NANCY MULLIGAN,	BEFORE THE
Appellant	MARYLAND
v.	STATE BOARD
QUEEN ANNE'S COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION,	OF EDUCATION
Appellee.	Opinion No. 11-09

OPINION

The Appellant filed this appeal challenging the May 5, 2010 decision of the Queen Anne's County Board of Education (local board) to indefinitely postpone the adoption of a redistricting and reconfiguration plan for Kent Island and Bayside Elementary Schools. The decision maintains the status quo wherein the schools are in a paired configuration with Kent Island offering Pre-K through second grade and Bayside offering third through fifth grade.

We referred this case to the Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH) as required by COMAR 13A.01.05.07A(1). The local board filed a Motion for Summary Decision. The Appellant opposed the Motion.

On December 13, 2010, the Administrative Law Judge issued a Recommended Order proposing that the State Board grant the local board's Motion for Summary Decision and affirm the local board's decision postponing the redistricting and reconfiguration of Kent Island and Bayside. The Appellant did not file any exceptions to the ALJ's Recommended Order.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The factual background in this case is set forth in the Administrative Law Judge's Proposed Order, Findings of Fact, pp. 3 – 7.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Decisions of a local board involving a local policy or a controversy or dispute regarding the rules and regulations of the local board shall be considered prima facie correct. The State Board may not substitute its judgment for that of the local board unless the decision is arbitrary, unreasonable, or illegal. *See* COMAR 13A.01.05.05A.

The State Board referred this case to OAH for proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law by an ALJ. In such cases, the State Board may affirm, reverse, modify, or remand the ALJ's Proposed Decision. The State Board's final decision, however, must identify and state reasons for any changes, modifications, or amendments to the Proposed Decision. *See* Md. Code

Ann., State Gov't § 10-216. In reviewing the ALJ's Proposed Decision, the State Board must give deference to the ALJ's demeanor based witness credibility findings unless there are strong reasons present that support rejecting such assessments. *See Dept. of Health & Mental Hygiene v. Anderson*, 100 Md. App. 283, 302-303 (1994).

CONCLUSION

Based on our review of the record, we concur with the ALJ that the local board's decision is not arbitrary, unreasonable or illegal. We therefore adopt the ALJ's Proposed Order and affirm the local board's decision not to redistrict or reconfigure Kent Island and Bayside Elementary Schools.

James H. DeGraffenreidt, Jr.
President

Charlene M. Dukes
Vice President

Mary Kay Finan

S. James Gates, Jr.

Luisa Montero-Diaz

Sayed M. Naved

Madhu Sidhu

Madhu Sidhu

Guffie M. Smith, Jr.

Donna Hill Staton

ABSENT

Ivan C.A. Walks

Kate Walsh

February 22, 2011

NANCY MULLIGAN	* BEFORE DAVID HOFSTETTER,
v.	* AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
QUEEN ANNE'S COUNTY	* OF THE MARYLAND OFFICE
BOARD OF EDUCATION	* OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS
	* CASE NO.: MSDE-BE-09-10-30023

* * * * * * * * * * * * *

RECOMMENDED ORDER ON THE QUEEN ANNE'S COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY DECISION

STATEMENT OF THE CASE
ISSUE
SUMMARY OF THE EVIDENCE
DISCUSSION
PROPOSED CONCLUSIONS OF LAW
RECOMMENDED ORDER
NOTICE OF RIGHT TO FILE EXCEPTIONS

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

On May 5, 2010, the Queen Anne's County Board of Education (Local Board or LB) voted to indefinitely delay a decision on the reconfiguration and redistricting of Kent Island Elementary School (KIES) and Bayside Elementary School (BES) and instead to maintain the status quo regarding these schools. The Appellant filed an appeal with the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) on or about May 25, 2010. By letter of August 18, 2010, the MSDE forwarded the appeal to the Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH) for a hearing.

On September 24, 2010, I conducted a telephone pre-hearing conference in the matter. The Local Board was represented by Rochelle Eisenberg, Esquire, and David Burkhouse, Esquire. The Appellant represented herself. At the conference, I established a schedule for the filing of motions for summary decision and a date for a hearing on the merits, in the event a

motion for summary decision was not dispositive. The briefing schedule provided that pleadings regarding any motion for summary decision would be accepted through December 13, 2010. The Local Board filed a Motion for Summary Decision (the Motion) with supporting documents and an affidavit, and a supporting memorandum, on October 16, 2010. On November 4, 2010, the Appellant filed a letter, which I will consider to be an Opposition to the Motion. The Opposition did not include any affidavits or other documents. No further pleading was received by either party and on December 13, 2010, the record regarding summary decision closed. After reviewing the Motion and the Opposition, I determined that oral argument on the Motion was not necessary.

