

NUMBER: 39-1990
STATUS: APPROVED
PLACE: ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND
DATE: OCTOBER 9, 1990
TEXT:

Re: STUDENT TRANSFER PROCESS

Dr. Pitt stated that the report before the Board made an effort to look at the issues. They did not have a lot of solutions, and the paper gave a little of the history of the transfer process. They did have some recommendations for change which had more to do with process rather than the policy.

Dr. Carl Smith, associate superintendent, introduced Ms. Judy Bresler, Board attorney; Dr. Henry Shetterley, hearing examiner for transfer appeals; Mr. Barron Stroud, director of the Department of Quality Integrated Education; and Dr. Pat Newby, area director of educational services. Dr. Shoenberg thanked Dr. Shetterley for the remarkable job he did in hearing appeals. People were frequently angry and anxious when they entered into the appeals process, and even when the decision went against them, parents thought Dr. Shetterley did a fair and sensitive job of hearing the appeals. He complimented him for his efforts.

*Dr. Cronin joined the meeting at this point.

Dr. Smith reported that he had started being on committees regarding the transfer policy in 1975, and the current policy had been adopted in 1971. He asked Board members if they had questions about the paper.

*Mrs. Praisner joined the meeting at this point.

Dr. Shoenberg recalled that in this last round of transfer appeals they had a large number of appeals involving a small number of magnet schools. He would guess that half the appeals were focused on three or four schools. For reasons that seemed sensible at the time, a decision was made to deny the appeals and to tell parents that if space opened up there would be a lottery on or about August 1. He wondered whether it would not be the wiser course simply to deny the appeals in the first place.

Dr. Pitt explained that he was responsible for some of these problems. The great majority of cases dealt with all-day kindergarten. The problem was that staff was not able to project kindergarten size as well as they could other grades. This did not mean it might not be better to just say no or yes at the earlier time. Dr. Smith added that they had a responsibility to serve the students who attended that school. They waited until the first of August when they were fairly confident of the enrollment. If there were spaces available, they would allow transfers to occur. If there were more students than they could accommodate, they held a lottery. However, if there were extenuating educational needs, they reserved the right to place students in advance of the lottery.

Ms. Bresler said the current procedure was in the implementing regulations, but how well the public was informed of the details was a different issue. This was a recurring problem in terms of making the rules of the game known to the public. Dr. Shoenberg commented that even if the procedure were known, parents wanted it both ways. They wanted the opportunity for success in the lottery, but they complained because the decision came so late. He wondered what would create the most reasonable state of affairs as they looked at the future.

Dr. Pitt replied that he did not have a good answer. He tried to meet with a small group of parents to get their input after their appeals had been decided. He had received both sides of the story. Some had told him that decisions should be made earlier, and others had told him to make the decision at the last minute. Dr. Smith pointed out that many of the appeals involved the Blair cluster which came under the aegis of the QIE policy and their efforts to assure reasonable racial balance in the schools. This complicated the process because of the additional requirements in the QIE policy. He asked Ms. Bresler to explain the process.

Ms. Bresler explained that there were a number of considerations that came into play when they started dealing with cluster schools. Depending how the variables interacted with each other, they could get different results with what appeared to be similar circumstances. For example, for a number of years MCPS had used the net effect practice within the clusters. A lot of their practices developed as a means of maximizing the ability to grant requests and permit students to move from one school to another. In the net effect practice, the transfer would be approved if it had a neutral impact on racial and socioeconomic balance. The transfer review committee looked at all the requests, and there could be a domino effect so that through multiple moves students would be permitted to transfer. When they looked at transfer requests coming in from outside the cluster into cluster schools, the variables had to do with whether the school the student was transferring from was open or closed to transfers. If the school was closed for overenrollment, a transfer out would not harm the school. If the school was closed for racial or socioeconomic balance, it would depend on who was applying for transfer out and where they were going. If the school were open to transfers and the sending school had no problem, they would have to look at the impact on the receiving school.

Ms. Bresler said that when they dealt with cluster schools they had several layers of complexity having to do with a whole series of variables. Then they had the additional factor of all-day kindergarten which would then add the lottery consideration if there were not enough spaces. There were some separate considerations involving the area gifted and talented programs and secondary magnets where there were program admission requirements.

Dr. Cronin said they were often criticized about the transfer policy. People thought the policy should exist but not affect their child. The paper listed all the variables and explained why they were dealing with a moving target, but that was why they were discussing it. He noted that there was one paragraph which stated that all of the foregoing paper was invalid because MCPS did not follow its own policy. They did not stay with their timeline and made every effort to accommodate people. The open/closed list came out in early January and told principals whether their schools were open or closed. Yet they heard from parents that the schools had given them transfer forms. There did not seem to be a first level of cuts at the school level. Mrs. Praisner pointed out that the principal did not have the authority to approve or disapprove a transfer request. Dr. Cronin thought the principal should explain that the school was on the closed list. This might pull back some of those subsequent requests.

Dr. Shoenberg said that if principals told parents the school was closed, the parents would proceed with the appeal because they knew exceptions had been made. Mrs. Praisner added that the school system said that unless a school was closed the parents filled out a form and the transfer was approved. The form and process began whether the school was closed or not. If the school were closed, the form was an appeal to override the closure.

Dr. Cronin said that his next question was one of timing. In June and July, the Board was receiving appeals that had been filed in January. The window for appeals had not been closed, and the appeals continued to come in during the spring. Dr. Smith explained that most of those appeals had to do with QIE, and these were held until staff could see the net effect. They did communicate this to parents in late spring and early summer.

Dr. Cronin thought that parents should receive some kind of notice telling them that this issue would not be resolved until August. Parents were calling to find out the status of their appeal. Ms. Bresler explained that right now the timelines to submit transfer applications for elementary school magnet were January 1 to May 1. Dr. Cronin suggested that when someone applied in January they ought to know that a decision would not be made until May. Some parents did not know what was happening to their appeal.

Mr. Stroud indicated that most cases were acted on within a 30-day period. Parents were notified if they were denied that they would continue in the process because of the net effect. The complexity was they could not move cases until other cases came in. Most parents were notified one way or the other within that 30-day period. They were also notified that their name would be kept in because of the net effect process. Dr. Smith said that

frequently it looked as if the transfer was being held up. However, they were dealing with 4,000 transfers each year. Frequently the parent would be told that the transfer was denied for this year, but MCPS would continue to consider their request. This frequently appeared to parents that the school system people could not make up their minds. The problem was that this was not a simple process. He agreed that they did need to communicate better. The issue was having to wait a long time because the process was very complex and factors were interrelated and held up decisions.

Mr. Ewing said there were pieces of information that the Board should have before it made a decision about whether it wanted to make a change in the policy. One of those was the scope and size of the problem. He wanted to know how many applications for transfer they received in a given year. If they had between 4,000 and 5,000, they were dealing with a 5 percent problem which was consuming a substantial amount of time and energy. If they knew how many transfers were granted, they would know how big the discontent factor was. They needed to know what proportion of all the requests were decided, one way or another, by July 1, August 1, September 1, and later. Again, this would give them a sense of how big the problem was. If they were deciding 95 percent of the cases by August 1, he was not sure they needed to worry excessively about the 5 percent that still had to be resolved. If a lot did not get resolved until school started or after, then they had a serious problem to deal with.

Mr. Ewing suggested they might want to consider making a public announcement when they announced the open and closed list that their expectation was and their policy was that all decisions would be made by a date certain and try to hold to that. They had a time frame as to when people might apply, but they did not have a statement about when they would make decisions. They might not be able to hold to that. He was familiar with federal agencies that stated they would make decisions by a certain date. If the decision were not made by that date, people could assume they had been turned down unless there was a case filed in court. It seemed to him that absent any legal guidance to the contrary, they ought to pursue that as an objective.

It seemed to Mr. Ewing that the biggest problem was they did not have enough room in the magnet schools. The Board needed to address that. For example, did they want these schools to be magnets or schools serving only the communities in which they were located? It was his view that these schools should continue as magnets. However, Rosemary Hills could hardly function as a magnet because it did not have enough room. This was true of virtually all the elementary schools in the Blair cluster, and it would become the case with the secondary schools as well. What was wrong was not the transfer policy, but the inadequacy of the size of their schools. They thought they would

have lots of space available in New Hampshire Estates and Rolling Terrace, but these schools did not have space for transfers in.

Finally, Mr. Ewing thought it was important for the Board to know something in a systematic way about the applicants and the pattern of turndowns. The Board saw a tiny fraction of the total number of appeals. They had to know where the problems were with the process. He suspected it was the magnet schools, but they did not have numbers. He thought the paper before the Board was a good one because it raised the major issues they needed to address. He hoped they could discuss this again before they rushed to policy changes.

Mr. Ewing said that the only policy change the Board might consider was saying that all students should attend the school in the district in which they resided. The exception would be the opportunity to transfer including to magnet schools. They could continue to encourage transfers to magnets, but they ought to make the burden lie with the applicant for change. Most school systems had such policies, but some were now abandoning these policies in the interest of parental choice. While he was in favor of parental choice, he did not know that they should raise expectations in a time of facilities limitations when they had to turn down a lot of parents for transfers.

Mrs. Praisner agreed with Mr. Ewing for the most part based on perceptions. She thought the information would be very helpful. While they had seen some of this information before, it would be useful to review that information again. She reported that even with the increased interest in choice, most of the choice policies in school districts had the kinds of caveats that Montgomery County already had in its policy. For example, most stated that transportation was the responsibility of the parent or the request depended upon space availability. In addition, there was the issue of racial balance.

Mrs. Praisner said they had to make sure they were clear in communicating the information. They had to make corrections in their procedures and process as much as policy. She was interested in knowing whether they were accepting transfer requests in July and August or that they were not making the decisions until then. She asked whether those acceptances of transfer requests came from people new to the system or for other reasons. Dr. Smith replied that the issue was complex. He said the three most difficult issues they faced had to do with utilization, daycare, and all-day kindergarten which was tied in somewhat to daycare. They had not discriminated transfer requests on whether or not someone was new to the system because very frequently the request was predicated on changes in the daycare situation.

It seemed to Mrs. Praisner they might want to look at the amount of time needed to get through the layers of the process. They needed to communicate with a paper as to when it was likely people would get an answer and with a description of the process people had entered with the time allotments between each step. She asked whether there were some things they could do to compress the layers without affecting due process. She recognized that they wanted the parent to go to the school and get the form and have some conversation about the school. There was a reason for that years ago. Now there were different reasons as to why people wanted to transfer. She suggested that it might be better to start the process at the area office level and have a better control over what was said to parents. The Board got papers from parents in which they stated that the principal saw no problem with the request which gave the perception that the request was not okay at the next level. Since so many people went through the QIE process, it might be well to have only one step at the area level.

Dr. Smith said that last spring they had discussed this issue. They would be meeting this fall with the special services supervisors, the area directors, Mr. Stroud, and other people involved in the process to look at ways to do the best job procedurally and consistently across the system. They would factor Mrs. Praisner's suggestion into their discussions.

Dr. Pitt thought that comments made by Mr. Ewing and Mrs. Praisner were on target. They could improve the process, but it was important to look at the underlying issue. When they had a lot of space, they started a modified choice program in Montgomery County. Most parents who wanted to move, could if they provided transportation. Secondly, they had started a magnet program. Their goal was to bring people in and improve the integration process and maintain the population they had in those areas. They now had a problem because the population had increased and they had been very successful in the magnet program. Now their schools were full, and so the opportunity for the rest of the county to move was also very limited. They had a policy that caused some frustration because of the changes that had occurred in their population and programs. They had to keep this issue in their minds as they looked at this process because it would not get easier.

Mr. Goldensohn reported that when his daughter started school in the early 1970's she could attend almost any school she wanted to as long as he provided transportation. His daughter did transfer out because of where his wife was teaching. They no longer had that luxury. He said that each year they received a long list of schools that were closed to transfers in and out. He would like to see a separate list which showed the schools that were open. This would show people that these few schools were the only choices. He presumed that most requests were

turned down at the first level. He thought they would save a lot of paperwork if some of these requests did not even come in. This could be done at the local school level.

Mr. Goldensohn stated that communication was critical. Parents did not understand what was happening. They file an application for something and maybe they get an acknowledgement that it was received, but then the request was in limbo. They became concerned because they wanted to know where their child was going to school in September. He thought that clearer communication would reduce the number of applications. Those applications coming in needed a much faster and more complete response to them. They might tell people a point of contact for their appeal. They could call and be told where their application was in the process. There might be a transfer coordinator for an area office so that people would have a point of contact. Dr. Newby reported that each area had a transfer secretary who tried to respond to the calls.

Dr. Shoenberg indicated that he would like to hear the views of the people at the table about what they thought was going on with the transfer process.

Dr. Cronin commented that attacks had been made on the area offices to cut them out because they were not needed. The issue might be to centralize the process. He asked how much time was consumed in handling these transfer requests and whether people had suggestions about simplifying the process.

Dr. Newby replied that for certain periods of time each area office had a full-time secretary to deal with transfers. The secretary handled the request and processed it with the advice of the supervisor of special services. After the initial process, other secretaries were involved in the appeals process. In Area 1, there were 16 days in March when George Goldsmith heard 140 appeals. It required 30 to 45 minutes per appeal. Each one of those had to be discussed, and she spent about an hour to an hour and a half each day doing this. The appeals process took a lot of time at the area office particularly between March and August. The week before school opened they received requests from parents because of changes in daycare arrangements. During this week they dealt with 40 to 50 requests every day.

In regard to suggestions, Dr. Newby thought they should say that August 1 should be the decision day for all-day kindergarten and not accept appeals until that time. She would like to see a change in the timeframe for accepting appeals, but she was not sure they could do this because of changes in daycare situations.

Mr. Stroud reported that from January to September he spent 50 percent of his time on transfer requests. He noted that in excess of 80 percent of the schools were closed, and almost 70 of

these were the responsibility of QIE. His secretary spent in excess of a quarter of her day dealing with transfer requests. In addition, they had a weekly contact with the principals of the QIE schools to maintain a roster to determine whether they had space or changes in their school. The matching process between Blair cluster schools and those outside was very time consuming. Mr. Stroud thought they had to look at how much access there was and how much staff was needed to help facilitate the process. They had to look at where this process was housed, where it started and where it stopped. Parents got frustrated because they might be denied in late January or early February and have to wait until August 1 for an all-day kindergarten final decision. Parents called frequently because they were anxious. In addition, they had to move a lot of those cases through the net effect process. He felt that they had to train themselves to be consistent from area to area. He said they were looking at this issue this year, and he would be working with staff.

Dr. Shetterley reported that he had been doing transfers at the superintendent's level since 1984. They had not departed from the rationale for the transfers during that time. The numbers had increased, but the rationale seemed to be the same. The policy itself did not speak to daycare, but daycare was a major issue. They had to recognize this, and it had to be factored in somehow. He thought the areas were now consistent in regard to all-day kindergarten which helped a little bit. People talked to each other and knew what was going on. He said that he had not seen racially motivated transfer requests as looming large in this process. He thought that the Board, superintendent, and staff deserved a lot of compliments on that.

Dr. Shetterley said that at the elementary level the majority of requests were based on daycare, all-day kindergarten, some magnet situations, and a few social and emotional problems. At the secondary level, the policy listed "program" as a reason, and parents used program. However, the state had upheld the Board's ruling on the ROTC appeal. He did not know where program fit into this. In reality, most secondary school transfer requests were because of social and emotional reasons relating to the school and their home situation. If the policy or the regulation reflected these issues, they would get ahead of the process.

Mr. Ewing said they might want to consider fixing the dates for application and decision. They could have a category of emergency appeals and define the criteria for those. He suggested that they consider this.

Dr. Pitt agreed to come back with some data and some recommendations. They had to look at how they improved the process they had now or consider if they wanted to change the policy. Once they answered the question of whether they wanted to change the policy, they could look at how to improve the

present process. He would come back with that information in a month or two.

Mrs. Praisner pointed out that Mr. Goldensohn had suggested a list of open schools. If they did this, they would be changing the policy because it presumed a student was to be served by his or her home school except where there were schools that were open. Dr. Pitt agreed that this would be a change in the policy.

Dr. Shoenberg thanked staff for their information.

Re: FUTURE SCHOOL LEADERSHIP NEEDS

Dr. Pitt explained that the paper was divided into four categories: projected leadership needs, development of school leadership, outside sources of leadership, and next steps. They were making some changes in their development of school leadership, especially in how they assessed people. There was one change in the assessment center process. The executive staff members had been acting as assessors. Now principals and others would do this because the executive staff made the decisions on the selection of people.

Dr. Smith introduced Mr. Jess Graham, assistant director of the Department of Personnel Services; Dr. James Shinn, director of Personnel Services; and Mr. Gary Levine, specialist for employment standards. The paper highlighted the approach and the strategies they were using to assure a well qualified pool of candidates for the principalship. Dr. Smith said they continued to believe that the majority of their new principals would come from within the ranks of MCPS. In the past three years they had taken several steps to recruit internally and externally. Their efforts were to respond to the significant growth in the school system. They had reopened or built 24 schools in the past five years. They had worked somewhat differently at the elementary and secondary levels. Their needs at the elementary level had stripped the available internal pool, and they had increased their external recruitment in response to that need. This year, for example, four of the elementary principals came from outside of MCPS. At the secondary level their internal pool had been sufficient to date, and except under special circumstances they had not needed to interview and select outside candidates for those vacancies. As the elementary enrollment moved up through secondary, their posture might change.

Dr. Shinn believed that by the end of 1995 they were going to need 115 school-based administrators. There had been a question about elementary and secondary assistant principals. He explained that they did not divide these because at the present time there were only 29 assistant principals at the elementary level who were full appointed assistant principals. The rest of the positions were acting appointments for one year, and they

used those for leadership development. When an assistant principal at the elementary level left, they did not need someone from their pool. They needed someone from the group of people who were getting ready to go to a traineeship. The numbers filled on a regular basis were very small; therefore, they could not be projected.

Dr. Shinn reported that they were opening several elementary schools in each of the next few years, and they were predicting that at least one assistant principal would be needed in each of those years. In the past few years when they opened elementary schools they had not been large enough to need an assistant principal, but they now believed that one of the two schools each year would be large enough to need an assistant principal.

In regard to filling the 115 positions projected, Dr. Shinn said the Board could look at the graphs regarding enrollment in the leadership programs. Enrollment had declined steadily but now was on the upswing. There were now 107 registered in the Phase I leadership course. They had invited Asian-Americans and Hispanics to talk to Personnel about how they could become administrators, and about 20 to 30 people had registered for Phase I. He believed that enrollment in Phase II would increase as well. The assessment centers had shown that same decline but were on their way back up. He said that the Commission on Excellence had wanted to make it possible for outstanding teachers to stay in the classroom, and they had succeeded. Now they were trying to cultivate people to fill those 115 vacancies before 1995. He said that this was the first year of a major modification in the assessment center process. They had replaced an exercise called "the principal problem exercise" which was a group problem-solving effort to an in-basket exercise.

Mr. Levine explained that the in-basket exercise was a decision-making exercise. Candidates were given several messages, notes, and memos and asked to deal with each item in a short timeframe. They had to indicate the actions they would take to resolve the issue and give the rationale for their decisions. Candidates were assessed on their ability to do this. In addition, candidates were assessed on their ability to prioritize their actions. They were also assessed on their ability to delegate responsibility and to show good human relations skills.

Dr. Shinn said that Dr. Smith had indicated their supply of candidates from inside was not enough particularly at the elementary principal level. He pointed out that even if that supply were to increase greatly, their ability to train internally was limited. Dr. Pitt added that they generally promoted from inside, especially at the secondary level. However, they still provided opportunities for people to apply. If there were an outstanding applicant, this person would be

considered. The goal was to give their own inside people every opportunity.

Mr. Graham reported that they had attempted to communicate their need for principals through all channels available to them. They had worked with the two principals' associations. They had attended a national conference and had recruiting session there. They established some contacts for current candidates and candidates for the future. They had done advertising in educational journals as well as local and ethnic newspapers. They had tried to spread the word about their need for and interest in outside principals.

Dr. Shinn indicated that the Maryland State Department of Education ran an assessment center program at the state level. They had been allocated positions over the past two years and had sent people to MSDE for the purpose of their own staff development. They did not use those results at the present time to select; however, they had been communicating with the state about the ability of that assessment center to be used by Montgomery County. They might want to come back to the Board with some recommendations on this issue. One of the problems was the state did not have the resources to send the number of people through that Montgomery County needed to send through. MCPS had been in contact with the National Association of Secondary School Principals to see if, with the cooperation of and approval of the state, they might be interested in a center in Montgomery County. Dr. Smith was continuing to negotiate at the state level to see what could be done.

Mrs. Praisner commented that this was a useful paper. It was important for them to be seen as doing what they needed to do from a day to day basis but also looking long range at their needs from the standpoint of leadership and training. She asked if they had some measure of how many needed to go through the process in order to get the numbers they needed in addition to their external candidates. Dr. Smith replied that they did a projection of their need in the fall for the spring. In the spring, when they identified the principal trainees at the elementary level they tried to look at the number they put into the training program and the relationship between that and the number of vacancies they anticipated. They had increased that number of trainees at the elementary level in the past two years. They then looked at the external recruiting and the pool they needed.

Mrs. Praisner remarked that one of the things, whatever the process, was to have some consistency from year to year both from the people going through the process and their expectations as far as quality was concerned. They had to maintain consistency in regard to judgments and the quality level as far as exiting with an acceptance level. She wanted to have some assurances

that they were not changing their criteria in order to have successful candidates internally based on numbers. Dr. Smith replied that some of the individuals in the program for the past three years had opted not to continue in the training program or as a result of midyear evaluation. He said they did maintain quality control and standards, and they tried to help every candidate be successful in the program.

Dr. Pitt stated that they had also tried to measure the success rate of their candidates which was very hard to do. It was their judgment that the people selected in the last four years had been very successful. This was based on evaluation and community input. The people involved in the internship program had not changed dramatically, and he believed the standards had remained consistent. For this reason, they had had to go outside more and look for a larger pool.

Mrs. Praisner indicated that Howard County had its own assessment center using the NASSP model. She assumed that the state would not object to Montgomery County's running one internally except to the extent they did not participate in the state program. Dr. Smith replied that Howard County was one of the first working with NASSP, but he thought they might have joined the state plan and were using the state model. The only county using the NASSP model was Anne Arundel.

Mrs. Praisner said she would be interested in knowing what they were doing when they hired experienced principals to develop continuing education for them. They had talked in the past about trying to professionalize the assistant principal position and the effect that might have on the principal process at the secondary level. She would like to know what strategies had worked the best and where they needed change. She wondered about the potential impact of state changes on alternative methods to the principalship just as they had tentatively approved alternative paths to the teaching role. She pointed out that the paper focused on the principalship and the school leadership role. When she had mentioned leadership as a long-term issue, she hoped they would not focus solely on the principalship. There were a lot of other positions and departments within MCPS they should look at in regard to paths for career development. She said that lots of them had been through career development in other departments. It seemed to her it would be useful for them to know where they had gone with the suggestion that they work with the major corporations in the county who were also interested in leadership development within their own systems and had used in-basket exercises. They could work together with these organizations and provide some sharing of opportunities.

Mrs. Karolyn Rohr, administrative program coordinator, reported that she met with all the principals from outside the county. She conducted a needs assessment with them, and they met monthly

with the other principals new to the county and Dr. Alan Dodd, their outside consultant who put the program together. They also had a special summer session with these principals to review MCPS policies and procedures. They connected them with resources in the county and served as a sounding board for these people.

Dr. Smith said Mrs. Praisner had mentioned some possible movements at the state level to consider alternate routes into the principalship. He was not aware of anything concrete. There had been considerable discussion about certification requirements and about the possibility of requiring participation in the NASSP/MSDE assessment center as one of the requirements for certification. Dr. Shinn added that he had been told the state people had their hands full looking at the teacher process now.

Dr. Cronin commented that MCPS did not control the certification process. Therefore, they would not be able to bring in a very talented business executive to be a principal or a scientist from NIH to be a teacher. Dr. Smith replied that they could not do this unless these people had the certification requirements. The state teacher proposal was an alternate route which would enable graduates with bachelor's degrees in content areas to come into the teaching field, but there would be arrangements for them to take 90 clock hours of identified course work in pedagogy and developmental psychology. The latest proposal would also apply at the elementary school level. However, this was on hold at the state level and had not been adopted.

Dr. Cronin noticed that for the secondary administrative intern and elementary principal trainee that there were requirements for five years experience, three years classroom, and master's plus 15. In other words, there was an established set of criteria before an individual could begin to be qualified. This set up the question of the source of many of their principals. By requiring three years of classroom experience, they were starting with someone who was certified as a teacher. They had to look at what people got when they became principals. If they looked at issues under consideration, they had the Commission on Excellence, autonomy, school-based decision-making, etc. Most of this was teacher-centered. He heard very little about the status of the principal's profession. As the lower salary of an assistant principal or principal was bucking up against the higher salaries of the teachers and as they looked at the time required to do the job of principal, he wondered why people would want to be a principal.

As a former principal, Dr. Smith agreed that it was important that the principal be compensated for their responsibilities because all of the research told them that the key to leadership and the key to effective schools resided in the role of principal and the effectiveness of his or her leadership. He did not think they could sell the principalship solely on the basis of monetary

compensation. He remarked that in his personal opinion it was the most exciting job that anyone could have in education if he or she was going to come out of the classroom. The principal had enormous influence in the school and enormous opportunity to have a positive effect on the lives of children.

Dr. Cronin commented that he was also talking about the whole variety of substructure supports that went into a school. As they were building elementary schools with capacities of 700 to 800, this changed the concept of the elementary principal.

Mr. Ewing said the educational requirements for becoming a candidate for the principalship had been described. What was less clear to him were the personal and psychological characteristics needed to be a principal. If they believed the research about leadership, there were people who would be leaders in almost any situation in which they were placed. However, some of those people were so determined to be leaders that they could be destructive if they did not have other qualities which moderated that. He hoped they were able to get at an assessment of those characteristics and to determine what blend of leadership skills and motivations they needed and wanted in the school system. As Mrs. Praisner had stated, they needed to be consistent in the way they judged people, but it was true that they needed to think about the changes they needed to make in the kinds of people they intended to recruit in the future. The school system was changing, and the students and their needs were changing. Some schools were changing the relationship between principals and teachers as they instituted the flexibility pilots. They needed to find people who were capable of and interested in changing themselves. There were leaders who would not consider that they needed to change themselves. He was as much interested in that aspect of it as he was in anything they were doing in this arena. He hoped that at some juncture they would have a list of the kinds of characteristics they were looking for.

Dr. Pitt replied that they were looking at that. Some characteristics had not changed in a long time in terms of what was needed, but the way a person thought and his or her ability to be flexible were areas they were looking at. For this reason, they were looking at the national model which focused on personal characteristics. It was his feeling that the personal characteristics determined whether someone failed or passes the true test out in the field.

Mr. Goldensohn pointed out that the graph on secondary administrator competency sessions showed a sharp decline in numbers applying through 1989. He suggested that this was a factor of how many were admitted to the program. In 1986, 80 applied but only 32 were admitted and that sent a signal to people that the odds were stacked against them. They had the

same thing on the graph for the elementary principal trainee program. There was a high number of applications a few years back, but it dropped because the success rate of being chosen was so small. He thought that the application pool would maintain itself, but whether these were the right people was another story. He was concerned about one graph which showed that in 1982, 49 applied, 28 were admitted, and 13 were qualified. He asked whether this meant that 15 were not qualified. Dr. Shinn explained that "qualified" meant successful completion of the competency program. Of the 49 who applied, 28 were qualified to be admitted to the session which was a mini-assessment center. Of the 28, 13 received scores on the exercises which qualified them to be interns. Dr. Cronin asked whether admission was automatic. Dr. Shinn replied that it was not. There was a paper screening based on references, past performance, evaluation, academic achievement, etc.

Mr. Goldensohn stated that the role of an assistant principal in a secondary school was rather established. It varied from school to school depending on how large the school was and how many assistant principals there were. In the elementary school it was more of a new phenomenon, and he wondered whether they had a standard. Dr. Shinn replied that they had a class description for the elementary assistant principalship and would share it with the Board.

In regard to the Phase I and II programs, Mrs. Hobbs said there were references to increasing interest in these programs. She asked how they were going to do this. Dr. Shinn replied that personal invitation had been the most successful route. Each year he met with the principals by area and asked them to identify those people in their schools they believed had the potential to become administrators. These people were invited by letter or personal contact to get into Phase I. They had an affirmative action program and sent individual invitations to people from minority groups.

Dr. Shoenberg thanked staff for the very helpful paper. He was reassured by what had been done.

Re: EXECUTIVE SESSION

The Board met in executive session from noon to 1:10 p.m. to discuss personnel issues.

Re: PUBLIC COMMENTS

The following individuals appeared before the Board:

1. Delegate Jean Roesser
2. Peggy Driver
3. Mary A. Sullivan, St. Martin's School

2-91	Library Furniture	
	AWARDEES	
	Baltimore Stationery Company	\$ 1,431
	Dawn's Office Supply Company	4,382*
	Douron, Inc.	26,679
	Gaylord Brothers, Inc.	7,848
	The Jaid Group International	11,468*
	The Library Store, Ltd.	38,990*

	Total	\$ 90,798
9-91	Motor Vehicle, Refrigerated Van	
	AWARDEES	
	District International Trucks, Inc.	\$ 30,856
	Dorsey/Records, Inc.	28,806

	Total	\$ 59,662
	TOTAL MORE THAN \$25,000	\$315,599

* Denotes MFD vendors

RESOLUTION NO. 588-90 Re: BID NO. 17-91, LEASE/PURCHASE OF A
LASER COPIER

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mr. Goldensohn seconded by Mrs. Praisner, the following resolution was adopted unanimously#:

WHEREAS, The Board of Education of Montgomery County received Bid No. 17-91, Lease/Purchase of a Laser Copier, to be used for the copying needs of the Division of Data Processing Operations; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education has determined in accordance with Section 5-110 of Maryland's Public School Law that Xerox Corporation is the lowest responsible bidder conforming to specifications to supply a laser copier; and

WHEREAS, Xerox Corporation has offered to provide the necessary equipment through a three-year lease/purchase arrangement at preferred financing; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education has determined that it is in the public interest to obtain the laser copier through a lease/purchase arrangement with Xerox Corporation subject to cancellation in the event of nonappropriation; and

WHEREAS, Xerox Corporation has agreed to provide the laser copier equipment in accordance with the lease/purchase terms and nonappropriation condition set forth in the bid specifications; now therefore be it

October 9, 1990

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education of Montgomery County award Bid No. 17-91 for laser copier equipment and financing to Xerox Corporation, totalling \$109,363.83 for the acquisition and the three-year lease/purchase of a laser copier, in accordance with the terms and conditions of the bid specifications; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education president and the superintendent of schools be authorized to execute the documents necessary for this transaction.

RESOLUTION NO. 598-90 Re: MECHANICAL SYSTEM CONTROLS
REPLACEMENT - PARKLAND MIDDLE
SCHOOL

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mr. Ewing seconded by Mr. Chang, the following resolution was adopted unanimously#:

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received on September 26, 1990, for mechanical system controls replacement at Parkland Middle School in accordance with MCPS Procurement Practices; and

WHEREAS, Details of the bid activity are available in the Department of School Facilities; and

WHEREAS, The low bid is within the budget estimate, and sufficient funds are available to award the contract; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That a contract be awarded to the low bidder for the project and the amount listed below:

PROJECT	AMOUNT
Mechanical System Controls Replacement Parkland Middle School LOW BIDDER: TEX/AM Construction Co., Inc.	\$16,899

RESOLUTION NO. 599-90 Re: ENGINEERING ASSESSMENT OF FUTURE
SCHOOL SITES

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mr. Ewing seconded by Mr. Chang, the following resolution was adopted unanimously#:

WHEREAS, Proposals were received on August 17, 1990, from engineering firms qualified to perform assessments of potential school sites for the purpose of determining their suitability for construction of school facilities; and

October 9, 1990

WHEREAS, The project bonding company, Reliance Insurance Co., has consented to this reduction; and

WHEREAS, The project architect, Arley J. Koran, Inc., recommended this request for reduction be approved; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the 10 percent retainage withheld from periodic payments to Waynesboro Construction Co., Inc., general contractor for Col. E. Brooke Lee Middle School, be reduced to 5 percent, with the remaining 5 percent to become due and payable after completion of all remaining requirements and formal acceptance of the completed project.

RESOLUTION NO. 602-90 Re: ALBERT EINSTEIN HIGH SCHOOL SECOND
GYMNASIUM ADDITION

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mr. Ewing seconded by Mr. Chang, the following resolution was adopted unanimously#:

WHEREAS, On September 27, 1990, the following bids were received for the construction of the second gymnasium addition at Albert Einstein High School:

BIDDER	BID AMOUNT
1. Lynmar Corporation of Virginia, Inc.	\$ 698,920
2. D. D. & B. Construction Inc.	705,000
3. Columbia Construction Company, Inc.	725,000
4. The Gassman Corp.	728,000
5. Heritage Builders, Inc.	730,000
6. Smith & Haines, Inc.	741,600
7. Willits Construction Company	745,153
8. The McAlister-Schwartz Co.	748,210
9. Kimmel & Kimmel Inc.	759,000
10. Pioneer Builders, Inc.	759,285
11. E. A. Baker Company, Inc.	772,000
12. Caldwell and Santmyer Inc.	776,000
13. Giles Management Constructors, Ltd.	778,777
14. Keller Brothers, Inc.	783,500
15. Bob Porter Company, Inc.	798,530
16. Ronald Hsu Construction Co., Inc.	799,700
17. Robert L. Lawrence Co., Inc.	800,000
18. Meridian Construction Co., Inc.	820,000
19. Dennis Anderson Construction Corporation	820,000
20. CKS, Inc.	821,900
21. FOX-SEKO Construction, Inc.	822,000
22. Dustin Construction, Inc.	834,900
23. Fredericksburg Construction Company, Inc.	860,000
24. Nucci Brothers Stone & Masonry, Inc.	1,089,824

and

WHEREAS, The low bid is below the staff estimate of \$825,000; and

WHEREAS, Lynmar Corporation of Virginia, Inc., has done similar type construction in the Washington metropolitan area; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That a \$698,920 contract be awarded to Lynmar Corporation of Virginia, Inc., for the construction of the second gymnasium at Albert Einstein High School in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by Fox, Hanna, Architects.

RESOLUTION NO. 603-90 Re: CHANGE ORDERS OVER \$25,000

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mr. Ewing seconded by Mr. Chang, the following resolution was adopted unanimously#:

WHEREAS, The Department of School Facilities has received change order proposals for various capital projects that exceed \$25,000; and

WHEREAS, Staff and the project architects have reviewed these change orders and found them to be equitable; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, The Board of Education approve the following change orders for the amounts and contracts indicated:

ACTIVITY 1

Project:	Burtonsville Elementary School
Description:	Modify the access driveway plans to include additional paving and traffic control signalization
Contractor:	Hanlon Construction Company, Inc.
Amount:	\$56,644

ACTIVITY 2

Project:	E. Brooke Lee Middle School
Description:	All modular classroom units were initially scheduled to be located at E. Brooke Lee. Following county budget action, the addition was split and placed on two sites--North Lake and Lee. Site, mechanical, and utility modifications were required to place the units at both sites.

Contractor: Waynesboro Construction Co., Inc.

Amount: \$225,922

ACTIVITY 3

Project: Laytonsville Elementary School

Description: Installation of water storage tank for the fire protection systems required by the fire marshal

Contractor: Kimmel and Kimmel, Inc.

Amount: \$34,994

ACTIVITY 4

Project: Sherwood High School

Description: Installation of addition fire protection systems (sprinklers) required by the fire marshal

Contractor: Dustin Construction, Inc.

Amount: \$34,222

RESOLUTION NO. 604-90 Re: INDEMNIFICATION AGREEMENT WITH THE
MARYLAND SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT
OF MONTGOMERY COUNTY

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mr. Ewing seconded by Mr. Chang, the following resolution was adopted with (Mr. Chang), Dr. Cronin, Mr. Ewing, Mr. Goldensohn, Mrs. Hobbs, and Dr. Shoenberg voting in the affirmative; Mrs. Praisner abstaining#:

WHEREAS, Construction of the Rachel Carson Elementary School increased the stormwater runoff to a natural channel located on the private property on the south side of Darnestown Road (MD 28); and

WHEREAS, The Maryland Soil Conservation District for Montgomery County, acting on its authority to approve the stormwater management plan, required that the Montgomery County Public Schools (MCPS) request permission from a private property owner to make downstream channel improvements; and

WHEREAS, After repeated attempts to negotiate with the private property owner, MCPS was refused entry onto the property to make the required channel improvements; and

WHEREAS, The law also requires County Council approval before the Board of Education can enter into contracts with the artist; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education enter into the following contractual agreement subject to County Council approval for a work of art at John F. Kennedy High School

Lilli Ann and Marvin Rosenberg Lobby Treatment \$11,000

and be it further

RESOLVED, That the County Council be requested to approve the above commission to the indicated artists.

RESOLUTION NO. 608-90 Re: WORK OF ART FOR FRANCIS SCOTT KEY
MIDDLE SCHOOL

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Cronin seconded by Mrs. Praisner, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

WHEREAS, Authorization for the selection of artists to receive commissions to produce works of art is delineated in Article V, Section 1, Chapter 8, "Buildings," of the MONTGOMERY COUNTY CODE; and

WHEREAS, Staff has employed the established selection procedures; and

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County Arts Council has participated in the selection as required by law; and

WHEREAS, Funds have been appropriated for this purpose in the FY 1991 Capital Improvements Program; and

WHEREAS, The law also requires County Council approval before the Board of Education can enter into contracts with the artist; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education enter into the following contractual agreement subject to County Council approval for a work of art at Francis Scott Key Middle School

Lilli Ann and Marvin Rosenberg Bas-Relief \$8,000

and be it further

RESOLVED, That the County Council be requested to approve the above commission to the indicated artists.

Re: PRESENTATION OF PRELIMINARY PLANS -
ROBERT E. PEARY CENTER
REHABILITATION

Dr. Cronin moved and Mr. Ewing seconded the following:

WHEREAS, The architect for the Rehabilitation of the Robert E. Peary Center has prepared a schematic design in accordance with the educational specifications; and

WHEREAS, The Robert E. Peary Center Facilities Advisory Committee has approved the proposed schematic design; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education approve the preliminary plan report for the Robert E. Peary Center Rehabilitation developed by Duane, Elliott, Cahill, Mullineaux & Mullineaux, P.A.

RESOLUTION NO. 609-90 Re: AN AMENDMENT TO THE PROPOSED
RESOLUTION ON PEARY CENTER

On motion of Mr. Ewing seconded by Mr. Chang, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

RESOLVED, That the proposed resolution on the Robert E. Peary Center be amended by the addition of the following WHEREAS clause:

WHEREAS, Although the building has been designed as a holding school for multiple uses, including elementary, middle, and high school programs, it is initially intended to be used as interim housing for elementary and middle schools; now therefore be it

RESOLUTION NO. 610-90 Re: PRESENTATION OF PRELIMINARY PLANS -
ROBERT E. PEARY CENTER
REHABILITATION

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Cronin seconded by Mr. Ewing, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

WHEREAS, The architect for the Rehabilitation of the Robert E. Peary Center has prepared a schematic design in accordance with the educational specifications; and

WHEREAS, The Robert E. Peary Center Facilities Advisory Committee has approved the proposed schematic design; and

WHEREAS, Although the building has been designed as a holding school for multiple uses, including elementary, middle, and high school programs, it is initially intended to be used as interim housing for elementary and middle schools; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education approve the preliminary plan report for the Robert E. Peary Center Rehabilitation developed by Duane, Elliott, Cahill, Mullineaux & Mullineaux, P.A.

RESOLUTION NO. 611-90 Re: MONTHLY PERSONNEL REPORT

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Praisner seconded by Mr. Chang, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

RESOLVED, That the following appointments, resignations, and leaves of absence for professional and supporting services personnel be approved: (TO BE APPENDED TO THESE MINUTES).

RESOLUTION NO. 612-90 Re: DEATH OF MRS. BARBARA J. COLLINS, SCHOOL FINANCIAL SECRETARY ON LONG-TERM LEAVE FROM MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Praisner seconded by Mr. Chang, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

WHEREAS, The untimely death on September 7, 1990, of Mrs. Barbara J. Collins, a school financial secretary on long-term personal illness leave from Martin Luther King, Jr. Intermediate School, has deeply saddened the staff and members of the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, In the 17 years that Mrs. Collins had been a member of the staff of Montgomery County Public Schools, she had made outstanding contributions to the school program in a variety of positions; and

WHEREAS, Mrs. Collins' strong organizational abilities and steady, conscientious performance were recognized by staff, associates, and students; and

WHEREAS, Mrs. Collins' personal courage and efforts to overcome her physical problems were admired by all who knew her; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the members of the Board of Education express their sorrow at the death of Mrs. Barbara J. Collins and extend deepest sympathy to her family; and be it further

RESOLVED, That this resolution be made part of the minutes of this meeting and a copy be forwarded to Mrs. Collins' family.

RESOLUTION NO. 613-90 Re: DEATH OF MR. MAX. E. TAYLOR, BUS
OPERATOR IN AREA II TRANSPORTATION

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Praisner seconded by Mr. Chang, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

WHEREAS, The death on August 5, 1990, of Mr. Max E. Taylor, a bus operator in Area II, has deeply saddened the staff and members of the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, In nearly five years with Montgomery County Public Schools, Mr. Taylor demonstrated exceptional ability as a bus operator; and

WHEREAS, Students and staff will miss his cheerful and cooperative attitude and his concern for his passengers; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the members of the Board of Education express their sorrow at the death of Mr. Max E. Taylor and extend deepest sympathy to his family; and be it further

RESOLVED, That this resolution be made part of the minutes of this meeting and a copy be forwarded to Mr. Taylor's family.

RESOLUTION NO. 614-90 Re: DEATH OF MS. TAMARA L. WHITE,
INTERPRETER FOR THE HEARING
IMPAIRED, ROCKVILLE HIGH SCHOOL

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Praisner seconded by Mr. Chang, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

WHEREAS, The untimely death on September 15, 1990, of Ms. Tamara L. White, an interpreter for the hearing impaired at Rockville High School, has deeply saddened the staff and members of the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, In the two years Ms. White was with Montgomery County Public Schools, she was a dedicated professional who took personal pride and pleasure in the successes of her students; and

WHEREAS, By striving to improve her skills in sign language, Ms. White provided exceptional support to her students who will miss her; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the members of the Board of Education express their sorrow at the death of Ms. Tamara L. White and extend deepest sympathy to her family; and be it further

RESOLVED, That this resolution be made part of the minutes of this meeting and a copy be forwarded to Ms. White's family.

RESOLUTION NO. 615-90 Re: PERSONNEL APPOINTMENT

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mr. Goldensohn seconded by Dr. Cronin, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

RESOLVED, That the following personnel appointment be approved:

APPOINTMENT	PRESENT POSITION	AS
Margaret M. Yates	Acting Asst. Principal Flower Hill ES	Principal Bel Pre ES Effective: 10-10-90

Re: OVERVIEW OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Dr. Carl Smith, associate superintendent, introduced Mrs. Kitty Blumsack, staff development specialist and trainer; Mr. Michael Glascoe, principal of Einstein HS; Dr. Stanley Fagen, director of the Department of Staff Development; Mr. William Romack, social studies teacher, Gaithersburg High School; and Mrs. Karolyn Rohr, administrative program coordinator.

Dr. Fagen remarked that what MCPS did in training was terrific, but they also had quite a ways to go to develop the program they would like for all staff. Their goal was to promote a more comprehensive program of staff development. They needed a balance between two types of clients, individuals and school/units. The second part of their comprehensive program was moving from the centrally directed university-type menu program to more responsive and dynamic programs. Third, they wanted to be sure that the opportunities for staff development were there for every member of the school and that all were involved in training. In this way, students would see adults in a constant process of learning. The fourth aspect was the need to incorporate innovations and trends into a comprehensive program. The fifth was to work as a team in a coordinated fashion.

Dr. Fagen stated that all of this would mean better outcomes for students. They had seen some changes in the Department of Staff Development going to three units. They were broadening the roles for the in-service labs for mainstreaming to in-service centers for staff development. Mr. Glascoe and Mr. Romack had launched a countywide staff development management team under Dr. Pitt's direction.

Mr. Goldensohn said he enjoyed reading the paper regarding staff development. He was impressed with the rationale for a

comprehensive staff development program. He particularly liked the statement, "student success is due in large measure to attitudes, knowledge, and skills of ALL staff."

Dr. Shoenberg remarked that when they started talking about how they ought to reorganize staff development efforts about a year and a half ago it seemed very abstract to him. He did not understand what the advantages were likely to be. This paper clearly illustrated that they had created a unit that did reflect the philosophy of those initial discussions. He congratulated Dr. Fagen and his staff for the model.

Dr. Cronin asked for additional information about the data base and the resource bank mentioned in the report. Dr. Fagen explained that staff throughout the school system would submit information. In the first phase, they would be entering all of their in-service courses into the data base. In subsequent phases they would enter information about consultants, workshops and modules, and finally materials. They hoped to interface materials with the professional library about print and nonprint materials. All of this would be in the master computer and could be obtained from terminals in schools. They hoped that in all time all schools would have access to the database. Staff Development would help people become knowledgeable about how to use the computer to get at the resources.

Dr. Cronin inquired about how they set priorities for offerings. For example, there might be budget cutback affecting staff development. Dr. Fagen replied that this was where the collaborative process came in. They needed the team to help them determine priorities as they saw it and school staff to help determine priorities as they saw it. This all had to be within the goals and objectives set by the Board and superintendent. Dr. Pitt added that the superintendent had to make those recommendations to the Board as part of the budget process. The idea of a team would help them focus on the right priorities for staff development. They were trying to move away from a centrally dominated staff development process to one that had more flexibility. He believed that the need for educating staff would be much greater a year from now.

Dr. Smith reported that they were trying to move away from a course dominated approach to staff development. They were working with local school staffs and principals in terms of identifying their training needs and then training them, in effect. Mrs. Blumsack said there were two programs. In one staff development pilot they trained people for the last two years in working with the other adults in the building. The first year they were asking what they could do, and now they were sharing resources. In addition to that, they had also been able to identify where their needs were strongest. Last year one school focused on individuals and this year they were looking at

cooperative learning. They would involve everyone from the building service workers to the teachers in this effort. Staff Development had also worked with successful practices to give schools an opportunity to look at their own mission to determine how their resources could best be used.

Dr. Cronin saw a state of flux between a central administration and Board priorities versus autonomy and flexibility issues at the local school. The Board very often did not define its own priorities in terms of telling staff what they were attempting to do first, second, third, fourth, and fifth. He pointed out that at this meeting they were looking at school leadership needs, staff development, early childhood, induction, and flexibility. All of these required staff training, but no priorities had been established for this.

Mrs. Praisner said that several things were going on, and there was a variety of people at different places in their knowledge or skill base as well as a system that had a variety of needs. It was a marriage of the system's needs as reflected in an individual school and the individual's needs. It seemed to her that the individual person's needs were in support of the system's needs and vice versa. They could get hung up in restricting each other. Some of what she saw as empowerment was both a movement of the schools to recognize that they could do some things and also recognizing each other's strength and also being more comfortable about identifying where they could use some assistance. If they cut back on the number of course offerings, this was a reflection of the assessment process not just an arbitrary wiping out of something. For example, there were a lot of courses for students but students self-selected among them and did not take all these courses. They were becoming more sophisticated in the breath of how they defined training and also how they defined the delivery of it while encouraging and strengthening the local school and individual's exploration of those options.

Dr. Fagen said the team had spent many hours talking about system versus individual. Mr. Romack commented that Dr. Cronin's question was an enormous one. For example, how much did they trust the people working in school buildings? They were committed to the idea that the people working in their buildings were professionals who had a professional commitment to improving themselves. If they were committed to this, they had to give these people the opportunity to make lots of choices and have lots of control over the staff development that was taking place. If they did not buy into that, they would keep all the control in the central office. He said that the Board had sponsored the Commission on Excellence and accepted that report, and he assumed they were moving toward those professionals in the buildings. They hoped to have a computer system where people would be able to edit and refine what was offered on a continuous basis

throughout the year simply by what they were signing up for. They expected that eventually people would be able to sign up using the computers. They had spent at least four years debating this question.

Dr. Cronin commented that they often heard from people that the curriculum should be weeded out because there was so much in there. He liked the self-selection direction adopted by Staff Development. The schools would be defining what was required by looking at school needs. In that sense within some umbrella priorities, the schools were really defining priorities. He was more comfortable with that than the Board setting those kinds of directions.

Mr. Glascoe added that they had also taken a direction away from the old way of looking at staff development as something that was thrust upon staff and was punitive. He was seeing an enthusiasm grow for staff development which was overwhelming. The most important thing was that it was a collaborative effort. They had supporting services, administrators, and teachers all working together to look at staff development and improvement within the school.

Mr. Ewing thought this was a good way to move. He believed it was important for them to recognize that the school Board now and in the future would be establishing some priorities that might be different than the current priorities with regard to curriculum, for example. If the curriculum changed in some dramatic way because of state or local action, they had to think about how staff development could contribute to making certain that that change was reflected in the knowledge and skills of teachers. If they didn't do that, they were not doing the right job. They had changed high school graduation requirements several times over, and to some extent that got reflected. He said they should not suggest that everything was going to be a matter of choice by individual teachers. It raised the question of how they got there. One could establish the objective and then decide in consultation with school-based staff as well as others in the school community what was needed at a school in order to get there. It could be a kind of blanket requirement for a whole set of people depending on what the priority might be. He thought it was important to recognize that this kind of system-wide priority was very likely to continue to be a fact of life. The question then became one of how they accommodated that.

Dr. Smith stated that they should keep in mind the fact that they still had a number of courses such as teacher competency and the in-service program. Many of these courses were designed to support priorities. He thought Mr. Ewing was right, and they were not talking about a completely decentralized system. They were trying to talk about the balance between those two pieces, system-wide needs and individual needs.

Dr. Pitt commented that the key was having enough flexibility so people at the local school level could get what would be most helpful to them in meeting priorities. They all recognized that the Board's major responsibility was to set policy, and it was staff's responsibility to implement policy. Dr. Fagen added that the staff development management team was operating the pilot in 10 schools. An interim report would be forthcoming soon. When they saw this report, it would help reassure the Board that the activities at the local school were focused on school system priorities as they related to the school management plan which, in effect, was a tool for establishing local school priorities. In addition, they were working on individualized priorities of staff.

Dr. Shoenberg noted that in order to have the comprehensiveness they wanted and in order to have the flexibility of program, they were going to have to spend a lot more money on staff development. It would not be easy in today's environment. He pointed out that medium-sized companies were spending about 7 percent of their budget on staff development, and MCPS was spending about a third of 1 percent. There was the sense in which they expected professionals to learn on their own and to spend a certain amount of their own time keeping up with their profession. However, they needed to begin to build a public awareness of the underfunding of staff development and the need to put more money into that function. Perhaps one way to start was to include some kind of goal for staff development among their multiyear goals, particularly as they moved into an environment in which outside forces were going to dictate some of their staff development needs. He thanked Dr. Fagen and staff for a very good report.

Re: EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION: UPDATE
AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Dr. Pitt stated that early childhood education was one of his high priorities, and he knew the Board shared this priority. The paper was an effort to focus on a philosophy and an approach to use in early childhood. He believed the paper would cause some discussion because there were different points of view on this subject. He hoped the discussion would move the Board toward a specific policy in terms of where they were going with early childhood education.

Mrs. Katheryn Gemberling, associate superintendent, introduced Dr. Naomi Plumer, coordinator of early childhood education. Mrs. Gemberling explained that the paper was in response to questions raised by the Board at the March presentation on the early childhood curriculum. Dr. Plumer introduced Mrs. Judith Digne, Head Start Teacher Specialist.

Dr. Plumer reported that in the audience were summer workshop participants and representatives from Head Start, Child Find, and Academic Skills. There were also principals, supervisors, and representatives from the Montgomery County Department of Family Resources. Dr. Plumer reported that since March they had fully implemented a new kindergarten orientation program with great success. Along with this, they had a parent handbook which was being modified as a result of input from schools. Many of their early childhood teachers participated in this year's annual conference, "Celebration of Teacher Success," sponsored by the Association for Childhood Education International.

Dr. Plumer said they worked toward increasing their parent involvement efforts. They conducted an informal survey of schools to find out how each was working toward involving their parents. They had provided Systematic Training for Effective Parenting (STEP) to all of their EEEP classes. They were currently training two of their staff members in mega-skills, and they would train people in the four administrative areas this year. They had expanded the project at New Hampshire Estates whereby a record of all parent/teacher contacts was kept. They now had four primary schools using the project this year.

Dr. Plumer indicated that they had established partnerships outside of MCPS. They had been a resource in terms of advice to a number of private schools. They had established an early childhood advisory committee which was a joint interest group with MCPS and other agencies. They had participated in a number of efforts with the Department of Family Resources. They had regularly distributed to schools current publications and articles dealing with early childhood education. Their EEEP schools had just completed a self-evaluation using the new state standards. They had increased their teacher training opportunities three-fold. They had reorganized the way they did their evaluation and selection of materials. She expressed her appreciation to Mrs. Janet Wells for this effort. They had brought the skills of the performing arts to early childhood staff. They had produced a television program for MCPS about early childhood education, and they were doing another one for their next kindergarten orientation program.

Dr. Plumer said they had presented the perspective of early childhood at the sex equity conference. They had held a very gratifying summer workshop in which a group of early childhood professionals reviewed MSDE prekindergarten units, made recommendations to subject coordinators, created a list of multicultural activities, and wrote a philosophy of early childhood education.

Mr. Ewing commented that this was a very helpful paper. He hoped that the Board would move ahead to the development of a specific policy on early childhood education. He hoped that the policy

would contain a number of elements that would help to sell it. It seemed to him they had not been as effective in selling early childhood education to the County Council as they would have hoped. First, they had to be very clear about a definition of early childhood education. Secondly, they needed to spell out in some detail what they planned to do in such a policy in policy terms. They needed to spell out why they were doing it, and they needed to spell out the results they expected to achieve. It was important to make sure that parents understood what this amounted to as well.

Mr. Ewing had one concern. They had spoken to developmentally appropriate practices for young children, and he had no quarrel with that. However, they needed to be very clear about what that meant. This was not instantly apparent to the average parent or to others. He thought they also needed to be careful about how far they carried that. When one used that language, there was the danger that people would see that as a retreat from a commitment to high standards and high expectations. Some people might say this was another way to arrange things so that those who were poor or educationally poorly prepared would not get the kind of attention that they deserved. He realized the reverse was the intent. A teacher who was consciously or unconsciously racist could see the child as a poor minority child who didn't know much and reflect that in his or her developmentally appropriate practices.

Mr. Ewing said that he had read all of the attachments to the report with some care. He hoped that they could use some of the language in Dr. Elkind's article in their policy because it did speak to the promise of early childhood education. On the other hand, he thought Dr. Elkind had never read Mr. Bloom's book because he had distorted it. It seemed to Mr. Ewing there was a good argument to be made for an approach that used developmentally appropriate practices for young children, but the purpose of this was that at some juncture children could reach more or less comparable levels of accomplishment. They could then say a child had reached that level, and they could have expectations of a substantive kind of what it was they hoped the child would be able to learn. He would oppose the direction proposed by Dr. Elkind. He thought that the staff approach to early childhood education was excellent, but he hoped they would rethink their view of Dr. Elkind's article except for the first page.

Dr. Plumer stated that each of the educators quoted had their own paradigms. She was not suggesting a new paradigm. She was suggesting a Venn diagram of all of those paradigms and taking the best from each and not getting away from their high standards. She was concerned with how they helped children reach those high standards. One of the ways they helped children was to give them a wide enough timeframe. She reported that they had

a curriculum for prekindergarten with 57 very clearly stated objectives and suggestions for reaching those objectives. However, there was no reason to expect that all children would reach each of those objectives at the same time. She cited the analogy of a child learning to walk. Some walked as early as six months, some not until eighteen months, but most walked between nine and fourteen months. They did not give up on the child who did not walk at fourteen months. There was a wide span of time that required educators to look carefully at children. They also had a program of studies for kindergarten, first grade, and second grade. They needed to think about how wide a timeframe they needed for children to reach the expectations.

Mr. Ewing had no quarrel with Dr. Plumer's remarks. However, he pointed out that at some juncture they had to state what they expected children to be able to do and to know. If they did not do that, they were not doing their job as public school educators. He was glad to hear Dr. Plumer's remarks.

Dr. Cronin pointed out that there was a recommendation in the report about increasing teacher training. He asked how they planned to do this and what funding they needed. Dr. Plumer replied that they had funding from the EEEP grant and from the Department of Academic Skills non-credit training. They had three major teacher training programs this year. The first was to increase the number of workshops on social setting which was one kind of strategy for delivering appropriate programs to children. They were going to have another teacher training session on improving the EEEP reporting to parent process. Up until this year a report card of sorts was sent home, and they thought it would be more productive to hold parent conferences twice a year. The parent received a conference guide ahead of time, and the guide was done in multiple languages.

Dr. Cronin asked about the number of participants in one year. Dr. Plumber said they were talking about nine teachers, and they would be able to do that with EEEP funds at least four more times during this school year. She noted that there were only nine prekindergarten teachers. They had been using these people to train other early childhood teachers.

Dr. Cronin commented that the daycare provider was a critical element of a child's existence at this stage. While these people should not be an extension of the school system, he wondered how they were brought into the equation. Dr. Plumer replied that the early childhood advisory committee had been looking at this topic. The Child Care Division had done a survey of daycare providers and their needs for training. MCPS would work cooperatively with the county on this issue. MCPS had also responded to their concern that there be greater communication. Principals had been asked to include this as a topic in their preschool days in August. They had also hired a consultant to

talk to kindergarten, prekindergarten, and first grade teachers about how to help children build self-esteem and develop resiliency to deal with their own stress.

Dr. Cronin asked how they dealt with the issue of retention and communication to parents. Dr. Plumer replied that they would have this discussion on November 13 when they dealt with the promotion and retention policy. Mrs. Gemberling added that Dr. Plumer had been part of that committee that would be presenting the report on promotion and retention.

Mrs. Praisner asked for information about the ways in which they were working with the county government regarding early childhood. She also wanted to know where they were regarding multicultural infusion at this level. Dr. Plumer explained that the advisory committee started out to be an advisory committee only for the EEEP program. The membership now included representatives from the Montgomery Child Daycare Association, Montgomery College, the Commission on Children and Youth, Housing Opportunities Commission, Woodside Child Care Center, child care center representatives, and the Department of Family Resources. The committee had visited schools and had met in a variety of sites. The committee was now called the "early childhood" commission because it had gone beyond the EEEP program.

Mrs. Praisner was hoping they would identify some ways the different agencies were trying to meet the needs of the same child in a variety of ways and how communication and coordination could be improved. She also hoped they would be able to make recommendations about improving delivery of services to county officials. Dr. Plumer replied that their lab setting in some cases had been the four schools that were piloting the half-day kindergarten and half-day daycare program. She was participating on the evaluating team for this program.

Mrs. Praisner asked about multicultural activities. Dr. Plumer said that this summer they had developed a paper listing early childhood multicultural activities that would be appropriate for teachers to use because they correlated with ongoing activities. Their evaluation and selection committee had been reorganized by themes. Mrs. Praisner asked that the Board be provided with a copy of the paper developed over the summer.

Dr. Shoenberg commented that this was a first-rate paper which was very responsive to the Board's concerns. Mr. Ewing recalled that 12 years ago he had proposed an early childhood policy and program. He thought they were almost there. This was due to Dr. Pitt's being the first superintendent to fully embrace this notion. It was also due to Dr. Plumer's work which had been outstanding. Dr. Pitt remarked that Dr. Plumer had done more in a short period of time than anyone anticipated. She had covered a lot of bases and got a lot of people enthused about the

program. He was troubled a little bit by some of the questions raised during the discussion. They needed to clarify this in a policy and make a further commitment in this area.

Re: SCHOOL FLEXIBILITY PILOTS

Dr. Pitt stated that he was recommending they continue the pilot and continue the training for people. The committee had made a number of recommendations which he supported. The most essential of these was that the Board would develop a policy on school flexibility. They would continue discussions on moving flexibility from the pilot process to be part of policy in Montgomery County. He would be recommending funds in the budget even though they would not have a policy at that point. It was his hope that the policy would have input from MCEA, MCCSSE, and MCAASP and also from parents and students. They already had an outline of a policy and could use that as a basis for developing the policy. He was pleased with the way the pilots were developing although some people thought the process should be moving faster and others thought it was moving too slowly.

Dr. Pitt reported that the approach to flexibility had been a little different in Montgomery County than in other places. He had stepped back from the process, and a committee had made the decisions. His purpose in doing that was not to keep the superintendent or other organizations out of this but to develop an attitude that said they would work together in Montgomery County. He was very proud that in the flexibility pilot, the induction pilot, and the staff development pilot, they had worked together. He thought they had the basis for a very strong argument that within Montgomery County they could develop a policy that would allow local schools an opportunity to focus on Board goals in ways that utilized their resources to the best way possible.

Mr. Seth Goldberg, chair of the committee, introduced Mary Ann Bowen, MCCPTA; Diane Davidson, MCCSSE; and Dr. Patricia Sweeney, the Area 1 ADES. They had been working together for about two and a half years and had come to know and respect each other in a working relationships that was symbolic of what this process was about. For a year and a half a small group of schools had been trying to improve themselves using site-based participatory management processes. From what those on the Pilot School Advisory Committee (PSAC) had learned, these processes did hold some promise in their ability to create the kind of increased flexibility that they had set out to create. They had predicted that if local school autonomy and shared decision making were pursued by the school system that the initial signs would be increased levels of involvement, renewed proprietorship in the schools, and increased professionalism. They saw these as signposts on the road to success, long before success could be defined in terms of measurable student outcomes.

Mr. Goldberg thought they were right in their predictions. The process seemed to have re-energized the pilot schools, and the energy was directed into planning, implementing, and carrying out innovations in program, instruction, and curriculum. There had been some exciting, innovative, and creative things happening in the schools that people should be proud of. While perhaps some of these things might have been done without the flexibility effort, they probably would not have been. Flexibility empowered the people in the schools to take charge of their programs.

Mr. Goldberg stated that PSAC and staff in the pilot schools were very grateful to Dr. Pitt for the sensitivity he had shown in this process, for the risks he had been willing to take, and for the way he had supported the pilot process. They were gratified by Dr. Pitt's decision to move to the next phase of this process in committing the system to increased involvement with the site-based participatory management effort. They also supported the recommendation to expand the process to additional sites. They felt strongly about the need for an open dialogue between the system's leadership and the leadership from constituency organizations and agreed there should be a Board policy to provide the guidelines for the structure changes that the schools were engaging in. They were especially pleased with the recommendation to have Dr. Sweeney take over the administrative support of the pilots on a day-to-day basis and to facilitate the pilots and reconstitute the role of PSAC.

Dr. Shoenberg thought that it would be helpful for the Board to have some additional information. There were as many images of what they were talking about when they talked about flexibility or site-based management or local school autonomy as there were people who used the words. It seemed to him they should develop a very clear image of what it was that they were doing. It would be useful for the Board to have an account of what was going on under the general rubric of site-based management in four or five of the large school systems that had adopted some such model. They should know what terminology those systems used, what they meant by it, what difference it made for individual schools, the governance structure, the funding allocations, and ways in which they had approached this process. This information might be represented in discursive and diagrammatic form. He thought it probably had to be represented both ways because he did not think a schematic could provide a full enough explanation for what was going on. He said they had to understand where Montgomery County was and exactly what it was they were proposing.

Mrs. Praisner pointed out that Mrs. Bowen would be participating in the conferences that the National School Boards Association was going to be putting on next weekend, and one of the elements would be site-based management. Over a year ago she had participated in a smaller conference of NSBA leaders and state board presidents. They had spent time trying to come up with a

National School Boards Association's definition. It might be useful to look at that.

Dr. Pitt commented that what had happened around the country was very different from what had happened in Montgomery County. There had been school systems that were in trouble and were in very bad shape. Therefore, that process was almost revolutionary in nature. They took things apart and started over again. Montgomery County was a good school system that needed to be improved; therefore, he saw their process as being much more evolutionary in nature.

Dr. Shoenberg said he was hearing support for the recommendations, and Dr. Cronin asked if they could move up his new business item. Board members agreed to take action on the proposed resolution. Mrs. Praisner requested that the language be changed to read, "develop for discussion and action," and the makers of the motion agreed.

Mr. Ewing asked about the timing of the selection of additional schools and the adoption of Board policy. Dr. Pitt explained that they were going to put in place a training program and an information program without selecting the schools until the policy was developed. Mrs. Praisner was concerned that they move fairly quickly on the policy to eliminate some misunderstandings as to what exactly there were referring to or not referring to.

RESOLUTION NO. 616-90 Re: PROPOSED POLICY ON SCHOOL-BASED
DECISION MAKING

On motion of Dr. Cronin seconded by Mr. Goldensohn, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education request the superintendent to develop for Board discussion and action a policy on school-based decision making.

Re: TEACHER INDUCTION - LOCAL SCHOOL
SUPPORT TEAM PILOT

Dr. Pitt introduced Dr. Dawn Thomas, coordinator of elementary social studies and co-chair of the local school support team pilot. Dr. Thomas indicated that her co-chair Bonnie Cullison might be joining them later.

Dr. Pitt stated that in February of 1987 the Commission on Excellence in Education recommended that they develop a systematic and comprehensive induction program for training probationary teachers. Out of that came the same kind of committee made up of people representing all groups and including parents. There were two major recommendations for two kinds of approaches. One was an approach where every new teacher in the

system would have a teacher work with them in small groups before school started and through the school year. That teacher was kind of a mentor and support for the new teacher. They were now doing this across the system, and he did not intend to eliminate the program. The committee also recommended a much more comprehensive and intensive program to be piloted. Therefore, they were piloting a program called the local school support team which provided for a colleague teacher selected by local people. The colleague teacher worked with new teachers.

Dr. Pitt reported that they had done a comprehensive evaluation of the pilot which was supportive of the project. Given that, he was recommending that the program be instituted on more than a pilot basis. In the paper, he had indicated how they would do that. It would require that they do more talking with MCEA in terms of stipend costs, and he would like to reduce the costs somewhat. They had found that the total school got involved in working with new teachers in a very significant way.

Dr. Pitt said that at budget time he would move this into one of the Board budget goals so they would do this over time. It would still have the idea of schools having an option and not having to commit themselves to move into this program. He felt that the committee had done an outstanding job. The program had received much less publicity than school flexibility, but it was one of the most significant programs that he had ever seen. It had had an amazing influence on new teachers in the schools and principals were sold on the program.

Ms. Cullison stated that she had been working on this for almost three years. When the committee started, they looked at induction programs nationally and how their components might fit into MCPS. What they developed was a conglomerate of ideas, which she felt was effective for Montgomery County. They had found that new teachers were extremely happy to have this service and to have someone in their building who could help them on an immediate need basis. Although it increased the responsibilities of the veteran teacher, the program also compensated the veteran teacher. The veteran teacher received a stipend and released time so that the veteran teacher and the new teacher could have time together. Because of the stipend, new teachers had told the committee they felt comfortable in approaching the veteran teacher. The released time allowed them to deal with issues related to that school and the students. As much as possible, the veteran teacher was at the same grade level as the new teacher so that they could plan curriculum together and share ideas. The veteran teacher advised the new teacher on time management and classroom organization.

Although the program did require funds, Ms. Cullison felt that the money was well spent in benefits to the new teachers. She

thought they were seeing much more capable and qualified new teachers at the end of their first and second years.

Dr. Thomas added that the experienced teachers were reporting a great deal of professional growth and self-satisfaction, and principals had confirmed this. Principals, colleague teachers, and new teachers had commented on the change in the climate of the schools and staff morale. She reported that there was another benefit to the program. They no longer had the elementary teacher specialists, and the LSST could meet that need. New teachers received help in planning, organization and management, better understanding of county resources, and better understanding of materials. This was what the specialists had done. She was now co-chairing a committee for Dr. Vance to look at ways of delivering services to schools, and they wanted to discuss the possibility of the LSST's filling that need.

Dr. Pitt said that as superintendent he would move this program into the mainstream of the school system. It would no longer be a pilot and would be proposed in the budget for a multiyear plan. Dr. Cronin asked how they would decide which schools received the program. Dr. Pitt replied that they would maintain the committee structure, and he would assume the committee would be involved in that process.

Dr. Shoenberg remarked that some school systems had chosen to bring all of their new teachers into the school system through a certain number of schools. He did not know the number of new teachers they were dealing with and what percentage of the faculty would be new. He asked if the committee had thought about using this model. Dr. Thomas replied that they had considered it. They felt that a school could not have or should not have an excess number of new teachers that would exceed the number of available and experienced teachers who wanted to be part of the process and would be selected by the school process. They did reject a school for the pilot because that school had too many new teachers.

It seemed to Dr. Shoenberg that in spreading their new teachers out across many schools they created a situation in which it would be very hard to have all new teachers receive the advantages of this model. For example, they could limit the program to 30 schools rather than have a few new teachers in the 100 plus schools they had now. Dr. Pitt thought that this might be worth exploring again. If they did spread it over 30 to 40 schools it could speed up the process. Ms. Cullison pointed out that if they did this they would have the same community available to all new teachers so that they would not get a variety of experiences, and again it would be same veteran teachers delivering the service all the time unless they had a rotating staff through those centers. Dr. Shoenberg felt that 20 to 30 schools would give variety. He said that they were hiring

about 200 elementary school teachers each year, and 40 to 50 of them might have previous teaching experience. Therefore, they were talking about 150 new teachers.

Dr. Pitt explained that he was not asking for a vote today. He was assuming there was general agreement to go ahead in the manner he had described. Dr. Shoenberg thought that people were very comfortable with the plan. He thanked the committee for the fine job of guidance they had provided. Dr. Pitt added that people had come from all over the school system and had carried the load.

Re: BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

1. Mrs. Praisner reported that at the Maryland Association of Boards of Education Convention they had a round table discussion which focused on community involvement, parental involvement, and efforts to involve the business community. She had brought back materials which she would share with staff.

2. Dr. Shoenberg said that at the MABE Convention they had an opportunity to hear the state superintendent, Dr. Shilling, and to challenge him. Dr. Shilling had talked with ominous frequency about a state system of education that sounded like a radical departure from the state involvement they had had in the past. Dr. Shoenberg remained concerned about this issue and by the way in which the state Board seemed to be taking the agenda away from the local Boards of Education. On the program side, he had attended a session on the Frederick County community liaison program for at risk students. He thought it was a very attractive program, and he had material on the program for staff.

3. Mr. Ewing recalled that for two years running the Board had appropriated a small amount of money for a program at Einstein that was intended to be an extremely modest experiment in the approaches of the essential schools program. The Einstein program had vanished without a trace and without Board action or notice. He was concerned about that, and he would like a response from Dr. Pitt as to what had happened and why.

RESOLUTION NO. 617-90 Re: EXECUTIVE SESSION - OCTOBER 22,
1990

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Praisner seconded by Dr. Cronin, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

WHEREAS, The Board of Education of Montgomery County is authorized by Section 10-508, State Government Article of the ANNOTATED CODE OF MARYLAND to conduct certain of its meetings in executive closed session; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education of Montgomery County hereby conduct its meeting in executive closed session beginning on October 22, 1990, at 7:30 p.m. to discuss, consider, deliberate, and/or otherwise decide the employment, assignment, appointment, promotion, demotion, compensation, discipline, removal, or resignation of employees, appointees, or officials over whom it has jurisdiction, or any other personnel matter affecting one or more particular individuals and to comply with a specific constitutional, statutory or judicially imposed requirement that prevents public disclosures about a particular proceeding or matter as permitted under the State Government Article, Section 10-508; and that such meeting shall continue in executive closed session until the completion of business.

RESOLUTION NO. 618-90 Re: MINUTES OF AUGUST 27, 1990

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mr. Goldensohn seconded by Dr. Cronin, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

RESOLVED, That the minutes of August 27, 1990, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 619-90 Re: MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 12, 1990

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Shoenberg seconded by Dr. Cronin, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

RESOLVED, That the minutes of September 12, 1990, be approved with the addition of comments by Mr. Chang on the student member voting bill.

RESOLUTION NO. 620-90 Re: STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION BUDGET
REQUEST

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mr. Ewing seconded by Dr. Cronin, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County Board of Education generally supports the Maryland Goals for Public Education which are intended to improve student achievement; and

WHEREAS, The State Board of Education has requested additional State funding for programs to implement these goals; and

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County Board recognizes that programs to implement these goals cannot be carried out unless additional funding is provided; and

WHEREAS, The governor and the General Assembly will be reviewing the State Board's request for additional funding for these programs; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Montgomery County Board of Education takes the position that if the State implements programs to improve student achievement, then local education agencies must be provided with additional funding; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Montgomery County Board of Education does not support funding these programs through changes in the Basic Current Expense formula or through changes in the State's funding of teacher retirement and social security.

RESOLUTION NO. 621-90 Re: COOPERATION OF MCPS WITH MONTGOMERY COLLEGE ON MATH AND SCIENCE

On motion of Dr. Cronin seconded by Mr. Chang, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

RESOLVED, The Board of Education directs the superintendent to develop with Montgomery College content courses in math and science for elementary and middle school teachers.

RESOLUTION NO. 622-90 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1990-42

On motion of Mr. Goldensohn seconded by Dr. Cronin, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education adopt its Decision and Order in BOE Appeal No. 1990-42, a tuition waiver.

RESOLUTION NO. 623-90 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1990-60

On motion of Mr. Goldensohn seconded by Mrs. Praisner, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education dismiss BOE Appeal No. 1990-60, a student transfer matter, at the request of the appellant.

Re: NEW BUSINESS

Mr. Ewing moved and Mr. Chang seconded the following:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education request the superintendent to develop for its consideration a proposed policy that would provide a process for appropriate placement in other positions of employees who have become partially disabled, are unable to perform in their present positions, but could perform in other positions.

Re: ITEMS OF INFORMATION

Board members received the following items of information:

1. Items in Process
2. Construction Progress Report
3. DEA Oversight Committee

Re: ADJOURNMENT

The president adjourned the meeting at 4:10 p.m.

PRESIDENT

SECRETARY

HP:mlw