

## **MINUTES OF THE MARYLAND STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION**

Monday

June 26, 2017

Maryland State Board of Education

200 W. Baltimore Street

Baltimore, Maryland 21201

The Maryland State Board of Education met in special session on Monday, June 26, 2017 at 10 a.m. at the Nancy S. Grasmick State Education Building. The following members were in attendance: Mr. Andrew R. Smarick, President; Mr. David Edimo; Dr. Justin M. Hartings; Ms. Stephanie R. Iszard; Dr. Rose Maria Li; Dr. Michael D. Phillips; Mrs. Madhu Sidhu; Mr. Guffrie M. Smith; Dr. David Steiner; and Dr. Karen Salmon, State Superintendent of Schools. Dr. Chester Finn Jr., Vice-President, and Dr. Michele Jenkins Guyton were absent.

Elizabeth Kameen, Esq., Assistant Attorney General, and the following staff members were also present: Dr. Miya Simpson, Executive Director to the State Board; Dr. Sylvia Lawson, Deputy State Superintendent, Office of School Effectiveness; Dr. Carol Williamson, Deputy State Superintendent, Office of Teaching and Learning; and Kristy Michel, Deputy State Superintendent, Office of Finance and Administration.

The President introduced the two new members of the State Board: Dr. Justin Hartings and Dr. Michael Phillips.

### **Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) Plan Discussion**

The Superintendent asked Mary Gable, Assistant State Superintendent, Academic Policy and Innovation, Dr. Dara Shaw, Director of Research, Chandra Haislet, Director of Accountability and Data Systems and Danielle Susskind, Lead Academic Policy Specialist, to update the Board on the progress of Maryland's ESSA State Plan.

Ms. Gable explained that the presentation would deal with the following items:

1. Calculating scores and differentiating among schools
2. Frameworks
3. Updates to selected measures
4. English Learner (EL) proficiency
5. Identification of Comprehensive, Support and Innovation (CSI) and Targeted Support and Innovation (TSI) schools

Dr. Shaw reported on two methods of calculating scores and differentiating among schools: Measure scores and Measure points. She reiterated Maryland law, which requires that the composite score shall be calculated numerically in a percentile form and may not be reported using a letter grade model. She provided charts which included the measure, weight, measure value, measure score/points for all students and the math for assigning score/rules for both options.

Ms. Haislet discussed the communication of designations and the options available. She also provided examples of other state methods used for school designations.

Dr. Salmon said, “We want to make this system easy to reiterate to school staff and parents.”

Dr. Steiner said, “We need to make it clear that the bottom five percent get comprehensive help.”

There was brief discussion about the number of performance levels. Ms. Haislip explained that stakeholders prefer four levels using either stars or colors.

Dr. Shaw explained that there was not a lot of discussion among stakeholders but that they wanted to make sure that the system is informative and supportive.

Dr. Shaw discussed two options for inclusion of student groups:

- Make an equity determination “outside” of the school’s total score by comparing measure scores of all students with student groups. The equity determination affects school’s category.
- Include student groups “inside” the scoring system. A school’s score is partially “all students” and partially the average of student groups.

She reminded the Board that ESSA requires that the system for “annual meaningful differentiation” of schools be based on all students and each student group. She provided the definition of student groups as prescribed in federal law and charts depicting equity determinations “inside” and “outside” of the schools total score. Dr. Shaw discussed the feedback from stakeholders, which is to make this determination meaningful for school improvement and to focus on the measures and not the student groups.

Ms. Iszard urged the need for the Board to have a discussion on equity noting that the National Association of State Boards of Education (NASBE) has an interactive workshop on equity.

In response to a question by Mr. Edimo, Ms. Gable said that there could be a separate equity rating for schools.

Dr. Salmon said, “It is important for equity to be very visible. The Board’s retreat could include a discussion of equity.”

Updates for selected measures in the elementary, middle and high school frameworks were discussed.

Dr. Salmon reported that she discussed the measure of academic growth for K-3 with local superintendents and that all but six local school systems (LSSs) are doing census testing. She noted that she is considering doing some pilot testing.

