MINUTES OF THE MARYLAND STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Tuesday
March 22, 2011

Maryland State Board of Education
200 W. Baltimore Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21201

The Maryland State Board of Education met in regular session on Tuesday, March 22, 2011 at 9 a.m. at the Nancy S. Grasmick State Education Building. The following members were in attendance: Mr. James H. DeGraffenreidt, Jr., President; Dr. Charlene M. Dukes, Vice President; Dr. Mary Kay Finan; Dr. James Gates, Jr.; Ms. Luisa Montero-Diaz; Mr. Sayed Naved; Mr. Gayon Sampson; Mrs. Madhu Sidhu; Mr. Guffrie M. Smith, Jr.; Donna Hill Staton, Esq.; Dr. Ivan Walks; Ms. Kate Walsh and Dr. Nancy S. Grasmick, Secretary/Treasurer and State Superintendent of Schools.

Elizabeth Kameen, Esq., Assistant Attorney General, and the following staff members were also present: Dr. John Smeallie, Deputy State Superintendent for Administration; Mr. Steve Brooks, Deputy State Superintendent for Finance and Mr. Anthony South, Executive Director to the State Board.

CONSENT AGENDA

Dr. Grasmick asked for Board approval of the consent agenda and invited members of the staff to answer any questions about the COMAR revisions.

Having no questions and upon motion by Dr. Gates, seconded by Dr. Dukes, and with unanimous agreement, the Board approved the consent agenda as follows: (In Favor – 10; Ms. Walsh and Mr. Sampson had not yet arrived)

- Approval of Minutes of February 22, 2011
- Personnel (copy attached to these minutes)
- Budget Adjustments for February, 2011
- Permission to Publish:
  - COMAR 13A.07.01 (Amend)
    Comprehensive Teacher Induction Program
  - COMAR 13A.06.01-.03 (Amend)
    Child Nutrition Appeal Procedures
  - COMAR 13A.06.02.01-.05 (Amend and New)
    Pre-kindergarten Programs
MILKEN HONORS

The Superintendent reported that since 1994, Maryland has been involved in the National Milken Educator Awards Program and explained that teachers cannot submit their names in nomination but rather must be nominated by others. She explained that the theme of the Milken Award Program is “The Future Belongs to the Educated” and said, “This elevates the profession in many ways.”

Dr. Grasmick reported that McKinley Broome, a fourth grade teacher at Woodholme Elementary School in Baltimore County, was selected as the Maryland 2010 National Milken Educator. She said that Mr. Broome knows how to use fun and data to teach his students and that “he has been a mentor to other teachers.” She introduced Dr. Darla Strouse, Executive Director, Partnerships and Development, to introduce Mr. Broome and his supporters.

Dr. Strouse introduced Mr. Broome’s principal and superintendent and reported that Mr. Broome will be receiving a check in the amount of $25,000 from the Milken Foundation. Dr. Strouse said that “Mr. Broome has an innate ability to connect with his students. He truly represents the excellence in Baltimore County Public Schools.”

Mr. Broome said, “I wish every teacher could receive this, it is the ultimate experience.” He thanked all of his co-workers and supporters for their confidence in him. He reported that his family was en route but was delayed due to traffic problems.

Mr. DeGraffenreidt said that the Board would postpone the presentation and photographs until Mr. Broome’s family arrived.

RACE TO THE TOP (RTTT) UPDATE

Dr. Grasmick said that in response to a question posed by Dr. Dukes at the last Board meeting, she has invited Ann Chafin, Assistant State Superintendent, Division of Student, Family and School Support, and Mary Gable, Assistant State Superintendent, Division of Academic Policy, to brief the Board on the various grants that MSDE has received for low performing schools and how the grants are coordinated.

Ms. Chafin explained that the State was awarded a School Improvement Grant of approximately $6.17 million which was combined with $2 million of unexpended funds from last year’s grant. She explained that the grant is currently supporting the efforts of eleven identified schools and that there are five additional schools to be served, bringing the total number of schools in the lowest five percent of Maryland lowest performing schools to sixteen. She provided a list of the names of the schools, all of which are in Baltimore City and Prince George’s County and noted that the USDE is monitoring the progress of the schools.

Dr. Grasmick reported that the USDE performed an audit on the grant usage and Maryland scored “perfect.”

Ms. Chafin acknowledged the excellent work done by Maria Lamb and other members of staff.
In response to a question by Dr. Gates, Ms. Chafin said that the Department’s Parent Involvement Program, funded by Title I, has been recognized nationally and that the MSDE staff has conducted national webinars based on the program.

In response to a question by Ms. Walsh about the four strategies offered to the selected low-performing schools, Ms. Chafin said that the technical language in the law gives the local school system the option of choosing one of the four options and explained that option selection is very “situationa.l.”

