

**EVALUATION REVIEW COMMITTEE**  
**OF THE TEACHING AND SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION**  
**PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS ADVISORY BOARD**  
Kansas State Department of Education

**Official Minutes** for September 14, 2012

**Present:** Becky Cheney, David Hofmeister, Greg Mann, Michele Peres, Ken Weaver, and Warren White

**Absent:** Ralph Beacham, Linda Becker, James Carnes, and Martin Stessman,

**KSDE Staff:** Sungti Hsu, Janet Williams

---

**Called meeting to order—Chair, David Hofmeister**

---

**David Hofmeister**, chair, called the meeting to order 1:02 p.m.

---

**Approval of Agenda for September 14, 2012**

---

**Motion:** It was M/S (White/Weaver) to approve the agenda.

Motion carried; 6 in favor and 0 opposed

---

**Approval of June 18, 2012 Minutes**

---

**Motion:** It was M/S (White/Peres) to approve the minutes.

Motion carried; 6 in favor and 0 opposed

---

**Discussion**

---

The Chair went over the ERC process with the committee to introduce the new members to the

---

**Meeting of Review Teams**

---

The Committee reviewed the agenda items as one team.

**Assignments:**

Benedictine College Programs  
Newman University Programs

**Team:**

David Hofmeister  
Warren White  
Becky Cheney

---

---

**Committee Deliberations and Actions**

---

Deliberations and actions began at 1:32 p.m.

---

**Recommendations for Benedictine College (Program Review)**

---

**Adaptive (A, K-6, 6-12)**

Areas for Improvement:

**Standards 1-5, 7**

None

**Standard 6**

**AFI 6.1** Not all elements of the standard are included in the assessments.

**Rationale 6.1** The use of the term "and/or" in the rubric for Assessment 2 implies not all elements need to be included

**Standard 8**

**AFI 8.1** Assessments 3 and 4 do not provide standard alignment.

**Rationale 8.1** Assessments 3 and 4 do not assess professionalism and ethical knowledge.

**Motion:** It was M/S (Hofmeister/Weaver) to retain the areas for improvement and to recommend the status of "Approved" through December 31, 2017.

Motion carried; 5 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention

\*\*\*\*\*

**Biology (I, 6-12)**

Areas for Improvement:

**Standards 1-18**

None

**Motion:** It was M/S (Mann/Peres) to recommend the status of "Approved" through December 31, 2017.

Motion carried; 6 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstention

\*\*\*\*\*

**Building Leadership (A, PreK-12)**

Areas for Improvement:

**Standards 1-6**

None

**Motion:** It was M/S (White/Peres) to recommend the status of “Approved” through December 31, 2017.

Motion carried; 6 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstention

\*\*\*\*\*

**Chemistry (I, 6-12)**

Areas for Improvement:

**Standards 1-13**

None

**Motion:** It was M/S (Weaver/White) to recommend the status of “Approved” through December 31, 2017.

Motion carried; 6 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstention

\*\*\*\*\*

**Elementary (I, K-6)**

Areas for Improvement:

**Standards 1-7**

None

**Motion:** It was M/S (Peres/White) to recommend the status of “Approved” through December 31, 2017.

Motion carried; 6 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstention

\*\*\*\*\*

**English (I, 6-12)**

Areas for Improvement:

**Standards 1 -4**

None

**Motion:** It was M/S (Mann/Peres) to recommend the status of “Approved” through December 31, 2017.

Motion carried; 6 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstention

\*\*\*\*\*

**Foreign Language--French (I, PreK-12)**

Areas for Improvement:

**Standards 1 -9**

None

**Motion:** It was M/S (Peres/White) to recommend the status of “Approved” through December 31, 2017.

Motion carried; 6 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstention

\*\*\*\*\*

**Foreign Language--Spanish (I, PreK-12)**

Areas for Improvement:

**Standards 1 -9**

None

**Motion:** It was M/S (Peres/White) to recommend the status of “Approved” through December 31, 2017.

Motion carried; 6 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstention

\*\*\*\*\*

**Health (I, PreK-12)**

Areas for Improvement:

**Standards 1-4**

None

**Motion:** It was M/S (Peres/Mann) to recommend the status of “Approved” through December 31, 2017.

Motion carried; 6 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstention

\*\*\*\*\*

**History, Government, & Social Studies (I, 6-12)**

Areas for Improvement:

**Standards 1-10**

None

**Motion:** It was M/S (Peres/White) to recommend the status of “Approved” through December 31, 2017.

Motion carried; 5 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention

\*\*\*\*\*

**Mathematics (I, 6-12)**

Areas for Improvement:

**Standards 1, 8, and 9**

None

**Standard 2**

**AFI 2.1** Assessments do not fully align with the standard.

**Rationale 2.1** The only measure of candidate ability to “identify and apply these understandings within a real world context” is the new assessment 7. The review team interprets this phrase in the standard to mean that the candidate demonstrates the ability to apply college level understandings of numbers and number systems to applications in other disciplines such as medicine, engineering, and business. The assessment measures the candidate ability to demonstrate number and number system concepts and applications through his/her ability to teach these ideas at the 6-12 level, provided the student teaching assignment includes opportunity to address these concepts.

**Standard 3**

**AFI 3.1** Assessments do not fully align with the standard.

**Rationale 3.1** The only measure of candidate ability to “to identify and apply these relationships in the real world context, including the use of appropriate technology” is the new assessment 7. The review team interprets this phrase in the standard to mean that the candidate demonstrates the ability to apply college level understandings of patterns, functions and algebra to applications in other disciplines such as medicine, engineering, and business, and to use various technologies to assist in solving these college level problems. Assessment 7 measures these aspects of the standard through observation of the candidate’s teaching at the 6-12 level, and only if the student teaching assignment includes opportunity to address the concepts in this standard.

#### **Standard 4**

**AFI 4.1** Assessments do not fully align with the standard.

**Rationale 4.1** The only measure of candidate ability to “to identify and apply these relationships in the real world context including the use of appropriate technology” is the new assessment 7. The review team interprets this phrase in the standard to mean that the candidate demonstrates the ability to apply college level understandings of geometry, measurement and spatial visualizations to applications in other disciplines such as medicine, engineering, and business, and to use various technologies to assist in solving these college level problems. Assessment 7 measures these aspects of the standard through observation of the candidate’s teaching at the 6-12 level, and only if the student teaching assignment includes opportunity to address the concepts in this standard.

#### **Standard 5**

**AFI 5.1** Assessments do not fully align with the standard.

**Rationale 5.1** The only measure of candidate ability to “to identify and apply these relationships within a real world context including the use of appropriate technology” is the new assessment 7. The review team interprets this phrase in the standard to mean that the candidate demonstrates the ability to apply college level understandings of data, statistics and probability to applications in other disciplines such as medicine, engineering, and business, and to use various technologies to assist in solving these college level problems. Assessment 7 measures these aspects of the standard through observation of the candidate’s teaching at the 6-12 level, and only if the student teaching assignment includes opportunity to address the concepts in this standard.

#### **Standard 6**

**AFI 6.1** Assessments do not fully align with the standard.

**Rationale 6.1** The only measure of candidate ability to “to identify and apply these relationships within a real world context including the use of appropriate technology” is the new assessment 7. The review team interprets this phrase in the standard to mean that the candidate demonstrates the ability to apply college level understandings of calculus to applications in other disciplines such as medicine, engineering, and business, and to use various technologies to assist in solving these college level problems. Assessment 7 measures these aspects of the standard through observation of the candidate’s teaching at the 6-12 level, and only if the student teaching assignment includes opportunity to address the concepts in this standard.

#### **Standard 7**

**AFI 7.1** Assessments do not fully align with the standard.

**Rationale 7.1** The only measure of candidate ability to “to identify and apply these relationships within a real world context including the use of appropriate technology” is the new assessment 7. The review team interprets this phrase in the standard to mean that the candidate demonstrates the ability to apply

college level understandings of discrete processes to applications in other disciplines such as medicine, engineering, and business, and to use various technologies to assist in solving these college level problems. Assessment 7 measures these aspects of the standard through observation of the candidate’s teaching at the 6-12 level, and only if the student teaching assignment includes opportunity to address the concepts in this standard.

