Maryland Association of Boards of Education
Serving & Supporting Boards of Education Since 1957

The Monitor

a summary of the monthly
Maryland State Board of Education Meeting

621 Ridgely Ave., Suite 300, Annapolis, MD 21401-1112 410-841-5414, 800-841-8197 www.mabe.org

June 26, 2012

National Board Certification Candidates

The State Board approved the roster of 260 teachers to participate in the 2012-2013 fee incentive program which provides state and local funding to cover the costs of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) assessment and certification program.
Memo

Advanced Professional Certification Regulations

The State Board received a presentation from Jean Satterfield, MSDE, on proposed regulations to reform the Advanced Professional Certification (APC) program by amending COMAR 13A. 12.01.02, .06E, and .11. Board President James DeGraffenreidt opened the discussion by reviewing the recent deliberations between the State Board and Professional Standards and Teacher Education Board (PSTEB) regarding the addition of a fourth path for receiving the Advanced professional Certificate (APC). The APC is required to maintain teacher certification in Maryland, following no more than 10 years under Standard Certifications (I and II) which are valid for 5 years each. Currently, a teacher may qualify for the APC within 10 years by meeting one of three standards, including earning a master's degree, earning at least 36 hours of approved coursework, or obtaining National Board certification.

Mr. DeGraffenreidt explained that the State Board has been interested for some time in the development of a fourth option based a teacher's evidence of highly effective teaching, which in turn is based on student growth in the teacher's classroom. He emphasized that this initiative is consistent with the state's Race to the Top grant agreement with the U.S. Department of Education. Staff explained that in Maryland the State Board shares the authority to adopt teacher certification standards with PSTEB, and in instances of disagreement can form a conference committee to reach a compromise. However, ultimately the final decision to promulgate regulations resides with the State Board.

Mr. DeGraffenreidt described the recent conference committee meeting, held on April 5, 2012, which was successful in producing the pending regulations that add the fourth APC option. He shared that he believes the State Board and PSTEB view the issue so differently because PSTEB is constituted of representatives of stakeholders representing specific constituencies, whereas the State Board is constituted of broad representation from various professional backgrounds and life experiences. In addition, he observed that the minutes of the conference committee meeting did not accurately reflect

this agreement and mischaracterizing the State Board as being in disagreement itself. He also criticized minutes from previous PSTEB meetings for discussing teacher growth, but not student growth.

Board member Kate Walsh opined that there is no research showing a correlation between a teacher's education and effectiveness. She stressed that she remains concerned that in order to receive an APC a teacher will still have to pursue the coursework because time could run out on the option to receive highly effective evaluations for three of five years, as proposed in the regulations. She concluded that the fourth option is therefore not a viable option a teacher would realistically pursue. She reiterated her position that the APC should not be a requirement, but be made optional as a route to higher pay. Mr. DeGraffenreidt interjected that Ms. Walsh's discussion is why PSTEB could conclude that the State Board is not in agreement, whereas he believes the pending regulations represent a good start and that other issues and concerns can be revisited in the future. Board member Mahtu Didhu shared her concern that the definition of effectiveness is still not clear. Board member Finan shared that she hopes teachers continue to pursue master's degrees, but that as a member of the Educator Effectiveness Council she also sees the fourth option as being important to validate the value of the new teacher effectiveness evaluations being developed throughout the state.

The State Board granted permission to publish the regulations.
Memo

Superintendent of the Year

Dr. Carl Roberts, Executive Director of the Public School Superintendents Association of Maryland (PSSAM) introduced the 2012 Maryland Superintendent of the Year, Talbot County Superintendent Dr. Karen Salmon, who thanked the board and gave brief remarks. Several board members offered congratulations and praised the successes of the school system under Dr. Salmon's leadership. Dr. Salmon described the unique and highly successful program of providing all ninth graders with laptops which eliminate the need for textbooks and facilitate student learning and family engagement.
Memo

Elementary Principal and Assistant Principal of the Year

Debbie Drown, Executive Director of the Maryland Association of Elementary School Principals (MAESP), introduced the 2012 Assistant Principal of the Year, Ms. Dyann Mack, Assistant Principal of Homestead Wakefield Elementary School in Harford County.