The contested-case provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act, Md. Code Ann., State Gov't §§ 10-201 through 10-226 (2009 and Supp. 2010); MSDE Regulations for Appeals to the State Board of Education, COMAR 13A.01.05; and the Rules of Procedure, COMAR 28.02.01, govern procedure in this hearing.

ISSUE

Should the Local Board's Motion for Summary Decision be granted?

SUMMARY OF THE EVIDENCE

Exhibits

The Local Board submitted the following exhibits in support of its Motion, which are admitted into evidence:

LB Ex. #1: Affidavit of Dr. Carol Williamson, dated October 14, 2010

LB Ex. #2: QAPS Grade Organization and Redistricting Study, draft report, updated February 22, 2010

LB Ex. #3: Minutes of LB work session, dated November 18, 2009

LB Ex. #4: Minutes of LB meeting, dated December 2, 2009

LB Ex. #5: Minutes of LB budget work session, dated January 20, 2010

LB Ex. #6: Minutes of LB work session, dated February 17, 2010

LB Ex. #7: Minutes of LB meeting, dated March 31, 2010

LB Ex. #8: Minutes of LB work session, dated April 14, 2010

LB Ex. #9: Agenda for LB meeting, dated May 5, 2010

LB Ex. #10: Minutes of LB meeting, dated May 5, 2010

The Appellant did not attach any exhibits to her Opposition to the Local Board's Motion or otherwise offer any affidavits or other documents for admission into evidence.

Testimony

As the matter was submitted for determination on a motion for summary decision, no testimony was taken in this case.

FINDINGS OF FACT

Upon consideration of the evidence in the record before me, I find by a preponderance of the evidence, the following facts.

1. Since the 1980s, the Local Board has operated Kent Island Elementary School (KIES) and Bayside Elementary School (BES) in a so-called "paired configuration," with KIES offering Pre-K through second grade classes and BES offering third through fifthe grade classes. (LB Ex. 1.)
2. In 1992, the Capital Improvement Study Committee appointed by the Local Board recommended that the Local Board adopt a policy whereby schools would be organized by the following grade levels: Pre-K to fifth grade; sixth grade to eighth grade; and ninth grade to twelfth grade. The recommendation made an exception for

KIES and BES due to occupancy issues, and KIES and BES remained in the existing paired configuration. (LB Ex. 2, Appendix A).

3. In February 2009, the Local Board conducted a study to consider how KIES and BES should be configured and to consider redistricting options concerning the two schools. (LB Exs. 1 and 2).
4. At the March 4, 2009 meeting of the Local Board, redistricting options and grade configurations were discussed for KIES and BES. (Ex. 1; Ex. 2, Appendix 1) 1).
5. On March 10, 2010, Superintendent Dr. Carol Williamson sent a letter to parents concerning redistricting and grade configuration options and inviting attendance at a community meeting on March 19, 2009. (LB Exs. 1 and 2).
6. On March 10, 2009, QAPS Superintendent Dr. Carol Williamson sent a letter to parents outlining the grade and redistricting options being considered and inviting parents to attend and comment at a community meeting scheduled for March 19, 2009. (LB Exs. 1 and 2).
7. In April 2009, the Local Board directed the formation of a committee including parents and teachers to consider grade configuration plans for KIES and BES. The committee was designated as the "KIES/BES Grade Organization Committee" (the Committee). Between September 7, 2009 and October 5, 2009, the Committee met four times to discuss academic research, proposed grade models, facility information, transportation, redistricting and technology as they related to reorganization of KIES and BES. (LB Exs. 1 and 2).
8. The Committee noted that academic research was limited and not definitive. LB Exs. 1 and 2. The Committee members were actively divided between those who supported a

transition to a Pre-K through fifth model and those who wished to maintain the existing arrangement. (LB Exs. 1 and 2.)

9. At the Local Board meeting of November 18, 2010, the Local Board discussed the report of the Committee and decided it would have a full discussion of the report and the grade organization issues for KIES and BES at its December meeting. (LB Exhibits 1 and 3).

