” and “pedagogy tests” into the indicator description to align with 19 TAC §230. He also noted necessary language concerning where the PASL is included, and additional rule language in the ASEP manual to prevent the double counting of candidates who attempt tests 291 and 391. Dr. Olofson laid out the updated data collection for clinical experiences, noting the updates provide for alignment with information about internships, and that staff had worked with EPPs to design the collection. He described the rule text to allow the Board to revoke EPP authorization upon violation of rule, statute, or Board order; to require submission of data from EPPs to verify compliance with rule or statute; and to require sanctioned EPPs to post information on their website. Dr. Olofson described the small group reset for all indicators this year, aligning with prior approaches when an indicator has been report-only. He talked through the rule text related to commendations, shifting the target for retention and clarifying calculations and processes. Finally, he provided an overview of the updates within the ASEP manual to support the discussed rule text and implement SB 2066.

Dr. Muri asked for clarification about what supports were available to candidates when EPPs are revoked by the Board. Dr. Olofson noted that the educator preparation program support team has processes and experience supporting candidates when EPPs close. Mr. Coleman asked for clarification on the term “emergent bilingual students” and Dr. Olofson confirmed that this was in response to SB 2066. Mr. Kim asked about the data source for ASEP

indicator 4b and highlighted the importance of field supervision. Dr. Olofson confirmed that both indicators 4a and 4b were active indicators, and that TEA collects data on them.

Dr. Galvan commented on the structure and scoring procedures of the Core Subjects exam. Ms. Streepey noted that we could look to discuss it in the future. Ms. Oeser commented that staff was exploring the topic.

**Motion and vote:**

*Motion was made by Mr. Kim to approve the proposed amendments to 19 TAC Chapter 229, Accountability System for Educator Preparation Programs, to be published as proposed in the Texas Register. Second was made by Ms. MacDonald, and the Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion.*

**10. Proposed Revisions to 19 TAC Chapter 241, Certification as Principal**

Ms. McLoughlin presented this item to the Board. She shared the proposed revisions are based on legislation, House Bill 159, to ensure that all educators have the knowledge and skills to support students with disabilities. Specifically for principals, the Bill requires that they create a school culture that is inclusive, fosters parent involvement, and includes curriculum management for students with disabilities. To implement the legislation with fidelity, Ms. McLoughlin noted that six of the principal standards, identified in Chapter 241, are proposed to be amended. She also noted that staff would examine the Principal as Instructional Leader's exam framework to ensure the exam reflects the proposed updated standards. Superintendent Kim asked if EPPs with principal programs have the same accountability mechanisms as EPPs that have teacher preparation programs. Ms. McLoughlin shared that the SBEC's accountability system does include performance measures for all classes of certifications that EPPs offer, which includes principal programs.

**Motion and vote:**

*Motion was made by Mr. Kim to approve the proposed revisions to 19 TAC Chapter 241, Certification as Principal, to be published as proposed in the Texas Register. Second was made by Dr. Muri, and the Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion.*

**11. Approval of Bilingual Special Education Educator Standards Advisory Committee Members**

This item was presented by Dr. Wetherington and Mr. Pitre. Dr. Wetherington began presentation of this item by providing board members with context around the item including context regarding HB 2256 which seeks to ensure that students of limited English proficiency and disabilities receive the support needed in classrooms by qualified educators. Following the context of this item Mr. Pitre outlined the composition of the Bilingual Special Education Standards Advisory Committee. He also provided the Board with a timeline of events that would culminate in potentially presenting Bilingual Special Education standards for discussion at the December 2022 SBEC meeting. Following Mr. Pitre's comments, Superintendent Kim commented that bilingual certification part of the process combined with the special education requirement might add to the difficulty of finding teachers in this area

and asked staff if this would be something the committee would discuss. Chairwomen Streepey then commented that the certificate being a supplemental or standalone would be a critical piece of information given the shortage of teachers in this area. Dr. Muri concluded by stating that the development of this certificate area could be a long journey given the already high need of the Bilingual area, and he wondering what supports and resources could be employed to support this development. At the end of comments for this item, Associate Commissioner Garcia commented that the Teacher Vacancy Taskforce would be a potential resource for discussion and support regarding Board member's concerns around this item. Following Associate Commissioner Garcia's comments, Dr. Rodriguez commented that the Board should also consider the current process of Bilingual certification and how programs can work to encourage candidates to consider this new field. Dr. Galvan then encouraged the Board and TEA staff to consider what implications this certificate might have on the content of a future certification exam given the nature of both Special Education and Bilingual fields respectively. Superintendent Kim responded to Dr. Galvan's concern by speaking in favor of a potential portfolio-based assessment specifically for this field, and Chair Streepey agreed. At the end of Board discussion, the Board moved to approve the Bilingual Special Education Educator Standards Advisory Committee.

