

VIRGINIA COMMISSION ON YOUTH

October 20, 2014

1:00 p.m.

House Room C

MINUTES

Attending:

Delegates Christopher Peace, Mayme E. BaCote, Richard P. Bell
Senators Barbara Favola, Dave W. Marsden, Stephen Martin
Citizen members Deirdre Goldsmith

Attending Electronically:

Delegate Mark Keam

Not Attending:

Delegates Peter F. Farrell
Citizen members Charles Slemp, Frank Royal

Staff Attending

Amy Atkinson, Kevin Cottingham (intern), Will Egen, Leah Mills, Chad Starzer

I. Call to Order and Opening Remarks

Delegate Christopher K. Peace, Chair

Delegate Peace welcomed everyone to the meeting. Delegate Peace asked that the members introduce themselves and noted that Delegate Keam was participating electronically. He then introduced the Commission's new part-time staff person, Chad Starzer. Chad will be helping update the Commission's *Collection of Evidence-based Practices for Children and Adolescents with Mental Health Treatment Needs*. Chad is a graduate of Allegheny College with a Bachelor of Arts in Psychology with a minor in Communication Arts. Since graduating, Chad joined the Virginia Army National Guard and attended Basic Combat Training, with an emphasis placed on attention to detail, teamwork, and performing specific jobs in an efficient and timely manner.

Delegate Peace stated that the Virginia House of Delegates recently conducted a special signing ceremony for the Virginia Committee of Employer Support of the Guard and Reserve (ESGR). Members of the House of Delegates signed Statements of Support for the ESGR, pledging to recognize, honor, and enforce the Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act. The ESGR is a public declaration by an employer to recognize and protect the rights of National Guard and Reserve members when they must take leave from civilian employment in order to fulfill their service in the military.

The ESGR was formed in 1972 as an office of the Department of Defense with the mission of promoting cooperation and understanding between Reserve Component Service members and their civilian employers and to assist in the resolution of conflicts arising from an employee's military commitment.

II. Study – Unlawful Adoption of a Child

Will Egen, Legal Policy Analyst

Virginia Commission on Youth

Delegate Peace stated that the Commission received a request from the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice during the 2014 Session to study the subject matter contained in Senate Bill 411 dealing with unlawful adoption of a child. The bill's patron was Senator McWaters. The Commission studied this issue over the past several months and uncovered a number of concerns regarding many of the possible recommendations that stem from the original intent of the bill. One such issue was the lack of available data on the prevalence of this issue. Delegate Peace stated that the Commission follows the rule of "do no harm" and always considers the best interest of the child. There are potential negative implications in offering recommendations that could adversely affect:

- Parental rights;
- The Commission's previous work on kinship care – which is seen as a diversion from foster care; and
- Criminalization of good parents by changing the definition of an abandoned child.

The Commission, however, has identified a number of potential positive outcomes to address prevention services. Delegate Peace introduced the Commission's Legal Policy Analyst, Will Egen, and noted that he would be presenting on the Commission's findings and recommendations that focus on the post-adoptive piece.

Mr. Egen provided an overview of the study. He stated that SB 411 provided that any parent guardian or other person responsible for the care of a child who transfers physical and legal custody of a child with the intent to do so permanently without following established adoption procedures is guilty of a Class 6 felony. The bill was reviewed by the Senate Courts of Justice Committee and sent to the Commission for further study. Staff completed a number of study activities from interviewing impacted stakeholders, reviewing policies of other states, and reviewing federal legislation. He stated that this issue originated from an investigation conducted by Reuters in 2013 about the practice of "re-homing". The 2013 Reuters investigation shed light on the practice where parents who no longer wanted their adopted child gave them to another parent without going through the proper adoption process. Instead, these parents used a power of attorney. These children are extremely vulnerable and are at great risk for human trafficking and abuse. Currently, there is no legislation to unequivocally protect children from re-homing as the practice is not explicitly prohibited by Virginia law. The only law with minimal relevance to this practice is §18.2-371.1 of the *Code of Virginia*. This statute charges a Class 4 felony for any parent, or guardian, either by willful act or omission, causes or permits serious injury to the child and/or a Class 6 felony for any parent or guardian whose willful act or omission in the care of a child was so gross, wanton, and culpable as to show reckless disregard for human life.