Ms. Drown introduced the 2012 Elementary Principal of the Year, Mr. Gary Llewellyn, principal of Mt. Savage School in Allegany County.
Memo

National Green Ribbon Schools Award Recipients

The State Board recognized four schools for receiving U.S. Department of Education Green Ribbon School awards. Dr. Mary Carey, MSDE, presented the background on the Green Ribbon School awards program, and announced the following schools as winners: Dunloggin Middle School (Howard County), Folger McKinsey Elementary School (Anne Arundel County), Francis Scott Key Middle School (Montgomery County), and the Lucy School (non-public, Frederick County).

In addition, Dr. Carey informed the Board that the Educator Effectiveness Academies opened this week. She thanked incoming State Superintendent Dr. Lillian Lowery for participating in the opening video and invited board members to visit.
Memo

Race to the Top Update

Dr. Jim Foran, MSDE, reported that he had visited three more local school systems who are all making progress in implementing programs in accordance with the Race to the Top (RTTT) grant. He shared that he was particularly impressed with Baltimore City's progress, and added all school systems are now preparing for the annual performance report.

Race to the Top Focus Area: Student High Risk Alerts Dashboard

MSDE staff, Mr. Rob London and Ms. Pat Mikos, presented an overview of the various dashboards that MSDE is creating as a result of the Race to the Top (RTTT) grant agreement. MSDE is in the process of developing over 125 data presentation dashboards covering 36 performance subject areas. Staff then provided a detailed report on the Student High Risk Alerts Dashboard, which aggregates student data across a number of factors to indicate which students are at risk for insufficient academic progress. The factors include academic progress, attendance, suspension/expulsion, grade retention, and mobility, among others.

The State Board engaged in a lengthy discussion and raised numerous concerns with the purpose and implementation of the dashboard. Board President DeGraffenreidt asked about the process used to select the factors, and whether other models were consulted. Staff responded that they looked at several states to see what types of measures were being used.
Mr. Degraffenreidt also stated that the Board needed an overview of which policy decision makers this dashboard is intended to serve, and who will use it for what purpose. Staff responded that the dashboard would be available to local school systems, superintendents, principals, counselors, and teachers. .

President DeGraffenreidt asked if the dashboard and factors were designed around the specifics of what these groups stated they needed. Staff responded by describing the three-fold process; with phase one being general design based on what other states are doing, phase two being collaboration with local school systems, and phase three being implementation. Staff empathized that local school systems will be consulted on design and implementation before the dashboard is finalized. In addition, staff clarified that the dashboard is not intended to replace alerts for students already used n local school systems, but rather to provide a high level overview of what is happening in schools and school systems.

President DeGraffenreidt asked about the context of the questions being asked local school systems, and why they would care about a tool that is not intended for local purposes. Staff responded that it was designed using research-based evidence that will predict which students are at risk for dropping out, and to monitor the progression of students over time to prevent him/her becoming a dropout. It was clarified that the tool is designed to inform student interventions using individual student level measures, which some large school systems already have but many smaller ones do not.

Board member Donna Hill Staton asked for more specific information on how the dashboard will be helpful and how it works. Staff explained that based on annual data collection, teachers could use the data with incoming classes to predict what services and interventions students may need. Staff further explained the dashboard would combine, through a formula, several factors such as attendance data, movement of students, expulsion and suspension data, to give the teacher a history of an incoming student. Board member Staton voiced her concern that she could see how this could be helpful but also could be a danger in that a teacher may make assumptions about students. She stated that perhaps training was needed to encourage appropriate use. Student board member Nina Marks expressed similar concerns, emphasizing that students want a fresh start every year and not to be judged by new teachers on problems in previous years.

Staff stated that while they understand the Board's concerns about stigma and labeling, local educators and administrators would be able to use this dashboard as an early warning system, and shared that school systems with large data warehouses already have this alert.

Board member Finan shared that there were more complex factors at work than just the previous years grades, and that if a child is a blank slate, it takes longer to know what child needs and provide interventions.

Board members Walsh asked if there would be a way for a teacher to add notes to the student's record. Board member Staton raised a similar concern, asking if this dashboard was the appropriate place to accrue information that shows student history and progress. Staff shared that RTTT has another student intervention system which can be used for that type of information, and clarified that this dashboard collects information already entered in other places.

Board member Staton asked if MSDE had the means to require local school systems to use the dashboard and RTTT intervention system referred to, and staff replied that they have the means to look at data over time but not necessarily at the level of what intervention was provided and the effectiveness of specific interventions.

