

APPROVED
20-1994

Rockville, Maryland
April 20, 1994

The Board of Education of Montgomery County met in special session at the Carver Educational Services Center, Rockville, Maryland, on Wednesday, April 20, 1994, at 7:30 p.m.

ROLL CALL Present: Mrs. Carol Fanconi, President
 in the Chair
 Mr. Stephen Abrams
 Ms. Carrie Baker
 Mrs. Frances Brenneman*
 Dr. Alan Cheung
 Mr. Blair G. Ewing
 Mrs. Beatrice Gordon
 Ms. Ana Sol Gutierrez*

Absent: None

Others Present: Dr. Paul L. Vance, Superintendent
 Mrs. Kathryn W. Gemberling, Deputy
 Dr. H. Philip Rohr, Deputy
 Mr. Thomas S. Fess, Parliamentarian

RESOLUTION NO. 272-94 Re: BOARD AGENDA - APRIL 20, 1994

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Gordon seconded by Mr. Abrams, the following resolution was adopted unanimously by members present:

Resolved, That the Board of Education approve its agenda for April 20, 1994, with the addition of a closed session after the public meeting.

RESOLUTION NO. 273-94 Re: CLOSED SESSION - APRIL 20, 1994

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Gordon seconded by Mr. Abrams, the following resolution was adopted unanimously by members present:

WHEREAS, The Board of Education of Montgomery County is authorized by the Education Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland and Title 10 of the State Government Article to conduct certain meetings or portions of its meetings in closed session; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education of Montgomery County hereby conduct a portion of its meeting on April 20, 1994, at 9:30 p.m. to discuss matters protected from public disclosure by law, contract negotiations, and other issues including consultation with counsel to obtain legal advice; and be it further

Resolved, That this meeting be conducted in Room 120 of the Carver Educational Services Center, Rockville, Maryland, as

permitted under Section 4-106, Education Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland and State Government Article 10-501; and be it further

Resolved, That such meeting shall continue in closed session until the completion of business.

*Ms. Gutierrez joined the meeting at this point.

Re: ANNOUNCEMENT

Mrs. Fanconi announced that Mrs. Brenneman was attending a function for the Board and would arrive around 8 p.m.

Re: REPORT OF THE TASK FORCE ON LONG-RANGE PLANNING AND RESOURCE ALLOCATION

Mrs. Fanconi welcomed Mr. Michael Barnes and Mr. David Snyder, co-chairs of the task force. She expressed the Board's appreciation for the hard work and dedication of the group. The Board had originally appointed the task force because it had just gone through one of its worst budget seasons and realized the large amount of time it was spending on the immediacy of fiscal constraints. The Board felt they needed to prepare for the future and have a group look forward and be willing to look at innovations to prepare for the challenges of the year 2000 and beyond. It was clear from their report that the task force had provided the Board with a valuable opportunity to explore a number of issues. She noted that their report was succinct, and she hoped they would take this opportunity to expand on the report.

Mr. Snyder thanked the Board for giving them the opportunity and the privilege to serve their community in so fundamental a way. While it took them half-again as long to complete their task as originally proposed and while it involved hundreds of hours of work for many of the individuals, they believed that the report and recommendations were worthy products of that effort. Although most of them did not know one another at the start, they had become colleagues and comrades-in-arms. They had had lively and spirited debates from the outset which continued through this evening. However, the mission given to them was of such importance that their efforts be energized by what they learned and the implications of those findings for the future.

When the Board assigned the task force the responsibility for looking at and planning for the long-term future of MCPS, they had given the group the fun part of their job as opposed to the day-to-day nuts and bolts of short-term management. He had mentioned this to Dr. Cheung, and Dr. Cheung conceded that this was probably true but dealing with the day-to-day nuts and bolts was preemptive of the Board's time, and if they did not put the project off-line it probably would not get done at all.

Mr. Snyder reported that the group had looked at the long-term trends and developments that were reshaping public education

throughout America. They read the literature and talked and corresponded with educators and leaders in reform around the country. They wanted to report what they believed the Board must do to assure that the institution would, in fact, be able to prepare all county students to succeed in the 21st century.

