STATE OF IOWA

BOARD OF EDUCATIONAL EXAMINERS

400 E. 14th Street

Des Moines, Iowa 50319

Minutes

October 16, 2026

The Board of Educational Examiners (Board or BoEE) held a meeting on October 16, 2026. Chad Janzen, Board chair, called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m. Members attending were Pam Bleam, Dr. Davis Eidahl, Julie Lear, Jennifer Sammons, Eric St Clair, Paige Thorson, Dr. Kennesha Woods, Dr. Daniel Zylstra. Also in attendance was Mike Cavin, Executive Director, Beth Myers, Attorney, Lori Lavorato, Matthew Barron, and William Rector, Investigators, and Angela Stuedemann and Tyler Eason, Assistant Attorneys General. Miranda Brus was unable to attend.

Paige Thorson moved, with a second by Daniel Zylstra, to approve the agenda. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Eric St Clair moved, with a second by Jennifer Sammons to approve the consent agenda (minutes for September 11, 2026). **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Paige Thorson moved, with a second by Eric St Clair, that the Board go into closed session for the purpose of discussing closed session minutes whether to initiate licensee disciplinary proceedings, the decision to be rendered in a contested case, confidential health information, and mental health information, pursuant to Iowa Code sections 21.5(1)(a), (d), and (f). Roll call vote: Bleam – yes; Eidahl – yes; Janzen – yes; Lear – yes; Sammons – yes; St Clair – yes; Thorson – yes; Woods – yes; Zylstra – yes; **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

The Board returned to open session at 10:28 a.m.

Pam Bleam moved, with a second by Davis Eidahl, that in **case number 26-237**, the Board finds that, although one or more of the allegations in the complaint may be substantiated by the witnesses interviewed in the course of the investigation [and/or] the documents gathered in the course of the investigation, and the allegations may constitute a technical violation of the board's statute or administrative rules; the evidence before the board indicates that the alleged violation was an isolated incident, and adequate steps have been taken to remedy the violation and to ensure that incidents of a similar nature do not occur in the future. The Board will not pursue formal disciplinary action in this matter. Roll call vote: Bleam – yes; Eidahl – yes; Janzen – yes; Lear – yes; Sammons – yes; St Clair – no; Thorson – no; Woods – yes; Zylstra – yes; **MOTION CARRIED**

Davis Eidahl moved, with a second by Paige Thorson, that in **case number 26-246**, the Board find probable cause to establish a violation of the Code of Professional Conduct and Ethics, 282 IAC rules 25.3(1) e (4) 3, 25.3(8) a, and order the Board staff to proceed with the case. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Eric St Clair moved, with a second by Paige Thorson that in **case number 26-157**, the Board find probable cause to establish a violation of the Code of Professional Conduct and Ethics, 282 IAC rules 282 IAC rules 25.3(1) e (1), 25.3(6) c, 25.3(8) b, and order the Board staff to proceed with the case. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Eric St Clair moved, with a second by Kennesha Woods, that in **case number 26-206**, the Board find probable cause to establish a violation of the Code of Professional Conduct and Ethics, 282 IAC rule 25.3(2) b, and order the Board staff to proceed with the case. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Eric St Clair moved, with a second by Kennesha Woods, that in **case number 26-207**, the Board find probable cause to establish a violation of the Code of Professional Conduct and Ethics, 282 IAC rules 25.3(2) b, and order the Board staff to proceed with the case. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Eric St Clair moved, with a second by Kennesha Woods, that in **case number 26-208**, the Board find probable cause to establish a violation of the Code of Professional Conduct and Ethics, 282 IAC rules 25.3(2) b, and order the Board staff to proceed with the case. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Paige Thorson moved, with a second by Kennesha Woods, that in **case number 26-244**, the Board find probable cause to establish a violation of the Code of Professional Conduct and Ethics, 282 IAC rules 25.3(2) b and 25.3(3) c, and order the Board staff to proceed with the case. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Jennifer Sammons moved, with a second by Julie Lear, that in **case number 26-114**, the Board find probable cause to establish a violation of the Code of Professional Conduct and Ethics, 282 IAC rules 25.3(3) e, 25.3(8) a, and order the Board staff to proceed with the case. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Paige Thorson moved, with a second by Jennifer Sammons that in **case number 26-199,** the Board find probable cause to establish a violation of the Code of Professional Conduct and Ethics, 282 IAC rules 25.3(3) e, and order the Board staff to proceed with the case. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Eric St Clair moved, with a second by Paige Thorson, that in **case number 26-224**, the Board find probable cause to establish a violation of the Code of Professional Conduct and Ethics, 282 IAC rule 25.3(3) b, and order the Board staff to proceed with the case. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Daniel Zylstra moved, with a second by Kennesha Woods, that in **case number 26-177**, the Board find that, although one or more of the allegations in the complaint may be substantiated by the witnesses interviewed in the course of the investigation [and/or] the documents gathered in the course of the investigation, and the allegations may constitute a technical violation of the board's statute or administrative rules; the evidence before the board indicates that adequate steps have been taken to remedy the violation and to ensure that incidents of a similar nature do not occur in the

