MINUTES OF THE MARYLAND STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Tuesday
April 23, 2013

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

The Maryland State Board of Education met in regular session on Tuesday, April 23, 2013 at 8:30 a.m. at the Nancy S. Grasmick State Education Building. The following members were in attendance: Dr. Mary Kay Finan, Vice President; Mr. James H. DeGraffenreidt; Ms. Luisa Montero-Diaz; Jr.; Ms. Linda Eberhart; Dr. S. James Gates, Jr.; Ms. Ebehireme Inegbenebor; Mr. Sayed Naved; Mrs. Madhu Sidhu; Mr. Guffrie M. Smith; Donna Hill Staton, Esq.; and Dr. Lillian M. Lowery, State Superintendent of Schools. Dr. Charlene M. Dukes, President; was absent.

Elizabeth Kameen, Esq., Assistant Attorney General, and the following staff members were also present: Mr. Steve Brooks, Deputy State Superintendent for Finance; Penelope Thornton Tally, Esq., Chief Performance Officer; and Mr. Anthony South, Executive Director, State Board of Education.

CONSENT AGENDA

Upon motion by Mr. DeGraffenreidt, seconded by Dr. Gates, and with unanimous agreement, the Board approved the Consent Agenda as follows: (In Favor – 7; Ms. Diaz, Mr. Naved, and Ms. Inegbenebor had not arrived)

- Approval of Minutes of March 28, 2013
- Personnel (copy attached to these minutes)
- Budget adjustments for March, 2013

AMENDMENTS TO ATHLETIC REGULATIONS – COMAR 13A.06.03.01
PERMISSION TO PUBLISH
REQUEST TO WAIVE ATHLETIC REGULATION COMAR 13A.06.03.03A

Dr. Lowery requested permission to publish the proposed amended Athletic Regulations, COMAR 13A.06.03.01, and to waive Athletic Regulation, COMAR 13A.06.03.03A. She introduced Ned Sparks, Executive Director, Athletics Programs, MSDE, to brief the Board on the two actions that are being requested.

Mr. Sparks reported that comprehensive editorial revisions were made to the Athletic Regulations to provide greater clarity. He reported that included in the amendments is an earlier start date for fall practice which is being proposed in response to restrictions placed on practice
schedules by recently enacted legislation related to heat acclimatization for student athletes as well as training for the prevention of traumatic brain injury.

In regards to the Waiver Request, he noted that this is a one-time request which would provide school systems with the option to move forward the start date for the 2013 fall athletic season by as much as three days. This action is necessary given that the proposed amendments to the current athletic regulations, assuming that they are approved by the State Board, would not become effective until five days after the start of this year’s fall season.

In response to a question by Ms. Eberhart, Mr. Sparks reported that this request was vetted with the Board of Directors of the Maryland Public Secondary Schools Athletic Association and all and local superintendents.

Dr. Gates noted that the earlier start date in the regulatory proposal will mean more days of practice in August and noted the importance of hydration for student athletes when participating in sports during the summer months.

In response to a question by Mr. DeGraffenreidt, Mr. Sparks explained that the additional days will provide for one-on-one coaching of a student athlete. He said many students can afford private coaching and this allows for those students who cannot afford this to have the same opportunity.

In response to another question by Mr. DeGraffenreidt, Mr. Sparks explained that although there is no enforcement group to monitor practice sessions, parents report any problems to the local school system. He said that the athletic regulations include a ‘whistleblower’ provision.

Ms. Sidhu expressed her concern about starting practice early. She urged, “Keep your eye on the ball.”

In response to a question by Mr. Smith, Mr. Sparks said that all coaches will have been trained in heat acclimatization and traumatic brain injury (concussion) prior to starting practice.

