

Mrs. Praisner welcomed Mrs. Corinne Les Callette, president of MABE, and Mrs. Maureen Steineke, the executive director of MABE.

Mrs. Les Callette explained that it was one of her goals to visit local Boards of Education, and Montgomery County was the ninth such visit. She said that this was a learning experience for her, and she had picked up a number of ideas to take back to Wicomico County. She reported that MABE had moved into its new offices and invited Board members to visit.

Mrs. Les Callette was pleased that Montgomery County had joined the legal services trust. They now had 14 members and would be holding their first meeting on April 27. She stated that the liability pool had started with nine members and two more had joined. She presented Board members with copies of their resolution on school bus safety which would be voted on at the National School Boards Association Convention.

Mrs. Praisner thanked Mrs. Les Callette for her visit and remarks. She said that her participation in MABE activities had been a learning experience for her, and she had discovered that over the years she had been a part of MABE that local boards in Maryland had more in common than they had differences.

Re: BOARD/PRESS/VISITOR CONFERENCE

Mr. James Nowak, representing Edmar Construction Company, appeared before the Board of Education.

RESOLUTION NO. 196-87 Re: HONORS PROGRAM

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. DiFonzo seconded by Dr. Cronin, the following resolution was adopted with Dr. Cronin, Mrs. DiFonzo, Mr. Goldensohn, Dr. Shoenberg, and (Mr. Steinberg) voting in the affirmative; Mrs. Praisner and Mrs. Slye voting in the negative:

WHEREAS, The Board of Education passed a resolution on October 12, 1982, which established a system-wide pilot Honors Program in Grades 9-12; and

WHEREAS, The intent of the Honors Program is to provide appropriate instructional challenges for academically talented and motivated students; and

WHEREAS, Montgomery County Public Schools has pilot tested the Honors Program consisting of advanced placement courses, advanced level course, and honors work in designated courses for three years; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Honors Program that has been pilot tested for three years be given final approval for inclusion in the PROGRAM OF STUDIES and for continuing implementation in Grades 9-12.

For the record, Mrs. Praisner made the following statement:

"I still have concerns that we are not doing as good a job as we should be in encouraging students for whom honors courses would be thoroughly and totally appropriate, but by labelling it gifted and talented and by the comments included in here that a lot of females do not think that they are smart enough for the courses, I think I still have some concerns. For that reason, I cannot support moving it from a pilot to a regular program."

*Mrs. DiFonzo temporarily left the meeting at this point.

RESOLUTION NO. 197-87 Re: COMPLIANCE WITH FEDERAL AGE
DISCRIMINATION EMPLOYMENT ACT

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

WHEREAS, Congress has passed and President Reagan has signed the "Age Discrimination in Employment Amendments of 1986" which prohibit mandatory retirement by removing the age 70 cap in the 1967 Age Discrimination in Employment Act; and

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County Public Schools Employees Retirement (Section 4.3, Normal Mandatory Retirement Date) and Pension (Section 5.3, Normal Mandatory Retirement Date) Plans presently contain such a restriction; and

WHEREAS, In compliance with the federal law, the Maryland State Retirement Systems will no longer be able to enforce Article 73-B, Section 86, (1)(c) -- Retirement System and Section 145, (1)(b) and (c) -- Pension System of the ANNOTATED CODE OF MARYLAND, which presently require mandatory retirement at age 70; and

WHEREAS, The new federal law takes effect January 1, 1987; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the MCPS Employee Retirement and Pension Plans be amended and that Sections 4.3 and 5.3 of the respective plans be rescinded and deleted from the plans effective January 1, 1987.

RESOLUTION NO. 198-87 Re: PROCUREMENT CONTRACTS OVER \$25,000

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

WHEREAS, Funds have been budgeted for the purchase of equipment, supplies, and contractual services; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That having been duly advertised, the contracts be awarded to the low bidders meeting specifications as shown for the bids as

follows:

	NAME OF VENDOR(S)	DOLLAR VALUE OF CONTRACTS
54-87	Secondary School Science Supplies and Equipment	
	American Scientific Products	\$ 4,678
	Carolina Biological Supply Co.	363
	Central Scientific Company	651
	Curtin Matheson	11,151
	Fisher Scientific Co.	1,272
	Frey Scientific Company	4,554
	LaPine Scientific	2,816
	NASCO	1,078
	Parco Scientific Company	146
	Sargent-Welch Scientific Co.	3,517
	Science Kit, Inc.	890
	Southern Biological Supply Co.	9,029
	Wilkins-Anderson Co.	1,716