Ms. Gable discussed the changes brought about as the result of the General Assembly’s passage of the Education Reform Act of 2010. She said the Incentive Program included in the Act is designed to establish locally-negotiated incentives for highly effective teachers and principals who work in low-performing schools. She said the incentive program was included in the State’s RTTT application as Project #50. Ms. Gable said that in conformance with the RTTT grant, the local education agency staff (LEA) are responsible for selecting teachers and principals to receive the grants.

Dr. Grasmick recommended approval by the Board of the Guidelines for Incentives for Teachers and Principals who serve in the lowest performing schools.

Ms. Gable distributed a copy of the Education Reform Act of 2010 and referred the Board to the provision which stipulates that a teacher receiving the incentive grant must have obtained National Board Certification.

In response to a concern expressed by Mr. DeGraffenreidt, Ms. Gable said that the stipulation that the teacher must have “a proven track record” should be included in the procedures distributed to the LEAs.

In response to a question by Dr. Dukes, Ms. Gable said the stipend is only approved for teachers and principals and to include other education employees would require an amendment to the RTTT application.

In response to a question by Mr. Naved, Ms. Gable said the allocation to each school is based on total student enrollment.

In response to a question by Ms. Diaz, Ms. Chafin said that sustainability requirements are built into the School Improvement Grant requirements.

In response to a question by Ms. Staton, Ms. Gable said that LEA superintendents provide additional incentives that are designed to keep the grant recipients in the schools once the grant runs out.

In response to a concern expressed by Dr. Walks, Dr. Grasmick said that the Judy Hoyer Centers provide coordinated support for the schools and that Senator Mikulski is working on a bill on Community Schools to be included in the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).
Ms. Sidhu noted that specialized training for teachers is beneficial even if they leave their current school since other teachers can learn from them.

In response to a caution by Mr. Smith about the importance of sustainability, Ms. Chafin said that her staff does thorough two-day visits to each of the schools and provides recommendations to the LEAs on improving the schools.

In response to a question by Mr. Naved, Ms. Chafin said that if a school improves significantly, the grant continues to flow to the school.

Upon a motion by Dr. Dukes, seconded by Mr. Smith, and with unanimous agreement, the Board approved, as modified, the Guidelines to Implement the Incentives for Teachers and Principals Program. (In Favor – 11; Mr. Sampson had not yet arrived)

MILKEN HONORS (cont’d)

Mr. Broome’s family arrived and the President and Superintendent presented him with a plaque and obelisk and photographs were taken. The Board congratulated Mr. Broome for his excellent work.

RTTT FEATURED PRESENTATION: GREAT TEACHERS AND LEADERS

Dr. Grasmick introduced Dr. Jim Foran, Assistant State Superintendent, Division of Academic Reform and Innovation, to discuss the monitoring efforts underway for the RTTT Projects. She explained that Mary Cary, Assistant State Superintendent, Division of Instruction, and Jean Satterfield, Assistant State Superintendent, Division of Certification and Accreditation, would provide an update on the Maryland Educator Effectiveness Academies which are planned for this summer.

The Superintendent said that the Maryland Council on Educator Effectiveness (MCEE) is making progress in creating a Statewide Educator Evaluation Framework. State Board Member Mary Kay Finan, a member of the MCEE, said that the group is working very hard with a goal of providing a very professional product.

Dr. Foran enumerated the many monitoring activities conducted by the USDE and the various reports to be completed by the Department. He said that his staff is working on a document outlining how LEAs will be monitored by the State to be transmitted to the USDE by July.

Ms. Satterfield discussed the robust alternative certification processes and four projects underway to build teacher capacity in science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) and those working in high poverty, low performing schools. She explained that the institutions of higher education are partnering with school systems to assist in building teacher capacity. She also discussed a principal preparation program which focuses on preparing great principals using proven data-driven techniques. Ms. Satterfield said that they are working on a restructured educator certification system to provide a tiered certification ladder.
Ms. Cary said that her staff will be providing professional development for more than 6,000 educators this summer which will include transitioning to the National Common Core Curriculum for Maryland schools. Ms. Cary said that there will be more than 50 central office staff participating in the Maryland Educator Effectiveness Academies as well. She said that the State Board, as well as all local superintendents, will also be invited to attend. She discussed the various briefings that will take place prior to the summer academies to prepare assistant superintendents of instruction and content supervisors to answer questions posed by participants. Ms. Cary said that teachers will receive a stipend for participating in the academies and, as a result of their participation, will be prepared to provide training to other teachers in their schools.

In response to a question by Ms. Staton, Ms. Cary said that the Universal Design for Learning (UDL) will be included in a template for school planning teams.