A lawful disrupted or dissolved adoption can happen at the request of the adoptive parents but the placement of the adopted child occurs through a formal or recognized state processes. A disrupted adoption is never finalized whereas a dissolved adoption is finalized.

Mr. Egen stated that re-homing occurs without state oversight; thus, the fitness of the new adoptive parents cannot be established. Additionally, the child's well-being, or lack thereof, cannot be observed. Re-homing arrangements can be made through websites like Yahoo, Craigslist, and Facebook. Without the involvement of the state or a recognized child-placing agency, there is no assurance that a background check or home study will be conducted, nor is there any other verification of the fitness of the new family.

Mr. Egen stated that two relevant child abuse statutes in the Code were identified. In § 371.1 of the Code of Virginia, a parent or guardian act that causes injury to the life or health of such child is guilty of a felony. Mr. Egen also discussed the Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children (ICPC). The ICPC is a uniform law that sets procedures for the placement of children from state to state. Re-homing practice can violate ICPC and the Reuters study found not all law enforcement officials were aware of ICPC.

Mr. Egen stated that the Reuters article gave a number of examples of foreign adoptions gone awry. Many parents can be misinformed regarding the emotional or physical well-being of the adoptive child and remain unaware of the child's special needs at the time of adoption. These same parents also fail to pursue post-adoptive services because they are unaware of their options and fear if they contact authorities, they will be investigated for abuse and neglect.

Mr. Egen then discussed potential limitations to amending the abuse and neglect definitions of children. The definition is confined to willful acts permitting serious injury to a child's life or an act indicating reckless disregard. A bad re-homing would not necessarily trigger this statute. Moreover, there is also a lack of data in terms of laws. The Reuters study was posted only a year ago and only a few states have responded with laws. The Administration for Children and Families (ACF) under the Department of Health and Human Services issued a memorandum on this subject in May 2014. The ACF memorandum addressed many of these identified issues. The memorandum also emphasized developing and providing a continuum of post adoption services for domestic and international adoptive families.

Mr. Egen also noted that kinship care arrangements could potentially be impacted by re-homing legislation in Virginia. Mr. Egen also stated that Kinship care is the least restrictive and most family-like setting for children requiring out-of-home placement. Like other states, Virginia has increasingly turned to kinship care as a viable placement option for children when the family is in crisis. Kinship care typically occurs when local departments of social services facilitate the placement of a child with relatives to prevent a foster care placement when the child cannot remain with their parents. Kinship care is a valuable arrangement because it encourages family involvement, something extraordinarily positive that the Commission does not wish to undermine.

Accordingly, the Commission's findings focus on prevention services, specifically post-adoptive services. Post-adoptive services are provided through the Department of Social Services' grants. United Methodist Family Services manages and provides for the statewide services delivery of the Adoptive Family Preservation (AFP) network. He reviewed four draft recommendations for the Commission's consideration. These draft recommendations are outlined on the following page.

Draft Recommendations – Prevention Services

1. Amend the *Code of Virginia* to require the State Registrar to furnish a document, to be compiled and annually reviewed by the Department of Social Services, listing post-adoptive services available to all adoptive families simultaneous to when any new birth certificate is issued due to adoption. Also, to make this information available on the DSS website.
2. Request the Department of Social Services, with the support of the Office of Comprehensive Services for At-Risk Youth and Families, to allow regional requests for proposals rather than statewide requests for proposals for post-adoptive services.
3. Support the current funding level for post-adoptive services.
4. Request the Department of Social Services with the support of the Office of Comprehensive Services for At-Risk Youth and Families, to review existing policies and practices related to early prevention services. A report will be submitted to COY prior to the 2016 General Assembly Session.

Senator Martin asked Mr. Egen about the lack of state oversight for re-homing. Delegate Peace stated that it might be appropriate for another recommendation be included to support pursuing additional adoptive funding. Senator Favola concurred and noted that the budget language included in the 2014-2016 Appropriations Act directing the Department of Social Services to amend the Commonwealth's state plan on foster care to include the provisions of the federal Foster Connections to Success and Increasing Adoptions Act of 2008, which would extend foster care and adoption assistance until the age of 21. The members agreed that the Commission would include this in the recommendations and asked that staff draft a letter of support.