There were three reliable realities that could be forecasted. The first was that enrollment would increase 27 percent or 30,000 pupils between now and the year 2000. There would be concomitant growth in the cultural and economic diversity of the student population. Curriculum content must be expanded by 50 percent. All three of these trends represented substantial increases in growth rates which the school system experienced during the preceding six years. By comparison, the numbers of households, jobs, and businesses in the county were expected to grow much more slowly than they did in the last six years. The revenue base for the county school system would not expand fast enough to cover the predictable workload growth during the rest of the 1990's. This meant that there would be pressure for higher and/or new taxes with a commensurate anti-tax pressure backlash that could jeopardize school funding in general. Politically expedient economizing and substantial curtailment in MCPS current programs could arise from such a debate, or both could happen.

The workload for most U.S. school systems was expected to rise and would continue to rise for the rest of the decade. The baby boom echo was a national phenomenon, and the nearly 900,000 immigrants arriving each year were enriching the ethnic diversity of all metropolitan school districts including MCPS. The increasing gap between the poor and the prosperous in America as well as falling per capita wages at all levels of employment had brought economic diversity to once economically homogenous suburbs through the nation.

The technological transformation of the economy, which was the cause of the temporary decline in prosperity, was also a national phenomenon. The creative wave of destruction had already devastated many local and regional economies in the United States, and it was eliminating hundreds of thousands of white collar jobs a year. Behind this wave a new set of post-industrial enterprises were beginning to arise. These enterprises had "informed" jobs and operations requiring the mastery of knowledge and skills far beyond that currently conveyed to most K-12 students by most school systems, including MCPS.

To teach more skills to more and different students with fixed resources would require more than simply trimming or tinkering with the existing system. It would require them to re-assess the existing programs and re-allocate resources to get much more educational "bang for the buck." It would require the schools to search out, assess, and adopt superior innovative practices and programs throughout.

Mr. Snyder commented that the task force did not start out as

educational revolutionaries. It was only over the months of data-gathering that they began to grasp the comprehensive nature of the changes that would be required of all U.S. institutions, including MCPS, as a consequence of the information revolution. He thought it was fair to say that the Nation as a whole work up to that revolution only in the past 18 months. The group had held their first meeting in September, 1992, prior to the election of President Clinton, who had put re-inventing government and the national data highway on the front burner. In education alone, the administration had launched the National Service Corps and gained passage of the "School-to-Work Opportunity" Act. The president had just signed the new education act, "Goals 2000," which created a National Education Standards and Improvements Council empowered to set benchmark performance evaluation criteria for the nation's public school students.

They were also re-engineering corporations, reforming health care, and restructuring the economy. In this context, it would be naive to think that public schools, largely designed to meet the requirements of the Industrial Age, could survive unchanged into the 21st century and the information age. Remarkable, fundamental transformations were now underway throughout all of America's great institutions, and education, including Montgomery County Public Schools, must be a part of this moment. When they were done with this, they would have re-invented themselves as a nation. He believed this was a great and exciting moment to be alive and in public service.

Their review of the education reforms around the country revealed a virtual cornucopia of successful innovations, including team teaching, integrated curricula, experiential learning, in-school academics, performance testing, mentoring, and business/school partnerships, just to name a few. They also found research indicating that many current school programs, from remedial reading to computer-aided education to gifted and advanced placement classes, produced little or no educational benefits to students for substantial added cost. Even worse, there was a growing awareness within the educational community, that the processes by which students were rated reflected student memory more than mastery; cognition, rather than comprehension.

Numerous surveys and literature reviews agreed that the single most effective means of improving existing programs and implementing innovations was to transfer the authority for managing and allocating the resources of a community's public education system from the central office to the individual local schools. The thrust of their recommendations was the establishment of a comprehensive school-based management system as the means for re-inventing the public schools. This would involve delegating to individual schools or clusters the authority to control allocation of funds, the utilization and development of staff, and the design of curriculum. Parallel recommendations proposed the adoption by MCPS of program-based and multi-year school-based budgets, permitting the linkage of

resources expended and student performance, broken down by individual schools and programs, so that local leaders would have timely and objective information upon which to base their decisions and investments of resources into alternative programs and functions.