Upon motion by Mr. DeGraffenreidt, seconded by Mr. Smith, and with unanimous agreement, the Board granted permission to publish the proposed amended Athletic Regulations, COMAR 13A.06.03.01, and waived Athletic Regulation, COMAR 13A.06.03.03A for the fall 2013 season. (In Favor – 9; Ms. Diaz and Ms. Inegbenebor had not yet arrived)

MARYLAND SUPERINTENDENT OF THE YEAR

Dr. Lowery introduced Dr. Carl Roberts, Executive Director of the Public School Superintendents Association of Maryland (PSSAM), to introduce Maryland’s Superintendent of the Year.

Dr. Roberts explained that superintendents are nominated for this award through a very formal process and that a team of superintendents score the applications. He introduced Dr. Jack Smith, Superintendent of the Calvert County Public Schools as PSSAM’s 2013 Superintendent of the
Year. He described Dr. Smith as “a synergistic leader” who provides tremendous professional assistance to all of his colleagues.

Dr. Smith thanked the Board for this recognition. He said that across cultural and international lines, children need caring adults and learn when they get the right opportunities.

Dr. Lowery reported that Dr. Smith leads one of the three field testing school systems for teacher/principal evaluation models. She reported that he is building his own local model which she described as “amazing work.” She said, “In addition to being a great educator, he has been thoughtful partner and friend.”

**ORAL ARGUMENTS – ALLEN DYER VS. HOWARD COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION**

Ms. Kameen explained the procedures by which the Board hears oral arguments and introduced the following persons:

- Allen Dyer
  - Appellant

- Judith S. Bresler, Esq.
  - Representing
  - Howard County Board of Education

**ANNOUNCEMENT**

Ms. Inegbenebor introduced Christian Hodges, newly-appointed 2013-2014 student member of the State Board. On behalf of the Board, Dr. Finan welcomed him and said, “We are looking forward to working with you next year.”

**NEXT GENERATION SCIENCE STANDARDS (NGSS)**

Dr. Finan introduced Dr. Henry Johnson, Assistant State Superintendent, Division of Instruction and Assessment; Dr. Stephen Pruitt, Vice President, Achieve, Inc.; and Mary Thurlow, Coordinator of Science for MSDE, to brief the Board on the development and release of the final Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS). She explained that she and Dr. Gates worked on the creation of these Standards.

Dr. Gates said, “The country is taking a step to secure its future. It’s a revolutionary document” and thanked the Department and his colleagues for their efforts in producing this work.

Ms. Thurlow said, “It’s been an unbelievable experience; the most exciting and enjoyable experience in my professional career.”
Dr. Pruitt explained that there were twenty-six lead states involved including national and international leaders in the field of science. He reported that the writing was done by forty-one people from across the country and that the document was released twice with more than 10,000 responses. He discussed the feedback received and the response to that feedback by the group. He discussed the conceptual shifts science educators and stakeholders need to make to effectively use the NGSS. Dr. Pruitt reported that funding is available to launch an NGSS network in the near future.

In response to a question by Ms. Diaz, Dr. Pruitt said that states will implement plans to assist teachers with implementation and that various tools will be provided to show how these standards will look in the classroom. He noted that this change will not take place immediately.

In response to a question by Ms. Staton, Dr. Pruitt said that the standards help students understand concepts and apply those concepts. He said that there needs to be tools, examples and models to help teachers transition to these science standards. He noted the importance of looking at data to focus resources.

In response to a question by Dr. Gates, Dr. Pruitt said that these are voluntary standards and that publishers of textbooks are “market driven” and will rise to the needs of the schools. He said, “This is about preparing all kids to be interactive in our society.”

Mr. DeGraffenreidt asked about leading and lagging indicators to measure progress. Dr. Pruitt said they have developed a workbook for states which includes indicators of success. He said the group plans to work with states to help them define their plans and indicators. He said there is a huge advantage for states to work together on assessments.

In response to a question by Ms. Sidhu, Dr. Pruitt said that in the science world, the metric system is universal.

In response to a question by Mr. Naved, Dr. Pruitt said that the network will provide support to states signing on to these standards.