**Motion:** It was M/S (Peres/White) to retain the areas for improvement and to recommend the status of “Approved with Stipulation” through December 31, 2014.

Motion carried; 6 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstention

\*\*\*\*\*

**Music (I, PreK-12)**

Areas for Improvement:

**Standards 1-9**

None

**Motion:** It was M/S (Peres/White) to recommend the status of “Approved” through December 31, 2017.

Motion carried; 6 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstention

\*\*\*\*\*

**Physical Education (I, PreK-12)**

Areas for Improvement:

**Standards 1-7**

None

**Motion:** It was M/S (Mann/Weaver) to recommend the status of “Approved” through December 31, 2017.

Motion carried; 6 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstention

\*\*\*\*\*

**Physics (I, 6-12)**

Areas for Improvement:

**Standards 1-13**

None

**Motion:** It was M/S (Peres/White) to recommend the status of “Approved” through December 31, 2017.

Motion carried; 6 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstention

\*\*\*\*\*

**Psychology (I, 6-12)**

Areas for Improvement:

**Standards 1-2**

None

**Standard 3**

**AFI 3.1** The alignment between Assessment 3 and the standard is not clear.

**Rationale 3.1** Assessment 3 does not assess that candidates are able to teach students the applications of major theoretical approaches in each of the six domains. Application to educational issues is adequately assessed.

**Motion:** It was M/S (White/Peres) to retain the areas for improvement and to recommend the status of “Approved” through December 31, 2017.

Motion carried; 5 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention

\*\*\*\*\*

---

## Recommendations for Newman University (Program Review)

---

### Building Leadership (A, PreK-12)

#### Areas for Improvement:

#### Standard 1

**AFI 1.1** Narratives provide limited data analysis as well as an interpretation of how that data provides evidence that candidates are meeting the standard.

**Rationale 1.1** Data analysis is lacking describing candidate performance and evidence of mastery of the standard.

#### Standard 2

**AFI 2.1** Narratives provide limited data analysis as well as an interpretation of how that data provides evidence that candidates are meeting the standard.

**Rationale 2.1** Data analysis is lacking describing candidate performance and evidence of mastery of the standard.

#### Standard 3

**AFI 3.1** Assessment 4 (Appendix F) is used to address two standards, however the data does not represent Standard 3.

**Rationale 3.1** The data is not disaggregated by standard, rather functions are grouped together.

**AFI 3.2** Narratives provide limited data analysis as well as an interpretation of how that data provides evidence that candidates are meeting the standard.

**Rationale 3.2** Data analysis is lacking describing candidate performance and evidence of mastery of the standard.

#### Standard 4

**AFI 4.1** The assessment 4 (Appendix F) is used to address two standards; however the data does not represent Standard 4.

**Rationale 4.1** The data is not disaggregated by standard, rather functions are grouped together.

**AFI 4.2** Narratives provide limited data analysis as well as an interpretation of how that data provides evidence that candidates are meeting the standard.

**Rationale 4.2** Data analysis is lacking describing candidate performance and evidence of mastery of the standard.

**Standard 5**

**AFI 5.1** The assessment (Appendix G) is used to address two standards, however the data does not represent Standard 5.

**Rationale 5.1** The data is not disaggregated by standard, rather functions are group together.

**AFI 5.2** Narratives provide limited data analysis as well as an interpretation of how that data provides evidence that candidates are meeting the standard.

**Rationale 5.2** Data analysis is lacking describing candidate performance and evidence of mastery of the standard.

**Standard 6**

**AFI 6.1** The assessment (Appendix G) is used to address two standards; however the data does not represent Standard 6.

**Rationale 6.1** The data is not disaggregated by standard, rather functions are group together.

**AFI 6.2** Narratives provide limited data analysis as well as an interpretation of how that data provides evidence that candidates are meeting the standard.

**Rationale 6.2** Data analysis is lacking describing candidate performance and evidence of mastery of the standard.

**Motion:** It was M/S (White/Peres) to retain the areas for improvement and to recommend the status of “Approved with Stipulation” through December 31, 2014.

Motion carried; 5 in favor, 1 opposed, 0 abstention

**Motion:** It was M/S (White/Mann) to recant the recommendation of “Approved with Stipulation” through December 31, 2014.