Board member Dr. Ivan Walks observed that the dashboard appears to be a good research tool but expressed concern about variability across local systems with regard to resources, i.e., one district identifying a child that needs resources they can provide versus another district setting the child aside because they do not have resources. Staff responded that the concern has two parts, resource versus information, and that RTTT is intended to address both by enhancing access to information and providing additional funding for interventions.

President DeGraffenreidt asked why this dashboard would be used if it does not 'move the needle', and also asked how is it going to help the state's overall progress. Staff responded that if put into the hands of superintendents, principals and teachers, they will be able to look at the data and see what the critical factors are, including if a student has moved between school districts.

Board member Sayed Naved asked about the definition of the word 'alert' and was told that thresholds are set that will trigger a report, with local school systems having flexibility to set indicators for alerts based on different climates and cultures.

President DeGraffenreidt asked if there was a trigger set for chronic absenteeism. Staff responded that there is, but that it is not timely enough because the dashboard relies on annual data. Mr. DeGraffenreidt said that it should be able to adjust for more frequent data collection, and was told that such a decision was in the purview of the Board.
Memo

Follow Up to State Board Report: A Safe School, Successful Students, and a Fair and Equitable Disciplinary Process Go Hand in Hand: A Study of School Discipline Practices and Proposed Regulatory Changes

President DeGraffenreidt opened the discussion by providing background on this item, stating it was triggered in regard to a student who was out of school for a lengthy time without services, leaving the board to question what educational services are provided to suspended students. He added that, at this point, the board is not specifying yet what specific educational services should be provided, only what is expected. The Board's agenda indicated the discussion would include: Making decisions about proposed disciplinary regulations; Local school systems' student attendance policies; and Current data on positive behavioral interventions and supports.

Mr. DeGraffenreidt explained that the state's goal is to create a world class education system that prepares all students for college and career success in the 21st Century. Therefore, a "straw man" decision-making document was provided to the state board to provide a structured framework for discussion and decision. He stated that in order for our students to be college and career ready, they need to be in school. Therefore, the school discipline philosophy should focus on keeping students in school. He stated it has been established that if suspension or expulsion is necessary, as a last resort, the school must keep suspended or expelled students connected to the school by providing educational services that will allow the student to return to school with a chance to become college and career ready.

Chuck Buckler and Ann Chaffin, MSDE, presented the information collected through a survey of local school systems' application of student attendance policy regulations (COMAR 13A.08.01.05) to suspended students. Staff outlined the responses as follows:

- All twenty-four school systems have in place procedures to monitor attendance and intervene in cases where there is a pattern of chronic absences.
- In regards to a specific question about whether out-of-school suspensions, which are excused absences, figure into the count of days absent to trigger the interventions, responses varied.
- Fifteen school systems do count excused and unexcused absences in their chronicle of days absent and do put their intervention strategies and processes in place when a student accrues a number of absences.
- Nine school systems do not utilize out-of school suspensions (excused absences) in order to implement their intervention strategies and processes.

Mr. Buckler stated that it appears there is some variance in the application of COMAR 13A.08.01.05 across the state to students who are suspended, and that this variance can be remedied by staff in the Division of Student, Family, and School Support through guidance and technical assistance if it is the

board's intent that this particular regulation applies to all student absences, both excused and unexcused.

Mr. DeGraffenreidt said the documentation shows the State Board that school systems do take this seriously and this is good to see. He asked Board members if there was anything in the comments they wanted to address or that indicated a need for a change in regulation.

The Board then proceeded through a document that included several 'decision points' on policy questions, including options for specific amendments to regulations. In addition, the document included summaries of comments received during the State Board's multi-year inquiry on this topic.

School Discipline Policy

The first decision point asked "Does the Board endorse an amendment that better reflects its general philosophy of school discipline?" The proposed regulation under discussion reads:

A. Each local board of education shall adopt a set of school discipline policies and regulations that eliminate any zero tolerance policies and reflect the rehabilitative goal of school discipline designed to keep students in school so that they may graduate college and career ready.
B. The disciplinary policy shall be based on the goals of fostering and teaching positive behavior.
C. The disciplinary policy should explain why and how long-term suspensions are last-resort options.

Mr. DeGraffenreidt stated that the Board wants to make clear they do not want to see zero tolerance policies, so the proposed regulation could be modified to "prohibit" any zero tolerance policies, rather than call for the elimination of any such policies. Board members stated they were in agreement, but also discussed adding other more detailed language. Liz Kameen, MSDE General Counsel, advised that any language needed to be consistent with the regulatory mode, and that draft regulations would be circulated for adoption at the July meeting.