future. The Board will not pursue formal disciplinary action in this matter. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Jennifer Sammons moved, with a second by Julie Lear, that in **case number 26-193**, the Board finds that the evidence gathered in the investigation, including witness statements and the documentary evidence, does not substantiate the allegations in the complaint, and that the Board therefore lacks probable cause to proceed with this matter. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Paige Thorson moved, with a second by Jennifer Sammons, that in **case number 26-242**, the Board finds that the evidence gathered in the investigation, including witness statements and the documentary evidence, does not substantiate the allegations in the complaint, and that the Board therefore lacks probable cause to proceed with this matter. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Paige Thorson moved, with a second by Pam Bleam, that in **case number 26-247**, the Board find probable cause to establish a violation of the Code of Professional Conduct and Ethics, 282 IAC rule 25.3(5) a (2), and order the Board staff to proceed with the case. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Daniel Zylstra moved, with a second by Jennifer Sammons, that in **case number 26-143**, the Board finds that the evidence gathered in the investigation, including witness statements and the documentary evidence, does not substantiate the allegations in the complaint, and that the Board therefore lacks probable cause to proceed with this matter. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Paige Thorson moved, with a second by Julie Lear, that in **case number 26-219**, the Board finds that the evidence gathered in the investigation, including witness statements and the documentary evidence, does not substantiate the allegations in the complaint, and that the Board therefore lacks probable cause to proceed with this matter. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Jennifer Sammons moved, with a second by Eric St Clair, that in **case number 26-245**, the Board finds probable cause to establish a violation of the Code of Professional Conduct and Ethics, 282 IAC rule 25.3(6) c, 25.3(8) b, and order the Board staff to proceed with the case. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Daniel Zylstra moved, with a second by Julie Lear, that in **case number 26-238**, the Board finds that the evidence gathered in the investigation, including witness statements and the documentary evidence, does not substantiate the allegations in the complaint, and that the Board therefore lacks probable cause to proceed with this matter. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Kennesha Woods moved, with a second by Julie Lear, that in **case number 26-130**, the Board finds probable cause to establish a violation of the Code of Professional Conduct and Ethics, 282 IAC rule 25.3(6) c, d, m, and order the Board staff to proceed with the case. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Paige Thorson moved, with a second by Davis Eidahl, that in **case number 26-117**, the Board finds probable cause to establish a violation of the Code of Professional Conduct and Ethics, 282 IAC rule 25.3(6) m & s, 25.3(8) a & b, and order the Board staff to proceed with the case. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Julie Lear moved, with a second by Paige Thorson, that in **case number 26-118**, the Board finds probable cause to establish a violation of the Code of Professional Conduct and Ethics, 282 IAC rule 25.3(1) e (1), 25.3(6) m & s, 25.3(8) a & b, and order the Board staff to proceed with the case. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Julie Lear moved, with a second by Paige Thorson, that in **case number 26-151**, the Board finds probable cause to establish a violation of the Code of Professional Conduct and Ethics, 282 IAC rule 25.3(1) e (1), 25.3(6) m & s, 25.3(8) a & b, and order the Board staff to proceed with the case. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Paige Thorson moved with a second by Davis Eidahl, that in **case number 26-152**, the Board finds probable cause to establish a violation of the Code of Professional Conduct

and Ethics, 282 IAC rule 25.3(6) m & s, 25.3(8) a & b, and order the Board staff to proceed with the case. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Eric St Clair moved, with a second by Paige Thorson, that the Board accept the respondent's waiver of hearing and voluntary surrender in **case number 25-131 & 25-132** and that the Board issue an order permanently revoking the license with no possibility of reinstatement. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Paige Thorson moved, with a second by Jennifer Sammons, that in **case number 26-49**, the Board finds probable cause to establish a violation of the Code of Professional Conduct and Ethics, 282 IAC rule 25.3(1) d, e (1), (4) (2) & (3), and the Board accept the respondent's waiver of hearing and voluntary surrender and that the Board issue an order permanently revoking the license with no possibility of reinstatement. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Jennifer Sammons moved, with a second by Kennesha Woods, that in **case number 25-150 & 25-269**, the Board reject the agreement submitted by the parties, and return the cases for further proceedings consistent with this decision. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Paige Thorson moved, with a second by Daniel Zylstra, that in **case number 25-226**, the Board accept the agreement submitted by the parties, and issue an Order incorporating the agreement and imposing the agreed upon sanction. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Daniel Zylstra moved, with a second by Kennesha Woods, that in **case number 26-99**, the Board accept the agreement submitted by the parties, and issue an Order incorporating the agreement and imposing the agreed upon sanction. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Kennesha Woods moved, with a second by Jennifer Sammons, that in **case number 26-93**, the Board accept the agreement submitted by the parties, and issue an Order

incorporating the agreement and imposing the agreed upon sanction. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Paige Thorson moved, with a second by Kennesha Woods, that in **case number 22-190, 24-209 & 24-213**, the Board accept the agreement submitted by the parties, and issue an Order incorporating the agreement and imposing the agreed upon sanction. Roll call vote: Bleam – yes; Eidahl – yes; Janzen – recused; Lear – yes; Sammons – yes; St Clair – yes; Thorson – yes; Woods – yes; Zylstra – yes; **MOTION CARRIED**

Jennifer Sammons moved, with a second by Eric St Clair, that in **case number 25-212**, the Board accept the agreement submitted by the parties, and issue an Order incorporating the agreement and imposing the agreed upon sanction. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Daniel Zylstra moved, with a second by Paige Thorson, that in **case number 26-172**, the Board accept the agreement submitted by the parties, and issue an Order incorporating the agreement and imposing the agreed upon sanction. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Davis Eidahl moved, with a second by Paige Thorson, that in **case number 24-58**, the Board accept the agreement submitted by the parties, and issue an Order incorporating the agreement and imposing the agreed upon sanction. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Eric St Clair moved, with a second by Jennifer Sammons, that in **case number 25-104**, the Board accept the agreement submitted by the parties, and issue an Order incorporating the agreement and imposing the agreed upon sanction. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Paige Thorson moved, with a second by Jennifer Sammons, that in **case number 24-106**, pursuant to the order from the district court, remanding the case for a full evidentiary hearing on the information provided by the Iowa Department of Education