	TOTAL	\$ 41,861
76-87	Office and School Supplies	
	Alperstein Brothers	\$ 68,159
	Andrews Office Products	2,479
	Antietam Paper Co.	86,310
	Baltimore Stationery Co.	1,198
	Barton, Duer and Koch Paper Co.	10,242
	Chaselle, Inc.	105,099
	Garrett-Buchanan Company	15,746
	M. S. Ginn Company	148,949
	J. L. Hammett Company	4,933
	Hancoa	40,783
	InterAmerican Security, Inc.	315
	Interstate Office Supply Co.	17,985
	John G. Kyles, Inc.	10,616
	Maxima Quality Services, Inc.	1,050
	Westvaco	36,770

	TOTAL	\$550,634
93-87	Copying Machine	
	Xerox Corporation (one-year cost)	\$ 10,402
	GRAND TOTAL	\$602,897

RESOLUTION NO. 199-87 Re: GAITHERSBURG HIGH SCHOOL - KITCHEN
EQUIPMENT (AREA 3)

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

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received on March 17, 1987, for kitchen
equipment at Gaithersburg High School as indicated below:

BIDDER	LUMP SUM
1. Food Facilities, Inc.	\$54,253.50
2. Carter-Gibson, Inc.	54,458.06
3. National Refrigeration	57,420.00

and

WHEREAS, Sufficient funds are available in the project account to effect award; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That a purchase order be issued to Food Facilities, Inc., for \$54,253.50 for kitchen equipment at Gaithersburg High School in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by the Department of School Facilities.

RESOLUTION NO. 200-87 Re: NEW HAMPSHIRE ESTATES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL - ADDITION/MODERNIZATION (AREA 1)

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

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received on March 3, 1987, for the addition/modernization to New Hampshire Estates Elementary School as indicated below:

BIDDER	BASE BID
1. Edmar Construction Co.	\$4,265,000
2. Northwood Contractors, Inc.	4,337,000
3. S. B. Construction Co., Inc.	4,484,000
4. N. S. Stavrou Construction Co., Inc.	4,510,000
5. Kimmel & Kimmel, Inc.	4,578,000
6. The Gassman Corporation	4,717,000
7. Dustin Construction, Inc.	4,890,000
8. Tyler Construction Corp.	5,748,000

and

WHEREAS, The apparent low bidder, Edmar Construction Co., failed to provide the bid security as required by the project specifications and therefore should be rejected for not being in compliance with the specifications; and

WHEREAS, Northwood Contractors, Inc., bid proposal is in compliance with the specifications and the firm has satisfactorily completed similar construction work in other school jurisdictions; and

WHEREAS, Sufficient funds are available in the Blair Cluster capital project to award the contract; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That a contract be awarded to Northwood Contractors, Inc., in the amount of \$4,337,000 for the addition/modernization to New Hampshire Estates Elementary School in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by Abrash, Eddy & Eckhardt Architects, Inc.

RESOLUTION NO. 201-87 Re: PERSONNEL TRANSFERS

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Cronin seconded by Mrs. Slye, the following resolution was adopted with Dr. Cronin, Mr. Goldensohn, Mrs. Praisner, Dr. Shoenberg, and Mrs. Slye voting in the affirmative; (Mr. Steinberg was absent but requested that he be recorded in favor of the action):

RESOLVED, That the following personnel transfers be approved:

TRANSFER	FROM	TO
Eugene G. Haines	Principal Woodlin ES	Principal Gunner's Lake ES Effective: April 1, 1987
Judith A. Levine	A&S Teacher Woodlin ES	Principal Jones Lane ES Effective: April 1, 1987

RESOLUTION NO. 202-87 Re: EXECUTIVE SESSION - APRIL 21, 1987

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Slye seconded by Mr. Goldensohn, the following resolution was adopted with Mr. Goldensohn, Mrs. Praisner, Dr. Shoenberg, and Mrs. Slye voting in the affirmative; Dr. Cronin and (Mr. Steinberg) being temporarily absent:

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 April 21, 1987, at 9 a.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; and be it further

RESOLVED, That such meeting continue in executive closed session at

noon to discuss the matters listed above as permitted under Article 76A, Section 11(a) and that such meeting shall continue in executive closed session until the completion of business.

*Mrs. DiFonzo and Dr. Cronin rejoined the meeting at this point.