Delegate Peace thanked Mr. Egen for the information he provided. He stated that the Commission would receive public comment on the draft recommendations and that instructions would be posted on the Commission's website.

III. Study on the Use of Restraint and Seclusion by Schools

Leah Mills, Senior Policy Analyst

Delegate Peace stated that, during the 2014 General Assembly Session, the Commission was directed to review statewide policies and regulations related to seclusion and restraint in public and private elementary and secondary schools; and to review methods used in other states to reduce and eliminate the use of seclusion and restraint in public and private elementary and secondary schools. At the Commission's September meeting, Leah Mills and the Commission's legal intern, Kevin Cottingham, gave an overview of the study activities and presented draft findings and recommendations. Following the September meeting, the Commission accepted public comment on the draft recommendations and Commission staff completed the outstanding stakeholder interviews. He introduced Ms. Mills and asked her to present the additional information on the study. Later in the meeting, the Commission would receive public comment. The Commission would vote on the draft recommendations at the next Commission meeting scheduled for November 17.

Ms. Mills reviewed the study mandate, identified issues, and study activities. Ms. Mills stated that, as part of the study plan, staff analyzed this issue over the past several

months, conducting site visits and stakeholder interviews with representatives from agencies and organizations with expertise and/or special interest in this topic. Commission staff has also conducted an extensive literature review and analyzed state and federal laws and regulations. Ms. Mills highlighted the provisions in the Virginia School Boards Association's (VESPA) Policy, the 2009 Virginia Department of Education Guidelines, and the Proposed Regulations for Private Day Schools. National trends and other states' laws were also highlighted.

Ms. Mills then highlighted the survey findings. In September, responses were received from 99 school divisions at the time of the meeting. Since the last Commission meeting, 15 additional responses have been received. As of October 13, 2014, 114 of 134 school divisions responded to the survey. The survey revealed that:

- 78 school divisions utilize the VSBA Policy on Restraint and Seclusion;
- 9 have a separate school policy (non-VSBA) on Restraint and Seclusion; and
- 27 school divisions have no policy on seclusion and restraint.

Ms. Mills stated that, of these 27, two divisions were drafting a policy, one had documented procedures in place, and three school divisions stated that seclusion and restraint were not utilized.

Ms. Mills reviewed findings from additional stakeholder interviews. Family members and advocacy organizations noted that Virginia's reliance upon guidelines means that there is discretion in handling incidents pertaining to the use of seclusion and restraint. The Guidelines recommend training for staff and notifying parents after restraint or seclusion has been utilized, but there is no enforcement of these provisions. During interviews with school officials, concerns were raised regarding the need for flexibility. The majority of students attending Virginia's public schools are in the general education population and do not receive special education services pursuant to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). School officials commented that any recommendation adopted by the Commission should not be a "one-size-fits-all" approach. The facility specifications of a public school with campus-style architecture are very different from many private school settings. Moreover, the emotional and physical developmental differences of students attending primary versus secondary schools must also be considered.

Ms. Mills informed the Commission that school officials' communicated to staff that their primary goal was to protect the safety of the students as well as that of educators/administrators/staff. Schools are increasingly confronted with youth who exhibit challenging behaviors. For example, if it is mandated that training is required for all staff prior to use of restraint, school officials may hesitate intervening when there is a need to restrain a student for safety reasons (e.g., to break up a fight in the cafeteria). Schools also lack funding to train school personnel in costly proprietary crisis intervention and de-escalation techniques.

Delegate Peace requested that Ms. Mills brief the members on the draft findings and recommendations. She reviewed each finding and recommendation and highlighted the comments submitted to the Commission for each of the draft recommendations. She noted that a potential revision was included for the members' consideration for Recommendation 1 – Regulate the Use of Seclusion and Restraint in Virginia's Public Schools. This potential revision was formulated based upon concerns expressed during stakeholder interviews.

The draft recommendations are outlined below.

Draft Recommendation – Finalize the Proposed Regulations Governing the Operation of Private Day Schools for Students with Disabilities

1. Request that the Governor finalize Virginia’s Proposed Regulations Governing the Operation of Private Day Schools for Students with Disabilities.