which was outside of the administrative record Board of Educational Examiners considered in its final decision. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Kennesha Woods moved, with a second by Julie Lear, that in **case number 24-66**, the Board accept the dismissal submitted by the parties. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Davis Eidahl moved, with a second by Kennesha Woods, to accept the signed consents to waive the deadline in **case number 26-121** and issue an order extending the deadline. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Daniel Zylstra moved, with a second by Jennifer Sammons, to extend the 180-day deadline for issuance of the final decision in **case number 26-122**, based on the need to schedule the hearing or negotiate settlement and conclude the contested case process. Respondent does not object to the extension and, retaining this pending licensing matter ensures that any potential threats or risks to students are thoroughly evaluated while also guaranteeing the educator has the opportunity to dispute the alleged ethical wrongdoing. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Kennesha Woods moved, with a second by Davis Eidahl, to extend the 180-day deadline for issuance of the final decision in **case number 26-124**, based on the amount of time needed to complete the investigation and conclude the contested case process. Respondent did not file an objection to the extension even though given an opportunity to object. and justice would not be served by dismissing a pending complaint concerning alleged ethical wrongdoing of an educator given the need to maintain safe learning environments for Iowa students. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Paige Thorson moved, with a second by Pam Bleam, to extend the 180-day deadline for issuance of the final decision in **case number 26-125**, based on the need to schedule the hearing or negotiate settlement and conclude the contested case process. Respondent does not object to the extension and justice would not be served by dismissing a pending complaint concerning alleged ethical wrongdoing of an educator

given the need to maintain safe learning environments for Iowa students. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Jennifer Sammons moved, with a second by Julie Lear, to extend the 180-day deadline for issuance of the final decision in **case number 26-126**, based on the need to schedule the hearing or negotiate settlement and conclude the contested case process. Respondent did not file an objection to the extension even though given an opportunity to object and dismissal of the case would undermine public trust in educational licenses and would result in disparate treatment of similar ethical violations. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Kennesha Woods moved, with a second by Davis Eidahl, to extend the 180-day deadline for issuance of the final decision in **case number 26-127**, based on the need to schedule the hearing or negotiate settlement and conclude the contested case process. Respondent did not file an objection to the extension even though given an opportunity to object and dismissal of the case would undermine public trust in educational licenses and would result in disparate treatment of similar ethical violations. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Daniel Zylstra moved, with a second by Jennifer Sammons, to extend the 180-day deadline for issuance of the final decision in **case number 26-128**. Although the respondent has objected to the extended time, probable cause of an ethical violation has been determined by the Board. Additional time is needed to schedule a hearing and complete the contested case process. Dismissal of the case would undermine public trust in educational licenses and would result in disparate treatment of similar ethical violations. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Davis Eidahl moved, with a second by Pam Bleam, to extend the 180-day deadline for issuance of the final decision in **case number 26-129**, based on the amount of time needed to complete the investigation and conclude the contested case process. Respondent did not file an objection to the extension even though given an opportunity to object and retaining this pending licensing matter reinforces the

significance of due process for both the complainant and the respondent within the licensing disciplinary system. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Kennesha Woods moved, with a second by Pam Bleam, to extend the 180-day deadline for issuance of the final decision in **case number 26-130**. Although the respondent has objected to the extended time, probable cause of an ethical violation has been determined by the Board. Additional time is needed to schedule a hearing and complete the contested case process. Retaining this pending licensing matter ensures that any potential threats or risks to students are thoroughly evaluated, while also guaranteeing the educator has the opportunity to dispute the alleged ethical wrongdoing. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Paige Thorson moved, with a second by Julie Lear, to extend the 180-day deadline for issuance of the final decision in **case number 26-131**, based on the amount of time needed to complete the investigation and conclude the contested case process. Respondent does not object to the extension. Retaining this pending licensing matter ensures that any potential threats or risks to students are thoroughly evaluated while also guaranteeing the educator has the opportunity to dispute the alleged ethical wrongdoing. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Daniel Zylstra moved, with a second by Pam Bleam, to extend the 180-day deadline for issuance of the final decision in **case number 26-132**. Although the respondent has objected to the extended time, probable cause of an ethical violation has been determined by the Board. Additional time is needed to schedule a hearing and complete the contested case process. The Respondent would not be prejudiced by the additional time necessary to resolve the pending complaint given that investigative information remains confidential pending the final decision. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Davis Eidahl moved, with a second by Paige Thorson, to extend the 180-day deadline for issuance of the final decision in **case number 26-133**, based on the need to schedule the hearing or negotiate settlement and conclude the contested case process. Respondent does not object to the extension and the Respondent would not be

prejudiced by the additional time necessary to resolve the pending complaint given that investigative information remains confidential pending the final decision. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Jennifer Sammons moved, with a second by Julie Lear, to extend the 180-day deadline for issuance of the final decision in **case number 26-135**, based on the need to schedule the hearing or negotiate settlement and conclude the contested case process. The respondent did not file an objection to the extension even though given an opportunity to object. Retaining this pending licensing matter reinforces the significance of due process for both the complainant and the respondent within the licensing disciplinary system. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Kennesha Woods moved, with a second by Pam Bleam to extend the 180-day deadline for issuance of the final decision in **case number 26-136**, based on the need to schedule the hearing or negotiate settlement and conclude the contested case process. The respondent did not file an objection to the extension even though given an opportunity to object. Retaining this pending licensing matter reinforces the significance of due process for both the complainant and the respondent within the licensing disciplinary system. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Paige Thorson moved, with a second by Daniel Zylstra, to extend the 180-day deadline for issuance of the final decision in **case number 26-148**, based on the need to schedule the hearing or negotiate settlement and conclude the contested case process. The respondent does not object to the extension and retaining this pending licensing matter ensures that any potential threats or risks to students are thoroughly evaluated while also guaranteeing the educator has the opportunity to dispute the alleged ethical wrongdoing. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Kennesha Woods move, with a second by Julie Lear, to extend the 180-day deadline for issuance of the final decision in **case number 26-150**, based on the need to schedule the hearing or negotiate settlement and conclude the contested case process. The respondent did not file an objection to the extension even though given an opportunity to object and dismissal of the case would undermine public trust in

