

DOCKET NO. 022-R10-11-2024

PARENT A/N/F STUDENT,	§	BEFORE THE
Petitioner,	§	
	§	
v.	§	COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION
	§	
AUSTIN INDEPENDENT SCHOOL	§	
DISTRICT,	§	
Respondent.	§	THE STATE OF TEXAS

DECISION OF THE COMMISSIONER

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Petitioner is the parent of a student enrolled in Respondent Austin Independent School District's schools. Petitioner appeals from Respondent's school board's September 19, 2024 decision denying Petitioner's grievance about two books and an article used in the student's middle-school class during the 2023–2024 school year. Petitioner asserts that in denying his grievance, the board violated provisions of Texas Education Code section 28.0022. Respondent denies error and asserts that this appeal is moot. Alternatively, Respondent argues that it should be denied on the merits because Respondent has found that the materials at issue are appropriate for middle-school students.

Adrienne Butcher is the Administrative Law Judge assigned by the Commissioner to hear this appeal. Petitioner appears *pro se*. Respondent is represented by its in-house counsel, Kenneth M. Walker II.

This is a case of first impression construing Texas Education Code section 28.0022, which the Legislature enacted in 2021. Because the local record is not sufficiently developed for the Commissioner to resolve the issues raised in this appeal, which as addressed below, the Commissioner finds are not moot, the Commissioner remands this matter to Respondent's school board for additional proceedings consistent with this Decision.

FINDINGS OF FACT

After due consideration of the record and matters officially noticed, I find that the pleadings and record in this case establish the following Findings of Fact:

1. Petitioner is the parent of a student who was enrolled in Respondent's schools during the 2023–2024 school year and who continues to attend Respondent's schools. Petitioner also has another middle-school student enrolled in Respondent's schools.

2. On May 16, 2024, Petitioner filed a grievance complaining that the student's sixth-grade English Language Arts (ELA) class assignments included two novels that the class read aloud and studied over several weeks: *New Kid* by Jerry Craft and *Ghost Boys* by Jewell Parker Rhodes. The ELA class also used a one-day asynchronous assignment based on a July 7, 2020 KUT article, *Schools in Travis County Are Not Just Segregated. They're the Most Segregated in the State*, by Claire McInerney.

3. The two books and the KUT article address issues of racial discrimination and disparity between white and black people. The KUT article addresses historical race-based housing and economic policy discrimination that impacted schools in Travis County, Texas, and its continuing effects on Travis County residents, including reinforcing white students' discriminatory viewpoints. *New Kid* addresses racial bias and discriminatory treatment, including differential enforcement of school discipline practices, of black people by white people. *Ghost Boys* addresses racial discrimination and police violence against black people, including black children.

4. In his grievance, Petitioner complained that these materials negatively portray white people and that the KUT article portrays them as systemically entitled and racist.¹ For relief in his grievance, Petitioner asked that Respondent

cease assigning *New Kid*, *Ghost Boys*, and the KUT article as required reading for students. Apologize to the students and admit to them and parents that the school has engaged in discriminatory behavior toward whites in violation of federal and state law forbidding racially discriminatory lessons. Training for teachers to prevent them from assigning such discriminatory and illegal lessons to children.

5. The student's campus principal served as the Level 1 hearing officer. She partially granted the Level 1 grievance by granting Petitioner's request to stop assigning the books as

¹ Petitioner takes particular issue with an "equity expert" quoted in the KUT article who critiqued historic segregation in Austin, Texas, and its impact as giving white students a false sense of inherent superiority, based in part on their overrepresentation in advanced placement classes.

required reading but noted that the campus would continue to offer them to students as course reading options. The principal also granted relief regarding the KUT article, stating that it would not be used in the future as an asynchronous assignment without first ensuring proper introduction and discussion by the teacher. Finally, she granted Petitioner's request to provide training to teachers to prevent assignment of discriminatory lessons. Regarding Petitioner's request for an apology, she apologized for the impact Petitioner asserted the materials had on the student but also noted that the books served a literary purpose, that "[e]xamining the middle school experiences of African American characters is appropriate," and that Respondent's Director of Humanities found the books age-appropriate and suitable for sixth-grade ELA.