**Motion and vote:**

*Motion was made by Mr. Coleman to approve the Bilingual Special Education Standards Advisory Committee Membership as presented. Second was made by Mr. Tamarez Torres, and the Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion.*

The SBEC recessed at 11:58 AM.

The SBEC reconvened at 12:32 PM.

**12. Request to Approve a New Educator Preparation Program: Teach at Dallas College**

Dr. Wetherington presented this item to the Board. She began by providing an overview of Dallas County Community College District's approval to consolidate seven colleges to a single college in 2020 and grant a Bachelors of Applied Science degree in early childhood education and teaching. Dr. Wetherington noted that shortly after these approvals, Teach at Dallas College (TDC) submitted a new educator preparation program (EPP) application for TEA's review. She then provided a summary of the application's components for TDC to offer an EPP in the certificate category – Early Childhood Education (ECE), and TEA's process for reviewing the application. For example, she noted that staff verified compliance, in accordance with SBEC's rules, by reviewing all of TDC's materials such as handbooks, applications, admission screeners, syllabi, coursework materials, and observation instruments for the certificate category, ECE. She also noted that staff engaged in discussions with TDC staff and a pre-approval site visit. After reviewing the application's components and site visit, staff found TDC to be in compliance with SBEC's rules as identified in the Texas Administrative Code (TAC). Further, Dr. Wetherington shared that the staff who conducted the review indicated that there were instances in which TDC exceeded TAC. For example, teacher candidates will have completed at least 400 clock hours of early field-based experiences in K-12 classrooms before beginning their clinical teaching experience. Superintendent Kim asked about TDC's philosophy of support to recruit and train supervisors and the ratio of supervisors to teacher candidates. Dr. Rob DeHaas, the



Vice Provost for the School of Education at Dallas College, was invited to respond to Superintendent Kim's question and additional questions from the Board. Dr. DeHaas shared how the program is providing up-to-date training (e.g., residency pathway) for their faculty to serve as supervisors/coaches as opposed to hiring external personnel to serve as supervisors. He noted that the primary purpose for utilizing faculty as supervisors is for faculty to provide real-time feedback to teacher candidates and embed instruction in coursework that reflects what teacher candidates need more support in. Dr. DeHaas shared that the program is in the process of hiring additional faculty members so that the ratio of supervisors to teacher candidates is appropriate, so each candidate has dedicated support. Ms. MacDonald asked about the cost to candidates. Dr. DeHaas noted that the program's affordable model (e.g., \$79 per credit hour) is about ten thousand dollars per student, which includes: a 4-year Bachelors degree, coursework and course materials, and preparation to become a certified educator in Texas. Ms. MacDonald noted how this model should help strengthen the teacher pipeline. Mr. Tamarez Torres asked how the program identified the anticipated number (i.e., 2500) of students entering the EPP in the 2022-23 academic year. Dr. DeHaas shared the anticipated number of candidates reflects the number of candidates who are currently enrolled in the Bachelors program of study for early childhood education and teaching from freshman to senior year. Dr. DeHaas shared that the program is working with their LEA partners to recruit more students through Grow Your Own strategies so that the teacher pipeline is further strengthened, specifically regarding the certification of early childhood education that has been identified as a need in the Dallas region. Deputy Commissioner Oeser commended TDC in terms of exceeding the SBEC's requirements at an affordable cost. She then asked Dr. DeHaas to share how TDC is able to provide high-quality preparation at a lower cost. Dr. DeHaas explained that one of Dallas College's core principles is ensuring all of their students have access to high-quality instruction at an affordable cost to meet the needs of their communities, industry, and employer partners, and the same underpinning principle has been established for the preparation program. Mr. Gore asked what Dallas College has employed to increase the percentage of degree completion at the community college-level, which traditionally has been a low percentage. Dr. DeHaas acknowledged the challenge around persistence and shared how Dallas College identified barriers by surveying their students that affect their persistence to finish a degree and has worked to mitigate the barriers (e.g., lower cost, paid residencies, paid apprenticeships, paid tutors, provide childcare). Dr. Muri commended Teach at Dallas College's holistic approach (e.g., low cost, strong LEA partnerships) to recruit and prepare candidates who will be well-prepared to serve their communities. Chair Streepey agreed with Dr. Muri's comments.