educational licenses and would result in disparate treatment of similar ethical violations. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Daniel Zylstra moved, with a second by Pam Bleam, to extend the 180-day deadline for issuance of the final decision in **case number 26-151**, based on the need to schedule the hearing or negotiate settlement and conclude the contested case process. The respondent did not file an objection to the extension even though given an opportunity to object. Retaining this pending licensing matter ensures that any potential threats or risks to students are thoroughly evaluated, while also guaranteeing the educator has the opportunity to dispute the alleged ethical wrongdoing. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Davis Eidahl moved with a second by Kennesha Woods, to extend the 180-day deadline for issuance of the final decision in **case number 26-152**, based the need to schedule the hearing or negotiate settlement and conclude the contested case process. The respondent does not object to the extension and retaining this pending licensing matter reinforces the significance of due process for both the complainant and the respondent within the licensing disciplinary system. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Kennesha Woods moved with a second by Paige Thorson, to extend the 180-day deadline for issuance of the final decision in **case number 26-153**, based on the need to schedule the hearing or negotiate settlement and conclude the contested case process. The respondent did not file an objection to the extension even though given an opportunity to object. Justice would not be served by dismissing a pending complaint concerning alleged ethical wrongdoing of an educator, given the need to maintain safe learning environments for Iowa students. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Daniel Zylstra moved, with a second by Jennifer Sammons, to extend the on 180-day deadline for issuance of the final decision in **case number 26-157**, based on the need to schedule the hearing or negotiate settlement and conclude the contested case process. The respondent does not object to the extension. Retaining this pending

licensing matter ensures that any potential threats or risks to students are thoroughly evaluated while, also guaranteeing the educator has the opportunity to dispute the alleged ethical wrongdoing. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Paige Thorson moved, with a second by Julie Lear, to extend the 180-day deadline for issuance of the final decision in **case number 26-163**. Although the respondent has objected to the extended time, additional investigative information was requested by the Board to make a probable cause determination. Additional time is required to complete a comprehensive investigation and conclude the contested case process. Justice would not be served by dismissing a pending complaint concerning alleged ethical wrongdoing of an educator given the need to maintain safe learning environments for Iowa students. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Davis Eidahl moved with a second by Pam Bleam, to extend the 180-day deadline for issuance of the final decision in **case number 26-164**, based the need to schedule the hearing or negotiate settlement and conclude the contested case process. The respondent does not object to the extension and retaining this pending licensing matter reinforces the significance of due process for both the complainant and the respondent within the licensing disciplinary system. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Kennesha Woods move, with a second by Pam Bleam, to extend the 180-day deadline for issuance of the final decision in **case number 26-167**, based on the amount of time needed to complete the investigation and conclude the contested case process. The Respondent did not file an objection to the extension even though given an opportunity to object. Dismissal of the case would undermine public trust in educational licenses and would result in disparate treatment of similar ethical violations. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Eric St Clair moved, with a second by Pam Bleam, to extend the 180-day deadline for issuance of the final decision in **case number 26-169**, based the amount of time needed to complete the investigation and conclude the contested case process. The respondent does not object to the extension and retaining this pending licensing

matter reinforces the significance of due process for both the complainant and the respondent within the licensing disciplinary system. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Paige Thorson moved, with a second by Daniel Zylstra, to approve the closed session minutes for September 11, 2026. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Reinstatement Request

Request for reinstatement: Case No. 24-309, In the Matter of Zachary Liddle. Mr. Liddle was charged with committing an act of physical abuse of a student. He received a sanction of: a written reprimand, a 1-year suspension of his license, completion of an ethics course and completion of a seclusion and restraint training course. Mr. Liddle submitted an application for reinstatement at last month's meeting in September and it was denied. He has provided additional information in his application and has resubmitted his information for review at this meeting. The Board noted the timeline of the suspension period has elapsed and he is eligible for reinstatement. Mr. Liddle was not present before the Board. The Board noted that Mr. Liddle provided greater detail in his application this month. Daniel Zylstra moved, with a second by Jennifer Sammons, that the Board grant the application for reinstatement in Case No. 24-309, In the Matter of Zachary Liddle, as the reason for the suspension no longer exists and reinstatement is in the public interest. Zylstra further moved that the Board authorize the Executive Director to sign an order consistent with the Board's discussion.

Communication from the Public

The Board heard public comment.

Board Member Report

None

Executive Director's Report

Legislative Report:

Rules are attached and will be discussed at today's meeting.

Agency Update:
One of the BoEE Administrative Support Assistants has resigned. The position is advertised and the recruitment process will begin next week. Consultant staff has been out providing ethics and licensure training to education preparation program and local schools across Iowa.

Financial Report:
Income for September was down but there are no current concerns and monitoring will continue. It is the start of a new year and the retention of the 25% from the general fund. Expenses were incorrectly applied to one account and will be corrected for next month.

License Report:
Renewal applications are being processed within about 1 week of submission and conditional license application around 2-3 days. BEDS reporting has started and many corrections, renewals, extensions and conditionals are being issued.

The next three board meetings come very quickly with multiple holidays in between. Board members were asked to consult their schedules to ensure their ability to attend. BoEE staff will be off the day before Thanksgiving, Thanksgiving, and the Friday after, as well Christmas Eve and Christmas Day.

<u>Rules</u>
The following rules were on the agenda as a discussion item: Amend IAC 282 Chapter 7: Proof of Legal Presence, Amend IAC 282 Chapter 11: Complaints, Investigations, Contested Case Hearings, Amend IAC 282 Chapter 22: Limited Authorizations. Prior to Board discussion, Beth Myers provided a general overview of the rules process.

<u>Petition for Waiver:</u>
Davis Eidahl moved, with a second by Kennesha Woods, that the Board grant the PFW 26-07 Trisha Krusemark. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.** Reasons for granting the waiver: On September 8, 2026 the Board received a Petition from Ms. Krusemark

requesting a waiver of the rules for the Instructional Strategist II BD/LD. Ms. Krusemark is seeking a waiver of the requirement for an Instructional Strategist II: BD/LD. Current rules require applicants to have two competencies, characteristics and methods, to add the K-12 Strat II BD/LD. She has been teaching special education for 26 years and started her career teaching BD in the middle school. She has taught at various levels and grades over the years. Ms. Krusemark has taught students with behavior disorders over the years and often assigned BD students because she had the experience to help them improve behaviors and meet their goals. The Board found there was undue hardship because of her long tenure as a special education teacher. Additionally, she is currently working this area the classes would be duplicative of her current knowledge and skill. The Board found the rights of others are still preserved because she was already educated and experienced in this role. The rule from which Trisha Krusemark seeks a waiver is not specifically mandated by statute or any other provision of law, and, accordingly, may be waived by the Board. Regarding the protection of the public health, safety and welfare, the Board found Krusemark serves a hard to fill position, and she has a license for learning disabled students.