RESOLUTION NO. 203-87 Re: MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 12 and 24, 1987

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mr. Goldensohn seconded by Mrs. Praisner, the following resolution was adopted unanimously (Mr. Steinberg being temporarily absent):

RESOLVED, That the minutes of February 12 and 24, 1987, be approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 204-87 Re: NATIONAL SECRETARIES' WEEK, APRIL
20-24, 1987

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

WHEREAS, A well-qualified and dedicated staff of secretarial and clerical employees is an integral part of an effective school system; and

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County public school system is extremely fortunate in having such a staff; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education wishes to recognize publicly the competency and dedication of this group of employees and express its appreciation for their efforts in the effective, courteous, and economical operation of our school system; and

WHEREAS, The week of April 20 through April 24, 1987, has been designated as National Secretaries' Week; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That National Secretaries' Week be observed by the school system during the week of April 20 through 24, 1987; and be it further

RESOLVED, That Friday, April 24, 1987, be designated as Secretaries' Day for the Montgomery County Public Schools.

RESOLUTION NO. 205-87 Re: AMENDMENT TO TITLE IX ADVISORY
COMMITTEE CHARGE

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. DiFonzo seconded by Mrs. Slye, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

WHEREAS, The Title IX Advisory Committee was established in 1977 to advise the Board of Education on the extent the school system was complying with and properly implementing Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972; and

WHEREAS, The Committee has provided the Board and superintendent with valuable information and recommendations during the last decade; and

WHEREAS, The Committee, while believing the broad charge is still viable, has expressed a desire to further focus its efforts on a yearly basis on the most pressing sex equity issues within the Montgomery County Public Schools; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education and superintendent believe that such specificity will enable them to better comply with the spirit and intent of the 1972 act; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That Resolution 483-77, dated July 19, 1977, be amended to add the following:

RESOLVED, That to enhance the work of the Committee, and to provide specific direction, the Board of Education and superintendent each year request the Advisory Committee to study specified area(s) relating to sex equity within the Montgomery County Public Schools; and be it further

RESOLVED, That for the 1987-88 school year the Title IX Advisory Committee be given the following specific assignment:

To review and report on the progress made by Montgomery County Public Schools in improving the instructional opportunities for female students and recommend steps for enhancing the school system efforts to increase opportunities for female students.

RESOLUTION NO. 206-87 Re: APPOINTMENTS TO THE TITLE IX
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

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

WHEREAS, The Board of Education determined on July 19, 1977, that a Title IX Advisory Committee should be established; and

WHEREAS, The committee has been composed of 16 members, namely,

- 3 Montgomery County Public Schools staff members recommended by the superintendent in consultation with the employee organizations and the principals' associations
- 3 Student members recommended by the superintendent in consultation with the Montgomery County Region of the Maryland Association of Student Councils and Montgomery County Junior Council
- 8 Community members appointed by the Board of Education
- 1 Member either from the MCPS staff or the community (at the Board of Education's discretion)
- 1 Ex officio member from the Department of Human Relations; and

WHEREAS, Currently there are two vacancies existing on the committee,

namely,

2 community members

now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education appoint the following persons, effective immediately, to serve on the Title IX Advisory Committee for a two-year term ending June 30, 1989:

Marga Linotte Heimann, Commission for Women
Sylvia Rowe, MCCPTA

Re: BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

1. Mrs. Praisner congratulated Eastern Intermediate School on their national television debut. She had seen Willard Scott on the "Today" show with the communications magnet students. This became the topic of the day at the National Federation of Urban-suburban School Districts conference. She had drafted a letter on behalf of the Board to Dr. Egan and the students at the school.
2. Mrs. Praisner showed Board members a copy of a poster on the President's Academic Fitness Award which was produced by the MCPS Visual Arts Center.
3. Mrs. Praisner reported that Board members would be attending the NAACP Montgomery County 50th Anniversary celebration this Sunday. She thought it would be appropriate for the Board to convey a resolution congratulating them.
4. Mrs. Praisner stated that the NFUSSD conference was held last weekend in Granite, Utah. Those attending visited schools in the Granite district and looked at their vocational program. They also heard from former Secretary of Education Ted Bell. On October 14-17, Montgomery County would be hosting this group which meant a lot of work for Mr. Fess and staff. The topic for the conference would be "Students at Risk -- They Can Succeed."
5. Mr. Goldensohn commented that on April 11 the state finals for the Odyssey of the Mind competition would be held. A number of Montgomery County schools had qualified for the finals which would be held at the University of Maryland Baltimore campus. He would be a judge, and he declared his impartiality to all Montgomery County schools. However, he hoped that the Board would wish the best of luck to those schools. In 1986 Montgomery County schools went all the way to the national finals in Phoenix, Arizona.
6. Mrs. Praisner read the following statement into the record:
"A superintendent selection process is complicated and delicate, made even more so by the fact that it is a personnel issue and much of it is conducted in executive session. Furthermore, there are built into the process times when there is nothing or very little to report as I indicated when we discussed the process last December. This, I know, can be frustrating for some people. At the same time it is the Board's responsibility to select a superintendent and in doing so to maintain the integrity of the process and the people involved, a responsibility that extends beyond the actual selection. As Board members, we must keep this in mind as well.
"The Board's announced selection process states that our goal is to

have Superintendent Cody's replacement in place well before July 1 and hopefully this spring. The weather man, or Willard Scott I guess is the weather man, on that same TV show told me that spring officially began last Friday evening, March 20. Therefore, it seems to me that we are right on schedule. When we have reached a decision and have something, or rather someone, to announce to the public we will. Until then, we will have no further comment on the selection process or on candidates."