In response to a question by Ms. Ineghenebor about the struggle many students have with science, Dr. Lowery said, “our staff is doing amazing things around this; we are very much ahead on this work.” Ms. Thurlow said that staff has begun a draft on implementation of the standards.

**EMERGENCY PLANNING GUIDELINES FOR LOCAL SCHOOL SYSTEMS AND SCHOOLS**

Dr. Lowery reminded Board members that she was asked to report what steps were being taken in Maryland to enhance school safety following the horrific mass murders at Sandy Hook Elementary School. She said that in January, the Governor released his plan for reducing gun violence and called for a revision of local school system (LSS) emergency plans. She introduced Ann Chafin, Assistant State Superintendent, Division of Student, Family, and School Support; Chuck Buckler, Director of Students Services and Alternative Programs; and Dr. Sally Dorman,
Specialist, Psychological Services, to brief the Board on the draft Emergency Planning Guidelines that the Board is to consider today. Dr. Lowery recommended approval of the Guidelines.

Ms. Chafin introduced the staff that participated in this effort and publicly thanked them.

Mr. Buckler explained that staff consulted with many groups such as police, fire fighters, and the Maryland Emergency Management Agency (MEMA) and looked at policies in place throughout the country. He said that LSSs were asked for their input as well. He stressed the importance of LSSs and schools practicing their plans for emergencies on an ongoing basis. He said, “It will be a living document” which must be updated regularly. Mr. Buckler explained that following Board approval, LSSs will be asked to adopt their individual plans. He said that next month the Board will be asked to “grant permission to publish” amended regulations on emergency planning in support of these guidelines. He discussed various tools for schools to use in the event of an emergency situation.

Dr. Dorman reported on the tools provided to be used in classrooms which assist in the identification of risk factors in schools. She said there are recommending standards created by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and discussed the Emergency Management Process.

Dr. Gates urged that students need to be able to communicate electronically in the event of an emergency. Ms. Chafin said that LSSs set the policies on student use and possession of electronic communication devices in the classroom and that many school systems prohibit bringing electronics into the classroom. Mr. Buckler said that he will take Dr. Gates’ suggestion back to the school systems and that they may want to rethink their policies on the possession of electronic devices.

Mr. DeGraffenreidt noted that, in some emergency situations, electronics can be very harmful and urged that fire and rescue groups be included in this discussion.

In response to a question by Mr. Naved, Mr. Buckler said that a report will be prepared and presented to the Board in the fall on the plans that the LSSs have adopted.

In response to a question by Ms. Diaz, Mr. Buckler said that the revised state regulations will require that LSSs monitor school preparedness.

Ms. Sidhu suggested that emergency response drills be conducted at different times of the day in schools and that substitute teachers and parents who help in the schools should be trained as well as school staff. Mr. Buckler said that he will take these excellent suggestions back to LSSs.

In response to a question from Ms. Staton about long-term sheltering, Ms. Dorman said, “Yes, schools are planning for that.”

Upon motion by Ms. Sidhu, seconded by Ms. Diaz, and with unanimous agreement, the Board approved the Guidelines. (In Favor – 9; Mr. DeGraffenreidt was not present in the room.)
BALTIMORE COUNTY STUDENT ADVISORY BOARD
ANTI-BULLYING AND SCHOOL SAFETY

Ms. Inegbenebor introduced Olivia Adams, Student Member, Baltimore County Board of Education, to discuss the planning, action and effects of the Baltimore County Anti-Bullying efforts.

Ms. Adams explained that Baltimore County public school students worked with the Superintendent and staff of the Baltimore County Public School System (BCPSS) to design and implement an annual Anti-Bullying Day for all schools in the System. The Anti-Bullying Day provided programs that support positivism in schools and encouraged students to understand the repercussions of negative behavior. She said the event provided opportunities for students to sign pledges to prevent and identify bullying. In addition, items were distributed to remind students of the effects of bullying, and the message was articulated that any type of suspicious behavior should be taken seriously and reported. She said the idea was to “debunk the idea that reporting suspicious behavior is tattle tailing.” She said the Advisory Board is encouraging schools to give students an avenue to report and talk about bullying.