Motion carried; 5 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstention

**Motion:** It was M/S (White/Peres) to retain the areas for improvement and to recommend the status of “Not Approved”.

Motion carried; 6 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstention

\*\*\*\*\*

**Elementary (I, K-6)**  
Areas for Improvement:  
**Standards 2**

None

**Standard 1**

**AFI 1.1** Pass rate criterion for Assessment 1a subscores are not identified nor included.

**Rationale 1.1** Assessment 1a program subscore cut scores are not included in the report. The score range for proficient is omitted from the tables and narrative.

**Standard 3**

**AFI 3.1** Pass rate criterion for Assessment 1a subscores are not identified nor included.

**Rationale 3.1** Assessment 1a program subscore cut scores are not included in the report. The score range for proficient is omitted from the tables and narrative.

**Standard 4**

**AFI 4.1** Pass rate criterion for Assessment 1a subscores are not identified nor included.

**Rationale 4.1** Assessment 1a program subscore cut scores are not included in the report. The score range for proficient is omitted from the tables and narrative.

**Standard 5**

**AFI 5.1** Pass rate criterion for Assessment 1a subscores are not identified nor included.

**Rationale 5.1** Assessment 1a program subscore cut scores are not included in the report. The score range for proficient is omitted from the tables and narrative.

**Standard 6**

**AFI 6.1** Pass rate criterion for Assessment 1a subscores are not identified nor included.

**Rationale 6.1** Assessment 1a program subscore cut scores are not included in the report. The score range for proficient is omitted from the tables and narrative.

**Standard 7**

**AFI 7.1** Pass rate criterion for Assessment 1a subscores are not identified nor included.

**Rationale 7.1** Assessment 1a program subscore cut scores are not included in the report. The score range for proficient is omitted from the tables and narrative.

**Motion:** It was M/S (White/Peres) to retain the areas for improvement and  
It was M/S (Weaver/Peres) to recommend the status of “Not Approved”.

Motion carried; 6 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstention

\*\*\*\*\*

**English (I, 6-12)**

Areas for Improvement:

**Standard 1**

**AFI 1.1** Data are missing.

**Rationale 1.1** Assessment 2 has been revised with an addendum. This change is so recent that there are no scores for this addendum.

**Standard 2**

**AFI 2.1** Data are missing.

**Rationale 2.1** Assessment 2 has been revised with an addendum. This change is so recent that there are no scores for this addendum.

**Standard 3**

**AFI 3.1** Data are missing.

**Rationale 3.1** Assessment 2 has been revised with an addendum. This change is so recent that there are no scores for this addendum.

**Standard 4**

**AFI 4.1** Data are missing.

**Rationale 4.1** Assessment 2 has been revised with an addendum. This change is so recent that there are no scores for this addendum.

**Motion:** It was M/S (Peres/Mann) to retain the areas for improvement and to recommend the status of “Not Approved”.

Motion carried; 6 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstention

\*\*\*\*\*

**English for Speakers of Other Languages (A, PreK-12)**

Areas for Improvement:

**Standards 1 and 7**

None

**Standard 2**

**AFI 2.1** The modifications made on Assessment 8 do not verify candidate understanding of the standard.

**Rationale 2.1** There is no reference made in the rubric which is used to assess candidate understanding of the fundamentals, similarities, and differences of first- and second-language acquisition. The "Creativity" criterion that specifies "evidence the student included an additional element(s) to demonstrate understanding of the standard" does not specifically require candidate understanding of this standard.

**Standard 3**

**AFI 3.1** The modifications made on Assessment 7, namely 7a, 7b, and 7c, do not meet all the components of the standard.

**Rationale 3.1** Candidate acknowledgement of the role that language plays in the development of cultural identities and of the diverse historical tapestry of cultures that make up the U. S. is not specifically addressed in:

**3.1.1.** 7a (Multi-Cultural Action Plan Report, Options 1 and 2, and the Rubric).

**3.1.2.** 7b (Service Learning Report). The identification of an accommodation problem/issue with regard to a different culture is a valuable expectation, but does not meet the standard. The rubric

Creativity criterion of "evidence the student included an additional element(s) to demonstrate understanding of this standard" lacks specificity.