6. Petitioner filed a Level 2 appeal, stating as his grounds,

The resolution failed to recognize the racially discriminatory nature of the ELA reading assignments. There was no acknowledgment of the inappropriateness of the lessons, no curative action taken for the students who have been taught these discriminatory lessons, no guarantees these lessons would not continue to be taught, and the training for the teachers seems overly broad and not tailored to address this issue.

7. After a hearing, the Level 2 officer, Respondent's Director of Secondary Humanities, issued a decision both granting and denying relief. She found that the materials at issue complied with Respondent's Policy EF (Local)'s resource selection standards and noted that the right to challenge a resource extends only to a parent's own child. She provided that the campus administration would develop a process to share novel assignment ideas and Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS) connections with parents before assigning novels for study. She denied the requested relief of an apology and announcement that the school had engaged in discriminatory conduct. Finally, she granted Petitioner's request for teacher training, noting that campus staff had upcoming training on House Bill 3979 and Senate Bill 3 and that follow-up training would be provided as needed.

8. Petitioner appealed to Level 3, stating as his grounds,

The resolution failed to recognize the racially discriminatory nature of the ELA reading assignments. There was no acknowledgment of the inappropriateness of the lessons, no curative action taken for the students who have been taught these discriminatory lessons, no guarantees these lessons would not continue to be taught. They continue to endorse the course material that, for example, teaches children to

be afraid of white people, that white people are violent, and that white people are “psychopathic” white supremacists for taking AP classes and moving to better schools. This course material is racially discriminatory in violation of the Civil Rights Act and the Texas Education Code.

9. Petitioner presented his appeal to the board in a September 19, 2024 special session. Respondent’s board unanimously affirmed the Level 2 decision.

10. Petitioner timely appealed to the Commissioner of Education. After a prehearing conference on mootness, the parties submitted briefs. The Administrative Law Judge issued a Proposal for Decision. Petitioner filed exceptions, and Respondent filed a response to Petitioner’s exceptions. All filings were considered, and this Decision has been modified.

DISCUSSION

Mootness

Respondent argues that this appeal is moot. Mootness is a component of subject matter jurisdiction. In addressing whether a case is moot, the question is whether a real, live controversy exists that the requested relief can resolve. *See Alphonso Crutch Life Support Ctr., Inc. v. Morath*, No. 03-15-00509-CV, 2016 LEXIS 9923, at *7–8 (Tex. App.—Austin Sept. 7, 2016, pet. denied) (mem. op.); *In re Kellogg Brown & Root, Inc.*, 166 S.W.3d 732, 737 (Tex. 2005) (“A case becomes moot if a controversy ceases to exist between the parties at any stage of the legal proceedings, *including the appeal.*” (emphasis added)); *Empower Texans, Inc. v. Tex. Ethics Comm’n*, No. 03-16-00872, 2018 Tex. App. LEXIS 6072, at *5–6 (Tex. App.—Austin Aug. 3, 2018, no pet.) (mem. op.). A case becomes moot when (1) it appears that one seeks to obtain a judgment on some controversy when none exists or (2) when one seeks judgment on some matter which, then rendered for any reason, cannot have a practical legal effect on a then-existing controversy. *See Morath*, 2016 Tex. App. LEXIS 9923, at *7. When this occurs, even if the party originally had standing to bring the claim, the party loses standing to maintain it, and the claim is subject to dismissal. *Id.*

Respondent argues that no controversy remains that the Commissioner can resolve and that instead, all that remains is the parties’ disagreement about whether the class materials were discriminatory against white people in violation of Texas Education Code section 28.0022. In

response, Petitioner argues that this appeal is not moot because Respondent only partially granted his requested relief and denied his request that it acknowledge that the materials were discriminatory, which leaves the materials open to reassignment to Respondent's students, whether as required or optional class reading material.

Although Respondent partially granted Petitioner's requested relief in his grievance by agreeing that the complained-of materials would not presently be *required* class reading and by pointing Petitioner to his parental right to opt his students out of specific course materials, Respondent also denied that including the materials in the sixth-grade ELA course violates state law and stated that they are appropriate reading materials that it continues to maintain as optional class reading materials. Petitioner asserts that he has another student in Respondent's school district who now attends the same school.² He also argues that Respondent's continued inclusion of some or all of these materials in its ELA curriculum, even as optional materials, causes racial tension and confrontation among students.