<u>Reports and approvals:</u>

None

There being no further business, Paige Thorson moved, with a second by Jennifer Sammons, to adjourn the meeting at 11:52 a.m.

DISCUSSION MEMO

Date: October 16, 2026

To: Board Members

From: Mike Cavin, Executive Director

RE: Amend IAC 282 Chapter 7, PROOF OF LEGAL PRESENCE, IAC 282 Chapter 11 COMPLAINTS, INVESTIGATIONS, CASE HEARINGS, Amend IAC 282 Chapter 22, LIMITED AUTHORIZATION

Chapter 7

The proposed change to Chapter 7 complies with legislative changes from the 2026 session. SF 2218 created different requirements for applicants to prove legal authorization to work in the United States.

Item 1. Amend 282—Chapter 7 as follows:

282—7.1(256) Purpose. This chapter outlines a uniform process for applicants and licensees of the board of educational examiners to establish proof of legal presence pursuant to the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. §1621).

[**ARC 8806C**, IAB 1/22/25, effective 2/26/25]

282—7.2(256) Applicability.

7.2(1) Applicants and licensees who are U.S. citizens or permanent resident aliens may be requested to produce evidence of their lawful presence in the United States as a condition of initial licensure or license renewal.

7.2(2) Applicants and licensees residing in the United States, other than those described in subrule 7.2(1), may be requested to provide evidence of lawful presence in the United States at the time of initial licensure and with every subsequent renewal.

~~**7.2(3)** Evidence will not be required by foreign national applicants or licensees who are not physically present in the United States~~.

282—7.3(256) Acceptable evidence. The board will ~~accept as proof of~~ verify lawful presence in the

United States by accessing the Systematic Alien Verification for Entitlements (SAVE) Program ~~any acceptable document that establishes a U.S. place of birth or indicates U.S. citizenship or naturalization, or any documentation acceptable under the Immigration and Naturalization Act as amended to November 1, 2023, to establish alien status. Legible copies of documents will be accepted. Original documents will not be required unless a question arises concerning the documentation submitted.~~ Applicants for initial, renewal, and all practitioners who are not subject to renewal requirements, are required to send to the board a document that establishes employment authorization and identity, as described in 8 U.S.C §1324a(b)(1)(B), or employment

These rules are intended to implement the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. §1621) and Executive Order 15 (replace with SF 2218) .

Chapter 11

This proposed change to chapter 11 allows unlicensed administrators in nonpublic and charter schools to file complaints against licensees. This proposed amendment clarifies that the Executive Director will only file a complaint if the allegations are mandatory reporting areas or if directed by the Board. One public comment was received regarding this rulemaking during the Regulatory Analysis public hearing. Please see the attached.

Item 1. Amend subrule 11.4(1) as follows:

282—11.4(17A,256) Complaint.

11.4(1) *Who may initiate.* The following entities may initiate a complaint:

a. Licensed practitioners.

b. School human resource directors.

c. Recognized educational entities or local or state professional organizations.

d. Local boards of education.

e. Parents or guardians of students involved in the alleged complaint.

f. Administrators or Directors of non-accredited or independently accredited Iowa non-public schools.

f. g. The executive director of the board of educational examiners if the following

circumstances have been met:

(1) The executive director receives information that a practitioner:

1. Has been convicted of a felony criminal offense, or a misdemeanor criminal offense wherein the victim of the crime was 18 years of age or younger, and the executive director expressly determines within the complaint that the nature of the offense clearly and directly impacts the practitioner's fitness or ability to retain the specific license(s) or authorization(s) that the practitioner holds; or

2. Has been the subject of a founded report of child abuse placed upon the central registry maintained by the department of health and human services pursuant to Iowa Code section 232.71D, and the executive director expressly determines within the complaint that the nature of the offense clearly and directly impacts the practitioner's fitness or ability to retain the specific license(s) or authorization(s) that the practitioner holds; or

3. Has not met a reporting requirement stipulated by Iowa Code section 256.160, Iowa Code section 279.43, 281—subrule 102.11(2), 282—Chapter 11, or 282—Chapter 25; or

4. Has falsified a license or authorization issued by the board; or

5. Has submitted false information on a license or authorization application filed with the board; or

6. Does not hold the appropriate license for the assignment for which the practitioner is currently employed; or

7. Has assigned another practitioner to perform services for which the practitioner is not properly licensed; or

8. Has failed to comply with a board order as prohibited by 282—paragraph 25.3(7)*"c"*; and

(2) The executive director verifies the information or the alleged misconduct through review of official records maintained by the board, a court, the department of health and human services registry of founded child abuse reports, the practitioner licensing authority of another state, the department of education, the local school district, area education agency, or authorities in charge of the nonpublic school, or the executive director is presented with the falsified license; and

(3) No other complaint has been filed regarding Iowa Code section 256.160, or at the direction of the Board.

~~g~~. h. The department of transportation if the licensee named in the complaint holds a behind-the-wheel instructor's certification issued by the department and the complaint relates to an incident or incidents arising during the course of driver's education instruction.

~~h~~. i. An employee of the department of education who, while performing official duties, becomes aware of any alleged misconduct by an individual licensed under Iowa Code section 256.146.

Chapter 22

This proposed change complies with several legislative changes from the 2026 session. Item one removes the requirement for a baccalaureate degree for an Athletic Director Authorization as required in HF 2724. Item two creates a new pathway for licensing people with experience in arts and sciences as directed in HF 2724. Item three changes the requirements for the Career and technical authorization as required in SF 2168.