**3.1.3.** 7c (Personal Ethnicity Statement / content analysis). While one of the expectations asks, "How is your view of ethnicity related to diversity factors with an emphasis on language development as part of our ethnicity," is sufficient, the specification of "your view of sameness or difference with majority culture" does not specify diverse, non-majority cultures in the U. S. The rubric used for this component only assesses personal cultural identity and does not measure candidate acknowledge of the role of language or the historical tapestry of U. S. cultures.

#### **Standard 4**

**AFI 4.1** The modifications made on Assessment 6 do not measure the effectiveness of candidate communication with students, parents, and community cultural groups.

**Rationale 4.1.1** The rubric criterion of "Review of the activity" only assesses a candidate's review of communication with these groups in terms of the written review of the activity being clear and identifying three or more examples and the impact of the activity. Candidate effectiveness in communication with the three groups is not measured.

**Rationale 4.1.2** The "Creativity" criterion does not specify the evaluation of candidate effectiveness in communication with all three groups. It only provides written evidence of what "the student included as an additional element(s) to demonstrate understanding of the standard."

#### **Standard 5**

**AFI 5.1** While the modifications made on Assessment 2 meet the standard, those made on Assessment 5 do not.

**Rationale 5.1** The rubric on Assessment 5 used to gauge candidate understanding of this standard targets candidate collaborative supports. The "Creativity" criterion of "evidence the student include an additional element(s) to demonstrate understanding of this standard" lacks specificity in terms of using language and developing communication skills in multiple domains.

#### **Standard 6**

**AFI 6.1** The modified rubric on Assessment 3 does not measure all components of the standard.

**Rationale 6.1.** The rubric on Assessment 3 does not measure candidate understanding of formal and informal first- and second-language assessment techniques.

**AFI 6.2** The modified rubric on Assessment 4 does not measure all components of the standard.

**Rationale 6.2** There is no indication on Assessment 4 of how candidate understanding of formal and informal first- and second-language assessment techniques will be measured. Neither the rubric criteria for "Participate in and/or observe the process of an individual student's language program document" nor the "Flow chart of entrance/Exit/Placement Processes for both school/school district" measure candidate awareness of formal and informal first- and second-language assessment techniques. The criterion for "Creating" lacks specificity to determine candidate awareness and use of assessment tools.

#### **Standard 8**

**AFI 8.1** Assessment 7 does not address or measure all components of the standard.

**Rationale 8.1** While the revised rubric for Assessment 7d does specifically measure candidate proficiency in written English commensurate with the role of an instructional model, it neither addresses nor measures oral and visual English proficiency commensurate with this role. It is noteworthy, however,

that all assessment rubrics (2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7a, 7b, 7c, and 8) provide a measure of candidate proficiency in writing. With such emphases on English proficiency, albeit solely targeting the written domain, a rationale for meeting the standard is justified.

**Standard 9**

**AFI 9.1** The modified rubric for Assessment 3 does not meet the standard.

**Rationale 9.1** Although Assessment 3 targets the adaptation of assessments for ESL students with special needs, neither candidate understanding and use of a variety of methods for ESL students with special needs nor the ability to adapt existing materials for instruction is measured by the rubric on Assessment 3.

**Standard 10**

**AFI 10.1** Assessment 3 is not aligned with the standard.

**Rationale 10.1** The modified rubric for Assessment 3 does not measure candidate understanding of a broad range of literacy methodologies for English language learners or the acknowledgement of the important role of family literacy in second language acquisition.

**AFI 10.2** Assessment 6 is not aligned with the standard.

**Rationale 10.2** The rubric for Assessment 6 measures the ability of a candidate to identify, describe, and provide examples of communication or involvement activities. However, there is neither documentation of candidate understanding and use of a broad range of literacy methodologies, programs, and assessment tools, nor documentation of the important role of family literacy in second language acquisition.

**Motion:** It was M/S (Mann/Peres) to retain the areas for improvement and to recommend the status of “Not Approved”.

Motion carried; 6 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstention

\*\*\*\*\*

**History, Government, & Social Studies (I, 6-12)**

Areas for Improvement:

**Standards 1, 3, 5, 6, and 8**

None

**Standard 2**

**AFI 2.1** Assessment six is not fully aligned with the scoring rubric.

**Rationale 2.1** While Assessment six is identified to assess candidate learning, the clarity between the guidelines for Assessment six and the scoring rubric for assessment lack alignment. For example, the Document Analysis Activity for Assessment six has four parts to it. Are the questions associated with groups 1-3 in the Assessment six scoring rubric pertinent to the paper on Pearl Harbor or Title IX? There is insufficient information to fully determine how the assignment and scoring rubric are aligned to assess the standard.

**AFI 2.2** Assessment six does not include world history.

**Rationale 2.2** Standard two addresses world history but the assessment of standard two appears to align only with U.S. history.

**Standard 4**

**AFI 4.1** The course based grade does not evaluate the entire standard.

**Rationale 4.1** The grade does not clearly indicate how essential analytical skills are evaluated.

**Standard 7**

**AFI 7.1** Information explaining Assessment 5 is incomplete.

**Rationale 7.1** The report guidelines indicate that course grades used in Assessment 5 must include key activities, projects, and assessments that are aligned to each standard. The case study as well as the report/presentation represent 20% and 15% of the grade, respectively. Neither is explained so alignment with the standard is not evident. There is no information on how either project is scored.

**Standard 9**

**AFI 9.1** Information explaining Assessment 5 is incomplete.

**Rationale 9.1** The report guidelines indicate that course grades used in Assessment 5 must include key activities, projects, and assessments that are aligned to each standard. The following information from the rejoinder indicates two assignments from the course assessing this standard, "...Reading Reflections: 20% - The purpose of the assignment is to boost student participation and engage the class in exciting dialogue regarding course content. Research Paper: 40%." Sixty percent of the course grade is determined through the two activities without explanations as to what expectations are associated with the activities or how either activity is graded.

**Standard 10**

**AFI 10.1** Information explaining Assessment 5 is incomplete.

**Rationale 10.1** The report guidelines indicate that course grades used in Assessment 5 must include key activities, projects, and assessments that are aligned to each standard. The Code of the Streets activities lack clarity relative to the standard. The written activities are not explained. Approximately 33% of the grade for the course come from these two activities. While it is clear both are associated with the standard, alignment is not clearly developed.

**Motion:** It was M/S (White/Mann) to recommend the status of "Approved with Stipulation" through December 31, 2014.

Motion carried; 5 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention

\*\*\*\*\*

**Mathematics (I, 6-12)**

Areas for Improvement:

**Standards 1 and 4-7**

None

**Standard 2**

**AFI 2.1** Praxis subscore data cannot be used to meet two standards.

**Rationale 2.1** The Praxis II Algebra and Number Theory category was aligned to standards 2 and 3; KSDE only allows each category to be aligned with one standard.

**Standard 3**

**AFI 3.1** Praxis subscore data cannot be used to meet two standards.

**Rationale 3.1** The Praxis II Algebra and Number Theory category was aligned to standards 2 and 3; KSDE only allows each category to be aligned with one standard.

**Standard 8**

**AFI 8.1** Evaluation criteria not clear for Assessment 5 – Course grades.

**Rationale 8.1** Course grade components are listed, but no percentages/points allotted to each component provided.

**Standard 9**

**AFI 9.1** Compilation of reported scores for Assessments 3 and 4 is unclear.

**Rationale 9.1** Assessments 3 and 4 use subscores from the Observation and Assessment Form for Student Interns. It is not clear how the subscores are compiled from the specific indicators on the Form.

**Motion:** It was M/S (White/Peres) to retain the areas for improvement and to recommend the status of “Approved” through December 31, 2017.

Motion carried; 6 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstention

\*\*\*\*\*

---

**Discussion**

---

Throughout the deliberation, David and Sungti oriented and answered questions concerning the ERC process and procedure. Members of the committee reasoned the program approval status of Newman University. The committee requested a conference call to be scheduled so that the whole committee can be orientated to the procedures of the hearing in anticipation of a request for hearing.

---

**Adjourn**

---

It was decided by consensus to adjourn at 1:55 p.m.