Draft Recommendations – Regulate the Use of Seclusion and Restraint in Virginia’s Public Schools

1. Introduce legislation requiring the Board of Education to promulgate regulations on the use of seclusion and restraint in Virginia’s public schools. These regulations will be consistent with the 2009 DOE Guidelines and the U.S. DOE 15 Principles on Seclusion & Restraint and address definitions, criteria for use, restrictions for use, training, notification requirements, reporting, and follow-up.

Potential revision to Recommendation 1:

Introduce legislation requiring the BOE to promulgate regulations on the use of seclusion and restraint in Virginia’s public schools. These regulations will incorporate the 2009 DOE Guidelines and the U.S. DOE 15 Principles on Seclusion & Restraint and address definitions, criteria for use, restrictions for use, training, notification requirements, reporting, and follow-up. The regulations will also address the diverse population of students in the public school setting including students in the general education and special education populations and distinctions between primary and secondary schools including the students’ emotional and physical developmental differences.

-or-

2. Request BOE promulgate regulations on the use of seclusion and restraint in Virginia’s public schools. These regulations will be consistent with the 2009 DOE Guidelines and the U.S. DOE 15 Principles on Seclusion & Restraint. These regulations will address definitions, criteria for use, restrictions for use, training, notification requirements, reporting, and follow-up.

-or-

3. Introduce legislation for the Board of Education to establish guidelines and model policies for the use of seclusion and restraint in Virginia’s public schools. The guidelines and model policies shall include definitions, criteria for use, restrictions for use, training, notification requirements, reporting, and follow-up. School boards shall adopt and revise policies on the use of seclusion and restraint consistent with, but may be more stringent than, the guidelines of the Board of Education.

-or-

4. Introduce legislation requiring local school boards to establish guidelines and model policies for the use of seclusion and restraint in Virginia’s public schools.

Draft Recommendations – Encourage Training Efforts

1. Support DCJS efforts in training appropriate parties, including SROs and SSOs, in student development, de-escalation, and conflict mediation in the school setting.
2. Request DOE support local school divisions by providing resources and training on research-based appropriate behavioral management, prevention, de-escalation techniques to reduce the use of seclusion and restraint.

As noted on the agenda, public comment followed presentation of the study recommendations. The following individuals offered public comment:

- Alex Campbell discussed his experiences and offered comment in support of Recommendation 1 – Regulate the Use of Seclusion and Restraint in Virginia’s Public Schools.
- Sean Campbell discussed his son’s experiences in school and offered comment in support of Recommendation 1 – Regulate the Use of Seclusion and Restraint in Virginia’s Public Schools. He noted support for the original option, not the potential revision to Recommendation 1.
- Matthew Richardson offered comment detailing his son’s experiences in school and discussed the benefits of positive behavioral reinforcement and the use of quiet rooms. He also expressed his concern that child protective services may not be involved in these cases.
- Thomas Smith spoke on behalf of the Virginia Association of School Superintendents. He expressed support for Recommendation 3, which requires the Board of Education (BOE) to establish guidelines and model policies for the use of seclusion and restraint in Virginia’s public schools and for school boards to adopt/revise consistent policies on the use of seclusion and restraint.
- Jamie Liban spoke on behalf of the Virginia Coalition for Improving School Safety and offered comment in support of Recommendation 1 – Regulate the Use of Seclusion and Restraint in Virginia’s Public Schools.
- Meg Gruber spoke on behalf of the Virginia Education Association. She expressed support for Recommendation 3, which requires the BOE to establish guidelines and model policies for the use of seclusion and restraint in Virginia’s public schools and for school boards to adopt/revise consistent policies on the use of seclusion and restraint. She also commented that it was important that the Commonwealth provide state funding for training efforts.
- Emily Dreyfus spoke on behalf of the Legal Aide Justice Center’s JustChildren Program. She offered comment in support of Recommendation 1 – Regulate the Use of Seclusion and Restraint in Virginia’s Public Schools.
- Jeffrey Carrol with the Virginia Association of Secondary School Principals expressed support for Recommendation 3, which requires the BOE to establish guidelines and model policies for the use of seclusion and restraint in Virginia’s public schools and for school boards to adopt/revise consistent policies on the use of seclusion and restraint.
- Marie Tucker offered comment detailing her child’s experiences in school and discussed her desire that an imminent physical danger standard be included.
- Jessica Leitch offered comment detailing her son’s experiences in school and the need for positive behavioral supports.
- Kathleen Mehfoud spoke on behalf of the Virginia School Boards Association expressed support for Recommendation 3, which requires the BOE to establish

guidelines and model policies for the use of seclusion and restraint in Virginia's public schools and for school boards to adopt/revise consistent policies on the use of seclusion and restraint.