Expulsion and Extended Suspension

The next decision point addressed the option of adding back into the regulations the option for expulsion and, if so, whether the board wants to define what expulsion means and place limits on when it can be used. If so, the proposed regulation could state:

> "Expulsion" means the total exclusion of a student from the student's regular school program for 45 days or longer for conduct that the superintendent determines, on a case by case basis, is violent or poses a serious danger of physical harm to others in the school community.

Ms. Staton asked if this was too restrictive. Mr. DeGraffenreidt said he expects there will be more constructive feedback as the board proceeds. Ms. Kameen clarified that the question is whether the board want to change the definition of Extended Suspension to make clear that it is 'temporary' and time limited and, if so, it could read:

> "Extended suspension" means the temporary removal of a student from the students' regular school program for a time period between 11-45 days for conduct that the superintendent determines, on a case by case basis, poses a danger of harm to others in the school community.

This definition would remove the provision in the draft regulations previously considered by the Board which read: "Extended suspensions can include total exclusion from school only when that is the only

means by which to ensure a safe school." The Board agreed to clarify that expulsion should be defined as a limited option.

Short Term/Long Term Suspensions

The Board briefly discussed and agreed to retain the draft regulations' time frames for short and long term suspensions. However, the Board also agreed to remove the provision allowing for suspensions, and expulsion if appropriate, for disruptive behavior.

Return to School If Timely Decision Not Made

The next decision point concerned the proposed regulation intended to ensure that students recommended for an extended suspension be returned to school following 10 days, if the Superintendent has not made the final decision by that time. The board discussed the option to allow schools to deny a student's return after the 10 day period has ended if the delay is not the fault of the school system. In addition, the board considered whether the denial of a student's return should be in limited cases "only if the student presents a danger of serious physical harm to others."

Mr. DeGraffenreidt asked Dr. Sadusky for his opinion on the reasonableness of the 10-day provision, in light of critical comments from school systems and education organizations. Dr. Sadusky responded that it was reasonable, and shared that while he believes there are rare exceptions, the small systems can manage and the larger systems have even more resources based on scale. The board decided to endorse the draft regulation, but to go no further at this time.

Return to School After All Conditions Are Met

The Board reviewed and endorsed the draft recommendation to clarify that "A student suspended from school shall be allowed to return to school on the day that the terms and conditions of the suspension are met whether or not the student, parent, or guardian has filed an appeal of the decision."

Timely Open Process

The Board discussed the decision point regarding timely open process, and decided to not extend the 30 day and 10 day time periods.

Minimum Education Services

On the decision point regarding minimum education services, Mr. DeGraffenreidt stated he was reluctant to recommend amending the regulation at this point unless there was strong board consensus to do so. The proposed language reads: "Each student suspended out-of-school who is not placed in an alternative education program shall receive daily homework assignments from each teacher which shall be reviewed and corrected on a weekly basis and returned to the student."

Board members discussed the distinction between homework and assignments. Mr. DeGraffenreidt emphasized that the goal is keep students engaged and monitored.

Disproportionate Impact

The Board discussed the proposal to require local plans to remedy the disproportionate impact of student discipline policies on minority students, based on data collected by MSDE. Mr. Buckler described the proposed process of data collection and response to disproportional impact and "high numbers" of suspensions, expulsions, and referrals to juvenile services and the criminal justice system. He emphasized that MSDE will need time to implement this new process, which according to the

proposal will utilize the “discrepancy model”. The Board endorsed the pending recommendations without changes.

Delinquent Act and Arrest Data
In regard to the reporting of delinquent acts and arrest data, Mr. DeGraffenreidt stated he was in favor of continuing to allow the Department to have discretion to develop the data parameters.

Revision of the School Discipline Report
Regarding the revision of the School Discipline Report, Mr. Buckler stated it is expected there will be a draft for the Board’s July meeting, when the report will be revised and finalized to reflect the board’s philosophy, deliberations, and guidance to the school community. In addition, he noted that following the completion of this work, the next step is to consider the Code of Conduct.

