The Board of Education of Montgomery County held a work session at the Carver Educational Services Center, 850 Hungerford Drive, Rockville, Maryland, on September 11, 2012, beginning at 9:10 a.m.

Present: Ms. Shirley Brandman, President
         in the Chair
         Mr. Christopher Barclay
         Ms. Laura Berthiaume
         Dr. Judy Docca
         Mr. Michael Durso
         Mr. Philip Kauffman
         Mr. John Mannes
         Mrs. Patricia O’Neill
         Dr. Joshua Starr, Secretary/Treasurer

Staff:   Mr. Larry Bowers
         Dr. Beth Schiavino-Narvaez
         Dr. Kimberly Statham
         Mr. Brian Edwards
         Mr. Ikhide Roland Ikheloa
         Ms. Suzann King
         Mrs. Glenda Rose
         Ms. Samantha Cohen
         Ms. Kimberly Yearns

Guests:  Ms. Danuta Wilson
         Ms. Lynn Bui
         Mr. Chris Lloyd

Ms. Brandman welcomed those present and reviewed what was to be accomplished during this work session: review of Board’s disciplined work process and adoption of 2012-13 Board work topics. Board members provided their suggested topics. For discussion purposes, the proposed topics were aligned with the three strategic priorities identified for 2012-13, namely: Interventions, Professional Development, and Community Engagement, with the exception of dividing interventions between Instructional and Disciplinary Interventions.

The shared interests were agreed upon at the onset of the meeting. As the Board discovered, our shared interests have clear implications for policy, design of data points, and the renovation of the strategic plan:

1. Useful, thoughtful information.
2. An informed public.
3. Clear communication of ideas and strategies (data points in renovated strategic
4. Knowing what works and what does not work by using defined metrics and evaluating data.
5. Information necessary to fulfill role—policy implications, strategic planning, due diligence, fiscal implications, etc.
6. Focus and alignment by defining what the Board wants to do.
7. Clear roles and responsibilities—committees, Board, staff, etc.
8. Candid communication/discussion regarding identifying issues/problems so that the Board and the superintendent get right data and information.

In light of these shared interests, the Board reached consensus on the following work for the upcoming year:

**Professional Development:** In terms of professional development, it was agreed to have a comprehensive conversation on professional development training, which would provide the rationale for Professional Learning Communities, discuss how the work is being scaled up, the impact of the Common Core State Standards, and an analysis of what resources would be needed for full implementation.

**Interventions:** As a sign of the Board’s interests, the bulk of the questions focused on Interventions. There was a productive dialogue that focused on the following: What’s our goal?; What’s our vision?; How do we get there?; Do we have the right data to indicate how our students are performing?; What should we be looking at?; What do we do with the data?; and, Should we be looking at interventions in other areas, for example – writing? The interventions were assigned into two categories: Instructional Intervention and Disciplinary Intervention. The Board had a lengthy and engaging discussion during which the superintendent shared that he has directed staff to undertake a systemwide “gap analysis”. The Board agreed that the results of this “gap analysis” should be shared with the Board a robust Board discussion on Instructional Interventions—school-based, central office, and programs and resources that support the social/emotional aspects of learning. The following are issues culled from the discussion that were agreed to and should be addressed during a full Board presentation and discussion:

**Instructional Interventions:**
- What is a “red flag?” (Indicators that need to be present to draw attention to a student needs.)
- How are we helping schools to address gaps?
- Principals and local school administrators should engage the Board in conversations regarding articulation strategies.
- Mathematics instruction data as it relates to learning gaps must be studied.
- How do we know we have the appropriate type and level of resources (for example: number of resources/teachers)?
- How is our school district organized to address how and why there is a gap and ways to address it?
- What data does the Board need to advocate for the system? In presenting the
data, include explanation of data changes, why it occurred, strategies used, and what is needed to sustain improvements.

Students should be empowered to advocate for themselves when they believe they need help. In summary, the Board would like a work session on Instructional Interventions that would showcase a gap analysis that provides information on the gap that would be the focus for the next few years. This analysis would be shared with the Board and public along with information on existing models of interventions and how we are using them to support schools. The information would also explore resource allocations and how they are consistent with our core values.

**Disciplinary Interventions:** The upcoming November 13, 2012, discussion has been scheduled on the Board’s agenda to discuss the State Board’s proposed regulatory changes to suspension rules and the impact on MCPS practice.

In advance of that discussion, Board staff will solicit Board member’s questions that need to be addressed in the paper and during the discussion. The discussion will include a presentation on what we are currently doing and set the stage for a larger work session on instructional supports for students who are not thriving in their comprehensive school program. The goal is that these conversations will support the Board in its quasi-judicial capacity. The discussions on interventions need to be scheduled with special sensitivity to the budget development schedule and address the following:

- Intervention strategies should get to the root causes and focus on changing behavior.
- Provide a catalog of what is currently done as a system.
- What are the supports in place for suspended/expelled students? Some community providers provide supports for suspended students (“Sharp Street”). Should MCPS be providing the supports instead?
- What should alternative programs look like?
- There is interest in understanding the restructuring process at the Ewing Center, etc. Provide data on the performance of the students in alternative programs; how effective are these programs? How do you measure the effectiveness of these programs?

The Board discussed the distinction between providing alternative instructional options for students who are the subject of disciplinary interventions and the topic of alternative education which focuses on providing instructional alternatives to the traditional secondary model. There was agreement that alternative education is a different subject from traditional alternative programs. There will be a memorandum regarding the current status of alternative programs for students who are the subject of disciplinary intervention and the special populations committee may review this initial information.

**Community Engagement:**
The Board has committed to a work session on Communications and Community
Engagement that will focus on outreach efforts as a Board. Prior to the session, there needs to be a gap analysis that includes a catalog of current practices and resources. Initial reflection and recommendations will be developed by the Communication and Engagement Committee which can devote more intensive time and attention to considering the Board’s goals in its outreach effort and how to best align resources—including time spent in the community to achieve these goals. The work session would help clarify expectations and desires for community outreach and define the listening and input process (seek non-traditional voices and include students). The Board needs to go out and engage the community more proactively and ensure that all communications outreach initiatives are coordinated. The Board’s policy development outreach should also be reviewed.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:55 a.m.
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