Item 1. Amend 282—Chapter 22 as follows:

282—22.8(256) Activities administration authorization. An activities administration authorization allows an individual to administer any student activity program in a K-12 school setting.

22.8(1) *Requirements.* Applicants for the activities administration authorization will meet the following requirements:

a. Degree. A baccalaureate degree or higher. ~~related to athletics, physical education or a related field is required. Additional degree areas may be considered at the discretion of the executive director.~~

b. Credit hours. Applicants will complete credit hours or courses offered by the Leadership Training Institute (LTI) from the National Interscholastic Athletic Administrators Association in the following areas:

(1) Successful completion of 1 semester credit hour or LTI course relating to knowledge and understanding of risk management, Title IX, sexual harassment, hazing, Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), and employment law as they pertain to the role of the activities administrator.

(2) Successful completion of 1 semester credit hour or LTI course relating to knowledge and understanding of activities administration foundations including philosophy, leadership, professional programs and activities administration principles, strategies and methods.

(3) Successful completion of 1 semester credit hour or LTI course relating to knowledge and understanding of the role of the activities director in supporting and developing sports medicine programs, management of athletic player equipment, concussion assessment and proper fitting of athletic protective equipment, and sports field safety.

(4) Successful completion of 1 semester credit hour or LTI course relating to knowledge and understanding of the techniques and theory of coaching concepts and strategies for interscholastic budget and concepts and strategies for interscholastic fundraising.

(5) Successful completion of 1 semester credit hour or LTI course, approved by the board, relating to the assessment and evaluation of interscholastic athletic programs and personnel, dealing with challenging personalities, and administration of professional growth programs for

interscholastic personnel.

(6) Successful completion of concussion training approved by the Iowa high school athletic association or Iowa girls high school athletic union.

22.8(2) *Validity.* The activities administration authorization is valid for five years.

Item 2. Adopt the following new rule 282—22.15 as follows:

282—22.15(256) Arts and sciences authorization.

22.15(1) *Requirements for the initial arts and sciences authorization.*

a. Degree. Applicants will have a minimum of a baccalaureate degree or higher in any field.

b. *Credit hours or experience.* Applicants will meet one of the following qualifications:

1. *K-8, 5-12 Music*,

a. A baccalaureate or higher in Music or,

b. 24 semester credit hours in music and 6000 hours of recent and relevant experience.

2. *K-8, 5-12 Art*,

a. A baccalaureate or higher in Art or,

b. 24 semester credit hours in Art and 6000 hours of recent and relevant work experience.

3. *K-8, Science*,

a. A baccalaureate or higher in Science or,

b. 24 semester credit hours across a broad field of science and 6000 hours of recent and relevant work experience.

4. *5-12 Science – basic*,

a. A baccalaureate or higher in Science or,

b. 24 semester credit hours across a broad field of science and 6000 hours of recent and relevant work experience.

5. *K-8, Math,*

a. A baccalaureate or higher in Math including Algebra or,

b. 24 semester credit hours across a broad field of math including college algebra and 6000 hours of recent and relevant experience.

6. *5-12 Math – basic*,

a. A baccalaureate or higher in math, including Algebra and Geometry or,

b. 24 semester credit hours across a broad field of math including college algebra and geometry and 6000 hours of recent and relevant experience.

c. Recent and relevant experience will have been accrued within the ten years prior to the date of application. Experience that does not meet these criteria may be considered at the discretion of the executive director.

d. During the term of the initial authorization, the applicant will complete board-approved training in the following:

(1) Coursework in the methods and techniques for the endorsement content sought.

(2) Coursework in course and curriculum development.

(3) Coursework in the measurement and evaluation of programs and students.

(4) Coursework in the instruction of exceptional learners to include the education of individuals with disabilities, english language learners, and gifted and talented.

(5) Ethics training.

d. The applicant will be assigned a mentor by the hiring school district.

22.15(2) *Validity—initial authorization.* The initial authorization is valid for three years.

22.15(3) *Requirements for the arts and sciences authorization.* The initial arts and sciences authorization may be converted to the arts and sciences authorization if the applicant

completes the required coursework set forth in paragraph 22.15(1)*"d."* This authorization is valid for five years.

22.15(4) *Repeal.* Repeal effective July 1, 2030.

Item 3. Amend 282—22.3 as follows:

282—22.3(256) Career and technical authorization.

22.3(1) *Requirements for the initial career and technical authorization.*

a. Applicants will meet one of the following qualifications:

(1) Have 6,000 3,000 hours of recent and relevant experience;

(2) Have 4,000 2,000 hours of recent and relevant experience if the applicant holds a baccalaureate degree, or an associate's degree in the endorsement area, if such a degree is considered terminal for that filed of instruction;

(3) Have 3,000 hours of recent and relevant experience if the applicant holds an associate's degree in the teaching endorsement area sought, if such a degree is considered terminal for that field of instruction;

(4) (3) Hold a baccalaureate or graduate degree or closely related degree in the teaching endorsement area sought; or

(5) (4) Hold a baccalaureate degree in any area of study if at least 18 of the credit hours were completed in the teaching endorsement area sought.

For a career and technical cluster endorsement, an applicant will meet one of the above qualifications and have at least 2,000 hours of recent and relevant experience or nine semester hours each in two additional areas within the cluster endorsement. Combinations of experience and education may be approved by the executive director.

b. Recent and relevant experience will have been accrued within the ten years prior to the

date of application. Experience that does not meet these criteria may be considered at the discretion of the executive director. In subjects for which state registration, certification or licensure is required, the applicant will hold the appropriate license, registration or certificate before the initial career and technical secondary authorization or the career and technical secondary authorization will be issued.

c. Verification of educator ethics training.

c. d. During the term of the initial authorization, the applicant will complete board-approved training in the following:

(1) Coursework in the methods and techniques of career and technical education.

(2) Coursework in course and curriculum development.

(3) Coursework in the measurement and evaluation of programs and students.

