



**MARYLAND SCHOOL FOR THE DEAF
BOARD OF TRUSTEES
Meeting Minutes
November 18, 2011
Frederick Campus**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Benjamin B. Bahan, Ph.D.; Sheryl B. Cooper, Ph.D.; Laurie Corcoran; John Ertel, Ph.D.; Ernest Hairston, Ph.D.; Roslyn Hannibal-Booker; Sandra Harriman; Ricardo Hernandez, Ph.D.; Robin Kittleman; David Martin; Angela McCaskill, Ph.D.; Cynthia Neese-Bailes, Ph.D.; Khadijat Rashid, Ph.D.; Heather Zeolla

MEMBERS ABSENT:

ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL: William Fields, Esq.

INTERPRETERS: Myra J. Foley; Brenda Kelly Frey

President Benjamin Bahan called the meeting to order at 9:25 a.m.

A **MOTION** was made to approve the November 2011 Agenda– **SECONDED - PASSED.**

A **MOTION** was made to approve the September 2011 Open Session, Closed Session, and Executive Session Minutes– **SECONDED - PASSED.**

President Bahan shared with the Board that MSD has been recommended for full Accreditation by the Validation Team that conducted the on-site visit earlier in the week. President Bahan also shared that the Validation Team interviewed Ms. Laurie Corcoran, Mr. David Martin, and himself. The Validation Team asked President Bahan about his relationship with members of the school community. President Bahan explained that he always identifies which role he is assuming when interacting with members of the school community. Mr. Martin stated that the whole process should be commended.

President's Report: President Bahan stated that he wanted to revisit the discussion of admitting hearing students for one semester for an exchange program. President Bahan stated that perhaps it would do away with some of the perception that MSD is restricted. MSD is restricted but not completely. President Bahan suggested establishing an Ad hoc Committee to work on this concept. Superintendent Tucker stated that this fall he had received 3 emails from hearing students who wanted to come to MSD to work on their signing skills. Dr. Ertel stated that MSD has given his nephew everything but what is missing for his nephew is the desire to interact with the hearing community. Dr. Ertel stated he was in favor of hearing children participating in the Deaf community. Ms. Corcoran respectfully disagreed explaining that if the school were to bring in hearing students they should be siblings of students already here at MSD. Ms. Corcoran went on to explain that the best way to manage the bridge is to ensure that the Deaf child has support at MSD and at home. MSD is the only sanctuary deaf children have, they deal with barriers all the time in the real world.

FREDERICK CAMPUS
101 Clarke Place
P.O Box 250
Frederick, MD 21705-0250

301.360-2000
301.360.2001 TTY
301.360.1400 FAX
www.msd.edu



*Frederick Campus
Established 1868*

*Columbia Campus
Established 1973*



Maryland School for the Deaf does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, sex, age, national origin, religion, or disability in matters affecting programs, activities, or employment practices.

Vice-President's Report: Ms. Corcoran stated that she too was asked various questions by the Validation Team. Ms. Corcoran was asked about relationships within the school community, the interaction between the Board and the school's Management Team, and the process used to evaluate the Superintendent. Ms. Corcoran stated that she answered the questions to the best of her ability. Ms. Corcoran also explained to the Validation Team the problems encountered when public schools do not inform parents about MSD. The isolation that deaf students experience in Public Schools and the delayed learning deaf students experience because they come to MSD late in their schooling, are negative consequences faced by these students and their families. Ms. Corcoran posed the question of whether or not the Board should have appointed an Ad hoc committee to participate throughout the Accreditation process given the importance of Accreditation. Mr. Fields interjected that record keeping should be established so that the Board is prepared for the next Accreditation visit.

Secretary's Report: No report at this time.

Treasurer's Report: Dr. Ertel reported that MSDF had a meeting 3 weeks ago last Monday. MSDF is getting ready to prepare a report on the Board's finances. Dr. Ertel asked the Board how active does the Board want to be in the decision process of the finances. Is there anyone on the Board who has knowledge who would want to get involved? Dr. Ertel stated that the annual audit would be performed shortly so the Board would have a small bill to pay. The Board asked that from now on a copy of the Board's financial statements be included in the Board packets. Superintendent Tucker stated that the Foundation as a whole is nearing 1 million dollars and coming up on 25 years in existence, both worthy occasions to recognize and celebrate.

Superintendent's Report: Superintendent Tucker stated that the highlight at MSD this quarter is the re-accreditation. The MSD community was very involved throughout the entire process. Superintendent Tucker invited the Board members to look through the artifacts that were collected to show case how the school is meeting the 12 Accreditation standards. Superintendent Tucker stated that now the real work begins as MSD works to meet the goals established. The cycle is 7 years so at 3.5 years the school will submit a mid-cycle review report.

Superintendent Tucker explained that he has been actively involved with CEASD's "Child First" campaign. CEASD is trying to change the IDEA's LRE language and this is a formidable challenge. If the law cannot be changed then perhaps regulations can be changed in order to allow for better monitoring and enforcement.

Superintendent Tucker stated that he is working with the new MSDE's Assistant State Superintendent of Special Education, Dr. Marcella Franczkowski, in hopes to make her aware of how the State Performance Plans (SPP) is pushing disabled students including deaf and hard of hearing students into the public classrooms. The concept of SPP is required by law but the indicators were established by the United States Department of Education (USDOE). A discussion took place.

Mr. Martin asked the Superintendent if there was anything that the Board could do to support the “Child First” campaign. Superintendent Tucker explained that at this time the Board could get involved by contributing money to the campaign.