Mr. Snyder said that in support of their core set of proposals, they had further recommended that MCPS initiate an extensive ongoing outreach effort to assure broad-based awareness and involvement of all citizens in the re-invention of the public schools. They further recommended that MCPS create a professional or leadership development institute. They also proposed that the central office devote significant resources to develop a superior set of performance-based criteria for objective measuring student progress and achievement. The continued development of ever-improving measures of student performance, including post-graduation assessments, will be crucial to the success of any school-based initiative, as will the creation of an independent professional development institute to assure the appropriate quality and quantity of training staff, personnel, and other community participants in school-based projects and programs.

Taken together, these initiatives, each a substantial undertaking in itself, would establish an environment in which MCPS and the students and communities they served might work together to invent new and better ways of providing young people with the skills and comprehensions they would need in order to live socially and economically productive lives in the 21st century. The task force found these actions to have been effective in other school districts. Many surveys of effective school improvements had attested to the purposeful impacts of school decentralization under conditions of quality performance measuring.

The April 13 issue of Education Week cited a new report from the National School Boards Association, titled "A New Framework for School Governance," which endorsed school-based decision-making, charter schools, and other alternatives to traditional school governance structures, provided they meet local needs.

Mr. Snyder stated that in the past decade the notion had arisen that the public schools could not fix themselves and must be privatized. Minneapolis recently turned over the management of its schools to a private consultant. Indianapolis hired the Hudson Institute to re-invent its schools, and Chelsea, Massachusetts put Boston University in charge of its schools. Surely, in Montgomery County, with their existing base of quality and substance they did not need to bring in any outsiders. He believed they could do this themselves.

Mr. Barnes stated that it was a privilege to have this opportunity to take a look at the school system and learn more about it. He was a parent of children in MCPS, but he was not an expert on education. He had renewed respect for the calibre of

the people working on behalf of children. The group had visited schools and met with staff which was a very impressive group of people. He saluted Pat Hanehan who worked with the task force and who put in an extraordinary amount of time and effort.

While he had been unable to attend a lot of the meetings, Mr. Barnes had kept up with committee activities and was quite comfortable with the recommendations before the Board. He believed that if the recommendations were implemented this would be an opportunity for Montgomery County to jump from an excellent school system to what was needed in the future, which was an even stronger school system to meet the challenges ahead of them. He had heard the secretary of labor speak and noting that young people could anticipate having several careers. They had to find ways to help students prepare for that kind of future. Mr. Barnes maintained that if MCPS did move in this direction by the year 2000 it would be the best school system in the nation.

Mr. John Munson stated that the task force had taken its charge very seriously. As initially charged, the task force should have completed its work some nine months ago but found that to be difficult. Change was often hard, but in order for MCPS to meet the needs of its students, present and in the future, and to balance those needs with the changing demographics, the declining tax base, and increasing cost of educating young people, MCPS and the Board must embrace change and make it a hallmark for success.

Of the seven specific recommendations put forward in the report, Mr. Munson said he would like to address three general principles which embodied the essence of the study. The first was creating a climate of change. If MCPS was going to continue to excel in the education of children and serve both as a leader and model for other school districts, it must be given the charge to do so by the Board and be empowered to implement necessary changes which, in collaboration with administrators, educators, parents, students, and other stakeholders, allow new ideas and ways of delivering education to be introduced, nurtured, and brought to fruition. However, this could only be done if the Board re-invented its mechanism and methodology in policies for providing oversight of the administration of the schools.

Mr. Munson commented that there were areas that were rightly the Board's; however, beyond the policy and goal setting and within the bounds of legislative authority, the Board should strive to empower both the superintendent and the school administrators to re-examine current policies and ways of doing business to determine and change, as necessary, those which did not foster new ideas and philosophies. General Electric and Martin Marietta had embraced similar changes in the way business was conducted, and their results had been very successful. These successes had been possible only because a desire for change and the empowerment to change originated at the highest levels of corporations.