In response to a question by Dr. Gates, Ms. Cary agreed to provide the Board with the materials being used by the Academies.

**NATIONAL TEACHER OF THE YEAR FINALIST**

The Superintendent introduced Dr. Darla Strouse and Michelle Shearer, Maryland Teacher of the Year and one of four finalists for the position of National Teacher of the Year. Ms. Shearer teaches chemistry at Urbana High School in Frederick County.

Dr. Grasmick reported that Ms. Shearer has a degree in chemistry from Princeton University and said, "Ms. Shearer represents everything that this nation is promoting – a strong STEM approach."

Ms. Shearer said, "It is a tremendous honor to be the teacher of the year in the number one school system in the nation." She said that Maryland has great leaders who value Maryland’s teachers and noted the importance of including students with special needs into STEM initiatives. She thanked the Board and Superintendent for their support.

Dr. Linda Burgee, Frederick County Superintendent of Schools, invited the Board to visit Ms. Shearer’s classroom and expressed her pride in Ms. Shearer’s work.

Dr. Strouse presented Ms. Shearer with a memento and said that she will keep the Board apprised of the winner of the National competition.

**GRADUATION AND DROPOUT RATES SUPPORT PROGRAMS FOR GRADUATION AND DROPOUT**

Dr. Grasmick said that Dr. Leslie Wilson, Assistant State Superintendent, Division of Accountability and Assessment, would discuss Maryland’s planned transition to the new cohort method for calculating both graduation and drop-out rates for high schools. She said Dr. Wilson would also discuss the recommended standards and goals related to the Cohort Graduation Rate for implementation beginning with 2011 AYP determinations that are being recommended. Dr.
Grasmick said that following Dr. Wilson’s presentation, Ms. Chafin will provide an overview of the programs and efforts that have been and will be implemented to support attainment of the goal rates.

Dr. Wilson explained that the updated Longitudinal Data System (LDS) has been enhanced and will now track individual students from grade nine to graduation. She discussed the recommended standards for graduation rates which are based on the 2020 goals for cohort graduation rates and the standards related to the 2011 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) determinations. She noted that data will change as students move through school.

In response to a question by Mr. DeGraffenreidt, Dr. Wilson said that growth determination is a very complicated percentage and is done school by school.

Dr. Wilson discussed the new race codes and the changes to be made for the 2012 school year.

In response to a question by Ms. Walsh, Dr. Wilson said that Maryland’s standards are very comparable to other states with similar diversity.

In response to a question by Dr. Gates, Dr. Wilson said that the graduation rate methodology will remain the same even if the ESEA is changed.

In response to a question by Dr. Dukes regarding benchmark states, Dr. Grasmick said that New York and Massachusetts are very reform-minded states and considered comparable to Maryland.

Ms. Dias expressed concern that four out of five English Language Learners (ELLs) are not graduating. Mr. Naved asked for trend data and Dr. Wilson explained that the data only goes back to 2005.

Dr. Wilson explained the differences between the leaver rate and the cohort rate. She discussed how the 2020 targets were set to determine Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). Dr. Wilson explained that a stakeholder group went over the process and endorsed the concept of recommended goals for 2020 and that they set standards for 2011 by back mapping from 2020.

In response to a question by Dr. Gates, Dr. Wilson said that that this method matches the college and career readiness percentages. Dr. Grasmick noted that the College Board has set sixty percent as the goal for college completion. She said the Department and Maryland’s institutions of higher education are tackling this challenge and working to have the goals interface between high school and college graduation.

Dr. Dukes discussed the need to track students after they leave the public school system and suggested that the business community needs to prepare criteria for getting a job in this economy.

In response to a question by Ms. Walsh, Dr. Grasmick said that a minimum of an Associate’s Degree is now being required of job seekers by employers. Ms. Diaz said that most jobs require a GED or high school diploma plus two years of additional training.
Mr. Naved expressed concern about the consequences of not meeting the standards. Dr. Grasmick said there is very intense work being done and reported that if the standards are not met, the school will be placed in corrective action.

In response to concerns expressed by Dr. Gates, Dr. Wilson said that the model encourages principals to bring students back into the schools and keep them there until graduation. She said that responses from all of the stakeholders were very positive.

Ms. Staton suggested that the words, implementation beginning with be deleted from the motion. The Board agreed and upon motion by Ms. Staton, seconded by Dr. Finan, and with unanimous agreement, the Board approved the recommended standards and goals related to Cohort Graduation Rate for 2011 AYP determinations, as amended. (In Favor –12)

Dr. Wilson discussed the transition to the Cohort Drop Out Rate. She explained the differences between current and cohort drop out rates noting that schools will have to be more diligent in tracking the students who drop out of school.