The question of whether the books and article, as presented to students, violated section 28.0022 is unresolved, and the Commissioner can address the parties' disagreement on these issues.³ Therefore, the Commissioner finds that Petitioner's appeal is not moot.

Texas Education Code section 28.0022

Petitioner argues that by denying his grievance, the board violated Texas Education Code section 28.0022, which provides, in relevant part,

- (a) For any course or subject, including an innovative course, for a grade level from kindergarten through grade 12:
 - (1) A teacher may not be compelled to discuss a widely debated and currently controversial issue of public policy or social affairs;
 - (2) A teacher who chooses to discuss a topic described by Subdivision (1) shall explore that topic objectively and in a manner free from political bias.

...

² Petitioner referenced another alleged problematic assignment from 2025 in his brief. However, that assignment is not part of this appeal of the board's decision before the Commissioner.

³ Although the Commissioner has jurisdiction to address the issues raised in this appeal, for the reasons below, their resolution requires remand to Respondent's board for further findings and development of the local record.

(4) a teacher, administrator, or other employee of a state agency, school district, or open-enrollment charter school may not:

(A) require or make part of a course inculcation in the concept that:

(i) one race or sex is inherently superior to another race or sex;

(ii) an individual, by virtue of the individual's race or sex, is inherently racist, sexist, or oppressive, whether consciously or unconsciously;

(iii) an individual should be discriminated against or receive adverse treatment solely or partly because of the individual's race or sex;

(iv) an individual's moral character, standing, or worth is necessarily determined by the individual's race or sex;

(v) an individual, by virtue of the individual's race or sex, bears responsibility, blame, or guilt for actions committed by other members of the same race or sex.

Tex. Educ. Code § 28.0022(a)(1), (2), (4). Subsections (1) and (2) are addressed together below, followed by subsection (4).

Subsection 28.0022(a)(1)

The Commissioner finds that facially, content that argues that current government policies in United States jurisdictions, including policing practices, school enrollment policies, and student discipline policies, reinforce racial inequality (which, it should be noted, is distinct from content that argues that current human behavior absent government policy support can be racially discriminatory) is a widely debated and currently controversial issue of public policy or social affairs. The materials here seem to meet that criteria. Assuming they do, the next consideration is whether the TEKS include these issues or materials as required curriculum, which under section 28.0022(e) would permit their discussion in the course.⁴ The course here is sixth-grade English Language Arts, the TEKS for which are contained in the Texas Administrative Code Title 19, section 110.22. The applicable TEKS include seven integrated ELA “strands,” or core focus areas: developing skills in (1) foundational language and literacy; (2) reading comprehension and response; (3) literary elements and analysis; (4) writing; (5) research and inquiry; (6) listening,

⁴ For example, the high school social studies TEKS include an ethnic course for African American Studies that includes having students identify both the historical and continuing socioeconomic and other challenges confronting African Americans through the present. *See* 19 Tex. Admin. Code § 113.51(c)(6), (8), (12), (15).

speaking, and discussion; and (7) multimodal and media literacy. *See* 19 Tex. Admin. Code § 110.22. No strand or student expectation in sixth-grade ELA requires introduction of the specific subject issues or materials. Absent ELA TEKS, if other TEKS in the same grade level include the issues or materials as required curriculum, that would similarly support their inclusion as part of a cross-curricular implementation. There are TEKS specified for sixth-grade in Science, Social Studies, Math (including Personal Financial Literacy), Languages Other than English, Health, Physical Education, Fine Arts, Technology Applications, and Positive Character Traits.⁵ None of these appear to include a reference to the issues or materials included here, so no TEKS exception appears to apply.

If the course materials present widely debated and currently controversial issues not required for the course by the TEKS, the next question is whether Respondent “compelled” its teachers to discuss them, which would violate section 28.0022(a)(1). Petitioner argues that because the same books were taught across “multiple Sixth Grade classrooms by multiple teachers,” the teachers were either explicitly or impliedly required to use the same materials. Requiring grade-level teachers to coordinate use of particular materials in a course or subject, when those materials are not TEKS-required and present widely debated and currently controversial issues of public policy or social affairs, would compel teachers to discuss them in violation of section 28.0022(a)(1). Encouraging teachers to choose reading materials from a list approved by the school district, either centrally or at the campus level, could rise to the definition of being “compelled.” That would depend on other practices or policies at the district or campus level, including the requirement that a grade level team select materials to use in common. The record that Respondent filed with the Commissioner is insufficient to make a determination as to whether these materials and topics were compelled.

