

was a long time when people were waiting for promotions. Mrs. Praisner asked that staff supply them with some statistics on appointments.

Mrs. Praisner recalled that the Board had discussed whether they had enough staff in internships and had inquired about consistency from one assessment center to the other. They had asked about feedback to the applicants when they were not chosen and had discussed the assistant principalship as a career position. Dr. Cronin was not sure they really know when a position would be filled from inside or outside. At the Board level, they received a list of the persons interviewed and a recommendation from the superintendent. Dr. Pitt added that traditionally they advertised outside and inside and interviewed inside candidates and perhaps a few from the outside. He commented that they had gone through a period of time when there were no promotions. Dr. Cronin remarked that the person from the outside was always at a disadvantage because the insiders had a more complete knowledge of MCPS.

Mrs. Diane Ippolito stated that there was a strong feeling out there that a white male did not have a fair shot at some of the vacancies. She knew of one person who had been interviewed a number of times, came out as number one, but was not selected. Dr. Warren remarked that it was possible for a person like that to seem to become less qualified as they are interviewed a number of times and not selected, and Mrs. DiFonzo added that another perception was that these individuals applied for everything.

Dr. Cronin asked what they could do about this situation. Dr. Warren replied that they did not have a formal career ladder in MCPS. They should be looking at the experience a person should have and what training that person needed to qualify for a promotion. They should discuss the person's goals and let him or her know whether these goals were realistic. He did not feel personnel received sufficient feedback on their performances because they all received glowing evaluations which made them feel they were qualified to do anything. Mr. Ewing remarked that they had a fundamental problem in that, while they had a talented staff, they did not have enough positions to be able to promote everyone. They should be thinking about not only promotional opportunities but also what they could do with good people to be sure they were satisfied with their jobs. Mrs. DiFonzo agreed that they did not do a good job of recognizing performance, and in particular the performance of assistant principals. Dr. Pitt pointed out that if you were a secondary assistant principal and were not selected to be a principal, a lot of people saw this as downgrading.

Dr. Cronin asked about the possibility of creating a career ladder program and giving feedback to personnel. Dr. Pitt replied that this was not a simple problem; however, they were going into a period of growth, especially at the elementary school level. He thought it was incumbent on them to do something in this area because Board members had talked about this.

Ms. Pat Berry asked what they did with the person who was 32 years old and at the top of their scale. They had been asked to apply for other positions, and yet they felt where they were was best for them and for the school system. Mr. Goldensohn commented that it was not just A&S positions because this ran throughout the school system. They had teachers who were at the top of the scale and did not want to leave the classroom. It was not just a case of money. Mrs. Praisner agreed that it was not just financial. There had to be some recognition that a person could continue to grow in that particular position. The question was how they made that niche positive. Mrs. Ippolito added that several positive things helped here. They were professional leave days and conference funds.

Dr. Cronin pointed out that the Board had discussed this for several years. Ms. Maria Montgomery reported that the PDEI committee had talked about career ladders. They would like to see some quasi-administrative functions added to positions for people who did not want to leave the classroom. As far the assistant principalship being a career, the area offices were beginning to get the assistant principals together. Dr. Pitt added that the superintendent had also met with the assistant principals.

Dr. Warren noted that there was another piece to this. Most of them were around several years ago when there was some reorganization. A lot of people were shifted in their positions, and some people felt there should have been more due process. It would have been better if these people had been evaluated and counseled rather than having their jobs eliminated. They did not know whether this was going to happen again in the reorganization of the areas and the central office. Dr. Pitt replied that while he could not speak for the superintendent, there had not been a discussion about a major reorganization. The kinds of reorganization they were talking about would focus on ways of improving services, a fine tuning of the organization. Dr. Cronin added that there was no plan before the Board at the present time. They had looked at the area offices in terms of how these offices served schools. Nothing they had talked about involved threats to jobs or mass changes.

Mr. Ewing stated that if they looked at changes that had taken place in the past four years they would see additions to administrative positions. This was as a result of growth in the student population and programs and a feeling that the previous cuts were too severe. If they looked to the future, there was a concern that the Council and executive thought there were too many central office positions. It was the Board's view that they had asked administrators to take on tasks with an inadequate staff. Mrs. DiFonzo remarked that part of the problem was the way personnel were bunched under the administrative category. The County Council was not knowledgeable enough to know who these people were and what they did, and the Board seemed to be unable to educate them. Dr. Pitt remarked that two years ago they had tried to provide these explanations, and Dr. Shoenberg pointed out that all the county government did was to compare Montgomery County with the rest of the state. Dr. Cronin explained that the main focus of the area study was to see

how they could serve the classroom and whether or not there were sufficient resources in the area. He did not see any threat to the MCAASP membership. Dr. Warren replied that their major issue was not protecting their membership but to try to talk about future directions for MCPS. They would like to participate in their decisions.

Mrs. Praisner commented that the Board's fifth priority was long-range planning and having some units of MCPS think beyond today. It seemed appropriate for MCAASP to think long term and have an opportunity to react to certain educational studies that were planned. Dr. Shoenberg stated that nationally studies were being conducted on the role of the principal as the leader and the question of system responsibility and autonomy at the local school or area level. He said that the Board would have to come to terms with this, and it was his personal view that there should be more budget autonomy at the local level.

Mr. Ewing called attention to the meeting scheduled on December 17 on the future which was being conducted by their long-range planning staff. Mrs. DiFonzo commented that Board members were talking about a retreat and one suggested topic was long-range planning. They might wish to consider inviting some elements of MCPS to participate in that discussion.

Mrs. Ippolito asked what they saw as the long-range direction of the Board. Dr. Cronin replied that the Board had reaffirmed its priorities. However, there were areas in the priorities that had not been clearly articulated. He felt that the Board would start from its priorities. In addition, they had a committee looking at K-12 policies and did see some recommendations coming out of this study. The Commission on Excellence in Teaching would be reporting to the Board in January. The Board was also pleased about recent changes in the facilities process, and the next stage was facilities ratings and space utilization. He thought that these would be the major issues on future agendas.

Mr. Ewing noted that in their resolution on the capital budget they stated that they hoped to catch up on facilities in the next six years. He expected the Board would want to continue setting goals in art, music, counseling, class size, and all-day kindergartens. Dr. Shoenberg said they were also looking at computers and media resources. Dr. Warren commented that their organization would like to be a part of these deliberations. Mrs. Praisner remarked that at some point they might want to share what the research and evaluation committee had identified as major topics. They were planning more support for long-range planning and less emphasis on MORE studies.

Mr. Fess asked if they saw more needs for staff development especially on legal issues. Ms. Berry replied that she had signed up for a conference on the legal aspects of education in May because in her work she had a lot of contact with legal issues. However, the conference was being changed to focus on search and seizure and student rights. She pointed out that there were a large number of

people in the school system who dealt with legal issues far greater than search and seizure. She suggested that they might want to look into legal training in three or four types of issues. Mr. Ewing suggested they look into the idea of doing their own seminar. Ms. Berry said she would be interested in legal issues regarding safety, and Dr. Warren said he was concerned about special education issues. In regard to staff development, Mrs. Ippolito suggested they had to look beyond the one or two day workshops. They needed some form of renewal, and they should look at the models used by staff development to see if there could be growth and follow-up after people had taken courses or workshops. Mrs. Praisner reported that she was serving on a state commission, and one of their recommendations was that each individual principal would have a professional development plan including training and refresher courses needed. Dr. Pitt indicated that the area superintendents did discuss this with MCPS principals. Ms. Berry stated that a few years ago people were interested in time management and then stress management came along. Now they were ten years behind the times in employee wellness programs including mental attitudes. Ms. Montgomery said they had also discussed the timing of staff development courses which normally occurred at the end of the day when people were exhausted. She suggested that they could use funds from the MCAASP bonus plan for travel, workshops, and re-energizing programs. Mrs. DiFonzo asked if there was any interest in Saturday programs, and Ms. Montgomery replied that there was but a stipend would be involved. Ms. Berry pointed out that a lot of administrators already worked on Saturdays.

Dr. Cronin commented that very often in meetings like this one strong thoughts and suggestions were discussed, but these died at the end of the meeting. He suggested that Dr. Warren take these topics back to his membership and follow up with direct recommendations to the Board. In this way, MCAASP would become a partner in solutions.

Re: ADJOURNMENT

The president adjourned the meeting at 10:15 p.m.

PRESIDENT

SECRETARY

HP:mlw