10. At its December 2, 2009 meeting, the Local Board again discussed the grade reorganization issue at KIES and BES, including the relative merits of the current configuration and the proposed Pre-K through fifth model. Among the issues discussed by the LB were the effect each model would have on facilities utilization; the number of free and reduced-cost meal students at each school; the total capacity of each school; and the academic benefit to students of each model. At the conclusion of the discussion, LB member Darden moved that KIES be configured as Pre-K through fifth grade and that BES be configured as K through fifth grade. The motion passed by a vote of three to one. (LB Exs. 1 and 4).

11. Subsequent to the December 2, 2009 Local Board meeting, the reconfiguration of KIES and BES was not immediately implemented, and the Local Board continued to discuss the issue.

12. On January 20, 2010, the Local Board met again to discuss redistricting and reconfiguration options for KIES and BES. The Local Board listened to comments from approximately twenty members of the community regarding these issues. (LB Ex. 1).

13. On February 17, 2010, the Local Board met again and discussed the issue of reconfiguring and redistricting KIES and BES. The Local Board discussed various issues, including the costs of the proposed changes, the need to grandfather certain students so they could finish their elementary education at their currently-assigned school; extra transportation costs to provide bus service for grandfathered students; and whether a full-time enrichment specialist could be funded at each school. One Local Board member commented that the decision to reconfigure should be reconsidered because more parents would have participated in the December 2009 meeting if the meeting had been better publicized. (LB Exs. 1 and 6).

14. On March 31, 2010, the Local Board met again and took public comments regarding the reconfiguration plan. All, or almost all, community members who commented on the plan for KIES and BES were either opposed to reconfiguration or expressed reservations regarding the plan. (LB Exs. 1 and 7).

15. On April 14, 2010, the Local Board held a meeting on the proposed redistricting options for KIES and BES. At the hearing, comments from other county officials and members of the public were accepted. Gene M. Ransom, III, the President of the Queen Anne's County Board of Commissioners, commented that the proposed redistricting option would have an adverse effect on Title I federal funds received by other schools in the county that have a large African American population. He also commented that he did not believe that the county could financially afford the proposed plan. (LB Exs. 1 and 8).

16. At the April 14, 2010 Local Board meeting, a total of twenty persons from the community commented on the proposed plan, most of whom either opposed the plan and/or questioned its financial cost and its effect on the community. (LB Exs. 1 and 8).

17. On May 5, 2010, the Local Board held a meeting. One of the agenda items for the meeting called for reaching a "[d]ecision on Redistricting Options for BES/KIES." The Local Board discussed the various options that had been proposed for KIES and BES. One LB member commented that the public was almost universally opposed to the plan to reconfigure and redistrict the two schools. Local Board member Lisa Darden made a motion, which was seconded, to select what was known as Option 1, which would assign the communities of Cloverfields, Love Point, Mallord Run, and Ellendale to BES with the remaining communities previously assigned to either KIES or BES to be assigned to KIES. After discussion, including discussion about cost and the timing of any change, Local Board Vice-President Vito Tinelli moved to amend Darden's motion by postponing indefinitely a decision on reconfiguration and redistricting and to keep KIES and BES in their existing configuration for the 2011-2012 school year. The amended motion was passed by LB by a vote of 3 to 2. (LB Exs. 1 and 10.)

18. On May 25, 2010, the Appellant timely filed an appeal to the State Board seeking reversal of the Local Board's determination to defer a decision on the reconfiguration and redistricting of KIES and BES and seeking a remand to the LB with an order to consider and adopt one of the proposed options.

DISCUSSION

Legal Framework

Motion for Summary Decision

COMAR 28.02.01.12D governs motions for summary decision and provides:

> D. Motion for Summary Decision.
>
> (1) Any party may file a motion for summary decision on all or part of an action, at any time, on the ground that there is no genuine dispute as to any material fact and that the party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. Motions for summary decision shall be supported by affidavits.
>
> (2) The response to a motion for summary decision shall identify the material facts that are disputed.
>
> (3) An affidavit supporting or opposing a motion for summary decision shall be made upon personal knowledge, shall set forth the facts that would be admissible in evidence, and shall show affirmatively that the affiant is competent to testify to the matters stated in the affidavit.
>
> (4) The judge may issue a proposed or final decision in favor of or against the moving party if the motion and response show that there is no genuine dispute as to any material fact and that the party in whose favor judgment is entered is entitled to judgment as a matter of law.