The materials at issue, which Respondent continues to include in its ELA courses as optional reading materials and by implication a teacher could be compelled to use again, implicate

⁵ As of the date of this Decision, the State Board of Education has not adopted any TEKS for the required curriculum category of Religious Literature.

subsection (a)(1) and are not materials that the sixth-grade TEKS appear to require. The uniformity of the content offered through the sixth grade at the student's campus strongly suggests that teachers were compelled to teach that content. Accordingly, this case is remanded to Respondent's board for further findings. On remand, the board must address whether teachers are compelled to discuss widely debated and currently controversial issues of public policy or social affairs through its sixth-grade ELA curriculum, on this campus or district wide. In doing so, the board must consider evidence developed at the local level on that issue and supplement the record, if necessary, to make specific findings on it.

Subsection 28.0022(a)(2)

If section 28.0022(a)(1) is *not* violated, the next inquiry is whether Respondent violated subsection 28.0022(a)(2), as Petitioner claims. Under subsection (a)(2), a teacher who *chooses* to discuss a topic in subsection (a)(1)—in other words, who is not compelled but elects to discuss a widely debated and currently controversial issue of public policy or social affairs—must do so objectively and in a manner free from political bias. If a teacher violates this statute, such as by introducing a subsection (a)(1) issue in a politically biased manner, a school board must take appropriate corrective action to avoid violating section 28.0022(a)(2).

Petitioner complains that the student's teacher required the student's class to read *Ghost Boys* and *New Kid* aloud in class over several weeks, which led to confrontations and negative statements between students about white people generally. Respondent took partial remedial action in response to Petitioner's grievance by assuring Petitioner that the books would not be required reading on the student's campus. However, at the same time, it maintained that the materials were appropriate for students and would remain reading options at that campus and throughout the district. Petitioner therefore complains that he has no assurances that Respondent will not reintroduce the materials as required reading. He also argues that, notwithstanding his parental opt-out right from these materials, the student still faces indirect harm, as classmates continue to access the subject materials for class assignments, perpetuating bias and misperceptions against white people and encouraging interracial hostility and race-based shame.

Although school district teachers *may* address issues that are widely debated or currently controversial issues of public policy or social affairs (again, assuming they are not compelled to do so where these are not required by the TEKS), the Legislature has required that they must do so “objectively and in a manner free from political bias.” That requirement means that school boards must examine the teacher selection or delivery of course content for which section 28.0022(a) applies and make findings as to whether the materials present the widely debated or currently controversial issue in an objective manner and without political bias.

One pedagogical practice that teachers have used is to initially present students with one-sided content on a topic, followed by lessons or units presenting the other side. This dichotomy ensures that students develop the skills to objectively analyze complex topics. But if a course includes, as alleged here, three works on an issue subject to section 28.0022(a)(1), which the teacher chose and was not compelled to discuss, and there is no countervailing content, the teacher would appear to have repeatedly presented only one side or perspective of the controversy. Here, without any countervailing evidence to show the teacher explored the topic objectively and without political bias, the teacher likely violated section 28.0022(a)(2)’s objectivity standard. In that case, the board must take corrective action by either prohibiting the materials from optional use by teachers in the course and/or by otherwise ensuring that the teachers reaches objectivity in the course, including, where appropriate, through disciplinary action. Whether the objectivity standard was violated here requires analysis of the reading materials themselves, as well as the lesson plans and student activities associated with the materials, and possibly an analysis of related lessons in the unit in the course. Ultimately, the board must determine whether the teacher presented content subject to section 28.0022(a)(1) objectively and free from political bias.

As none of the course materials at issue are part of the local record, and Respondent’s current curriculum is also not in the record, the remaining analysis of whether the board correctly denied Petitioner’s appeal or violated Texas Education Code section 28.0022(a) requires additional record development and board findings. Accordingly, the Commissioner remands this matter to Respondent’s board to make specific findings on the following questions:

A. Regarding Texas Education Code section 28.0022(a)(1):

- (1) Whether Respondent's sixth-grade course presented widely debated and currently controversial issues of public policy or social affairs and, if so, whether the sixth-grade TEKS require these materials to be discussed as part of the course, with an explanation of the board's finding; and
- (2) If the materials present widely debated and currently controversial issues not required for the course by the TEKS, whether Respondent compels teachers to discuss those issues, with an explanation of the board's finding.