(4) An approved human relations course.

(5) Coursework in the instruction of exceptional learners to include the education of individuals with disabilities, English language learners and the gifted and talented.

(6) Ethics training.

d. e. The applicant will be assigned a mentor by the hiring school district.

22.3(2) *Validity—initial authorization.* The initial authorization is valid for three years.

22.3(3) *Requirements for the career and technical authorization.* The initial career and technical authorization may be converted to the career and technical authorization if the applicant completes the required coursework set forth in paragraph 22.3(1)*"c.d."* This authorization is valid for five years.

ISEA Iowa State Education Association

Iowa State
Education Association

777 Third Street
Des Moines, IA
50309-1301
tel 515.471.8000
fax 515.471.8017
www.isea.org

An affiliate of the
National Education
Association

October 6, 2026

Beth Myers
Bureau of Educational Examiners
Iowa Dep't of Education
400 East 14th St.
Des Moines, Iowa 50319
DELIVERED BY EMAIL ONLY: beth.myers@iowa.gov

Re: Public Comment on Regulatory Analysis 26-285

Dear Ms. Myers and Members of the Iowa Board of Educational Examiners:

The Iowa State Education Association (ISEA) respectfully opposes the proposed amendment to the executive director paragraph of subrule 282—11.4(1), which RA 26-285 would renumber as paragraph "g." ISEA represents Iowa educators, many of whom hold licenses issued by the Iowa Board of Educational Examiners (Board). Our members are the people most directly affected when the Board changes who may accuse a licensee of misconduct.

Currently, Rule 11.4(1) allows the executive director to file a complaint only if three conditions are met, the third being that "[n]o other complaint has been filed." RA 26-285 would rewrite that condition to read: "No other complaint has been filed regarding Iowa Code section 256.160, or at the direction of the board."

The Board's Regulatory Analysis never mentions this change. It describes the rulemaking only as giving unlicensed nonpublic and charter school administrators a way to file complaints. Yet the new language would turn the executive director's narrowly tailored discretion into a limitless and unqualified obligation to file any complaint the Board has directed him to file. Notably, the Board directing the filing of a complaint is the same Board that will decide it.

ISEA asks the Board to withdraw the amendment to paragraph "g" and retain the current condition. This comment is limited to paragraph "g" and does not

address the addition of unlicensed administrators to the list of those who may file a complaint.

Ambiguity in the Proposed Amendment of Rule 11.4(1)(f)(3)

Current Rule 11.4(1)(f)(3), allowing the executive director to initiate a complaint without first-hand knowledge of the conduct, is defensible today because three conditions confine it:

1. **Subject matter.** The information must fall within one of eight listed categories: a qualifying criminal conviction, a founded child abuse report, a failure to meet statutory reporting requirements, a falsified license, false application information to the Board, an assignment without the proper license, assigning another practitioner without the proper license, or failure to comply with a Board order. For convictions and founded abuse, the executive director must also expressly find that the offense bears on fitness to hold the license.
1. **Verification.** The executive director must verify the information through official records from public institutions or have received a falsified license.
2. **No other complaint.** The executive director may act only when no other complaint has been filed.

RA 26-285 rewrites the third condition in one sentence that can be read at least three ways, each expand the executive director's authority beyond what was ever intended by the Iowa Legislature:

Possible reading	What the executive director could do	Result
The executive director may file a complaint only if there has been no prior complaint "regarding Iowa Code section 256.160" (or there has been no prior complaint "filed at the Board's direction")	File a second complaint on the same facts whenever the first was not "regarding" section 256.160 (or any time no prior complaint was filed because the Board so directed)	Multiple complaints on the same facts become routine

Possible reading	What the executive director could do	Result
"At the direction of the board" is an alternative to condition (3)	File even while another complaint about the same conduct is pending, whenever the Board so directs	The Board can layer its own complaint on top of any other
"At the direction of the board" is an independent basis for filing	File any complaint the Board directs, without the eight subject-matter limits or records verification	The existing limits on the executive director's authority no longer apply and the Board may direct the filing of any complaint it sees fit

The meaning of "regarding Iowa Code section 256.160" is unclear. It could mean a complaint generated by a mandatory report under that section, or a complaint alleging that an administrator failed to make one. Nothing in the rule or the Regulatory Analysis explains what the Board intends. A rule defining who may accuse a licensed professional of unethical conduct should not leave open such a question.

Regulatory Analysis Fails to Disclose or Analyze Amendment to Rule 11.4(1)(f)(3)

Iowa Code section 17A.4A requires a regulatory analysis which describes the classes of persons affected, the probable impact and costs, the costs to the agency, a comparison with inaction, whether less costly or less intrusive methods exist, and the alternatives the agency considered. RA 26-285 does none of this for the proposed amendment to Rule 11.4(1)(f)(3). The *Purpose and Summary* says the rulemaking allows unlicensed nonpublic and charter school administrators to file complaints, but never mentions the executive director, section 256.160, or Board-directed complaints. The *Title* in the Bulletin's table of contents lists RA 26-285 only as initiating complaints by administrators or directors of nonpublic and charter schools. The *Persons Affected and Costs*

reports no known costs and names only "Iowans seeking to protect students" as affected. It does not mention licensed educators, who would bear the cost of defending multiple complaints at once and Board-directed complaints having none of the limitations and qualifications in the current rule. The *Costs to the State* account for none of the additional resources required of the State to process the additional complaints filed under the proposed rule (investigator, assistant attorney general, and administrative law judge and hearing time) or the costs and harm born by the licensee in the form of reputational harm, emotional distress, and litigation costs. Because the public, reading RA 26-285, would have had no notice that the Board's own complaint authority was at issue, the Board cannot "consider fully" public submissions under Iowa Code section 17A.4(1)(b) on a record that never identified the issue. At a minimum, the Board must engage in and publish a new regulatory analysis that addresses it directly.