Maryland appellate cases on motions for summary decision under the Maryland Rules of Civil Procedure (Maryland Rules) are instructive regarding similar motions under the procedural regulations of the OAH. In a motion for summary judgment or a motion for summary decision, a party goes beyond the initial pleadings, asserting that no genuine issue exists as to any material fact and that the party filing the motion is entitled to prevail as a matter of law. *Compare* COMAR 28.02.01.12D *and* Maryland Rule 2-501(a); *see Davis v. DiPino*, 337 Md. 642, 648 (1995).

A party may move for summary decision "on all or part of an action." COMAR 28.02.01.12D(1). The principal purpose of summary determination, whether it be summary decision or summary judgment, is to isolate and dispose of litigation that lacks merit. Only a

genuine dispute as to a material fact is relevant in opposition to a motion for summary judgment or summary decision. *Seaboard Sur. Co. v. Kline, Inc.*, 91 Md. App. 236, 242 (1992). A material fact is defined as one that will somehow affect the outcome of the case. *King v. Bankerd*, 303 Md. 98, 111 (1985); *Washington Homes, Inc. v. Interstate Land Dev. Co.*, 281 Md. 712, 717 (1978). If a dispute does not relate to a material fact, as defined above, then any such controversy will not preclude the entry of summary judgment or decision. *Salisbury Beauty Sch. v. State Board of Cosmetologists*, 268 Md. 32, 40 (1973). Only where the material facts are conceded, are not disputed, or are uncontroverted and the inferences to be drawn from those facts are plain, definite, and undisputed does their legal significance become a matter of law for summary determination. *Fenwick Motor Co. v. Fenwick*, 258 Md. 134, 139 (1970).

When a party has demonstrated grounds for summary judgment, the opposing party may defeat the motion by producing affidavits, or other admissible documents, which establish that material facts are in dispute. *Beatty v. Trailmaster Products, Inc.*, 330 Md. 726, 737-738 (1993). In such an effort, an opposing party is aided by the principle that all inferences that can be drawn from the pleadings, affidavits, and admissions on the question of whether there is a dispute as to a material fact must be resolved against the moving party. *Honacker v. W.C. & A.N. Miller Development Co.*, 285 Md. 216, 231 (1979).

In the instant case, Appellant did not submit any affidavits or other documents with her Opposition. Indeed, although she argues in her Opposition that the facts set forth by the Local Board in its Motion are "not complete and omit some very important points" she does not specifically allege that any material fact is in dispute. Moreover, because she submitted no affidavits or other admissible documents, she is necessarily unable to establish such a dispute of

material fact. The remaining issue is therefore whether the Local Board is entitled to judgment as a matter of law.

Standard of Review

The Standard of Review can be found in COMAR 13A.01.05.05A:

> Decisions of a local board involving a local policy or a controversy and dispute regarding the rules and regulations of the local board shall be considered prima facie correct, and the State Board may not substitute its judgment for that of the local board unless the decision is arbitrary, unreasonable, or illegal.

COMAR 13A.01.05.05B defines "arbitrary or unreasonable" as follows:

> A decision may be arbitrary or unreasonable if it is one or more of the following:
>
> (1) it is contrary to sound educational policy; or
>
> (2) A reasoning mind could not have reasonably reached the conclusion the local board or the superintendant reached.

COMAR 13A.01.05.05C defines "illegal" as satisfying one or more of the following six criteria:

> 1) Unconstitutional;
> (2) Exceeds the statutory authority or jurisdiction of the local board;
> (3) Misconstrues the law;
> (4) Results from an unlawful procedure;
> (5) Is an abuse of discretionary powers; or
> (6) Is affected by any other error of law.

The Appellant has the burden of proof in this matter by a preponderance of the evidence. COMAR 13A.01.05D.

Arbitrary or Unreasonable

The Local Board's decision may be arbitrary or unreasonable if it is contrary to sound educational policy, or a reasoning mind could not have reasonably reached the conclusion the Local Board reached.

A. Sound Educational Policy

As with all elements of her case, it is the Appellant's burden to establish, whether by expert testimony or some other means, that the Local Board's decision is contrary to sound educational policy. COMAR 13A.01.05D. In the context of a summary decision motion, the non-moving party must establish (again, by expert affidavit or otherwise) that there is a dispute of material fact as to whether the Local Board's decision was based on sound educational policy. The Appellant has established no such dispute of fact. Indeed, the record before me establishes that the issue of the reorganization of KIES and BES had been considered by the Local Board since at least 1992. During that time, the Local Board and various committees reporting to it had considered available data and research concerning the various proposed models and their possible effects on children. For example, a committee appointed by the Local Board in April 2009 produced a comprehensive "Grade Organization and Redistricting Study" and noted that academic research was limited and not definitive. LB Ex. 2. The committee members were divided as to those who wished to continue the existing configuration and those who did not, and a review of the document shows that the committee found both pros and cons for each approach. Of course, nothing in the applicable law suggests that there can only be one sound educational policy" in any given circumstance. Different approaches, each with advantages and drawbacks, may each be "sound." In this case, the Local Board repeatedly considered issues including financing, staffing, transportation, transitions, and academic benefit to students. It is clear that the Local Board engaged in appropriate consideration of the various implications of its decision and that the decision was not contrary to sound educational policy. COMAR 13A.01.05.05B(1). The Appellant has raised no genuine issue of material fact as to the question of the educational

soundness of the Local Board's decision.[1]

B. Reasonableness

The Appellant also failed to provide any evidence that a reasoning mind could not have reached the conclusion the Local Board did in maintaining the status quo regarding KIES and BES. When there is substantial evidence to support a board of education's decision and a reviewer (an administrative law judge, the State Board or the courts) disagrees with that decision, the reviewer must, nonetheless uphold the board of education's decision, despite his reaching a different conclusion. *Montgomery County Education Association, Inc., v. Board of Education for Montgomery County*, 311 Md. 303 (1987). As articulated above, there is no need to determine which plan is superior to the other. If both plans are reasonable, then it does not matter which of the two plans were ultimately selected.

In this case, the Appellant is unhappy with the Local Board's decision to maintain the status quo regarding KIES and BES. The mere fact that the Appellant disagrees with the Board's decision, however, does not render it unreasonable. The Appellant argues in her Opposition that the Local Board's decision was arbitrary because "each and every time finances, budget and costs associated with reconfiguration were discussed, the [Local Board] and the Superintendent of Queen Anne's County Schools responded that they had considered these items, planned and budgeted for reconfiguration and redistricting." It is not clear whether the Appellant's argument is that the Local Board was incorrect in maintaining that it had considered financing issues or whether, given that planning and budgeting had been addressed, the Board should have adopted

[1] The Appellant argues in her Opposition that the Local Board's decision is educationally unsound because maintaining the current configuration requires students to undergo an additional transition to a new school "which we know has been proven to have a negative impact on performance across the board in all subject areas. The Appellant's simple assertion of a supposed negative impact on student performance is insufficient to create an issue of material fact as to educational soundness of the Local Board's decision.

a reconfiguration and redistricting plan. In either case, the Appellant at most has shown that she is in disagreement with the Local Board's action, not that the action was arbitrary, unreasonable, or educationally unsound. Similarly, the Appellant argues that the Local Board's action was "unreasonable" because since 1992 there had been "a clear, unquestionable intent" to reconfigure the two schools when certain space limitations were resolved. Again, even assuming for the sake of argument that the Appellant's evaluation of the Local Board's historic "intent" was correct, such a fact would not render the decision here to be unreasonable or otherwise legally infirm. The Board, like any governing body, may change its mind. However, the mere fact that it does so does not mandate a conclusion of that it has acted arbitrarily or unreasonably.

It is important to note that the Local Board's decision to maintain the status quo is quasi-legislative in nature and not judicial or quasi-judicial. *Elprin v. Howard County Bd. of Ed.* 57 Md. App. 458, 465 (1984). In *Elprin*, the Court of Special Appeals held that a resident of a school district possesses no liberty or property interest in a school in his district remaining "as is," without changes resulting from closure or consolidation.[2] Therefore, the redistricting decision is quasi-legislative and the rights to be afforded to interested citizens are limited. As the Court of Appeals stated in *Bernstein, et. al. v. Board of Education of Prince George's County*, 245 Md. 464, 479 (1967), when considering several competing plans, "The test is not even that there may have been other plans that would have worked equally well, or may, in the opinion of some, have been better; the test is whether the action which was taken was arbitrary, capricious or illegal."

Although the Appellant is undoubtedly disappointed with the Local Board's decision,

[2] The converse is necessarily also true, i.e., that a citizen has no liberty or property interest in a school district *not* remaining "as is."

there is no evidence that the Local Board failed to take into consideration any of the facts presented to it during the prolonged study process by the staff, committees and the public. Indeed, the evidence is exclusively to the contrary. The public process provided substantial input from the community, and the Local Board considered and thoroughly discussed all of the issues raised by the Appellant, including issues concerning finances and the effect upon school children of transitions from one school to another. The Local Board considered all alternatives and ultimately decided to maintain the status quo. There was nothing arbitrary or unreasonable in the Local Board's decision. For those reasons, I find the Appellant has not met her burden to show that a reasoning mind could not have reasonably reached the conclusion that the Local Board reached. COMAR 13A.01.05.05B(2).

C. Illegal

In order for the Appellant to prevail by claiming that the Local Board's decision was illegal, the Appellant would have to provide evidence that the decision to maintain the status quo was unconstitutional; exceeds the authority or jurisdiction of the Local Board; misconstrues the law; results from an unlawful procedure; is an abuse of discretionary powers; or is affected by any other error of law. COMAR 13A.01.05.05C. In her Opposition, the Appellant does not allege that the Local Board's action was illegal. However, in her appeal of the Local Board's action, she argues that the decision "may be illegal" because the agenda for the May 5, 2010 called for a "decision regarding a redistricting option for the upcoming school year." Appellant's Appeal Letter, May 25, 2010. She argues that the agenda did not specify an option to "postpone the redistricting indefinitely." *Id.* The Appellant cites no authority to suggest that that by placing an item on an agenda, a body is compelled to act on the item. An agenda merely sets forth items which the body expects to consider at a particular meeting. The Local Board's

vote to defer a final decision on the redistricting issue was undoubtedly legal, not to say commonplace. Accordingly, I find that the Appellant has not shown that the Local Board's decision was an illegal decision. COMAR 13A.01.05.05C.

PROPOSED CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Based on the foregoing Findings of Fact and Discussion, I conclude as a matter of law that the Local Board's Motion for Summary Decision must be granted because there is no genuine dispute as to any material fact and the Local Board is entitled to prevail as a matter of law. COMAR 28.02.02.12D; COMAR 13A.01.05.05A.

RECOMMENDED ORDER

I **RECOMMEND** that the Motion for Summary Decision filed by the Queen Anne's County Board of Education be **GRANTED** by the Maryland State Department of Education, and that the contested-case hearing scheduled to begin on January 4, 2011 be **CANCELLED**; and I further,

RECOMMEND that the redistricting decision of the Queen Anne's County Board of Education, dated May 5, 2010 regarding the redistricting and reconfiguration of KIES and BES, be **UPHELD** by the Maryland State Department of Education.

December 13, 2010
Date Decision Mailed

David Hofstetter
Administrative Law Judge

DH/rbs
#118463

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO FILE EXCEPTIONS

Any party adversely affected by this Proposed Decision has the right to file written exceptions within fifteen days of receipt of the decision; parties may file written responses to the exceptions within fifteen days of receipt of the exceptions. Both the exceptions and the responses shall be filed with the Maryland State Department of Education, Maryland State Board of Education, 200 West Baltimore Street, Baltimore, Maryland 21201-2595, with a copy to the other party or parties. COMAR 13A.01.05.07F. The Office of Administrative Hearings is not a party to any review process.

NANCY MULLIGAN	* BEFORE DAVID HOFSTETTER,
v.	* AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
QUEEN ANNE'S COUNTY	* OF THE MARYLAND OFFICE
BOARD OF EDUCATION	* OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS
	* CASE NO.: MSDE-BE-09-10-30023

* * * * * * * * * * * * *

FILE EXHIBIT LIST

Exhibits

The Local Board submitted the following exhibits in support of its Motion, which are admitted into evidence:

LB Ex. #1: Affidavit of Dr. Carol Williamson, dated October 14, 2010

LB Ex. #2: QAPS Grade Organization and Redistricting Study, draft report, updated February 22, 2010

LB Ex. #3: Minutes of LB work session, dated November 18, 2009

LB Ex. #4: Minutes of LB meeting, dated December 2, 2009

LB Ex. #5: Minutes of LB budget work session, dated January 20, 2010

LB Ex. #6: Minutes of LB work session, dated February 17, 2010

LB Ex. #7: Minutes of LB meeting, dated March 31, 2010

LB Ex. #8: Minutes of LB work session, dated April 14, 2010

LB Ex. #9: Agenda for LB meeting, dated May 5, 2010

LB Ex. #10: Minutes of LB meeting, dated May 5, 2010

The Appellant did not attach any exhibits to her Opposition to the Local Board's Motion or otherwise offer any affidavits or other documents for admission into evidence.