In response to a question by Dr. Walks, Dr. Wilson said that there will be an outline of a five-year high school graduation program which will be available on the MSDE website for those students who are unable to graduate after four years. In response to the President’s call for a good communication strategy, Dr. Wilson said that the web page is being updated since better data is now available.

Dr. Grasmick said that when this proposal was presented to the local superintendents, they were unanimous in their support.

In response to a question by Dr. Walks, Dr. Wilson said that it would be beneficial to report the recovery rate of drop out students for each school system.

There was brief discussion about how school systems deal with student drop outs who return to another school and then graduate from that school. Ms. Chafin emphasized that students who drop out are almost always disengaged from their school. She discussed the reasons for students dropping out and noted that there are predictors and programs to deal with students who may be in danger of dropping out. Ms. Chafin explained the many programs being used to keep students in the schools. She noted that the High School Assessments have caused more engagement between the schools and the students and noted that the local school systems are required to address the drop out issue in their Master Plans.

In response to a concern expressed by Ms. Diaz, Ms. Chafin said that Maryland has a wonderful outreach for international parents.

**JUVENILE SERVICES EDUCATION PROGRAMS (ADOPTION)**

Dr. Grasmick introduced Kathy Oliver, Assistant State Superintendent, Division of Career and College Readiness, and Mark Mechlinski, Director, Juvenile Services Education Program
Branch, to answer any questions regarding new regulations for the Juvenile Services Education Program. She recommended Board adoption of the new regulations.

Upon motion by Mr. DeGraffenreidt, seconded by Mr. Smith, and with unanimous agreement, the Board adopted the new regulations for the Juvenile Services Education Program. (In Favor – 12)

**COMAR 13A.12.02 TEACHERS (APPROVAL)**

The Superintendent introduced Jean Satterfield and Dr. Joann Ericson, Chief, Certification Branch, to answer any questions about amendments originally proposed by the Professional Standards and Teacher Education Board (PSTEB) to the Teacher Certification regulations. She noted that no comments were received on the proposed amendments and recommended State Board approval.

Upon motion by Ms. Staton, seconded by Dr. Finan, and with unanimous agreement, the Board approved the proposed amendments to teacher certification regulations. (In Favor – 12)

**COMAR 13A.12.02.16 WORK-BASED LEARNING COORDINATOR (APPROVAL)**

Dr. Grasmick asked Kathy Oliver, Jean Satterfield and Joann Ericson to answer any questions about PSTEB proposed changes to the certification regulation for Work-Based Learning Coordinator. She said that no comments were received on the proposed amendments and recommended State Board approval of the proposed amendments.

Upon motion by Dr. Gates, seconded by Dr. Finan, and with unanimous agreement, the Board approved the proposed amendments to Work-Based Learning Coordinator. (In Favor – 12)

**EXECUTIVE SESSION**

Pursuant to §10-503(a)(1)(i) & (iii) and §10-508(a) (1) & (7), of the State Government Article, Annotated Code of Maryland, and upon motion by Dr. Walks, seconded by Dr. Gates, and with unanimous agreement, the Maryland State Board of Education met in closed session on Tuesday, March 22, 2011, in Conference Room 1, 8th floor of the Nancy S. Grasmick State Education Building. All board members were present except Charlene Dukes. In attendance were Dr. Nancy S. Grasmick, State Superintendent of Schools; Dr. John Smeallie, Deputy State Superintendent for Administration; Steve Brooks, Deputy State Superintendent for Finance; and Tony South, Executive Director to the State Board. Assistant Attorneys General Elizabeth M. Kameen and Jackie La Fiandra were also present. The Executive Session commenced at 12:55 p.m. (In favor – 12)

The State Board approved five Opinions for publication.
• Georgianna London v. Maryland State Department of Education – employee termination/professional assistant – Opinion No. 11-12
• Mountain Maryland Public Charter School v. Allegany County Public Schools – waiver requests – Opinion No. 11-13
• Shannon C. v. Carroll County Board of Education – early entry – Opinion No. 11-14
• Seneca Creek Charter School v. Montgomery County Board of Education – waiver request – Opinion No. 11-15
• Lessie B. v. Caroline County Board of Education – student transfer – Opinion No. 11-16

The Board deliberated five cases.

• John Anker v. Harford County Board of Education – non-renewal of professional teacher
• Michele Bucey v. Harford County Board of Education – bus driver termination
• Donald & Natalia C. v. Montgomery County Board of Education – student transfer
• Patrick McSwain v. Howard County Board of Education – employee issue
• Howard Robinson v. Charles County Board of Education – employee termination

The opinions in those cases will be published at a future Board meeting.

The State Board received legal advice concerning the Petition for Declaratory Ruling regarding Maintenance of Effort and on school fees.