Dr. Finan congratulated them on this program and urged that it be spread across the State.

STATE LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

Mr. Steve Brooks, Deputy State Superintendent for Finance, reported on the FY 2014 State Budget noting that Maryland has held the line during the past recession. He said the Bridge to Excellence funding has been increased by 3.6 percent in the Budget. He went over the various components of the Bridge funding such as the following:

- Digital learning program
- Early college innovation program
- Maryland STEM innovation network
- Maryland school for the Blind
- State aided institutions
- Textbook program
- Non-public aging schools program

He reported that as the Race To The Top (RTTT) funding ends, the Administration put forward $1.8 million for sustainability in the FY 2014 budget. He also noted funding increases for the Department of Rehabilitation Services to reduce its waiting list for services and for the Maryland Longitudinal Data System.

Renee Spence, Executive Director for Legislative Relations, introduced her colleagues and noted that Dr. Lowery was very well received during her first Maryland General Assembly session. She reviewed the status of the following pieces of legislation adopted by the 2013 Maryland General Assembly:
- HB 453 Maryland Center for School Safety
- HB 830 Alternatives to the General Educational Development Tests – Study
- HB 1107 Task Force on the Membership and Operation of the Prince George’s County Board of Education
- HB 1161 Commission on Special Education Access and Equity
- HB 1168/SB 548 Minority Teacher Recruitment – Study and Report
- SB 633/HB 685 County Library Capital Project Grant – Wealth-Based Cost Share
- SB 740 College Readiness and Completion Act of 2013
- SB 857 Commission on the Establishment of a Maryland Educators Service Memorial

Ms. Spence introduced several Legislative Services’ staff members who were observing the Board meeting.

**RACE TO THE TOP (RTTT) UPDATE**

Penelope Thornton Talley, Chief Performance Officer, introduced Dr. Jim Foran, Assistant State Superintendent, Division of Academic Reform and Innovation, to highlight changes that have been made in the RTTT projects or their status since last month’s report to the Board. She said, “We have many challenges. The May report will look very different.”

Dr. Foran said that since there has only been ten working days since the last report, there haven’t been many changes in the ratings.

Dr. Foran introduced David Volrath, RTTT Coordinator of Teacher/Principal Evaluation; Dr. Donnell Josiah, RTTT Program Director; Dr. Henry Johnson, Assistant State Superintendent for Curriculum and Assessment; and, Ann Chafin to discuss the progress of specific projects that were discussed at the last Board meeting.

Dr. Johnson discussed Project 3/2: Developing and implementing common, high-quality formative assessment items, tools and resources. He said they have made, “Some significant headway” and introduced a new Project Manager, Melissa Schropp, who was recently hired.

Ms. Schropp reported that there had been no work done on item development for the assessments and that the staff is procuring online assessment modules for teachers. She noted that they are looking at other states and LEAs and that a survey was distributed to LEAs to glean input on their efforts. She reported that a few states provided advice and insights. She noted that teachers are being included in the development process.

Dr. Josiah discussed Project 21/42 Implement a Statewide System to Support Student Instructional Intervention. He reported that staff is working on revising the amendment sent to the U.S. Department of Education (USDE) and defining some metrics.

Mr. Volrath discussed Project 29/48 Develop and Implement an Educator Evaluation System (Calculation Engine). He said they are working with the Maryland Tiered Achievement Index, a model to measure student growth. He reported that Student Learning Objectives (SLOs) are a
major piece of this work and that more than 4000 educators have engaged in this effort. He introduced Dr. Meg Dolan, Field Test Monitor, to discuss the progress being made in the local school systems.

Dr. Dolan said that many LSSs have requested another year of field testing. Dr. Dolan reported that each district is in a different place in their progress and that by the end of next year, there will be ratings from all districts and that the feedback will be very different from district to district. She said the focus should be on a clear, consistent communication plan. Dr. Lowery said that the Board will hear “a much deeper conversation” at its special work session on May 9.

Ann Chafin reported on Project 46/57 – Extend Student Learning and Improve School Culture, Climate, and Support. She said a matrix was developed for schools, meetings have been scheduled with principals in Prince George’s County schools and preparations are underway for a Summer Institute on Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports program (PBIS).

She also discussed Project 53/44 Charter Schools. She said that Prince George’s County Public Schools is considering a Charter school and that staff has contacted all LSSs to urge the approval of more charter schools. She said the term “innovation school” will replace “charter school.”

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Dr. Dukes explained procedures by which the Board hears public comments. The following individuals provided comments:

- Peter Kim (Voice of Korean Americans) – textbook correction
- Melanie Hood Wilson and Felicity Ross Messner – gifted and talented education
- Linda Turner – services for students with special needs
- Tom Hearn – sports related health concerns

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 Mr. DeGraffenreidt, seconded by Ms. Montero-Diaz, and with unanimous agreement, the Maryland State Board of Education met in closed session on Tuesday, April 23, 2013 in Conference Room 1, 8th Floor, at the Nancy S. Grasmick State Education Building. All board members were present except Dr. Charlene M. Dukes. In attendance were Dr. Lillian Lowery, State Superintendent of Schools; Steve Brooks, Deputy State Superintendent for Business Services; Penelope Thornton Talley, Esq., Chief Performance Officer; and Tony South, Executive Director, State Board of Education. Assistant Attorneys General, Elizabeth M. Kameen, Elliott Schoen, and Jackie LaFiandra were also present. The Executive Session commenced at 1:15 p.m. (In favor – 10)

The State Board approved four Opinions and one Order for publication.
• Cinda Anthony, et al. v. Queen Anne’s County Board of Education – moving 5th grade students to middle school from elementary school - Opin. No. 13-21
• Susan H. v. Howard County Board of Education – student transfer/sexual assualt – Opin. No. 13-21
• Howard/Carroll Officials Association v. Howard County Board of Education – bid protest – Opin. No. 13-23
• Allen Wright v. Board of Education of Charles County – teacher termination – Opin. No. 13-24
• Bryan Johnson v. Howard County Board of Education – teacher termination – Order No. OR13-02

The Board deliberated five cases. They will be published at a later date.

• Karen Chavis-Murphy, et al. v. Charles County Board of Education – redistricting
• Geneva Ferguson v. Baltimore City Board of School Commissioners – teacher termination
• Parent H. v. Montgomery County Board of Education – expulsion
• Tony Jones v. Baltimore City Board of School Commissioners – employee termination
• Gary Richardson v. Baltimore City Board of School Commissioners – teacher termination

The Board received legal advice on the Public Information Act exception to disclosure of intra-agency documents and the protection of the deliberative privilege as to documents related to the FY 2015 budget.

Henry Johnson and Janet Bagsby presented working draft intra-agency documents related to the budget for the PARCC Assessment.

The Board decided to hold a work session on May 9, 2013 to discuss Teacher/Principal Evaluation and PARCC Assessments.

The session ended at 2:25 p.m.

RECONVENE

The meeting reconvened at 2:25 p.m.

STATE SUPERINTENDENT’S REPORT

Dr. Lowery introduced Debbie Lichter, Director, Departmental Coordination and National Legislation Liaison, to report on the Federal budget.

Ms. Lichter reported that the FY 2013 federal Budget is not out yet and that the President’s FY 2014 Budget has been proposed. She said, “It is an excellent proposal.” She said the proposal would bring the funding formula programs back to the 2012 levels. Ms. Lichter reported that most of the funds in the Department of Education’s Budget represent discretionary spending and that there will be collaboration between federal agencies to provide wrap-around services.
Ms. Lichter discussed the six budget priorities proposed for the FY 2014 Budget. Ms. Sidhu said that funding intended to train educators and others to recognize the signs of mental illness could well be shifted to the training of new mental health professionals and to help young adults ages 16 to 25 to access mental health services. She went on to say that educators seem to intuitively hone in on children who might have mental health conditions and what they ask is for timely testing and quicker follow-up by health professionals.

In response to a question by Dr. Gates, Dr. Lowery said that students can currently graduate from high school with a high school diploma as well as an Associate of Arts Degree through participation in “Middle College” programs.

**BOARD MEMBER UPDATE**

Mr. Naved requested an informal conversation at the May Board meeting on Online Education.

**WORKING SESSION – PARCC ASSESSMENTS**

Dr. Lowery introduced Dr. Henry Johnson and Janet Bagsby, Chief, Planning and Assessment Branches, to provide information on the progress of the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC). PARCC was created to develop a new assessment system to measure student knowledge and skills against a common set of college and career ready standards in mathematics and English language arts.

Ms. Bagsby reported that only summative assessments will be introduced during the 2014-15 school year and reported that students who get a College and Career Determination (CCD) score in English II and Algebra II of four or five will be eligible for placement in entry level credit-bearing courses in public two and four-year postsecondary institutions. Ms. Bagsby reported that college and career readiness scores have no bearing on a student’s graduation status. She noted that if a student does not receive a four or five score, there are transition courses provided throughout the year.

In response to a question by Dr. Finan about whether students would get a different diploma if they score a four or a five, Dr. Lowery said no but that a decision will need to be made after assessments are in place for a couple of years as to whether the scores are used just to inform school personnel of a student’s needs. Dr. Lowery explained that there needs to be a data point for higher education. She said, “It’s about the continuum of K-12 and higher education.”

Ms. Staton expressed concern that a student may do very well in the class but not score a four or five on the test and not be considered college or career ready. She said they may not have an opportunity to express what they have learned. Dr. Lowery explained that we are trying to meet a threshold that college or university staff will feel comfortable with our students’ skill levels. She said there needs to be a data point for higher education. She said, for higher education, they need a metric with which they can work with their faculty and staff to say that students have mastered certain skills. She said it’s not about K-12, but it is about the continuum of K-12 and higher education.
In response to a question by Ms. Eberhart, Dr. Lowery said that the assessments may replace the Accuplacer test but will not replace SATs or ACTs.

Dr. Johnson said, “The more opportunities we have to expose students to the test, the better opportunities they will have for success. Over the course of two to three years, we will see an increase in student scores.”

Mr. DeGrafflenreidt urged that a positive term be selected to describe the differences between MSA and PARCC scores.

In response to a question by Ms. Sidhu, Dr. Johnson said that students can go back and correct their answers online, but that once a section is completed they are unable to go back to make any changes.

Ms. Diaz urged that a communication plan needs to be well thought out.

Dr. Lowery said that once a student reaches eleventh grade, the school knows the student’s literacy skill level. She said it is important to define what a Maryland high school diploma means.

Mr. DeGrafflenreidt said, “There needs to be a separate framework for evaluating what we define as career ready as opposed to college ready.” Dr. Lowery said, “We have a year to communicate this clearly. We have to come up with a universal decision and there will always be exceptions.”

In response to a question by Mr. DeGrafflenreidt, Dr. Johnson said that students can take tests multiple times to meet graduation requirements. He explained that a student could use the bridge option if he or she fails the assessment twice but that his transcript would show a failure for that class. He said, however, that the bridge program is an excellent way to prepare students for passing the test.

In response to a question by Ms. Sidhu about the gap analysis that was completed last year between the common core standards and the High School Assessment (HSA), Dr. Johnson said that elementary teachers are doing very well but that secondary teachers have been finding the transition more difficult. He said that resources have been put in place to help teachers with this issue.