B. Regarding Texas Education Code section 28.0022(a)(2):

If the teacher was not compelled to discuss an issue subject to subsection (a)(1) but chose to do so, whether the teacher presented the materials to students in an objective manner and free from political bias, with an explanation of the board's finding.

Subsection 28.0022(a)(4)

Petitioner also argues that the course materials at issue violate section 28.0022(a)(4)(A), which precludes school districts from requiring or inculcating in a course the concept that:

- (i) one race or sex is inherently superior to another race or sex;
- (ii) an individual, by virtue of the individual's race or sex, is inherently racist, sexist, or oppressive, whether consciously or unconsciously;
- (iii) an individual should be discriminated against or receive adverse treatment solely or partly because of the individual's race or sex;
- (iv) an individual's moral character, standing, or worth is necessarily determined by the individual's race or sex;
- (v) an individual, by virtue of the individual's race or sex, bears responsibility, blame, or guilt for actions committed by other members of the same race or sex.

Tex. Educ. Code § 28.0022(a)(4)(A).

For this issue, Petitioner points to *Ghost Boys*, a book about black youth killed by white police officers or similar racial violence and whose protagonist is the ghost of one such boy.⁶ The book's theme addresses racial bias that is based on at least two actual events. While Petitioner clarifies that he does not object overall to books that address race, he objects to *Ghost Boys* because, in his view, it suggests that all white people are threats to black people, misrepresents

⁶ The protagonist interacts with another character, the daughter of the white police officer who shot him, and the daughter experiences guilt and/or remorse about her father's actions.

facts about the events that inspired it,⁷ and promotes misleading statistics, suggesting that police killings of black youth is “commonplace.” He also argues that *Ghost Boys* presents inaccurate or unreliable data.⁸

Middle school ELA teachers may choose (but cannot be compelled absent requirements in the TEKS) to address difficult social themes, including widely debated and currently controversial issues of social affairs that would include discussions of race relations. As grade levels progress, these themes may naturally emerge through novels’ characters’ increasingly complex experiences and perspectives.⁹ That said, exploration of such themes or issues in an ELA class is only permissible under Texas law *if* the teacher presents them in an objective manner and does not introduce section 28.0022(a)(4)(A)’s precluded concepts. Petitioner argues that the course materials Respondent continues to offer inculcate students in the concepts that, *inter alia*, white people have inherent views of racial inferiority and are inherently racist or oppressive. *See* Tex. Educ. Code § 28.0022(a)(4)(A).

The key term here is “inculcate.” Merriam-Webster’s online dictionary defines the term “inculcate” as “to teach and impress by frequent repetitions or admonitions.” *See* <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/inculcate>. This dovetails with section 28.0022(a)(2)’s requirement that a teacher who chooses to introduce materials subject to section 28.0022(a)(1) must do so in an objective manner that is free from political bias. Presenting only one side or perspective about a subject with no corresponding different perspective or view could inculcate students by repeating and thus unilaterally reinforcing the only view of the subject presented to students. If, as Petitioner claims, course materials offered in a sixth-grade ELA class repeatedly create the impression or admonition that white people are inherently racist or oppressive

⁷ Petitioner notes that *Ghost Boys* was inspired by the police shooting of a twelve-year-old black boy, Tamir Rice, but that the book’s protagonist differed in fundamental ways that present a misleading account of what happened to Rice. The book also introduces the ghost of Emmett Till, a black boy killed in 1955 at age fourteen.

⁸ Petitioner asserts that *Ghost Boys* misstates the number of black people killed by police in 2015, which he contrasts with research from the Washington Post.

⁹ For example, *To Kill a Mockingbird* addresses racism, inequality in the justice system, and morality. Similarly, *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* includes themes of racism, stereotypes, slavery, and characters’ internal conflicts about these issues.

or are responsible for other white individuals' actions, while offering no countering perspective, that may violate section 28.0022(a)(4)(A).