Mr. Munson said that his next issue was school-based management

as a fundamental reform necessary to accomplishing the change they recommended. One of the quickest and fundamental means for implementing change in MCPS would be the introduction of school-based management with complete discretion over all aspects of governing the school. This would include staffing, facilities management, training, and budgeting. The idea was to place as much responsibility and authority into the school as required to permit the people closest to the action to have the ability to set priorities, establish goals and objectives, and make course corrections as necessary. Initially, such empowerment would require a significant investment in training for school principals, educators, parents, students, and others in the fundamentals of school management. In order to do this, the Board should take the necessary steps to direct MCPS to develop school-based management plans with realizable goals and timelines.

*Mrs. Brenneman joined the meeting at this point.

Mr. Munson stated that his final issue was accountability. If MCPS was going to meet the challenges of the year ahead, it must begin to embrace the idea of openness in any discussion relative to the budget. Facts, figures, and assumptions must be open for public debate and scrutiny. When citizens are asked to address budgetary issues, the data must be made available to them. The MCPS budget continued to grow because of inflation, increased costs, and population. The data used to substantiate this must be provided in a format and in a timely fashion to be useable by ordinary citizens. Citizens should not have to become budget analysts to evaluate the relative costs of one school and one program versus another. The two MCPS budgets were almost incomprehensible, and he believed they could be made more user friendly.

Mr. Munson suggested that the Board should direct the superintendent to develop a financial accounting system which could track costs more closely and with greater accuracy and which could be used to relate those expenditures with educational goals and outcomes. As they moved to a more restrictive funding from the county, the school system was going to have to substantiate those numbers. They could not just divide the number of students into the total budget. He expressed his special thanks to Pat Hanehan and Melissa Woods for their help.

Dr. Cheung thanked the task force for their report and indicated that he was looking forward to the final reporting and supporting document. He looked at MCPS as more than a school system. It was a multi-institutional system. When he read about centralization, decentralization, and school-based, he was pleased to see the word, "cluster," in there. By planning for an individual school, they were lacking the continuum from elementary to high school. By looking at clusters, they would be looking at economy of scale in terms of operations. They could pool resources for staff development, technology implementation, and networking. He did not see much in the report about

linkages. He asked about the transition from a centralized to a decentralized system as far as linkages were concerned. MCPS was not a total centralized organization because it was a school system.

Dr. Cheung said that another area was the informational database. It was very important to have information about workload if they really wanted to plan. They were now defining educational load, and it would be available in the future for planning. They would have to look at resources in the area of staffing, facilities, and equipment. By using a database they could look at an individual school, a cluster, and the whole system. Another concern was accountability. They had to have data for planning, monitoring, and accountability in terms of looking at productivity, efficiency, and effectiveness.

Dr. Cheung noted that they had talked about multi-year budgets, and he wanted to know whether their current budget process was adequate and, if not, how did they transform it. They had talked about school-based budgets, he would like to know about information needed to measure productivity, efficiency, effectiveness, and quality. He would like to know a little bit more about the role of the central office. The task force had indicated that the Board was involved in too much of the administrative functions rather than policy setting. He wanted to learn a little bit more about the linkage between policy formulation and policy implementation/management.

Mr. Jerry Duvall stated that Dr. Cheung was proposing a very interesting organizational model which Mr. Duvall would label as the "vertically integrated community school." The concept was that a school was a holistic enterprise, and they could arrive at an economic and educational rationale as to why it made good sense which was because of the externalities between learning at different stages. If they organized in a way that recognized that interdependence, they realized the educational advantage of a holistic program seen with a coherent philosophy. This provided an opportunity to redeploy resources at different stages of the educational process where the need might be greater. He was preparing a separate document on why this might be a reasonable alternative model to consider; however, this was not a model that the task force was endorsing.

Mr. Snyder commented that in regard to the multi-year budget they never stipulated a five- or three-year budget or whatever. It did not seem to them to be appropriate for them to attempt to dictate this because of the additional information they would have to gather. They did take note of the fact that there was a movement in the direction of multi-year budgeting. He explained that most recommendations they made were intended not to be fixed, completed tasks but rather inertial forces or vectors in that direction. Issues were constantly evolving, and there was always new research coming out. The first step might be a two-year budget and this would satisfy the task force that the system was moving in the right direction, recognizing that the school

system eventually might get to a three- or five-year budget. This was the whole notion behind the idea of a smooth transition.

In the body of the report, they did propose some timeframes for courses of action, but not a date certain. He quoted from Re-inventing Government, "the principal function of government as translated back to the original base Greek word is to steer." The task force was attempting to steer this enterprise. The leadership was the Board, and the management was the superintendent. The purpose of the task force was to point out those things that made sense -- multi-year budgets, program budgets, school-based budgets which were part of a fundamental database they had to have in order to make site-based management and the leadership of site-based operations informed enough to make good decisions. The thrust was to create a marketplace in which there were some reasonably valid measures of value that would enable the various participants in that marketplace to make some choices among different alternative ways of investing their resources.

Ms. Gutierrez expressed her thanks to everyone on the committee.

They had taken the charge very seriously and it showed. In regard to site-based management, she asked for additional information because the Board did have a policy although in her opinion they were not doing site-based management in any way. Mr. Snyder explained that the group had voted on three alternative edits of the report and selected the shortest one. He had just realized that the entire discussion of the failure of the MCPS site-based project had been edited out.

Mr. Snyder recalled that the task force had had an extended discussion including citing DEA's assessment of the MCPS site-based project. That report stated that the MCPS project exhibited every one of the classic failure modes of failed site-based management. It delegated no genuine authority over budget, personnel, or curriculum. The second volume of their report would include reprints of reports the task force found to be useful, including an independent report of the Jefferson County schools done by a representative of the Harvard School of Education. This study told them why it was absolutely essential that this be a comprehensive effort on the part of the school system. In Jefferson County, the schools that tried new things had a poorer performance rating than schools that elected to do nothing new or the schools that made a comprehensive commitment.

The schools with a comprehensive commitment had a four times higher rate of student improvement than schools changing a little bit and a two times higher rate than the schools that saw no need to change. The second volume would also contain some of the summary reports written by the task force members during last summer.

Ms. Gutierrez stated that she was glad that for the record she was hearing that whatever they had out there called site-based management was not the real thing. It was not adequate, and it could not work. She asked whether they had found any success stories that it could be done. Mr. Snyder replied that it was

being done in rural, suburban, and urban school districts.

Ms. Gutierrez asked if they had had discussion as to how MCPS could go about making that effective change. They had cited the models of re-inventing government. In her mind there were two distinct approaches. The first was the slower continuous improvement change which MCPS had begun to embark on. The second was the new approach or the total re-engineering. She asked if they were going for that bigger bang.

Mr. Snyder replied that they were going for a third alternative which was a marketplace approach. Rather than having the central office and the Board come up with a single master plan, they would set up a framework whereby those individual schools or clusters ready to change may do so now. Those who did not want to did not have to. Louisville had been doing this for 10 years, and some schools did not change because they were happy with their performance. The task force was suggesting that the Board set the system free and let people innovate at the pace that the local leadership wanted. There would be one governor on this. In their suggested timeframe, they had allowed time for the drafting of regulations.

Mr. Snyder said it was also very clear they needed to make a substantial investment in human resource development in order to do site-based management. They knew that 90 percent of the cost of organizational modernization was for the training and restructuring, and only 10 percent was for the hardware and the software. The districts doing it best had set up an independent training institute or academy that was free to go out and solicit private sector donations. The institute would provide training on a contract basis, and the institute could contract with local large-scale employers to provide particular types of skills. He noted that in many cases the kinds of skills needed to run a school as if it were a school district were not present in the people now running the school. People had to be trained in management and budget.

Mr. Snyder felt that if other districts could do site-based management certainly Montgomery County could. The League of Women Voters had described Montgomery County as "the most citizen-organized county in the nation." He believed that the creation of the institute was critical to the success of letting individual schools and their local leaders determine when it was they were ready to do this. The institute would serve as a network funneling national information about innovations to local schools. He said that the reorganization of a corporation was a brutal process because 80 percent of the middle managers were eliminated; however, in their report they were not talking about that kind of reorganization. The task force thought there were enough people out there who wanted to change and that they should be given the support to do those things. The other important piece was that the central office must have benchmarks for superior standards against all these individuals have to perform. If schools did not meet these benchmarks, they would know that

the process did not work. This was the counterbalance to freedom.

