

TO: Board of Directors of Des Moines Public Schools

FROM: Melissa Schilling

RE: Investigation Report

DATE: November 20, 2025

Des Moines Public Schools (“DMPS”) asked me to investigate and review two issues related to the 2023 superintendent search: (1) the RFP process and selection of JG Consulting as the superintendent search firm; and (2) the School Board’s knowledge, if any, related to educational, criminal, and immigration issues surrounding Ian Roberts pre-employment and the School Board’s knowledge, if any, related to educational, criminal, and immigration issues surrounding Ian Roberts post-employment.

Overview of Investigation

As part of my investigation, I interviewed six of the seven School Board members who served on the School Board during the 2022 – 2023 school year: Kim Martorano (in person on October 30, 2025 and follow up interview via phone on November 6, 2025); Kelli Soyer (in person on October 31, 2025); Maria Alonzo-Diaz (in person on October 31, 2025); Jenna Knox (in person on November 4, 2025); Jackie Norris (via zoom on November 5, 2025); and Dwana Bradley (in person on November 5, 2025). I was not able to interview the seventh School Board member, and Chair of the School Board at the time, Teree Caldwell Johnson, due to her death in 2024. In addition to School Board members, I also interviewed Phil Roeder (in person on October 30, 2025 and via phone on November 6, 2025) and Jimmy Waters from Third Degree Screening (via Microsoft Teams on November 7, 2025).

I also reviewed hundreds of documents and listened to several hours of closed session audio recordings related to the 2023 superintendent search.

I also requested records from the educational institutions and employers listed on Roberts’ resumes (e.g., from educational institutions: dates attended, degrees earned and date earned, awards and/or certifications, and final GPA; from employers: dates of employment, positions held, and reasons for departure). The educational institutions declined to provide me with any educational records absent a release from Roberts. However, Coppin State College provided me with two public weblinks related to Roberts:

<https://www.coppin.edu/andre-ian-roberts-98>

<https://coppinstatesports.com/honors/hall-of-fame/ian-roberts/51>

As of the date of this report, the only employer who responded to my request for information was St. Louis Public Schools (“SLPS”), which confirmed Roberts began his employment with SLPS on July 1, 2015 and stated Roberts resigned from his position and there were no public votes to fire or discipline Roberts, which is considered a public record under Missouri law.

Detailed Conclusions & Findings

1. Request for Proposal Process

a. Factual Findings

On November 1, 2022, DMPS issued an RFP for “experienced and qualified search consultants or law firms specializing in assisting with employment searches for administrators of large urban public school districts.” ***See Exhibit 1.*** Board members reported they issued an RFP for a search firm because they wanted to do a national search for a superintendent; not a local one. They also believed it was important to retain an expert in this area given the magnitude of the decision (i.e., it being one of the most important decisions of a school board) as well as their unfamiliarity and lack of expertise, as a volunteer school board, in searching for and hiring a superintendent.

At the same time DMPS was engaged in the RFP process, the Board sought feedback from the community related to the qualities they wanted in a superintendent. The Board called this work: “LET’S TALK: Searching for the Next DMPS Superintendent,” which gave the public an opportunity to learn about and be engaged in the superintendent search process. The community engagement included surveys to community members and 12 in-person meetings, which resulted in feedback from thousands of stakeholders.

There were 11 firms that submitted responses to the RFP. The Board created a subcommittee to review the submissions and then interview the top firms. This subcommittee consisted of Kim Martorano, Teree Caldwell Johnson, and Jenna Knox. When reviewing the submissions, the subcommittee used the following scoring rubric:

Scoring Matrix

Search Experience	20 points
Commitment to DEI	15 points
Search Methodology/Workplan	25 Points
Schedule/Timeline	10 Points
Strength of Search Team	20 Points
Cost Proposal/Fees	10 Points
Total	100 POINTS

Based upon a review of the submissions, the subcommittee selected four search firms for interviews: Alma Advisory, BWP, GR Recruiting, and JG Consulting. In terms of cost, each of these search firms proposed the following fees and costs:

Alma Advisory Chicago, IL - \$99,000+
 BWP Libertyville, IL - \$43,400+
 GR Recruiting Fountain Hills, AZ - \$35,500+
 JG Consulting Austin, TX - \$40,000+

The subcommittee then created interview questions to interview the four search firms. These questions focused on the search firm's experience with other superintendent placements, finding a candidate that was the right fit for DMPS and who was committed to staying for the long-term, and logistics related to the search process.