As addressed above, the relevant course materials are not in the local record for the Commissioner to review, and the board also did not make specific findings on subsection 28.0022(a)(4). On remand, the board should make findings on whether the materials or delivery of content at issue, in the context of the course, require or make part of the course inculcation in the concept that:

- (i) one race or sex is inherently superior to another race or sex;
- (ii) an individual, by virtue of the individual's race or sex, is inherently racist, sexist, or oppressive, whether consciously or unconsciously;
- (iii) an individual should be discriminated against or receive adverse treatment solely or partly because of the individual's race or sex;
- (iv) an individual's moral character, standing, or worth is necessarily determined by the individual's race or sex;
- (v) an individual, by virtue of the individual's race or sex, bears responsibility, blame, or guilt for actions committed by other members of the same race or sex.

Conclusion

This appeal is remanded to Respondent's school board for additional proceedings consistent with this Decision.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

After due consideration of the record, matters officially noticed, and the foregoing Findings of Fact, in my capacity as Commissioner of Education, I make the following Conclusions of Law.

1. The Commissioner has jurisdiction over this appeal, which asserts a school law violation and is not moot. *See* Tex. Educ. Code § 7.057(a)(2)(A).
2. Content that argues that racial inequality is exacerbated by current public policy of various jurisdictions of the United States is content that meets the standard of being a widely debated and currently controversial issue of public policy or social affairs. Tex. Educ. Code § 28.0022(a)(1).
3. Respondent's school board may have violated Texas Education Code section 28.0022(a)(1) by compelling teachers to teach topics that are widely debated and currently

controversial. However, the local record is not sufficiently developed for the Commissioner to address this issue and, accordingly, is remanded to Respondent's school board for further proceedings.

4. The student's teacher may have violated Texas Education Code section 28.0022(a)(2), which Respondent only partially remedied, and the materials remain part of Respondent's courses. The local record is insufficiently developed for the Commissioner to fully address this issue and, accordingly, is remanded to Respondent's school board for further proceedings.

5. Respondent may have violated Texas Education Code section 28.0022(a)(4) by denying Petitioner's request to remove course materials that inculcated students in the concept that an individual, by virtue of the individual's race or sex, is inherently racist, sexist, or oppressive, whether consciously or unconsciously. The record is not sufficiently developed for the Commissioner to resolve this issue on appeal and, accordingly, is remanded to Respondent's school board for further proceedings.

6. This matter is remanded to Respondent's school board to make the following findings, based on evidence developed at the local level and made part of the record:

Regarding Texas Education Code section 28.0022(a)(1):

- (1) Whether Respondent's sixth-grade course presented widely debated and currently controversial issues and, if so, whether the sixth-grade TEKS require these materials to be discussed as part of the course, with an explanation of the board's finding; and
- (2) If the materials present widely debated and currently controversial issues not required for the course by the TEKS, whether Respondent compels teachers to discuss those issues, with an explanation of the board's finding.

Regarding Texas Education Code section 28.0022(a)(2):

If the teacher was not compelled to discuss an issue subject to subsection (a)(1) but chose to do so, whether the teacher presented the materials to students in an objective manner and free from political bias, with an explanation of the board's finding.

Regarding Texas Education Code Subsection 28.0022(a)(4):

Whether Respondent's sixth-grade course inculcated in the concept that:

- (i) one race or sex is inherently superior to another race or sex;
- (ii) an individual, by virtue of the individual's race or sex, is inherently racist, sexist, or oppressive, whether consciously or unconsciously;
- (iii) an individual should be discriminated against or receive adverse treatment solely or partly because of the individual's race or sex;
- (iv) an individual's moral character, standing, or worth is necessarily determined by the individual's race or sex;
- (v) an individual, by virtue of the individual's race or sex, bears responsibility, blame, or guilt for actions committed by other members of the same race or sex.

(7) This appeal is remanded to Respondent's school board for additional proceedings consistent with this Decision.

ORDER

After due consideration of the record, matters officially noticed and the foregoing Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, in my capacity as Commissioner of Education, it is hereby ORDERED that the Petitioner's appeal be, and is hereby, REMANDED to Respondent's board for additional proceedings consistent with this Decision.

SIGNED AND ISSUED this 12th day of May 2026.

Mike Morath Digitally signed by Mike Morath
Date: 2026.05.11 16:17:54 -05'00'

MIKE MORATH
COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION