

BALTIMORE COUNTY
PARENT AND STUDENT
COALITION, INC.,

Appellant

v.

BALTIMORE COUNTY
BOARD OF EDUCATION,

Appellee.

BEFORE THE

MARYLAND

STATE BOARD

OF EDUCATION

Order No. OR26-10

ORDER

The Baltimore County Parent and Student Coalition, Inc. (“BCPASC”), through its officers Mary Taylor and Amy Adams, brings this appeal before the Maryland State Board of Education challenging the validity of the February 24, 2026, decision of the Baltimore County Board of Education (“local board”) to approve the Fiscal Year 2027 (FY2027) Operating Budget, which passed by a narrow 7-4 margin. The Appellant alleges that the decisive affirmative vote cast by local board Member Robin Harvey was legally invalid because she had filed a Certificate of Candidacy for the Maryland House of Delegates earlier that same day, thereby rendering her statutorily disqualified from holding her board seat as Md. Code Ann., Educ. § 3-2B-07 states, in relevant part, that a nonstudent member of the county board “may not” be a candidate for or hold elected or appointed office for the local, State, or federal government.

The local board has filed a Motion to Dismiss the appeal pursuant to COMAR 13A.01.05.03B, arguing that the Appellant lacks standing to bring this action. The State Board exercises its independent judgment when reviewing the threshold issue of standing. *See* COMAR 13A.01.05.06E; *Rose v. Frederick Cnty. Bd. of Educ.*, MSBE Op. No. 19-32 (2019).

The State Board has well-established precedent affirming organizational standing if the organization can establish standing by demonstrating a direct interest or an injury in fact in its own right or on behalf of its members. *See One Crofton, Inc. v. Anne Arundel Cnty. Bd. of Educ.*, MSBE Order No. 26-07; *Rock Creek Hills Ass’n v. Montgomery Cnty. Bd. of Educ.*, MSBE Op. No. 12-49 (2012). This showing of a direct interest or injury in fact requires that the individual be personally and specifically affected in a way different from the public generally, and is, therefore, aggrieved by the final decision of the administrative agency. *See Matthews v. Anne Arundel Cnty. Bd. of Educ.*, MSBE Order No. OR19-12 (2019).

In the present case, the Appellant’s officers Amy Adams and Mary Taylor, bring this action as the President and Vice President of BCPASC. In its Response to the Motion to Dismiss, they allege that BCPASC is a non-stock corporation whose members include parents and legal guardians of students currently enrolled in Baltimore County Public Schools (“BCPS”). Nowhere in the appeal, exhibits, or opposition to the local board’s motion is there any identification of the members that Appellant represents, information on where the members reside in the County, and

which specific school(s) their children attend or will attend to demonstrate how they are personally and specifically affected by the local board's decision in a way different from the public generally. They present no documentation to substantiate how these individuals or the BCPASC organization are connected to BCPS, such as being employees, current students, or parents of current students. Appellant has failed to allege any concrete and particularized injury in fact, either in the organization's own right or on behalf of its members, that shows they were personally and specifically affected by the FY2027 budget vote in a manner distinct from the general public. As such, this Board is unable to factually conclude that Appellant has standing to appeal. *See Summers v. Earth Island Institute*, 555 U.S. 488, 497-500 (2009)(requiring plaintiffs claiming organizational standing to identify members who have suffered the requisite harm). Because the Appellant has failed to show any direct interest or injury in fact sufficient to establish standing or identify any member(s) of the group who meet the State Board's tests for standing, the appeal is dismissed for lack of standing.¹ *See* COMAR 13A.01.05.03B(1)(c).

Accordingly, for the reasons stated above, it is this 28th day of April 2026, by the Maryland State Board of Education, ORDERED that the local board's Motion to Dismiss is granted and the appeal is hereby dismissed for lack of standing. COMAR 13A.01.05.03B.


Joshua L. Michael

April 28, 2026

¹ The local board also argues that the appeal should be dismissed because fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted as a matter of law. (Motion to Dismiss). We need not address this argument given our dismissal for lack of standing.