Board-directed Complaints Conflict with the Personal-Knowledge Requirement

The General Assembly directed the Board to adopt rules requiring specificity in written complaints "filed by individuals who have personal knowledge" of an alleged violation. Iowa Code § 256.146(14)(a). The Board's rules carry this out: a complaint must be filed by a person with personal knowledge, and it must explain the basis of that knowledge. 282—IAC 11.3(4), 11.4(2)(a), 11.4(2)(c)(4).

The executive director's current authority is a narrow exception that respects this mandate, because verification against official records stands in for first-hand knowledge. A complaint filed "at the direction of the board" has no such substitute. It could rest on whatever reached the Board: a news story, a social media post, or an anonymous tip. That is the kind of unfair process section 256.146(14)(a) was written to prevent.

Section 256.146(4) Requires Conditions and RA 26-285 Provide None

Section 256.146(4) directs the Board to designate who may initiate disciplinary investigations and proceedings, who shall prosecute them, "and under what conditions." Current Rule 11.4(1)(f) meets that duty with three concrete conditions. "At the direction of the board" states no condition at all. If the

General Assembly had intended the Board itself to initiate a complaint, it would have said so. A single of example of this is in Section 256.160 (Board "shall review the information reported to determine whether a complaint should be initiated" after a mandatory report).

A Board that Directs a Complaint Cannot Fairly Decide It

Iowa's Administrative Procedure Act provides that a person who participates in making a proposed or final decision in a contested case "shall not have personally investigated, prosecuted, or advocated in connection with that case." Iowa Code § 17A.17(8). The only exception covers a person who "determined there was probable cause to initiate the proceeding." *Id.*

Directing that a complaint be filed is not a probable cause determination. It happens before any complaint exists, before any investigation, and before the educator has notice or a chance to respond. A Board member who votes to have the executive director accuse a licensee has taken the role of an advocate. Under the amendment, that same Board would then decide whether probable cause exists (11.6) and what discipline to impose (11.33). The Board cannot at once be the complainant, a "partisan advocate", and the "neutral decision-maker." *Botsko v. Davenport Civil Rights Comm'n*, 774 N.W.2d 841, 851 (Iowa 2009)

Duplicate Complaints Diminish Statutory Protections and Drain Resources Unnecessarily

Section 256.146(14)(a) requires rules allowing the parties to resolve a complaint by mutual agreement, and rule 11.4(4) lets complainants withdraw or settle except in mandatory-report cases. A parallel complaint filed by the executive director on the same facts could nullify that right.

Investigations are limited to the allegations on the face of the complaint. Iowa Code § 256.146(14)(a); 282—IAC 11.5. A second complaint by the executive director could add allegations to the original complainant never made, expanding an investigation the General Assembly deliberately confined.

A complaint must be filed within three years of the conduct or its "discovery of the conduct by the complainant." 282—IAC 11.3(5). If the executive director becomes the complainant at the Board's direction, the discovery date could

become whenever the Board learned of the matter, overcoming the three-year limitation.

The "no other complaint" condition has been part of the rule since at least 2007. The Board readopted it through ARC 8810C, effective February 26, 2025. The Regulatory Analysis identifies no problem with the current condition. Existing pathways remain available: mandatory reports and Board review under section 256.160, complaints by Department of Education employees, and complaints by districts, parents, practitioners, and professional organizations.

Every duplicate or Board-directed complaint draws on the same investigators, assistant attorneys general, and hearing time needed for cases involving student safety. Expanding the docket without expanding resources makes it harder, not easier, to act quickly where it matters most.

An educator facing two complaints on the same facts must answer two sets of allegations, respond to two investigations, and pay for counsel through both. A finding of probable cause becomes public under Iowa Code § 256.146(14)(c), so a Board-directed complaint carries reputational harm long before any decision on the merits. The prospect that the Board can generate complaints on its own initiative will make it harder for Iowa schools to recruit and keep educators.

The Board must resolve complaints within 180 days unless good cause is shown. Iowa Code § 256.146(14)(a); 282—IAC 11.4(8). Every duplicate or Board-directed complaint draws on the same investigators, assistant attorneys general, and hearing time needed for cases involving student safety. Expanding the docket without expanding resources makes it harder, not easier, to act quickly where it matters most.

Many concerns are properly addressed by districts, parents, and educators at the local level, and rule 11.6(3)(d) directs the Board to weigh whether adequate local steps have been taken. Many concerns are properly addressed by districts, parents, and educators at the local level. If the Board can overcome any local outcome with its own complaint, those resolutions lose their value. Other complainants also lose control over their own complaint because the Board's parallel complaint may override whatever they might decide.

ISEA Iowa State Education Association

RA 26-285 Invites Politicized Complaints

The Board's role in generating complaints is already the subject of federal litigation. In *Mejia v. Iowa Board of Educational Examiners*, No. 4:26-cv-00020 (S.D. Iowa, filed Jan. 9, 2026), two educators allege that the executive director's September 2025 letter to superintendents, encouraging complaints over educators' comments about the assassination of Charlie Kirk, amounted to viewpoint discrimination and retaliation.

On February 23, 2026, Chief Judge Stephanie Rose abstained and declined to halt the Board's proceedings. She nonetheless described the record as, at minimum, "deeply troubling," citing the letter's timing, statewide reach, and viewpoint-specific framing. The damages claims against the executive director are stayed while the Board's proceedings continue.

Under the current rule, the executive director has no authority to file complaints of that kind directly. Under the broadest reading of the amendment, the Board could simply direct the executive director to file them.

Conclusion

ISEA appreciates the opportunity to comment on RA 26-285. With great concerns about the proposed rulemaking, ISEA respectfully asks the Board to withdraw the proposed amendment of Rule 11.4(1)(f) and retain subparagraph (3) as it reads today: "No other complaint has been filed." If the Board believes a specific gap exists, we encourage the Board to propose narrowly drafted language aimed at that gap, staying within the eight listed categories, requiring verification through official records, requiring a recorded vote in open session with written reasons, and keeping the decision to file separate from the decision on the merits. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Coy Marquardt, Executive Director

Christy Hickman, General Counsel