Mrs. Brenneman understood how they could allocate resources to schools so that they could hire their own staff. She asked how they could delegate curriculum school by school or cluster by cluster and have equity between clusters. Many students moved from one area of the county to another area.

Mr. Snyder replied that with respect to the second part they found those disparities now when people moved from one school district to another or one state to another. Mrs. Brenneman noted that the Board did have control over what happened within the county. Mr. Snyder added that the trauma of change based on physical moves was not unknown. The question was its importance educationally for the child. He asked whether it was the school system's responsibility to have a child able to move from one side of the county to the other and find no difference in the curriculum content or delivery of that curriculum. It was not clear to him that it was because they could not guarantee this on a national basis. He was not familiar with any research that said children were not adaptive enough to deal with this as long as they assured the quality. He believed that the bigger impact on the child would be assimilating to a new social context.

With regard to equity, Mr. Snyder explained that several benefits arose from site-based management. If their resources were constrained, schools could have complete freedom as to how they spent this fixed budget. People getting that freedom found it almost as good as a funding increase. Teachers, students, parents, and administrators had the opportunity to spend the money as they saw fit. They saw this as getting a better deal because they could change staffing or invest funds in hardware rather than in staff.

Mrs. Brenneman said she could understand budgeting and staff, but she wanted to know what was meant by delegating curriculum. Mr. Snyder explained that this meant that teachers had the opportunity to innovate in curriculum and change the curriculum design. This was one of the most outstanding achievements of site-based management. Teachers might know how to teach a subject to this set of children in a particular school, but they were not permitted to do it this way because the curriculum was micromanaged from the central office. All of the school success stories came from freedom to innovate; however, all schools would still have to meet state standards in terms of what they covered. They received freedom for the manner of delivery.

Mrs. Brenneman said she could understand changing different styles, and she thought that MCPS teachers did this very well. This was what quality teaching was all about. Teachers adapted their style and a basic curriculum to meet the needs of individual children in each class with or without site-based management. The report seemed to indicate they were not changing teaching style but changing curriculum to meet the needs of

students. Mr. Snyder explained that they had a semantics problem. He was thinking about the teacher's being able to scrap a reading list. Although the teacher would still have to meet the objectives for the course, the teacher could choose different avenues to meet those objectives.

Mr. Abrams thanked the task force for the report which was worth the wait. In regard to a change in information and budget, he wondered if they were talking about a concept of transparency to turn current information into something that was much more user friendly. This could work whether they had a centralized or decentralized budget system. If he were to reformat their current operating budget, he would bring it down by cluster as they did the capital budget. Even if they kept other systems in place, the richness of the discussion in the community would be enhanced several times.

Mr. Abrams asked if they were really talking about public school choice when they talked about charter schools, contract schools, and other innovative organizational structure. Mr. Snyder replied that they did discuss this later in the report. Mr. Abrams noted that they talked about marketplace and resources following the individual student, and implicit in that was a free movement within the system. They were going to offer a broad range of different ways of delivering educational services and empowering parents and the school community to make that choice within reasonable limits. The Board was doing that in part in controlled choice in the eastern area, and they were doing it in part with the math/science magnet at Blair, the IB program at Richard Montgomery, and the communications emphasis at some schools. Some schools used an interdisciplinary approach for delivery services, and what the task force was suggesting that it be thrown wide open. Mr. Snyder agreed that it should be a grass roots movement. Mr. Abrams pointed out that when they coupled this with the element of choice within the context of the public schools, they got the best of all possible worlds because they now had a marketplace factor.

Mr. Snyder commented that where they found a lot of support for site-based management, there were substantial arguments being made against free choice within a school district. Therefore, the task force made two recommendations. The first one was that the Board had to do site-based, but later on they suggested considering open enrollment countywide. Mr. Abrams asked whether they had examined this in light of the Quality Integrated Education Policy. Mr. Snyder replied that they had not discussed the potential outcome of free open enrollment. It had come up as a topic after the superintendent proposed it for the northeast area. He noted that choice had been touted as being beneficial; however, in recent reports doubts had been raised.