- Jim Baldwin with the Virginia Association of Elementary School Principals expressed support for Recommendation 3, which requires the BOE to establish guidelines and model policies for the use of seclusion and restraint in Virginia's public schools and for school boards to adopt/revise consistent policies on the use of seclusion and restraint.
- Maureen Hollowell with the Virginia Coalition for Students with Disabilities expressed concern about existing notification provisions and the need for positive behavioral interventions and supports.
- Gary Taylor offered comments as a qualified mental health professional. He noted the important role that behavioral health professionals play in coordinating with other professionals regarding the needs of youth with behavioral health needs.

After hearing public comment, Commission members discussed the issues further. Delegate Peace confirmed that the members would vote on the recommendations at the November 17 Commission on Youth meeting.

IV. Early Childhood Education – Workgroup on Quality

Amy Atkinson, Director

Virginia Commission on Youth

Ms. Atkinson discussed the draft findings and recommendations from the Commission's Early Childhood Education Workgroup on Quality. The workgroup met on June 17 at the Capitol. The workgroup agenda included national experts and Virginia speakers to provide information on quality indicators in early childhood education, Virginia's quality improvement initiatives, and program attributes influence quality/outcomes. Ms. Atkinson stated that several potential revisions to the Recommendations, as well as a new Recommendation, were included for the members' consideration. These potential revisions were formulated based upon public comment submitted to the Commission. Ms. Atkinson then presented the draft recommendations, which are outlined below.

Draft Recommendation – Establish a coordinating council to convene stakeholders/decision makers

1. Introduce legislation establishing a statewide early childhood advisory council to improve the quality, availability, and coordination of funding and services for children from birth to school entry. Membership shall include all impacted state agencies, institutions of higher education, local early childhood providers, business representatives, parents, Head Start agencies, the Department of Veteran Services, and members of the Virginia General Assembly. The Council, under the direction of the Secretary of Education shall make recommendations to the Board of Education and the General Assembly on (a) quality early childhood education programming, (b) availability of high-quality early childhood programs, (c) opportunities for and barriers to collaboration and coordination among programs and agencies responsible for early childhood education, and (d) professional development for early childhood educators.

- or -

2. Request the Governor's Commonwealth Council on Childhood Success to assess and make recommendations to improve the quality, availability, and coordination of funding and services for children from birth to school entry.

Draft Recommendation – Build quality by linking training/supports to teachers which emphasize their interactions with children

1. Introduce legislation requiring individuals seeking initial licensure with an endorsement in early childhood/Pre-K education and persons seeking licensure renewal as teachers who have not completed such study to complete coursework in effective teacher-child interactions and social and instructional supports based on evidence-based curriculum guidelines developed by the Board of Education, in consultation with the Department of Social Services, relevant to the specific teacher licensure routes.

Potential revision to Recommendation 1 based on public comment:

Introduce budget amendment/resolution to establish an interagency, cross-sector workgroup with representatives from VDOE, VDSS, VECF, the Virginia Cross Sector Professional Development Network (VCPE), Head Start, Virginia Start Quality Initiative (VSQI) coordinators, providers and other stakeholders to examine the existing professional development opportunities by identifying gaps in services, opportunities to collaborate at the state and local level, and content areas. The workgroup shall make recommendations to the COY and legislature by November 1, 2015 in identifying opportunities for alignment among agencies, ensuring the principles of research-based methods, such as an emphasis on teacher-child interactions, are available and additional resources needed to improve professional development opportunities.

- or -

2. Request VDOE review professional support and in-service training programs for early childhood educators to ensure that such requirements include focus on teacher-child interactions that promote gains in children's social and academic development. Such a review will include the use of technology in delivering professional support and in-service training.

Potential revision to Recommendation 2 based on public comment:

Support linking resources for professional development and quality-improvement initiatives to any legislation seeking to bring Virginia in compliance with forthcoming federal changes or improve safety in early learning settings.

3. Request VDOE/VDSS re-assess licensure requirements to ensure the structural/physical plant requirements are not overemphasized over teacher licensure/training requirements that are proven to enhance quality.
4. Request VDOE review *Virginia's Quality Indicators for Responsive Teaching: Creating a High Quality Preschool Learning Environment* to ensure that quality of teacher-child interactions and social and instructional supports are utilized as core competencies for early childhood educators.

5. Support VDOE's efforts to build capacity with private partners that emphasize hiring teachers with training on the importance of quality teacher-child interactions and social and instructional supports.

Potential revision to Recommendation 5 based on public comment:

Request the Governor's Commonwealth Council on Childhood Success assess and make recommendations on methods to build capacity with private partners that emphasize hiring teachers with training on the importance of quality teacher-child interactions and social and instructional supports.

6. Support the proposed revisions to Virginia's Star Quality Standards, which emphasizes those elements that best demonstrate success such as teacher preparation/professional development versus structural and/or physical plant components.

Draft Recommendation – Improve Access and Quality to the Virginia Preschool Initiative

1. Request the Board of Education to review the funding formula and cost-per-child for VPI and make recommendations to address barriers to access such as local match and facility space to achieve a balance between program quality and easing access for children in all regions across the Commonwealth.

- or -

2. Request the Joint Legislative Audit and Review Commission (JLARC) follow up on the previous study of VPI, review the funding formula and cost-per-child for VPI, and make recommendations to address barriers to access such as local match and facility space to achieve a balance between program quality and easing access for children in all regions across the Commonwealth.

Potential revision to Recommendation 1 based on public comment:

Request JLARC follow up on the previous study of VPI and analyze Virginia's specific programs supported by general funds prenatal to age five.

- or -

3. Direct/Request the Board of Education to develop a quality framework for any childhood program that receives VPI funding.

Potential revision to Recommendation 3 based on public comment:

Recommendation: Request the Board of Education examine how to strengthen and incentivize the local option for VPI partnerships with private providers.

4. Allow private providers that meet the requirements for quality (QRIS and or the Quality Framework described above) to access VPI money.

Draft Recommendation – Improve Awareness of Gaps in Virginia's High-Quality Early Childhood Education Programs

1. Request VDSS, in cooperation with VECF, to map all of the quality ratings for the participating early care programs across the state. Such mapping may help show regional gaps and help communicate the benefits of licensure to providers.

Draft Recommendation – Address the lack of high-quality community-based early childhood education programs for geographically dispersed reserve and active-duty families

1. Request the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and Homeland Security and the Secretary of Public Safety include access to high-quality early childhood education for Virginia’s military families in all efforts seeking to improve services and programs for Virginia’s military families.

Additional Recommendation (Submitted after the Commission’s September 16 meeting)

1. Implement a statewide comprehensive kindergarten assessment led by the University of Virginia, in collaboration with the VDOE, that defines the readiness gap (Virginia’s entering Kindergartners’ readiness skills), tracks readiness across domain areas, longitudinally tracks the progress of students through third grade, reports annually, and determines strategic data-driven investments to address the gap.

As noted on the agenda, public comment followed presentation of the study recommendations. The following individuals offered public comment:

- Barbara Newlin with the Virginia Department of Social Services made note of a typo on the bottom of page 4 through page 5 of the decision matrix and stated that the comment should read, “Virginia does not require child care teachers or program directors (serving children from birth through school-age) to hold a professional teaching license.” Staff noted that they would make that change.
- Karin Bowles with the Virginia Early Childhood Foundation thanked the Commission for convening the workgroup and stated that this was an opportunity to bridge the private and public sectors and that the Foundation was appreciative of these efforts.

Senator Favola stated that the recommendations on VPI might also include removing the 50 percent match requirement and allowing localities to employ in-kind support to access slots so that available slots were not left unused. Many localities also struggle with the per pupil allocation of \$6,000 because their actual per pupil allocation was much higher. She stated that the Commission would want to look at specific recommendations when the members voted. There was consensus regarding the recommendations to work with the Lieutenant Governor’s Commonwealth Council on Childhood Success.

Delegate Peace reminded the members that the next Commission meeting was scheduled for November 17. The members would be voting on the recommendations at this meeting. The final Commission meeting for the 2014 study year would be held December 2 at 2:00 p.m.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 2:58 p.m.