Board member Sidhu shared that she does not feel there is sufficient reference to the responsibility of parents in the document, and she wants to see some acknowledgement that parents are also responsible for student behavior. Mr. DeGraffenreidt said there is no clear answer to that, and that many schools and principals agree with these concerns. He added that the board needed to be careful when looking at whether the school gives up on the student or whether it’s recognized the trigger points for further inquiry. Mr. DeGraffenreidt said the question is "are we closer to our objective," which will not be known until the set of reforms are implemented.
Memo and Survey of Local Policies on Student Attendance
Making Decisions about Proposed Disciplinary Regulations

PBIS and Character Counts

The Board received an update about current Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) and Character Counts education initiatives and data which reflect efforts to proactively plan by promoting positive mental health, reduction in school violence, and reducing the number of youth being suspended or referred for additional services because of disruptive behaviors in Maryland Schools.
Current Character Counts and PBIS Data

Status Report on Maryland Regulatory and Legislative Action Related to Head Injuries in High School Sports

A panel including Renee Spence, MSDE, Ned Sparks, Maryland Public School Athletic Association, and Mike Williams, Howard County Public Schools Athletics Director, reviewed the legislative history and contents of a report entitled Policies and Programs on Concussions for Public School and Youth Sport Programs. Attached to the report was the testimony of Mr. Tom Hearn who made public comments at the Board’s May 22, 2012 meeting criticizing the state’s approach to sports related concussions and in particular the failure to adopt regulations similar to Massachusetts.

Ms. Spence provided the history of concussion legislation enacted in 2011 (HB 858/SB 771), which required MSDE to develop a program to provide concussion awareness to coaches, school personnel, students, and parents in collaboration with the Department of Health and Mental Hygiene (DHMH), local boards of education, and other experts and stakeholders. She described the late filing of legislation in 2010, the workgroup convened by Mr. Sparks that interim, and the subsequent passage of amended legislation in 2011. concussions.

Mr. Sparks presented the report which details definitions, the coach's education, concussion awareness for student-athletes, parents or guardians, or school personnel, handouts and forms available for school use, a chart detailing the graduated return to play protocol, and a form that outside sports teams must complete. The report reflects activities underway prior to the legislation as well as the new law's requirements. Specifically, the 2011 legislation requires that a student or youth athlete who is suspected of sustaining a concussion or other head injury in a practice or game must be removed from play. Once removed from play, a student or youth athlete may not return to play until he or she has obtained written clearance from a licensed health care professional trained in the evaluation and management of

Ms. Walsh asked about public comment made at the previous Board meeting regarding concussions, and the fact that the board wanted to discuss points raised in those comments. She specifically asked about regulations in Massachusetts, and why were they cited as superior to Maryland regulations. She also asked about limiting full contact practices to twice a week as the National Football League had done.

Mr. Sparks noted that the report did not get into that level of detail, and that there wasn't data to support that. Ms. Walsh responded that she was interested in that level of detail, that the public comments were compelling, and that the board needed to be educated about the issue so as to make informed judgments. Board member Navid asked when data would be available. Mr. Sparks stated that a national organization was starting to collect that information, and that they would want to look into that data before banning specific things. President DeGraffenreidt agreed that the board needed to be educated about the issue, asked what additional information DHMH would be able to provide the Board. He stated they need to know what their responsibilities are and how they can make the problem better. Ms. Spence responded by assuring the Board that DHMH was involved in the development of the new concussions policy and program as required by the legislation.

Board member Staton stated there is a lot of data and they need to be informed about it. She said she was interested in what Harford County was doing but wanted to hear from others also.
Mike Williams, Howard County School System, then informed the board about the concussion program in Howard County, and walked the board through the details of baseline testing, concussion testing, and elements involved in making the decision to allow a player to return to play.

Board member Staton asked what is being done to prevent or to minimize the risk of concussion injuries. She requested information on what, if anything, was being done through rules or regulations that would be preventative in nature. Mr. Williams distinguished prevention from education and responses to impacts and symptoms. Mr. Sparks stated that over the years, the game of football has become safer with the removal of face blocking and other changes to the rules of play. He also discussed preventing heat related injuries, and said it was an ongoing process.

Ms. Walsh asked if MSDE was considering any actions that would reduce or prevent concussions from occurring, and Mr. Sparks said that beyond the legislation, they were not.

Board member Smith stated it was important to know what was happening in other states and Maryland counties, and that there need to be policies and procedures in place to ensure concussions do not happen.

Ms. Spence clarified that the first legislation enacted in the nation was in Washington State in 2009, with 10 states following in 2010, and Maryland in 2011. She reiterated the comprehensive scope of work following the 2011 legislation, including policies and regulations that have been put together by Mr. Sparks, DHMH, and the Children's National Medical Center in Washington, DC.