Following the interviews, the subcommittee sent follow-up questions to the search firms. The subcommittee ultimately recommended to the full Board that the Board hire JG Consulting. JG Consulting rose to the top during the interview process for a few reasons: (1) cost; (2) their use of technology and knowledge and experience in finding a pool of diverse candidates; and (3) JG Consulting's connection to Council of Great City Schools (Michael Hinojosa worked as a consultant for Council of Great City Schools where he helped train aspiring superintendents. Michael was also a former school administrator and school board member). Alma Advisory also rose to the top during the interview process but the subcommittee could not justify the cost of hiring that firm.

The subcommittee's written recommendation contained the following reasons for selecting JG Consulting:

- Specific experience with districts of comparable size and demographic makeup
- Successful record of searches for pre-K-12 education leaders
- Record of placing urban superintendents
- Demonstrated commitment to diversity and equity resulting in the placement of a pool of candidates reflecting gender, racial, and ethnic diversity in districts ranging from 8,100 students to 200,000 students

- Use of current real-time technology platform to achieve recruiting efficiency
- Strong team of administrative “back of house” staff to support the search process to include candidate communication/screening and board engagement and communication
- Minority owned and led consultancy utilizing diverse team of search and education professionals support search process
- Competitive cost proposal

See Exhibit 2.

b. Conclusions

Based upon the investigation, the investigator finds that the Board, via the Board’s subcommittee, undertook a deliberate and thorough process to find a search firm for the 2023 superintendent search. The evidence shows the subcommittee developed and applied evaluation criteria consistent with the RFP, and grounded its recommendation in JG Consulting’s experience, expertise, and fees. Furthermore, the investigator identified no irregularities in the process. There were no red flags concerning JG Consulting’s eligibility, performance history, or professional integrity, and no information suggesting that the firm would misguide or mislead the Board. To the contrary, the information provided by JG Consulting was consistent with the RFP’s requirements and supported the subcommittee’s recommendation.

2. Superintendent Search

a. Representations Made By JG Consulting

i. Factual Findings

In the RFP, JG Consulting represented the following to the DMPS School Board:

- “Candidates that successfully pass the pre-screening process will be presented to the Board for discussion and determination for the first phase of interviews.”
- “JG Consulting will conduct thorough background checks of each candidate with a third-party.”
- “JG Consulting is a registered agent with E-Verify.”¹
- “JG Consulting will provide comprehensive profiles of each candidate selected for an interview.” The profiles will include a “comprehensive background check by a third-party, completed reference checks and

¹ There were no documents provided to the investigator that suggested or showed JG Consulting actually used E-Verify to verify whether Roberts was authorized to work in the United States.

original resume. We work with each group to ensure that the candidates have been vetted.”

See Exhibit 3.

In a set of questions sent to JG Consulting after their initial interview with the subcommittee, the Board asked JG consulting to describe its approach to candidate vetting and what resources they have at their immediate disposal and what others they will access to ensure candidate character and reputation. JG Consulting provided the following response:

JG Consulting requires that each candidate (internal and external) submit electronic applications (received by the firm) including a letter of interest, resume, references, and academic transcripts. The search firm also requires that each candidate complete an OnDemand (virtual) interview and the Wonderlic assessment for preliminary screening purposes. The Board will have access to the OnDemand interviews during the initial review of Superintendent candidate profiles. JG Consulting will also screen and vet candidates in-person, by phone and virtually during the executive search. The executive search firm will have candid, private conversations with the applicants’ employer and previous supervisors including individuals not provided as a formal reference in the application materials.

See Exhibit 4.

In the contract with DMPS, JG Consulting specifically stated the following:

Section 2. Duties: JG CONSULTING’s duties include...complete reference checks and presentation of qualified candidates according to the needs as stated by the CLIENT as outlined by CLIENT’S descriptions of same.

Section 5. Background Investigations/Disclosure of Information to District: JG CONSULTING agrees it shall disclose to the CLIENT all known information of a positive or negative nature regarding candidates for the Superintendent position. With respect to the group of applicants selected for an interview by the Board, JG CONSULTING agrees it shall, in good faith and with due diligence, conduct comprehensive reference calls on each applicant to include the verification of all related employment experiences. In addition, JG CONSULTING will arrange for comprehensive criminal, credit, and background checks to be conducted by a third party...JG CONSULTING agrees not to refer any candidate for the Superintendent position unless JG consulting reasonable believes the candidate can lawfully satisfactorily perform the position and the information contained in the candidate’s application materials is true and complete.

See Exhibit 5.

During the search process, JG Consulting also made a number of statements to the DMPS Board regarding Roberts and their vetting process. These statements included the following:

- JG Consulting placed Roberts in their Tier 1 candidates, which JG Consulting explained were individuals JG Consulting recommended.
- JG Consulting told the Board that while the quantity of candidates who were being presented to be Board was lower than normal, the quality was not.
- As discussed in more detail below, JG Consulting provided the Board with an incorrect version of Roberts' resume during the hiring process and did not disclose this to the Board before or after the search process was complete. JG Consulting likely provided the Board with a forged transcript from Morgan State University but never disclosed that issue to the Board nor identified any irregularities related to the transcript to the Board.²
- When Board members falsely believed Roberts had doctorates from two separate places – Trident University and Morgan State University – JG Consulting did not correct the Board members.
- When a Board member questioned whether Roberts was native born, JG Consulting stated his parents were from Guyana but he spent his formative years in Brooklyn.
- During the process, JG Consulting explained to the Board why some candidates were not presented to the Board. When doing so, JG Consulting talked about their “behind the curtain check,” which revealed information that could not be learned through a google search. They also talked about doing “some real heavy checking.” At one point, JG Consulting also stated, “we have done our homework.”
- When discussing their vetting of candidates, JG Consulting stated they were “very comfortable with Dr. Roberts” but stated he had one “blemish.” JG Consulting then discussed how a Caucasian park ranger issued a citation to Roberts when Roberts was hunting and put his loaded gun in the back of his car. According to JG Consulting, Roberts was in the wrong place at the wrong time. Other than this one “blemish,” JG Consulting did not disclose any other negative information to the DMPS Board about Roberts.

Based upon their conversations with JG Consulting throughout the search process, Board members generally understood that JG Consulting would fully vet all candidates put in front of the DMPS Board and that the candidates would exceed the Board's expectations. The Board members relied upon and trusted JG Consulting throughout the entire search process, especially as it related to the vetting of each candidate.

² Based upon a review of the transcript and an interview of a DMPS employee, the investigator is fairly confident that JG Consulting provided the DMPS Board with a forged transcript from Morgan State University; however, Morgan State University was unwilling to provide the investigator with any information related to Roberts without a written release from Roberts. Without confirmation from Morgan State University directly, the investigator was hesitant to conclude with 100% certainty that the transcript was forged. As a result, the word “likely” was used to describe this situation.

ii. Conclusions

Given JG Consulting’s explicit representations in the RFP that it would pre-screen candidates, conduct thorough third-party background checks, and deliver comprehensive candidate profiles including completed reference checks, it was reasonable for the DMPS Board to rely on the firm’s statements and expertise in the superintendent search process. JG Consulting reinforced these commitments in its written responses to the Board and in the contract’s binding obligations to complete reference checks, disclose all positive or negative information, verify employment history, and arrange for comprehensive criminal, credit, and background checks through a third party. Throughout the search, JG Consulting continued to present itself as exercising rigorous due diligence by designating “Tier 1” recommended candidates, emphasizing quality over quantity, describing “behind the curtain” checks and “heavy checking,” and expressing confidence that candidates—particularly Dr. Roberts—were fully vetted aside from a single disclosed “blemish.” In light of these formal commitments, repeated assurances, and the firm’s asserted expertise and processes, the Board’s reliance on JG Consulting’s vetting and candidate representations was reasonable.

b. Superintendent Search Process Generally

i. Factual Findings

Once JG Consulting was selected, each Board member met one-on-one with a representative(s) of JG Consulting to provide their individual input on what each Board member wanted in a superintendent. During these one-on-one meetings, Board members were asked questions such as the desired characteristics and traits they wanted in the next superintendent, the experience they wanted the superintendent to have, and challenges and accomplishments of DMPS that should be emphasized to potential candidates. This process assisted in the creation of the leadership profile, which guided the Board’s search process.

The final leadership profile contained the Board’s goals and guardrails and specific qualities the Board was looking for in a candidate. The specific qualities included a proven leader with a track record of improving academic success, ability to increase teacher and staff retention, an advocate for the DMPS community, and a fiscally savvy leader. During this investigation, several of the Board members highlighted the need for the next superintendent to be visible and accessible to the community because the community had provided feedback on that particular issue.

Ultimately, over 15 individuals applied for the superintendent position. However, JG Consulting only presented seven (7) of those candidates to the Board. On February 28, 2023, JG Consulting met with the Board to allow them to screen the seven (7) candidates JG Consulting had chosen. JG Consulting split the seven (7) candidates into two categories: Tier 1 candidates were candidates JG Consulting recommended, and Tier 2 candidates were individuals that JG Consulting found “intriguing” but did not meet JG Consulting’s “muster to get into the top tier.”

Tier 1 consisted of five (5) candidates, including Roberts. Tier 2 consisted of two (2) individuals.

JG Consulting provided each Board member with an iPad so that they could electronically review the resume packets for the Tier 1 candidates on the iPad. For Roberts, the resume packet contained his cover letter; his resume (no “abd” noted under Morgan State University); a document called “Letters of Reference for Dr. Ian A. Roberts” (which was actually just a list of references); transcripts from Georgetown University, Coppin State University, Morgan State University (likely falsified as discussed below), St. John’s University, Trident University; and JG Consulting’s verification form, which was completed by Dr. Roberts.

The Board spent approximately 1.5 hours reviewing the resume packets for the five (5), Tier 1 candidates. The Board then watched all five (5) videos of the Tier 1 candidates as well as the videos for the two, Tier 2 candidates.

During the final hour of the meeting, Board members identified who they wanted to bring in for an in-person interview and decided to bring in four (4) of the five (5) Tier 1 candidates as well as a fifth potential candidate who the Board was interested in speaking with but who had not applied for the position.

Prior to the first round of in-person interviews, a subcommittee of the Board drafted interview questions and a scoring rubric to use during the first round of interviews. The six interview questions focused on the candidate’s leadership experience and style, ability and plan to lead a diverse district and advance the Board’s goals and guardrails, their strategy for addressing the district’s declining enrollment and budgetary issues, and their plan to engage stakeholders. The scoring rubric matched the six questions to the relevant portion(s) of the leadership profile and allowed each Board member to score the candidate on their answer to each question on a scale of 1 – 4 with 1 meaning unsatisfactory, 2 meaning developing, 3 meaning proficient, and 4 meaning exemplary.

The Board held their first round of in-person interviews on March 31, 2023 and April 1, 2023. The Board interviewed five candidates over the course of those two days. Each interview was approximately 60 minutes long. Following the last interview on April 1, 2023, the Board deliberated for approximately four (4) hours. The majority of the Board members agreed to bring back three candidates, including Roberts, for a second in-person interview. However, one of the candidates dropped out of the process, and the Board only interviewed two candidates during the second round.

For the second round of interviews, the Board created eight (8) questions to ask each candidate. The Board also created two specific questions for each candidate. The interview questions were also matched with a scoring rubric, which allowed each Board member to rate each answer on a scale from 1 – 3. A score of 1 was described as the candidate “is not confident in ability to lead, implement change, improve student outcomes. Is defensive and resistant to the acknowledgment of needing assistance or room for growth;” a score of 2 was described as “the leader readily acknowledges personal and organizational failures and offers clear suggestions for

personal learning;” and a score of 3 was described as “the leader offers frank acknowledgements of prior personal and organizational failures and clear suggestions for system-wide learning resulting from those lessons.”

Each second-round interview lasted approximately two hours. It also included a dinner with each candidate’s spouse. The Board met on April 13, 2023 to deliberate. Based upon the interviews, the majority of the Board agreed that Roberts was the lead candidate. Roberts also scored the highest under the scoring rubric. Even though Roberts was their lead candidate, the Board wanted to get more specific information from Roberts related to student outcomes in other districts. The Board then sent follow up questions to Roberts and held a third interview with him virtually on April 22, 2023. After the third interview on April 22, 2023, the Board deliberated for approximately 75 minutes, and the majority agreed that they should begin contract negotiations with Roberts.

ii. Conclusions

The evidence shows the Board’s search process was methodical, data-informed, and rigorous from inception through selection. The Board repeatedly used scoring rubrics and interview questions, which were based upon the Board’s leadership profile, to drive its decision-making process. The Board dedicated substantial time to evaluating and interviewing candidates. They also spent many hours engaged in meaningful deliberation and sought supplemental information where warranted rather than making a rushed decision. As discussed above, the School Board also hired and relied upon JG Consulting to examine and vet the superintendent candidates. Overall, the Board’s process was designed to select a superintendent aligned with the District’s needs and priorities.

c. Findings Specific to Ian Roberts

The Board conducted an initial screening of Roberts and the other candidates on February 28, 2023 and then held three separate interviews with Roberts before the Board approved his contract on May 16, 2025. The first interview took place on March 31, 2023 and lasted approximately 60 minutes; the second interview took place on April 11, 2023 and lasted approximately one hour and 50 minutes; and the third interview took place on April 22, 2023 and lasted approximately 90 minutes.

i. Resumes

1. Findings

The evidence shows that JG Consulting provided the Board with an incorrect version of Roberts’ resume (i.e., the one that did not note “abd” under Morgan State University) on two separate occasions prior to Roberts first interview. *First*, JG Consulting electronically provided the Board with the incorrect version of the resume on February 28, 2023 during the Board’s initial screening of candidates. ***See Exhibit 6.*** *Second*, the Board was provided electronic access to this same incorrect resume on March 21, 2023. ***Id.***

For Roberts' first in-person interview, Roberts provided the Board with a corrected, hard-copy version of his resume with "abd" noted under Morgan State University. *See Exhibit 7*. This subtle change was not pointed out by Roberts or JG Consulting and was not caught by any of the Board members.

After the Board voted to approve Roberts' contract on May 16, 2023, JG Consulting again sent DMPS the incorrect version of Roberts' resume on three separate occasions: May 17, 2023, May 19, 2023, and May 25, 2023. On May 25, 2023, JG Consulting also admitted to District counsel, and a District employee (not the School Board) for the first time that it had two different versions of Roberts resume; however, both of those resumes were incorrect versions of the resume as they did not note "abd" under Morgan State University. *See Exhibits 6, 8*. However, the purpose of this email exchange appeared to be to clarify the version of the resume that was used to respond to an open records request, not for the Board to vet Roberts, as he was already under contract with the District. In the email, JG Consulting explained the difference between the two resumes as one that was released for the open records request and being "truncated and cleaned up," meaning typographical and grammatical errors fixed, and the other one being the original one sent to the Board on March 21, 2023. JG Consulting did not indicate there were any substantive differences between the two versions of his resume.

2. Conclusions

The evidence shows JG Consulting provided the Board with an incorrect version of Roberts' resume on multiple occasions pre-hire and post-hire. The evidence also shows that the Board relied upon the incorrect version of Roberts resume when initially screening Roberts in for an in-person interview. The evidence further shows JG Consulting never notified DMPS that it had multiple versions of Roberts' resume until after he was hired and never highlighted to the Board that Roberts did not have his Ed.D. from Morgan State University.

Even though Roberts provided the Board with a different version of the resume during his in-person interview, it is not surprising the Board did not catch the addition of the "abd" designation. The reason for this is threefold: (1) the addition of three letters to his 4.5 page resume was extremely subtle; (2) none of the Board members were scholars in graduate programs or degrees and likely did not know the meaning of these three letters (in fact many of the Board members informed the investigator that this was the case); and (3) the Board interviewed five different candidates over the course of two days. They put in numerous hours and would have reviewed several documents for each candidate. They would not have had the time or ability to compare resumes line by line to each other, especially given the fact that they received one version of the resume electronically and one version of the resume via hard copy.

ii. Background Check

1. Factual Findings & Conclusions

Prior to the second interview, the background check was ordered for Roberts and was provided to the Board at 1:57 p.m. on April 11, 2023. The background check only looked at records for the past 7 years. The background check did not identify any immigration issues. In addition, it did not identify any of the criminal charges or convictions identified in the Department of Homeland Security's press release from October 3, 2025 except for the Pennsylvania gun citation. The background check also noted variances between information provided by Roberts and the information reported Morgan State University, but reflected this information in a manner favorable to Roberts.

a. Immigration Issues

With respect to immigration issues, these do not appear on background checks unless there is a criminal charge or conviction associated with the immigration issue. Immigration issues may be spotted through E-Verify, but even that system is imperfect and has errors with false positives and false negatives. While E-Verify may have spotted an issue with Roberts' employment authorization in 2023, it is unknown whether it actually would have. It is also unknown whether JG Consulting used E-Verify as part of its vetting process of Roberts despite its representation to the DMPS Board that it was a registered agent of E-Verify. Ultimately, JG Consulting did not identify any immigration issues related to Roberts for the DMPS Board.

To summarize, the DMPS Board did not know there were any immigration issues related to Roberts or that he was not authorized to work in the United States at the time he was hired or prior to his arrest on September 26, 2025. For the reasons discussed above, DMPS reasonably relied upon JG Consulting – who stated they were a registered agent with E-Verify – to fully vet Roberts and all other candidates.

In addition, the DMPS Board did not become aware of immigration issues surrounding Roberts until his arrest on September 26, 2025, and the days that followed thereafter. Roberts never made the Board aware of his 2024 deportation order or that he was involved in immigration proceedings prior to his arrest. If the DMPS Board had conducted a background check on Roberts during his employment, the background check would not have revealed these immigration issues to the Board because they did not result in a criminal charge until after his arrest.

b. Criminal Issues

Many of the Board members recalled knowing about the 2021 gun citation prior to the Board receiving the background check. JG Consulting discussed it with the Board during the Board's initial screening of candidates, and Roberts discussed it with the Board during his second interview. Based upon the information provided by JG Consulting and Roberts, the Board did not view this citation as a barrier to Roberts' candidacy for superintendent.

Even though JG Consulting represented it would conduct “comprehensive criminal, credit, and background checks,” that was not done for DMPS. As an initial matter, JG Consulting did not discuss with any of the surviving Board members that the background check would only go back seven (7) years. While state laws can limit the type of information that is reported within each state, the Fair Credit Reporting Act allows the disclosure of criminal convictions without any time limitation, and the disclosure of adverse information (e.g., records of arrest) beyond 7 years for positions paid more than \$75,000. 15 U.S.C. § 1681c.

In addition, JG Consulting did not discuss with any of the surviving Board members that there may be an issue with reporting non-convictions, such as arrests or charges, on background checks because the EEOC discourages employers from using charges or arrests when making employment decisions due to its potential impact on minorities.

Lastly, JG Consulting did not discuss with any of the surviving Board members the limitations state laws can impose on background checks. For example, in New York, a consumer reporting agency cannot report or maintain in the file on a consumer, information relative to an arrest or a criminal charge unless there has been a criminal conviction for such offense, or unless such charges are still pending. N.Y. Gen. Bus. Law § 380-j (a). This type of state law could have prevented Baker Eubanks from reporting the following charges identified by the Department of Homeland Security to the Board:

- July 3, 1996: Charges for criminal possession of narcotics with intent to sell, criminal possession of narcotics, criminal possession of a forgery instrument and possession of a forged instrument in New York.
- Nov. 13, 1998: A charge for third-degree unauthorized use of a vehicle in Queens, New York, which was dismissed July 6, 1999.³

In Maryland, a consumer reporting agency cannot disclose on a background check any records of arrest, indictment, or criminal conviction that is older than 7 years unless the applicant is applying for an employment position where the annual salary is \$75,000 or more. Md. Code Ann., Com. Law § 14-1203. This limitation should not have prevented Baker Eubanks from disclosing Roberts’ 2012 conviction for reckless driving, unsafe operation and speeding in Maryland. Therefore, the Board may have learned about this conviction if JG Consulting had conducted a comprehensive background check, as promised, but it is unlikely the Board would have learned about the other criminal charges identified by the Department of Homeland Security through the background process.

³ The Department of Homeland Security also reported criminal charges from 2020 related to the possession of a weapon, but the location of those charges is unknown. State law or EEOC guidance may have prevented the disclosure of this charge on the background check, but that is unknown at this time.

Even after Roberts was hired, the DMPS Board was not made aware of these charges and the Maryland conviction. The DMPS Board did not learn about these criminal issues until after Roberts was arrested on September 26, 2025.

c. Educational Issues

With respect to the variance in the information Roberts provided to Baker Eubanks versus what Morgan State University provided, Board members stated this was not raised by JG Consulting and not something that stood out to them. The background check also framed the issue favorably to Roberts.

After Roberts' arrest on September 26, 2025, a DMPS employee further inspected Roberts' transcript from Morgan State University given the publicity surrounding his resumes and Morgan State University. From the inspection, the employee suspected a portion of the transcript was forged. The employee contacted his counterpart at Morgan State University who then contacted the Registrar's office at Morgan State University. According to this Morgan State University employee, the Registrar's office indicated a portion of the transcript was not in the correct place.

To the extent the transcript contains forged or false information, it was provided to the DMPS School Board by JG Consulting both pre-hire and post-hire without any indication the transcript was incorrect or that Roberts did not have an Ed.D. or Ph.D. from Morgan State University. For the reasons discussed above, the School Board reasonably relied upon JG Consulting to fully vet the candidates.

d. Summary of Conclusions

To summarize, the Board was aware of Roberts' 2021 gun citation from Pennsylvania prior to hiring Roberts. However, the Board was not provided any information that led the Board to believe this minor citation would impact Roberts' ability to serve as a superintendent. The Board was not aware of any other criminal charges or convictions, and was not aware of any immigration issues surrounding Roberts, prior to hiring him in 2023 or prior to his arrest on September 26, 2025. While the Board had access to Roberts' background check prior to hiring him, the Board did not recall or perceive the information related to the variances about his education to be an issue. The background check summarized this information in a way that was favorable to Roberts and JG Consulting never raised this as an issue. Again, the DMPS Board reasonably relied upon JG Consulting to guide them through the search process and to fully and properly vet each candidate.

4901-2845-2731-1\10390-407