Mr. Abrams stated that Mrs. Brenneman had raised the issue of equity, and in their marketplace solution they suggested that as students were moved to a particular school they would take with them the packaged dollars. He asked whether they had discussed

an alternative model to take a look at a school-based allocation of resources and measure the outputs based on the inputs in that school. As long as the output level was being achieved, there was the possibility of redirecting resources to where they were needed. Mr. Snyder explained that they had not done that for two reasons. First of all, the measures of outcome were so abysmal it was not fair to base very much on that. They also recommended that there be better measures of outcomes. This could be done from the top down, but their fundamental recommendation was that this had to be done bottom up.

It seemed to Mr. Abrams that they were using the Sunnyvale municipal model in terms of any benefit accrued going back to the department where it had accrued. There was another approach in terms of maximizing the effectiveness of the dollars when they had a shrinking pie. These dollars could be tied to output and to non-traditional sources of revenue coming into a school. Mr. Snyder cited the different resources coming in from renting different kinds of facilities. A number of commercial enterprises also set up a formula that would penalize competing divisions within a company for poor performance.

Mr. John Taylor recalled that they had talked about making public discussion about measures for outcomes so that schools could be compared with schools. On the equity issue, they talked about the educational load formula. Parents would like to see these discussions opened up so that if funds followed the student from school to school, they had to evaluate the educational load and the school would be evaluated on outcome. There would be funds dedicated to that school to ensure some kind of equity.

Mr. Ewing commented that this was a very interesting report which raised for him a number of very fundamental issues that the report itself addressed indirectly. There was a great dichotomy in American political thought between those who saw the virtues of local, independent activity that was in the Jeffersonian view the genesis of democratic institutions that work effectively to make America a great nation. At the same time, there was a Hamiltonian tradition that spoke to the necessity of maintaining security both at home and abroad through central leadership and direction. He thought that the same issues were raised here. America's solution to that had been to incorporate both traditions and to manage with both. He had the view that the group's recommendations were far more Jeffersonian than Hamiltonian. This should give him pleasure because he was a Jeffersonian in disposition. On the other hand, it gave him pause because 18 years as a Board member had led him to conclude that many of the changes which had been for the good in the school system had been the function of central staff and Board action and leadership. On occasion, the Board had forced people to change, and they had changed or left. They had often engaged in central design and leadership. There would not be any magnet schools today, if the Board had not insisted on it. There would not be racial balance as an objective of the school system, if the Board had allowed local choice in the Bethesda-Chevy Chase

area.

Mr. Ewing stated that it was a function of leadership to choose what it believed to be the right direction. If the school system staff did not want to do that, the Board had to require it. This had to be said, and he thought in addition one of the things that was clear to him after all these years was that there were many opportunities to make important changes and one could wish there would be more willingness, time, and support for change at the local level. Sometimes when the Board had fostered change, they had not found the ground ready for the seed of change, and it had been extinguished at the local level. He believed that site-based management had a great deal to recommend it, and the group was quite right about training being available. It was also critical that there be time not only for training but for local decision-making activities. This involved some expense.

Mr. Ewing said he hoped their final report would indicate that the constraints were in some cases self imposed and, therefore, could be removed if the Board chose. However, some of those self-imposed constraints were deliberately chosen with a view to improving the school system. The Board had adopted a math/science program which stated that students would be taught about the nature and purpose of math and science, and every student will take algebra. This would be a constraint on what local schools could do. One could read the report and conclude that this constraint was one the task force would like them to remove. It sounded as if they were saying that local schools could choose whether or not to teach math. He did not think they meant that.

Mr. Snyder explained that all schools would have to meet state requirements. Mr. Ewing pointed out that these were local requirements which exceeded state requirements. The Board had chosen to exceed state standards in the exercise of their leadership responsibilities for the purpose of improving the system as a whole. It seemed to him that they had to think about what it was they meant when they delegated. He thought the question of delegation was a question of how much they wanted to ask local schools to exercise their leadership in deciding "how" not deciding "whether" to meet standards. Standards would continue to rise, and MCPS had increased its standards and its expectations and would continue to do so. It was important for them to be sure that their students knew what they needed to know and to be able to exercise a number of skills. He saw a real conflict if they told local schools they could staff, budget, and set curriculum any way they liked. However, this might not be what the task force was saying. It would be up to the Board to try to figure out how to adjust for the constraints on the one hand and the need to encourage local innovation and at the same time ensure that the standards were there and enforced. He hoped that the group's second volume would have a fuller explanation.