Dr. Grasmick and the Board discussed management and personnel issues related to the merger with MHEC and recent budget decisions.

Board President DeGraffenreidt discussed the Candidate Review Committee for Baltimore City and RTTT appointments.

Ms. Montero-Diaz distributed a draft of a board self-evaluation instrument which she and Dr. Dukes had collaborated on. Mr. DeGraffenreidt asked Board members to submit any comments on the draft to Mr. South by April 1, 2011.

The Board discussed security for board meetings provided by Department of General Services. They directed staff to request security for all board meetings.

The Executive Session ended at 2:25 p.m.

RECONVENE

The meeting reconvened at 2:35 p.m.
OVERVIEW OF SPECIAL EDUCATION

Dr. Grasmick explained that Ms. Staton had requested an overview of the work of the Division of Special Education. She asked Dr. Carol Ann Baglin-Heath, Assistant State Superintendent, Division of Special Education, to give an overview of the work of her staff.

Dr. Heath introduced the six Branch Chiefs who supervise the work of the following Branches and briefly outlined the duties of each Branch:

1. Early Childhood Intervention and Education
2. Special Education Administration and Policy
3. Student Achievement and Professional Development
4. Family Services and Interagency
5. Complaint Investigation and Due Process
6. Special Services

Dr. Heath provided a snapshot of the number of students served in the State of Maryland and presented graphs depicting the number of students with disabilities broken down by the type of disability. She noted that, nationwide, there has been a decline in children identified with disabilities.

Dr. Heath reported that autism has grown less proportionately in Maryland than in the nation as a whole. However, she said that the autism waiver is a very big issue and that there are many children on the waiting list.

In response to a question by Ms. Staton, Dr. Heath said that the increase in the identification of autism in children is due to a higher incidence of autism rather than better identification.

Dr. Heath discussed the ways in which the achievement gap is being bridged in Maryland and provided a list of tools that can be used to bridge the gap. She also discussed the use of the Longitudinal Data System (LDS) in monitoring the progress of special education students.

Dr. Heath discussed the performance of various groups of special education students on the Alt-MSA, MSA, Mod-MSA and Mod-HSA and the graduation rate for these students. She noted that with the majority of schools that do not make Annual Yearly Progress (AYP), it is often due to the performance of special education students.

In response to a question by Ms. Staton, Dr. Heath said that disabilities in learning processes are very pervasive and will impact a student across the continuum.

Dr. Heath reported on two Leadership Academies conducted to enhance the development of new and current special education teachers. She also discussed the various supports provided to families of children with special needs.

Dr. Heath discussed the Maryland Co-Teaching Network, the Maryland Learning Links and public and private partnerships to enhance special education services for children with disabilities in the least restrictive environment.
She provided data on the number of students who were eligible for the Maryland Tuition Assistance Program during the 2010-2011 school year. She also discussed the Office of Dispute Resolution which conducts complaint investigations to ensure compliance with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and related State requirements.

Dr. Heath provided data on the funding of Maryland's Special Education Program noting that the reauthorization of IDEA could change much of the data she provided.

In response to a question by Ms. Sidhu, Dr. Heath said that if a school allows too many students a waiver of the Alt-MSA, it can affect the schools' performance outcome.

In response to a request by Ms. Staton, Dr. Heath said that she will provide the Board with a report on the numbers of students with learning disabilities and in what local jurisdictions they reside. In response to a question by Ms. Staton, Dr. Heath said that most of the resources for learning disabled students are in the general school population. She noted that this is one of the emphases of the co-teaching project. Ms. Staton asked how this situation can be improved. Dr. Heath said that the Summer Institute will provide training for all special education teachers and that there was a handbook produced several years ago which addressed this issue. She offered to update the hand book and provide it to schools in Maryland.

**REVIEW OF DISCIPLINARY POLICIES**

Dr. Grasmick reminded Board members that, at last month's meeting, they discussed a tragic suicide of a student in Virginia who had previously been suspended from school. She said she discussed the situation with local school superintendents in Maryland and asked Chuck Buckler, Director, Student Services and Alternative Programs Branch, to give an update on a review of the disciplinary policies in Maryland schools. She said that local superintendents reported they discipline students on a case-by-case basis.

Mr. Buckler provided the federal and state mandates affecting disciplinary policies. He reported on a new state law which provides that if a student is alleged to have committed a serious offense, the student is moved to another school and transported on another school bus. He said when superintendents were surveyed on the subject of disciplinary policies; they agreed that they do not want mandated consequences for offenses but rather the ability to deal on a case-by-case basis. Mr. Buckler said there are requirements to be met to suspend a student for a short- or long-term suspension. He also noted that there is an appeal process.

He reported that all schools are mandated to have a suicide prevention program in the schools and that there is a lot of information being provided to students on suicide prevention.

In response to a question by Mr. Sampson about a policy dealing with threats in schools, Mr. Buckler said there is no statewide protocol and that he will look into this matter and report back.

In response to a concern expressed by Ms. Diaz, Dr. Grasmick said she will emphasize the importance of providing translation services to ELL families when a student is being disciplined.
Mr. Buckler said that a Student Manual which outlines required student behaviors is being revised and will be brought to the Board for approval once revisions are completed.

In response to a question by Ms. Walsh, Mr. Buckler said that there is a disproportionate number of African American males being either suspended or expelled. He said that he receives many calls from parents whose students are suspended from school for months awaiting appeals. Dr. Grasmick said that local boards of education are grappling with these issues. Dr. Grasmick said that a report can be compiled in June which captures the interventions and training that has been conducted throughout the year in the local school systems.

Mr. Buckler explained that smaller school systems do not have alternative schools to which students with disciplinary problems can be sent and students in those systems are sometimes required to wait long periods of time for the appeal process to be completed.

In response to a question by Mr. DeGraffenreidt, Ms. Kameen said that the Board has the authority to limit the time a school district can keep a student out of school waiting for a decision on the appeal of a suspension or expulsion.

Mr. Smith suggested that the Master Plan Process can be required to deal with these disciplinary issues.

The President said that the Board needs more data, a better metric and possible solutions to the statewide problem. He said that Mr. Buckler will be returning to the Board at the June meeting to provide recommendations regarding actions that need to be taken by the Board in response to the findings of the survey conducted of long term suspensions and expulsions.

Mr. DeGraffenreidt went on to say that there is urgency to the issue being discussed today, noting that “Justice delayed is justice denied.” He asked that a draft regulation be prepared by the April meeting that will provide for a speedier appeal process for long term suspensions and expulsions.

**EARLY CHILDHOOD UPDATE**

The Superintendent said that Maryland is recognized as a leader among the states in Early Childhood Development. She asked Dr. Rolf Graffwallner, Assistant State Superintendent, Division of Early Childhood Development, to review the highlights of the results of the tenth annual assessment of School Readiness. She also noted that Margaret Williams, Executive Director, Maryland Family Network, was present to share new guidelines for infant and toddler care.

Dr. Graffwallner provided demographics of children entering preK and kindergarten during the 2010-2011 school year. He discussed the key trends in Maryland which show very positive gains by children entering Maryland public schools. He noted a 32-point jump in school readiness during this school year compared with the 2001-2002 school year.
In response to a question by Ms. Staton, Dr. Grafwallner said that there are a variety of reasons why a child might repeat kindergarten such as disability and other special needs. He noted, however, that the number of repeaters has declined over the years. He also noted the advantages derived by children who attend pre-school.

He discussed a strong link between kindergarten readiness and Grade 3 reading and math scores on the MSA. He provided the Board with a document entitled, *Healthy Beginnings: Supporting Development and Learning from Birth through Three Years of Age* which provides early learning guidelines for parents and child care providers.

In response to a question by Dr. Walks, Dr. Grafwallner said that child care centers generally provide all-day care whereas preK provides half-day care.

In response to a request by Ms. Walsh, Dr. Grafwallner said that he will provide the Board with a breakdown of children, by race and socio-economic factors in preK and child care facilities.

Ms. Williams reported that the *Healthy Beginnings: Supporting Development and Learning from Birth through Three Years of Age* will be used to train all licensed day care providers and early childcare centers in Maryland. She reported that, through the MSDE, there is a network of early childhood specialists available to help childcare providers meet the demands of their profession.

Dr. Grasmick said, “We are the envy of most states. This investment pays off long-term.”

**STATE LEGISLATIVE UPDATE**

The Superintendent introduced Renee Spence, Executive Director, Governmental Relations, to provide an update on actions of the State Legislature. Ms. Spence said that there has been a lot of debate over non-education bills and reported that the legislature is currently going through the budget process. She reported that the Department did not fare poorly in budget decisions.

Ms. Spence reported on the budget bill that includes the possibility of the Cheltenham Center being placed under the purview of MSDE. She said that Dr. Grasmick is prepared to argue the case for additional funding to make needed repairs and to provide for increased security at the facility.

Ms. Spence distributed a synopsis of various pieces of legislation that are currently be considered by the legislature.

**STATE SUPERINTENDENT’S UPDATE**

Dr. Grasmick distributed a request from the Superintendent in Carroll County for a calendar modification to waive one day, Friday, June 17, 2011, from the 180 day Carroll County school year calendar.
Upon motion by Mr. Smith, seconded by Mr. DeGraffenreidt, and with unanimous agreement, the Board approved a calendar modification for Carroll County Public Schools. (In Favor – 11; Dr. Gates had departed the meeting.)

Dr. Grasmick brought to the Board’s attention, the Gifted and Talented Award received by Jeannie Paynter, MSDE Specialist for Gifted and Talented Education. She also introduced and applauded Sherry Harkin from Wicomico County for being named the Maryland 2011 World Language Teacher of the Year and the Northeast Area Language Teacher of the Year.

She also thanked Board members for their attendance at various events throughout the year.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. DeGraffenreidt explained procedures by which the Board hears public comments. The following persons presented comment:

• Jennifer Barmon, Assistant Public Defender, Montgomery County
• Janet Hartge, Legal Aid Bureau, Baltimore City

OPINIONS

Ms. Kameen announced the following Opinions:

11-12  Georgianna London v. Maryland State Department of Education – employee termination/professional assistant (adopted ALJ decision to terminate)
11-13  Mountain Maryland Public Charter School v. Allegany County Public Schools – waiver requests (denied the waivers)
11-14  Shannon C. v. Carroll County Board of Education – early entry (affirmed local board’s decision)
11-15  Seneca Creek Charter School v. Montgomery County Board of Education – waiver request (denied waiver requests)
11-16  Lessie B. v. Caroline County Board of Education – student transfer (affirmed local board’s decision)

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business before the Board, the meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Nancy S. Grasmick
Secretary, Treasurer
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MARYLAND STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

CLOSED SESSION

On this 22nd day of March 2011, at the hour of ______ am/pm, the Members of the State Board of Education voted as follows to meet in closed session:

Motion made by: ____________________
Seconded by: _______________________

In Favor: [Number]  Opposed: [Number] Member(s) Opposed: ____________________

The meeting was closed under authority of §10-503 (a) (1) (I) and §10-508 (a) of the State Government Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland for the following reason(s): (check all which apply)

☑ (1) To discuss: (I) the appointment, employment, assignment, promotion, discipline, demotion, compensation, removal, resignation, or performance evaluation of appointees, employees, or officials over whom it has jurisdiction; or (ii) any other personnel matter that affects one or more specific individuals.
☐ (2) To protect the privacy or reputation of individuals with respect to a matter that is not related to public business.
☐ (3) To consider the acquisition of real property for a public purpose and matters directly related thereto.
☐ (4) To consider a matter that concerns the proposal for a business or industrial organization to locate, expand, or remain in the State.
☐ (5) To consider the investment of public funds.
☐ (6) To consider the marketing of public securities.
☑ (7) To consult with counsel to obtain legal advice.
☐ (8) To consult with staff, consultants, or other individuals about pending or potential litigation.
☐ (9) To conduct collective bargaining negotiations or consider matters that relate to the negotiations.
☐ (10) To discuss public security, if the public body determines that public discussion would constitute a risk to the public or to public security, including: (I) the deployment of fire and police services and staff; and (ii) the development and implementation of emergency plans.
☐ (11) To prepare, administer, or grade a scholastic, licensing, or qualifying examination.
☐ (12) To conduct or discuss an investigative proceeding on actual or possible criminal conduct.
☐ (13) To comply with a specific constitutional, statutory, or judicially imposed requirement that prevents public disclosures about a particular proceeding or matter.
☐ (14) Before a contract is awarded or bids are opened, to discuss a matter directly related to a negotiating strategy or the contents of a bid or proposal, if public discussion or disclosure would adversely impact the ability of the public body to participate in the competitive bidding proposal process.

The topics to be addressed during this closed session include the following:

1. Discuss 5 legal appeals.
2. Review 2 draft opinions.
3. Consider 3 expedited appeals.
4. Receive legal advice on a Petition for Declaratory Ruling
5. Receive legal advice on proposed regulations.
6. Discuss 3 internal Board management matters.
7. Discuss 1 personnel matter.

[Signature]
President
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE OF APPOINTMENT</th>
<th>DIVISION/OFFICE</th>
<th>GRADE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>03/23/2011</td>
<td>Rehabilitation Services, Region VI</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/23/2011</td>
<td>Rehabilitation Services, Region VI</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/23/2011</td>
<td>Rehabilitation Services, Region VI</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Position: Vocational Rehabilitation Specialist I
Salary: $12,000

Position: Vocational Rehabilitation Specialist II
Salary: $13,000

Position: Vocational Rehabilitation Specialist II
Salary: $13,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE OF APPOINTMENT</th>
<th>DIVISION/OFFICE</th>
<th>GRADE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/1/2012</td>
<td>TBP</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/1/2012</td>
<td>TBP</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Position: Education Compliance Investigator
Salary: $21,000