**Motion and vote:**

*Motion was made by Ms. Galindo to approve Teach at Dallas College as a new educator preparation program as presented. Second was made by Dr. Brescia, and the Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion.*

**13. Consider and Take Appropriate Action on Continuing Approval for A+ Texas Teachers Educator Preparation Program**

Ms. McLoughlin and Ms. Moriarty presented this item to the Board. Ms. McLoughlin began by providing an overview of A + Texas Teachers (ATT) continuing approval review in April of

2021, which led to ATT receiving a formal notification of proposed recommendation of revocation, resulting in the development of the Agreed Order, which was originally rejected by the Board at their April 2022 meeting. She went on further to note that staff revised the terms of the Agreed Order based on the Board's feedback, and ATT agreed to the revised terms. Ms. McLoughlin then shared the terms of the updated Agreed Order, and the Board's two options: (1) approve the Agreed Order or (2) reject the Agreed Order and issue the Final Order, and the strengths and limitations for each option. Mr. Coleman asked for clarification regarding the deficiency for the number of observations that occurred outside of the regular school day. Ms. McLoughlin explained that during the continuing approval review, staff reviewed evidence (e.g., completed observation forms) to ensure the program is in compliance with the SBEC's rules. When staff reviewed the observation forms submitted by ATT, the timestamps on the forms indicated times after the school day had been completed (i.e., when students were no longer in the classroom receiving instruction). When staff asked ATT why the observations were conducted after regular school hours, ATT noted there was a technical error within their observation system, affecting the incorrect timestamps. However, staff was not able to verify that the timestamps were a result of a technical error; thus, resulting in an identified deficiency.

Superintendent Kim asked if the timeline provided for ATT to correct their deficiencies was sufficient. Ms. McLoughlin noted that ATT had a significant runway to bring items back into compliance before the development of the Agreed Order but also noted that ATT had begun correcting their deficiencies to meet the October 21, 2022 deadline to correct all deficiencies. Superintendent Kim requested clarification in terms of what would happen if ATT did not come back into compliance within the allotted timeline (as identified in the Agreed Order). Ms. Moriarty noted that with the first option, ATT agreed to come back into compliance on a shorter timeline as compared to the second option, which would give ATT until July 22, 2023 to come back into compliance under a Final Order.

Superintendent Kim voiced concerns regarding the deficiency of field-based experiences and asked for clarification. Ms. McLoughlin noted that staff was not able to verify if candidates had been assigned a field-based experience location and completed the required field-based experience hours.

Mr. Gore asked about the timeline that would require ATT to post content related to the Agreed Order (e.g., Under SBEC Board Order) to its website and link to the Agreed Order. Ms. McLoughlin explained that if the SBEC approved the Agreed Order, ATT would need to add the posting to their website on July 23, 2022, and would remain until staff reviewed all corrective evidence, and if ATT was found to be in compliance, ATT could remove the posting from their website after November 18, 2022.

Mr. Gore asked what the Monitor's responsibilities would include. Ms. McLoughlin described the Monitor's primary responsibility would be to provide a first-round review of ATT's corrective evidence and share findings with TEA staff. Deputy Commissioner Oeser asked if staff felt confident conducting the review by solely reviewing files or if staff would feel more confident if the review was conducted on-site. Ms. McLoughlin noted that the requested corrective evidence would be documentary evidence and reviewing the files was an appropriate approach.

Superintendent Kim asked what ATT had planned to implement in terms of processes for complaints. Ms. McLoughlin shared that ATT's staff were in attendance and could address specific questions such as this. Dr. Muri asked if staff has received questions, concerns, or complaints after the April 2022 SBEC meeting when the Board discussed ATT and rejected the proposed Agreed Order. Ms. McLoughlin shared that there had been an increased volume of calls from candidates indicating concerns (e.g., uncertain of what their next steps would be). Dr. Muri directed staff to provide regular updates regarding ATT's Agreed Order and updates regarding the number of complaints filed on ATT.

Mr. Tamarez Torres voiced concerns regarding ATT's deficiencies and whether ATT will consistently comply with SBEC's rules. The Board asked for continued updates on ATT's status after the October 21, 2022 deadline for compliance of the Agreed Order.

Superintendent Kim asked if ATT does not submit evidence, does staff overlook this and only review evidence submitted. Ms. McLoughlin stated that, according to SBEC's rules, when there is a lack of evidence, the program is considered to be out of compliance. Mr. Gore voiced concern that ATT may only comply with SBEC's rules for the 350 files required for documentary evidence rather than developing systems and procedures to ensure all of their files comply with the SBEC's rules. Ms. McLoughlin shared that one of the terms in the Agreed Order specifies ATT has 24 hours to submit all documentary evidence after receiving the Monitor and TEA's notification (e.g., random selection of candidates' names).