Mrs. Barbara Wells commented that they did not want it to be suggested that they were saying the Board could not mandate

requirements for math or science. They saw setting standards, outcomes, and high levels of achievement as functions of the Board. The Board should not be satisfied with what the state said was an educated person. The task force would support the Board's continuing in that function, but they should allow the schools to reach that. The Board would hold the schools accountable for the four years of math and let the schools with their creative staff and vision reach those outcomes.

Mr. Snyder said that schools might choose to use an integrated curriculum rather than having science as a free-standing course.

If schools passed the benchmark standard test set by the central office, it should not make a difference to the Board how it was they got to that point. Mrs. Wells added that one school might want to do chemistry through global ecology, another through biomedical, and a third through chemical engineering. All the students would come to chemistry but from a different viewpoint and free the teachers to use their skills.

Mr. Ewing pointed out that if they were to give schools a free hand on staffing they would have to repeal the state negotiations law. He believed in collective bargaining, and they were already experiencing serious difficulties in reconciling their collective bargaining process with site-based management. Mrs. Wells replied that there were some school districts in Maryland doing staffing at the local level and meeting the state requirements. Schools districts around the nation were developing with unions exceptions to the rules. Mr. Snyder added that they had proposed by September that a labor/management partnership council be established to explore these issues and make proposals including changes in the state legislation if required.

Mrs. Fanconi wondered how they could shift to a climate that promoted risk taking and allowed mistakes. When they got risk taking, they also got some risks that did not work out. How would that be acceptable in the climate where parents held the Board very accountable. Mr. Snyder said this was another part of the report that had been cut. The key leadership role of the Board was to make a public commitment. They could hold a series of forums and discuss what they were proposing that the school system commit to do. They would establish site-based management and give considerable freedom and local autonomy to innovate and create. The Board could then state that they understood mistakes would be made. Parents and students needed to understand the experimental nature of this, and students needed to know they were participating in a great continuation of the American experiment. The Board would have to build the consensus in the community and establish a compact with the community. They would try to limit errors, but if mistakes were made, they would learn from them.

Mrs. Fanconi asked if they had models of districts that had gone through this. Mr. Snyder indicated that these would be in their second volume. There would also be an article summarizing the keys to successful site-based management. The first key was to

make a public commitment. The successful models had involved a public dialogue.

Ms. Gutierrez asked the task force to address the issue of diversity and how this helped them meet the challenge as MCPS grew more diverse. Mr. Snyder replied that in the final draft they came up with the idea that the diversity issue was an economic diversity rather than cultural or ethnic. In looking at the research, they were trying to take this very good school system and squeeze more and more yield out of it and close the gap. They had a huge body of research that stated only about 25 percent of the general population learned effectively in a passive classroom setting. About 30 percent learned best by watching a peer or role model carry out a task, and about 45 percent of the people were tactile-kinesthetic learners who learned best by doing it themselves. Some schools had done learning style testing and put individuals into teaching modes accommodating to their learning style. These schools had doubled and tripled their test scores in a matter of two years. If they could increase the output of MCPS by getting that kind of educational yield by using more appropriate teaching techniques, they should not be arguing over putting additional resources into this single model system. The best way to provide success for individual students was to provide success for every teacher. If they permitted that freedom, and a thousand flowers would bloom.

Mr. Abrams asked about next steps. Mrs. Fanconi assumed they would get the second volume, and the superintendent would provide his reactions. The Board did have a discussion scheduled on site-based management. Dr. Vance said he would prefer to hold his recommendations until they received the second volume and Mr. Duvall's report. Mrs. Fanconi expressed the Board's appreciation for the work of the committee.

Re: ADJOURNMENT

The president adjourned the meeting at 9:30 p.m. to a closed session.

PRESIDENT

SECRETARY

PLV:mlw