Board member Walks stated that the discussion was really about traumatic brain injuries. He noted this issue is not an MSDE issue but rather one that has to be solved by a group already formed, referring to the Maryland Traumatic injury Advisory Board. He suggested that an interdisciplinary group was needed to make recommendations to the State Board. Ms. Spence responded that she would come back to the Board after researching available options.

Memo & Report on Concussions

Evaluation of Teachers and Principals Regulations (COMAR 13A.07.09)

MSDE staff reported the Education Reform Act of 2010 calls for the State Board to adopt regulations to establish standards for performance evaluations for teachers and principals which include model performance evaluation criteria. The regulations apply to the evaluations of all principals and teachers, and identifies criteria for local school systems, in a manner that complies with the Education Reform Act of 2010 and meets the requirements of the ESEA Flexibility Request recently approved by the U.S. Department of Education. The State Board granted final approval of the regulations.

Memo & Regulations

School Counselor Regulations (COMAR 13A.12.03.02)

MSDE staff presented the proposed amendments to School Counselor regulations that are aligned with the recent change in terminology from "Guidance" to "School" Counselor. In addition, the proposed changes include adding a second degree option to the existing degree requirement and allowing an experienced School Counselor with the requisite credential and school counseling experience to obtain initial Maryland certification. The amended regulations are intended to provide greater hiring flexibility for local school systems. The State Board granted final approval of the regulations.
Memo & Regulations

Online Learning and Maryland Public Education Regulations (COMAR 13A.93.92.92 and .905)

MSDE staff requested the emergency adoption of a proposed change to COMAR 13A.03.02.05D to include a vendor fee structure for reviewing online courses. The proposed amendments are in response to legislation enacted by the General Assembly in 2011 (Senate Bill 674). The vendor fee structure will also support professional development to train educators across the State to review and evaluate online courses. The State Board granted permission to publish emergency regulations. .
Memo and Regulations

Interim State Superintendent Update and Remarks

Interim Superintendent Sadusky reported on options for reporting student readiness to parents with four levels possible; the highest being ready for college, and lowest needing intervention. He added there would be many debates before this issue is resolved. He also noted the difficult issue of states agreeing on how to quantify when a student is ready for college, and that it would be difficult to get states to agree on that number.

Mr. DeGraffenreidt thanked Dr. Sadusky for his hard work, especially during the initial Race to the Top program implementation, and wished him well in his new job. Dr. Sadusky thanked the board for the opportunity to serve as interim superintendent, and said he enjoyed working with talented staff and the board, and appreciated doing such important work.

Board Member Updates

Ms. Sidhu reported that she attended a boat trip with Maryland's teachers of the year and enjoyed it very much. She related that teachers very much appreciated the year-long celebration and applauded Dr. Strouse for managing the program.

Recognition of Student Board Member

President DeGraffenreidt thanked student board member Nina Marks for her service this past year. Ms. Marks said she appreciated the opportunity and enjoyed her time very much. She added that she appreciated being treated as an equal. Board members commented they appreciated her maturity, intelligence and willingness to participate.

Public Comment

Betty Weller, Maryland State Educators Association, thanked Dr. Sadusky for his service and applauded him for his work on the Teacher Effectiveness Council. She welcomed Dr. Lowery and said she looked forward to working with her in the future. She shared that MSEA strongly supports the continuation of the current options for achieving a professional certificate. She spoke strongly against the state board instituting “Option 4” (referring to the option to achieve 3 years of highly effective ratings rather than obtain a master’s degree).

Kathy Serbany, nationally board certified teacher, former teacher of the year ear, and member of PSTEB, expressed concern about the state board considering changes to certification, specifically “Option 4”.

Diana English Brown, national board certified teacher in the Prince George's County Public Schools, expressed concern about the state board considering changes to certification, specifically “Option 4”.

Opinions

The State Board issued options in the following cases:

Baltimore City Public School System Petition for Declaratory Ruling, the Board dismissed the petition to reverse the Interim State Superintendent's decision regarding the local school system's out of county living arrangement program

Nicholas Moon v. Somerset County Board of Education, affirming the local board's bus contract decision

- Brian and Ivonne O. v. Montgomery County Board of Education, dismissing the appeal of the local board's student transfer decision as moot
- Joseph Gwin v. Baltimore City Board of School Commissioners, upholding the teacher's termination
- Karima G. v. Baltimore County Board of Education, dismissing the student residency appeal as moot
- Mr. and Mrs. Abu B. v. Howard County Board of Education, affirming the local board's student residency decision