Position: Education Program Specialist I, Special Education
Salary: $19,000

Position: Education Program Specialist II, Special Education
Salary: $19,000

Position: Determination Claims Adjudication Manager I, Disability
Salary: $21,000

Position: Determination Claims Adjudication Manager II, Disability
Salary: $19,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE OF APPOINTMENT</th>
<th>DIVISION/OFFICE</th>
<th>GRADE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/1/2012</td>
<td>TBP</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/1/2012</td>
<td>TBP</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Position: Education Compliance Investigator
Salary: $21,000

Position: Education Program Specialist I, Special Education
Salary: $19,000

Position: Education Program Specialist II, Special Education
Salary: $19,000

Position: Determination Claims Adjudication Manager I, Disability
Salary: $21,000

Position: Determination Claims Adjudication Manager II, Disability
Salary: $19,000

BOARD LIST

The following professional appointment is submitted for approval by the State Board of Education:

Name: Diana C. Stashik
Position: Program Manager I, DDS Claims Adjudication
Division: Rehabilitation Services, Disability Determination Services
Salary Grade: 19 ($48,691 - $78,173)
Effective Date: TBD

JOB REQUIREMENTS:

Education:

A Bachelor’s Degree is required; course work in Management, Supervision or Administration is desirable. A Master’s Degree is preferred.

Experience:

Five years of professional experience in rehabilitation or in the adjudication or processing of disability claims. Two years of the required experience must have included direct supervision of other professional employees or specialized experience as the technical lead providing rehabilitation services for clients with disabilities or in developing disability claims and establishing eligibility for Social Security Disability Insurance and Supplemental Security Income.

Notes:

A Master’s Degree or equivalent 36 credit hours of post baccalaureate course work in Educational Administration, Rehabilitation Counseling, Special Education, Counseling and Guidance, Vocational Evaluation, Psychology, or in a Social Science related field may be substituted for one year of the required experience in rehabilitation or the adjudication or processing of disability claims.

DESCRIPTION:
This position is responsible for providing leadership and direction for four disability claims adjudication units and for assuring the effective and efficient management of claims development and processing.
**Qualifications:**

**Education:**

Washington College (Chestertown, Maryland) 1993 – Bachelor of Arts in Sociology

**Experience:**

Maryland State Department of Education (Baltimore, Maryland)

2001 – Present: Vocational Rehabilitation Specialist Supervisor I, Disability Determination Services

1998 – 2001: Vocational Rehabilitation Technical Specialist, Disability Determination Services

1993 – 1998: Vocational Rehabilitation Specialist I-V, Disability Determination Services

**Employment Status**

Promotion
March 22-23, 2011

BOARD LIST

The following professional appointment is submitted for approval by the State Board of Education:

Name: Tyra S. Williams

Position: Education Program Specialist I, Special Education Complaint Investigator

Division: Special Education/Early Intervention Services

Salary Grade: 21 ($55,084 - $88,439)

Effective Date: TBD

JOB REQUIREMENTS:

Education:
A Juris Doctorate or, Master’s Degree or equivalent 36 post baccalaureate credit hours of course work in Special Education or Educational Administration/Supervision or a related field.

Experience:
Four (4) years of professional experience in evaluation or compliance monitoring, supervision/administration, or related experience within or affiliated with an organization serving school-aged children with disabilities and legal technical writing experience is preferred.

DESCRIPTION:

This is a professional position responsible for conducting investigations to ensure compliance with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and the corresponding State and federal laws for the education of students with disabilities, and providing technical assistance in resolving conflicts between local school system and other public education agency staff and parents.
Qualifications:

Education:

University of Maryland (Baltimore, Maryland) 2002 – Juris Doctorate

Syracuse University (Syracuse, New York) 1999 – Bachelor of Arts Degree in Policy Studies and International Relations

Experience:

Maryland State Department of Education (Baltimore, Maryland)
2009 – Present: Education Program Specialist I, Family Support Services Coordinator (Part-time)

Kelly Law Registry (Washington, D.C.)
2009: Contract Attorney

DC Action for Children (Washington, D.C.)
2008 – 2009: Policy Counsel (for children and youth with disabilities)

The Davis Law Group (Columbia, Maryland)
2007 – 2008: Counsel (Early Intervention and Special Education Services)

Advocates for Justice and Education, Inc. (Washington, D.C.)

Neighborhood Legal Services (Washington, D.C.)
2003 – 2005: Staff Attorney/Frederick B. Abramson Fellow

Morgan State University, Office of the General Counsel (Baltimore, Maryland)
2002 – 2003: Law Clerk (Part-time)

United State Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights (Washington, D.C.)
2001: Legal Intern

Employment Status
Horizontal Transfer