Dr. Galvan asked if the SBEC has the authority to conduct a review one year following an Agreed Order. Ms. McLoughlin noted that SBEC's rules do give TEA staff the authority to conduct a discretionary review at any time if there are noted issues.

Dr. Galvan asked who selects the Monitor and what criteria is used to select the Monitor. Ms. McLoughlin shared how the SBEC approved a vetted list of monitors many years ago, and staff selected the Monitor from SBEC's vetted list.

Chair Streepey invited Ignacio Giraldo, member of ATT's Board, to present to the SBEC as invited testimony. Mr. Giraldo began by providing information about ATT's vision and mission and the timeline by which ATT was acquired by the Rise Fund. He then disclosed that The Rise Fund was not aware of ATT's continuing approval review and the program's deficiencies until November 2021, three months after The Rise Fund acquired ATT. Mr. Giraldo stated that after learning of ATT's deficiencies, the company began to address the deficiencies and collaborate with TEA staff. Mr. Giraldo implied that the SBEC had misconceptions about the program and asserted that ATT had corrected all deficiencies by April 2022. Dr. Brescia voiced concerns regarding the timeline The Rise Fund learned of ATT's deficiencies. Mr. Giraldo shared that he was not able to provide information regarding the timeline per legal advice. Dr. Muri cautioned Mr. Giraldo about making assumptions that the SBEC had misconceptions about ATT and asked Mr. Giraldo to share ATT's goals to create quality teachers for Texas' students. Mr. Giraldo noted ATT is focused on retention and investing in curriculum and resources (e.g., classroom simulations). Dr. Muri encouraged ATT to keep teacher quality at the core of their business model.

Superintendent Kim asked Mr. Giraldo to provide context around the recent complaints that were identified by TEA staff. Mr. Giraldo explained how ATT had implemented systems to

respond to candidate complaints and inquiries in a timely manner. Superintendent Kim asked Mr. Giraldo to identify the types of complaints and inquiries ATT had received in recent months. Mr. Giraldo noted a recent complaint: Eighteen of ATT's candidates completed their internship in a virtual setting during the 2021-22 academic year, which violated SBEC's rules. He continued to explain that the other complaints and inquiries could be classified as normal inquiries. Ms. McLoughlin addressed the complaint related to virtual teaching and observations by noting TEA staff learned of this issue from school district personnel who had to terminate their interns' employment after learning the internship in a virtual setting was in violation of the SBEC's rules. She further explained that the interns would have to redo their internship in a regular classroom setting during the 2022-23 academic year. Mr. Giraldo noted that ATT had refunded the cost of the program for the 18 interns and is currently supporting them to find employment for the 2022-23 academic year.

Mr. Gore asked about candidates' persistence (i.e., retention rate) to pursue a Standard certificate. Associate Commissioner Emily Garcia noted that TEA's dashboards only identify retention rates for candidates who have received their Standard certificate, and candidates who are pursuing their Standard certificate are not accounted for. Deputy Commissioner, Ms. Oeser, shared Commissioner Morath's recent conversation with ATT's staff, which included discussions on how ATT could implement systems to track candidates' performance and retention during the program prior to being recommended for their Standard certificate. Ms. Oeser then asked ATT to share the measures they have implemented to track candidates' performance and retention during the program. Mr. Giraldo shared how ATT is now evaluating candidates' field-based experiences.

Superintendent Kim asked if ATT had identified the appropriate ratio of field supervisors to teacher candidates so that candidates have the support they need. Desiree Delaney, ATT's Chief of Customer Success, shared supervisors could be assigned anywhere between five to 50 teacher candidates during the internship year and noted how ATT had implemented a mechanism to track the field supervisors' conversations and observations.

Dr. Galvan asked ATT to clarify their self-auditing procedures the program had spoken about at the beginning of their invited testimony. Mr. Giraldo shared how ATT is evaluating and vetting certain platforms that include self-auditing features that integrate the SBEC's rules and ATT's systems to track compliance.

Dr. Muri requested the Board go into a closed session to deliberate the options before taking action.

At 2:12 PM, Ms. Streepey called a closed session of the Board, pursuant to the Texas Open Meetings Act, Texas Government Code §551.071.

At 2:52 PM, Ms. Streepey called the SBEC meeting back to order in open session. The Board did not take any action while in closed session.

Chair Streepey asked Ms. Moriaty to provide clarification on the options the Board could take action on. Ms. Moriaty noted that although there were other issues discussed related to ATT's program, those issues are not included in the Agreed Order and may not influence the Board's decision. Ms. Moriaty shared that there could be an additional option: Deny TEA

staff's recommendation and advise staff to revoke ATT's ability to operate as an educator preparation program in Texas. To this end, staff would pursue a contested case proceeding at the State Office of Administrative Hearings (SOAH) and then return to the SBEC with a proposal for a decision. Ms. Moriarty also clarified that if the SBEC chose this decision, there is no guarantee the SOAH judge would find that revocation to be the appropriate action. Dr. Muri asked what the timeline would look like if the SBEC were to choose the third option. Ms. Moriarty estimated up to two years before the case proceedings concluded. Chair Streepey voiced concerns for the candidates who are currently in ATT's program and could enroll in the program in the coming months. To this end, Chair Streepey asked for discussion on the earlier timeline (i.e., the first option) and whether this would be most appropriate for the SBEC to take action on. Superintendent Kim also voiced concerns for candidates who may enroll in ATT's program without fully understanding the breadth of the Agreed Order and suggested the SBEC should transparently disclose the credibility for all programs so the consumer can make informed decisions about which program they would like to enroll in.

**Motion and vote:**

*Motion was made by Dr. Brescia to approve the Agreed Order for A+ Texas Teachers educator preparation program as presented. Second was made by Ms. MacDonald, and the Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion.*

**14. Revisions to the Board Operating Policies and Procedures (BOPP) and Discussion of Rulemaking Regarding Stakeholder Engagement**

Ms. Moriarty presented this item to the Board. She stated that the Board had an opportunity to update their BOPP to comport with the requirements of statute regarding advisory committees and to clarify board member participation in stakeholder meetings. She also presented options to the Board regarding maintaining the stakeholder group, Educator Preparation Stakeholder Group (EPSG), or engaging in rulemaking to adopt rules to create an Educator Preparation Advisory Committee (EPAC). The Board directed TEA staff to solicit feedback from the current EPSG of their desire to continue in the current structure or for the Board to engage in rulemaking to create an EPAC. TEA staff will present the feedback for the Board's consideration at the September SBEC meeting.

**Motion and vote:**

*Motion was made by Dr. Brescia to approve the revisions to the Board Operating Policies and Procedures as presented. Second was made by Mr. Kim, and the Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion.*

**DISCIPLINARY CASES**

**15. Pending or Contemplated Litigation, including Disciplinary Cases**

**A. Defaults**

**No Answer Defaults**

1. In the Matter of Adrian Dodd; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment  
Staff recommendation: 1-year suspension
2. In the Matter of Alex Kamber; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment  
Staff recommendation: 1-year suspension
3. In the Matter of Ana Sanchez-Andrade; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment  
Staff recommendation: 1-year suspension
4. In the Matter of Andrea Laster; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment  
Staff recommendation: 1-year suspension
5. In the Matter of Coleigh Koon; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment  
Staff recommendation: 1-year suspension
6. In the Matter of Daniel Allen; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment  
Staff recommendation: 1-year suspension
7. In the Matter of Emma Laroche; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment  
Staff recommendation: 1-year suspension
8. In the Matter of Gabriella Vasavi-Bollman; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment  
Staff recommendation: 1-year suspension
9. In the Matter of Geoffrey Schoolar; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment  
Staff recommendation: 1-year suspension

10. In the Matter of Georgina A. Munoz; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment  
Staff recommendation: 1-year suspension
11. In the Matter of Irileria Muhammad; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment  
Staff recommendation: 1-year suspension
12. In the Matter of Jerome Key; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment  
Staff recommendation: 1-year suspension
13. In the Matter of John David; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment  
Staff recommendation: 1-year suspension
14. In the Matter of Joi Bowles; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment  
Staff recommendation: 1-year suspension
15. In the Matter of Jonathan Maciel; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment  
Staff recommendation: 1-year suspension
16. In the Matter of Karen Rivas; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment  
Staff recommendation: 1-year suspension
17. In the Matter of Karina Alvarez Guillen; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment  
Staff recommendation: 1-year suspension
18. In the Matter of Kate Avery; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment  
Staff recommendation: 1-year suspension

19. In the Matter of Kathlene Brown; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment  
Staff recommendation: 1-year suspension
20. In the Matter of Kellyn Radler; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment  
Staff recommendation: 1-year suspension
21. In the Matter of Lalena Flores; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment  
Staff recommendation: 1-year suspension
22. In the Matter of Lizeth Barron Salas; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment  
Staff recommendation: 1-year suspension
23. In the Matter of Mackenzie Clarke; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment  
Staff recommendation: 1-year suspension
24. In the Matter of Matthew Reilly; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment  
Staff recommendation: 1-year suspension
25. In the Matter of Melissa Cepeda; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment  
Staff recommendation: 1-year suspension
26. In the Matter of Michael Lewis; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment  
Staff recommendation: 1-year suspension
27. In the Matter of Ricardo Oropeza; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment  
Staff recommendation: 1-year suspension



28. In the Matter of Sara Dane; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment  
Staff recommendation: 1-year suspension
29. In the Matter of Shontel Rutledge; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment  
Staff recommendation: 1-year suspension
30. In the Matter of Olivia Jackson; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment  
Staff recommendation: 1-year suspension
31. In the Matter of Omar Cavazos; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment  
Staff recommendation: 11-month suspension
32. In the Matter of Mickey Reed; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment  
Staff recommendation: Suspension until expiration of certificate on August 11, 2022
33. In the Matter of Morufat Aminu; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment  
Staff recommendation: Suspension until expiration of certificate on August 5, 2022
34. In the Matter of Tanya Martinez; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment  
Staff recommendation: Suspension until expiration of certificate on August 24, 2022
35. In the Matter of Valerie Gomez; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment  
Staff recommendation: Suspension until expiration of certificate on August 2, 2022
36. In the Matter of Zachary Bramlett; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment  
Staff recommendation: Suspension until expiration of certificate on August 9, 2022

- 37. In the Matter of Jerome Spencer; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment  
Staff recommendation: Suspension until expiration of certificate on July 31, 2022
- 38. In the Matter of Brian Wood; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment  
Staff recommendation: 2-year suspension and proof of successful completion of a substance abuse treatment program
- 39. In the Matter of Steven Hennigan; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment  
Staff recommendation: Permanent Revocation
- 40. In the Matter of Vanessa Rodriguez; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment  
Staff recommendation: Permanent Revocation
- 41. In the Matter of Erik Wiggins; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment  
Staff recommendation: Permanent Revocation
- 42. In the Matter of Nicholas Daniels; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment  
Staff recommendation: 1-year suspension
- 43. In the Matter of Stephanie Greene; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment  
Staff recommendation: 5-year suspension
- 44. In the Matter of Martha Montoya; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment  
Staff recommendation: Revocation
- 45. In the Matter of Julie Fletcher; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment  
Staff recommendation: 2-year suspension

**Motion and vote:**

*Motion was made by Ms. Glasscock to grant staff's request for the issuance of default judgments on cases 1-45, as listed on the agenda, excluding cases 2, 4, 5, 7-13, 16, 18, 27-31, 34, 37, 42, 44 and 45, and issue final orders consistent with staff's recommendations. Second was made by Mr. Kim, and the Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion.*

**Motion and vote:**

*Motion was made by Mr. Coleman to grant staff's request for the issuance of default judgment on case number 45, and issue a final order of a 5-year suspension. Second was made by Mr. Kim seconded the motion, and the Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion.*

**Ms. Galindo recused herself from deliberations and voting on cases numbered 2, 4, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 16, 18, 27, 28, 29, 30, 34 and 37.****Motion and vote:**

*Motion was made by Mr. Coleman to grant staff's request for the issuance of default judgments on cases 1-45, as listed on the agenda, excluding cases 2, 4, 8-12, 16, 18, 27-30, 34 and 37, and issue final orders consistent with staff's recommendations. Second was made by Mr. Tamarez Torres, and the Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion.*

**Mr. Tamarez-Torres recused himself from deliberation and voting on case number 42.****Motion and vote:**

*Motion was made by Mr. Gore to grant staff's request for the issuance of default judgment on case number 42, and issue a final order consistent with staff's recommendation. Second was made by Mr. Coleman, and a majority of the Board voted in favor of the motion. Dr. Brescia voted against the motion.*

**SOAH Defaults**

1. In the Matter of Susan Herrera; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment

Staff recommendation: 2-year suspension

**Motion and vote:**

*Motion was made by Mr. Coleman that the Board grant Staff's Request for the Issuance of SOAH Default Judgment 1 and enter final order of a 1-year suspension and submit evidence of a successful completion of a mental health evaluation by a licensed psychiatrist or psychologist finding that respondent is suited to return to work as an*

educator. Second was made by Ms. MacDonald, and the Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

2. In the Matter of David Finch; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment

Staff recommendation: Denial of Certificate

**Motion and vote:**

*Motion was made by Mr. Kim that the Board grant Staff's Request for the Issuance of SOAH Default Judgment 2 and enter a final order consistent with staff's recommendation. Second was made by Mr. Coleman, and the Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion.*

**B. Contested Cases**

Proposals for Decision

1. Docket No. 701-22-1386.EC, Texas Education Agency, Educator Preparation, Certification, and Enforcement Division v. Graysen Cisneros; Action to be taken: Consideration of Proposal for Decision and Issuance of Final Order.

ALJ Recommendation: Permanent Revocation

Staff Recommendation: Accept ALJ Recommendation

**Motion and vote:**

*Motion was made by Ms. Glasscock that the Board accept the Proposal for Decision and Issue a Final Order consistent with the ALJ's recommendation that Ms. Cisneros's educator certificates should be permanently revoked. Second was made by Mr. Tamarez Torres, and the Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion.*

2. Docket No. 701-22-0366.EC, Texas Education Agency, Educator Preparation, Certification, and Enforcement Division v. Carlos Herrera; Action to be taken: Consideration of Proposal for Decision and Issuance of Final Order.

ALJ Recommendation: Permanent Revocation

Staff Recommendation: Accept ALJ Recommendation

**Motion and vote:**

*Motion was made by Mr. Kim that the Board accept the Proposal for Decision and Issue a Final Order consistent with the ALJ's recommendation that Mr. Herrera's educator certificates should be permanently revoked. Second was made by Ms. Galindo, and the Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion.*

3. Docket No. 701-22-0081.EC, Texas Education Agency, Educator Preparation, Certification, and Enforcement Division v Catherine O. Alia; Action to be taken: Consideration of Proposal for Decision and Issuance of Final Order.

ALJ Recommendation: 1-year suspension

Staff Recommendation: Accept ALJ recommendation

**Ms. Galindo recused herself from deliberations and voting on PFD 3.**

**Motion and vote:**

*Motion was made by Mr. Gore that the Board accept the Proposal for Decision and Issue a Final Order consistent with the ALJ's recommendation that Ms. Alia's educator certificates should be suspended for one (1) year. Second was made by Mr. Coleman, and the Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion.*

4. Docket No. 701-21-2778.EC, Texas Education Agency, Educator Preparation, Certification, and Enforcement Division v. Christopher Smith; Action to be taken: Consideration of Proposal for Decision and Issuance of Final Order.

ALJ Recommendation: 2-year suspension

Staff Recommendation: 3-year suspension and proof of successful completion of substance abuse treatment program

**Mr. Tamarez Torres and Ms. MacDonald recused themselves from deliberating and voting on PFD 4.**

**Motion and vote:**

*Motion was made by Mr. Kim that the Board adopt the Proposal for Decision including Findings of Fact Nos. 1 – 32 and Conclusions of Law Nos. 1 – 10 and that the Board modify Conclusion of Law No. 11 as follows:*

*11. Respondent's educator certification should be suspended for three (3) years and Respondent should be required to complete a drug treatment program.*

*This modification of sanction is permissible pursuant to Texas Government Code §2001.058(e) and is necessary because the Administrative Law Judge did not properly apply Board rules and policies, specifically the factors the Board considers in determining a sanction under 19 Texas Administrative Code §249.17.*

*The SBEC sanctioning guidelines necessitate a stronger sanction than the two (2) year suspension recommended by the ALJ. The minimum sanction for an educator who tests positive for drugs while on a school campus is a one-year suspension and completion of a drug treatment program. But the ALJ found that Mr. Smith did not just test positive for drugs. In Findings of Facts Nos. 21-23 and 29 and Conclusion of Law No. 8, Respondent:*

- *Tested positive for drugs;*
- *Violated school board policies;*
- *Sent a text message to another educator that constituted a threat of physical violence;*
- *Lied on his application when asked if he had ever been the subject of an investigation, and*
- *Lacks good moral character and is unworthy to instruct or supervise youth.*

*Additionally, the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law show several of the factors that the Board considers in making sanctioning decisions.*

- *Mr. Smith's violations were serious. Conclusion of Law No. 8 states that he violated multiple provisions of the Educator's Code of Ethics.*
- *Finding of Fact No. 29 states that Mr. Smith attempted to conceal his misconduct by lying about it on his employment application.*
- *There was no evidence in the record that Mr. Smith has been rehabilitated.*
- *Finding of Fact No. 30 and Conclusion of Law No. 8, state that Mr. Smith's "behaviors do not indicate honesty, accountability, trustworthiness, reliability and integrity," and that his actions have affected his moral character and made him unable to be a good role model for students.*

*The recommended sanction of a two-year suspension and successful completion of a drug treatment program is insufficient to address Mr. Smith's multiple violations, his lack of good moral character, his lack of rehabilitation, and his attempt to conceal his misconduct.*

*A more appropriate sanction is a three-year suspension and successful completion of a drug treatment program, which will better serve to deter Mr. Smith and other educators from committing similar violations in the future.*

*Second was made by Mr. Coleman, and the Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion.*

5. Docket No. 701-22-0345.EC, Texas Education Agency, Educator Preparation, Certification, and Enforcement Division v. Belinda Creel; Action to be taken: Consideration of Proposal for Decision and Issuance of Final Order.

ALJ Recommendation:            Non-Inscribed Reprimand

Staff Recommendation:        Inscribed Reprimand

**Motion and vote:**

*Motion was made by Mr. Coleman that the Board adopt the Proposal for Decision including Findings of Fact Nos. 1 -- 32 and Conclusions of Law Nos. 1 – 11, as amended by the*

*Administrative Law Judges' letter of June 30, 2022, and that the Board modify Conclusion of Law No. 12 as follows:*

*12. For Respondent's violations of STAAR testing protocols in administering the Grade 5 STAAR test on April 10, 2018, the Board should impose an inscribed reprimand against Respondent's teaching certificates.*

*This modification of sanction is permissible pursuant to Texas Government Code §2001.058(e) and is necessary because the Administrative Law Judges did not properly apply Board rules and policies, specifically the factors the Board considers in determining a sanction.*

*In Conclusion of Law No. 10, as amended, noted that Respondent's conduct presented a risk to the health, safety and welfare of students. Under 19 Texas Administrative Code §249.17(c)(9), the Board considers whether the sanction will deter future violations. Under 19 Texas Administrative Code §249.5, the Board has stated that its purpose is to protect the safety and welfare of school children and has recognized the unique position of public trust a certified educator holds.*

*The Administrative Law Judges' recommended sanction of a non-inscribed reprimand is insufficient because a non-inscribed reprimand does not appear on an educator's public-facing certification record, and is not visible to school districts, parents, or other educators. It therefore cannot achieve the Board's goals of:*

- *protecting the safety and welfare of school children,*
- *upholding the public trust, and*
- *detering future violations.*

*The Board's rules require a stronger sanction in this case. The appropriate sanction is an inscribed reprimand, which is visible on the face of the educator's certificate to inform the public and deter other educators from engaging in similar conduct. Second was made by Dr. Muri, and the Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion.*

## **C. Court Cases**

### *District Court Cases*

1. Texas Education Agency, Educator Preparation, Certification, and Enforcement Division v. Bradley Bowen; No. 03-22-00331-CV; In the Third Court of Appeals; On Appeal from Cause No. D-1-GN-18-004203, in the 98<sup>th</sup> Judicial Court for Travis County, Texas.
2. Texas Education Agency, Educator Preparation, Certification, and Enforcement Division v. David Demiglio; No. 13-21-00331-CV; In the Court of Appeals for the Thirteenth Judicial District, Corpus Christi, Texas, On Appeal from Cause No. D-1-GN-20-001242, in the 353<sup>rd</sup> Judicial Court for Travis County, Texas.

**DISCUSSION ONLY****16. Discussion of Reading Specialist and School Librarian Educator Standards**

Dr. Wetherington began this item by setting context for the development of both the Reading Specialist and School Librarian educator standards over 2021-2022 academic year. Mr. DeMarco Pitre then presented the composition of each of the standards committees along with the goals each committee sought to achieve within their respective content standards. Before closing the item, Superintendent Kim expressed appreciation of the Science of Teaching Reading's inclusion in the Reading Specialist standards. Dr. Muri followed Superintendent Kim by asking TEA staff about the process for stakeholder feedback on the standards, expressing that having current Reading Specialist feedback would be important. TEA staff assured Dr. Muri that stakeholders would have an opportunity for feedback during the public comment period after the standards had been adopted.

Public Testimony:

Ms. Becky Calzada – Texas Library Association

**17. Discussion of the Special Education Certification Redesign and Test Development Updates**

This item was not presented to the Board.

**INFORMATION ONLY****18. Update of State Board for Educator Certification Enabling Legislation from the 87th Texas Legislature****19. 2019–2022 Rule Review Plan for State Board for Educator Certification Rules****20. Adjournment**

Ms. Streepey adjourned the meeting at 5:09 PM.

**21. Statutory Citations**

The Board may go into closed session regarding any item on the agenda to the extent it is authorized to do so pursuant to the Texas Open Meetings Act, Texas Government Code, Chapter 551. The presiding officer of the Board intends to be physically present in Room 1-104, William B. Travis Building, 1701 North Congress Avenue. Some members may attend via videoconferencing.