Superintendent Tucker explained that there is a box on all state IEP forms and counties are to check it off signifying that they informed parents about MSD and that’s how MSDE monitors compliance with this requirement, however after 20 years the stories continue that parents are either not being informed about MSD or they are being told negative things about MSD. The school’s outreach coordinator, Ms. Erin Buck has only been invited to five IEP meetings in the last few years. Superintendent Tucker stated that a new solution is to write stronger regulations to ensure that the counties share information about MSD with parents and to seek reciprocity to ensure that MSD is invited to all IEP meetings for deaf or hard of hearing students. Draft regulations have been written and Superintendent Tucker will share the draft with Dr. Franczkowski who will then share the proposed regulations with Interim State Superintendent Dr. Bernie Sadusky. Dr. Sadusky will then present the proposed regulations to the State Board of Education.

Update on Accreditation by Marcia Virts, Lead Internal Coordinator: Ms. Virts reported to the board her 7th and final Accreditation update. Ms. Virts thanked the Board for their support and thanked the Board members who were available to meet with the Validation Team. Ms. Virts expressed her appreciation for the other Internal Coordinators and the members of the Accreditation Planning Team (APT) stating that they worked very hard throughout the lengthy process. Ms. Virts stated that overall the Validation Team seemed very pleased with what they saw and the entire community worked together to make sure that the visit went as smoothly as possible. Ms. Virts stated that she was very happy that the end result was the recommendation for Full Accreditation and that she was looking forward to returning to the classroom.

Recognition by the Board: The Board recognized the five Internal Coordinators for all of their hard work throughout the Accreditation process. Ms. Marcia Virts, Lead Internal Coordinator, Ms. Tara Holloway, Frederick Campus Internal Coordinator, Mr. Rick Ballard, Columbia Campus Internal Coordinator were present. Ms. Elizabeth Reed, Columbia Campus Internal Coordinator and Ms. Lisa Brinks, Frederick Campus Internal Coordinator were not able to attend.

Executive Committee: No report at this time.

Education Committee: No report at this time.

FM/FM Committee: Dr. Ertel explained that as treasurer he interacts with MSD Foundation and he asked that the committee obtain more members.

Personnel Report: None. There was a discussion on how and when to evaluate the Superintendent. It was suggested that by the next Board meeting the Personnel

Committee should meet to decide how to evaluate whether or not the Superintendent had met his goals for this school year.

Student Life Committee: None

Trusteeship Committee: Ms. Corcoran stated that there are now 16 Board Members. Two of the 16 are waiting for confirmation from the Governor's office. Perhaps once they are appointed a student could take them on a tour around campus and they could be given an orientation.

Open Forum: No one signed up.

President Bahan acknowledged the letter that the Board received thanking the Board for their donation to the ASDC conference.

Old Business: A discussion began on the plans for the Board Retreat. Ms. Corcoran stated that an offer has been made to use the Lions Camp which is located in Southern Maryland. President Bahan stated that there was an ad hoc committee to help plan the retreat. The members are: Mr. Martin, Ms. Corcoran, Dr. Neese-Bailes, Dr. Ertel, and President Bahan. It was suggested that the committee could discuss the activities but the Board should decide on the goals of the retreat. It was suggested that half of the time of the retreat should be just the members of the Board but that the other half of the time the Board members should be joined by members of the Orioles Management Team (OMT).

Suggested Goals for the retreat are:

- Make sure that every member understands their roles and responsibilities.
 - Dr. Rashid suggested the history and background regarding the relationship between the school and the State be shared with the Board.
- Roles of the Committees – Should they be left as is or should they be enhanced?
 - Should the committee's pair with OMT to better understand how they can best serve the school? This needs to be done in such a way that the Board is not micromanaging OMT.

The following dates were suggested for the Retreat:

April 20-21, 2012 or April 27-28, 2012

The Retreat would begin late afternoon on Thursday, go all day Friday, and everyone would depart Friday evening.

Ms. Corcoran suggested that the committee should check within the next 2 weeks on the availability of places to hold the retreat and then send out 3 possible dates for everyone to consider. President Bahan asked that the ad hoc committee stay after the Board meeting to discuss the retreat.

A **MOTION** was made to close Old Business – **SECONDED-PASSED**.

New Business: A **MOTION** was made that the Board should give a gift certificate of \$100 each to the 5 Internal Coordinators-**SECONDED-DISCUSSION**. **MOTION** was withdrawn.

A **MOTION** was made that the Board recognize the members with a plaque – **SECONDED-DISCUSSION**. A friendly amendment was made so that the word “plaque” should be modified to read “appropriate item of recognition”– **SECONDED-PASSED**.

A discussion began on coming up with a standard format for the appropriate item of recognition. Dr. Hernandez thought this would be a good model for the students regarding appreciation and Thank You’s. Ms. Corcoran stated that she would like to see Mr. John Snavlin, former principal of the Columbia Campus recognized. A discussion on who should determine who will be recognized took place. The final decision was that the school should make the recommendations.

A **MOTION** was made that the Board should get the appropriate paper and plaques on hand for future Board recognitions-**SECONDED-PASSED**.

A **MOTION** was made to adjourn at 2:01 p.m. – **SECONDED – PASSED**.

Respectfully,

Roslyn Hannibal-Booker

The Board evaluated itself upon the conclusion of the meeting and the scores ranged from 4 to 4.5.

The strengths that the Board expressed regarding the meeting were the high member attendance and the discussions that took place.

The weaknesses that the Board expressed were the amount of discussion on the same topics already previously discussed, the lack of committee reports, and the need for a larger room to meet in once additional members join the Board.