Ms. Eberhart requested a report, by grade level, on how many students don’t pass the HSAs.

Dr. Lowery suggested that the Board revisit these issues at their May 9th work session. She asked Dr. Johnson to provide the Board with past data regarding students receiving a failing grade if they complete a bridge product instead of taking the test.

Dr. Johnson provided a video prepared by the New York State Board of Regents discussing the PARCC transition in that state.
In response to a question by Ms. Eberhart, Dr. Johnson said that implementation of the common core curriculum and the PARCC assessments are being recommended prior to implementing the new science standards.

**OPINIONS**

Ms. Kameen announced the following Opinions:

13-21  *Cinda Anthony, et. al. v. Queen Anne’s County Board of Education* – moving 5th grade students to middle school from elementary school (affirmed the local board’s decision)

13-22  *Susan H. v. Howard County Board of Education* – student transfer/sexual assault (dismissed)

13-23  *Howard/Carroll Officials Association v. Howard County Board of Education* – bid protest (affirmed the local board’s decision)

13-24  *Allen Wright v. Board of Education of Charles County* – teacher termination (affirmed the local board’s decision)

Ms. Kameen announced the following Order:

**OR 13-03**  *Bryan J. v. Howard County Board of Education* – redistricting (dismissed)

**ADJOURNMENT**

With no further business before the Board, the meeting adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

Lillian M. Lowery, Ed.D.
Secretary/Treasurer

Date: May 21, 2013
MARYLAND STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

CLOSED SESSION

On this 23rd day of April 2013, at the hour of 1:07 pm, the Members of the State Board of Education voted as follows to meet in closed session:

Motion made by: Mr. DeGraff

Seconded by: Ms. Montevan

In Favor: 10  Opposed: 0  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 or proposal process.

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

1. Discuss 6 legal appeals.
2. Review 2 draft orders.
3. Review 4 draft opinions.
4. Discuss a matter that is subject Executive Privilege.

[Signature]
Vice President/Presiding Officer
MARYLAND STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
PERSONNEL APPROVALS FOR THE April 23, 2013 BOARD MEETING

I. Appointments Grade 19 and above:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>POSITION</th>
<th>SALARY</th>
<th>DIVISION/OFFICE</th>
<th>DATE OF APPOINTMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. Appointments Grade 18 and below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>POSITION</th>
<th>SALARY</th>
<th>DIVISION/OFFICE</th>
<th>DATE OF APPOINTMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clark, Leisha L.</td>
<td>Teacher, School Counselor</td>
<td>IEPP</td>
<td>Career and College Readiness, Juvenile</td>
<td>05/01/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawford, Zulieka</td>
<td>Child Care Licensing Specialist Trainee</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Division of Early Childhood Development, Region V</td>
<td>05/01/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crocken, Lori</td>
<td>Child Care Licensing Specialist Trainee</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Division of Early Childhood Development, Region III</td>
<td>05/01/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard, Shaun M.</td>
<td>Computer Network Specialist II</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Career and College Readiness, Juvenile Services Education Program</td>
<td>05/01/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howk, Lisa A.</td>
<td>Child Care Licensing Specialist Trainee</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Division of Early Childhood Development, Region VII</td>
<td>05/01/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox, Cara M.</td>
<td>Child Care Licensing Specialist Trainee</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Division of Early Childhood Development, Region III</td>
<td>04/17/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller, Nancy</td>
<td>Child Care Licensing Specialist Trainee</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Division of Early Childhood Development, Region XI</td>
<td>06/12/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mukherjee, Mary Elizabeth</td>
<td>Child Care Licensing Supervisor</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Division of Early Childhood Development, Region V</td>
<td>04/17/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winslow, Debra</td>
<td>Accountant Supervisor II</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Division of Business Services, General Accounting Section</td>
<td>05/01/2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>