Dr. Steiner suggested adding the word “earning” to the credit for dual enrollment listed under credit for completion of a well-rounded curriculum for high school. Board members agreed to change the wording of “Completion of an industry certification from a Career and Technology Program” to “Completion of an MSDE approved Career and Technology Program.”

President Smarick suggested that student scores, from those who do not meet the standard on the ASVAB examination, should be disaggregated.

Ms. Gable went over the School Quality/Student Success (SQSS) Access to a well-rounded curriculum for all schools, English Language Proficiency Indicators, and the identification of Comprehensive and Targeted Improvement Schools. She provided a chart indicating concerns of the US Department of Education (USDE) expressed about Plans submitted by other states and Maryland's responses to those concerns.

In response to a concern expressed by Mr. Edimo, Ms. Gable agreed to add wording to the credit for completion of a well-rounded curriculum for middle schools to explain that the percentages may change over time.

Ms. Haislet discussed two options for English Language Proficiency Indicators: Option A Fixed population size and Option B Proportional population size. She provided graphs depicting English Language Proficiency Impact Data included and not included at each criterion.

After brief discussion, Board members agreed on an  $n$  size of ten.

Dr. Salmon applauded her staff and said, "I have never worked with a more responsive group of people. Thank very much for your incredible turn-around time and persistence.

### **EXECUTIVE SESSION**

Pursuant to §3-305(b)(1) of the General Provisions Article, *Annotated Code of Maryland*, and upon motion by Dr. Steiner, seconded by Ms. Iszard, and with unanimous agreement, the Maryland State Board of Education met in closed session on Monday, June 26, 2017, in Conference Room 1, 8<sup>th</sup> floor of the Nancy S. Grasmick State Education Building. All Board members were in attendance. Also in attendance were Dr. Karen Salmon, State Superintendent of Schools, Dr. Sylvia Lawson, Deputy State Superintendent, Office of School Effectiveness, Dr. Carol Williamson, Deputy State Superintendent, Office of Teaching and Learning, Kristy Michel, Deputy State Superintendent, Office of Finance and Administration, Dr. Miya Simpson, Executive Director to the Office of the State Board. The Executive Session commenced at 12:20 p.m. (In favor – 8)

The Board requested legal advice concerning their options regarding the requested investigation of Prince George's County Public School System and to discuss possible procurement and contract specifications.

The session ended at 1:15 p.m.

**ADJOURNMENT**

With no further business before the Board, the meeting adjourned at 1:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Karen B. Salmon, Ph.D.  
Secretary/Treasurer

Date: July 18, 2017

**MARYLAND STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION**  
**PRESIDING OFFICER'S WRITTEN STATEMENT FOR CLOSING A MEETING ("CLOSING STATEMENT")**  
**UNDER OPEN MEETINGS ACT (General Provisions Article § 3-305)**

1. Recorded vote to close the meeting.

Date: June 26, 2017

Time: 12:30 p.m.

Location: 200 West Baltimore Street, Baltimore, Maryland 21021

Motion to close meeting made by: Dr. David Steiner

Seconded by: Stephanie Iszard

Members in favor: 9

Opposed: 0

Abstaining: 0

Absent: 2

2. The meeting was closed under authority of Section 3-305(b) of the General Provisions Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland (check all provisions that apply). This meeting will be closed under General Provision Art. § 3-305(b) only.

- 1. To discuss: (i) the appointment, employment, assignment, promotion, discipline, demotion, compensation, removal, resignation, or performance evaluation of appointees, employees, or officials over whom this public body has jurisdiction; or (ii) any other personnel matter that affects one or more specific individuals.
- 2. To protect the privacy or reputation of individuals concerning a matter 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.

3. For each provision checked above, disclosure of the topic to be discussed and the public body's reason for discussing that topic in closed session.

Citation (insert #  
from above)

Topic

Reason for closed-session discussion of topic

§ 3-305(b) (7)

Legal Advice

Obtained legal advice on: (1) requested investigation of Prince George's County Public School System and possible procurement and contract specifications; and (2) legal appeals.



4. This statement is made by \_\_\_\_\_, Presiding Officer.