Re: COMMISSION ON EXCELLENCE IN TEACHING

Mrs. Praisner welcomed Mr. Michael O'Keefe, chair of the commission, Dr. Laura Dittman, Mr. Thomas McFee, and Mr. James Culp. She noted that Dr. Cody had provided a memorandum which suggested a process for proceeding through the recommendations of the commission. Dr. Cody hoped that the discussion would not be to debate issues but to identify ways recommendations might be carried out.

Mrs. Praisner stated that they would be confining their comments to a discussion on attracting and keeping excellent teachers. The report had been divided into segments for purposes of discussion. She asked for comments on chapter one and chapter two. She noted that in the executive summary reference was made to the dropout rate, and she requested again that information on this topic be provided to the Board. She recalled that there was a question about the definition of "dropout" used by MCPS.

Mrs. Praisner said that mention was made that the state teacher education programs were not producing enough teachers for the needs of Maryland, and she thought this had been traditional. Dr. Kenneth Muir, director of long-range planning, replied that the state was looking at this problem, and in the second report prepared by the state they acknowledged the problem by taking into account the number of teachers from outside the state who were hired in county schools. They were forecasting that even with the traditional pool of hires from the outside as well as new graduates in the state that the supply would be only 70 percent of the demand in 1988. Mr. Culp noted that there was a tremendous competition for these graduates because teachers had a lot of skills that industry was looking for.

Mrs. Praisner said she wanted more information on the turnover rate and the statement that "our analysis reveals that more teaching vacancies over the next six years will result in turnover than from any other cause." Mr. O'Keefe replied that this information was the statistical underpinning of what they were doing here. Dr. Muir explained that they had assembled some historical data from 1977 through 1986. The enrollment data had been provided by Dr. Rohr, and the number of teachers was based on current staffing ratios. In FY1987, 51 teachers had been added based on enrollment increases. Program improvement was based on the average number of new teachers for improvement purposes over the last three or four years. That average was 73. Retirements were projected based upon the historical projections of retirement and an analysis of how many teachers were over age 60 or had 30 years of service. Basic turnover was the

number of people they anticipated would leave based on past experience. The extra turnover line was based on the assumption that they would be hiring more brand-new teachers, and statistics showed that the less experienced, younger people quit at a much higher rate than the more experienced, older people. They also looked at statistics on people not returning from leave. These ingredients brought them to projections of new teachers needed over the next six years.

Dr. Cody asked why the conclusion was made that MCPS would be hiring more new teachers because the trend had been in the opposite direction. Dr. Muir replied that there was a feeling that the pool of more experienced people was running dry. Dr. Cody suggested they should concentrate on hiring the people still in the pool because they didn't leave, and Dr. Muir suggested they also look at improving the induction process.

Dr. Shoenberg commented that he found one of the recommendations highly plausible which was the recommendation for mentoring in the first couple of years of teaching. He agreed that they could not expect 100 percent success even with that extra effort, but they could expect a marginal addition of success because they were giving people that extra support. He asked if the commission had any estimate of what this marginal difference of success might be. Mr. O'Keefe replied that they were unable to find any data, but the benefits of mentoring were two-fold. One might be able to reduce attrition and, therefore, reduce the need for additional teachers. The other would be to improve the effectiveness of those teachers.

Mrs. Praisner inquired about studies done showing that X-number of hours of in-service training produced more effective teachers. Mr. O'Keefe replied that there had been studies on the retention of in-service training, but he had not seen studies where educational effects had been sought as a result of increased in-service because there were too many linkages and variables. Dr. Dittman commented that there was a study on the effectiveness of a mentor experience. Dr. Cody stated that in the Rand report it was shown that the attrition of teachers in their first two or three years in MCPS had dropped dramatically in the last couple of years. It might be that they were hiring fewer beginning teachers or it might be that the summer training program they had conducted for the last two years had had some impact. Mrs. Praisner asked if they had surveyed new teachers about that experience, and Dr. Pitt did not think that they had.

Dr. Cronin remarked that he had a question that probably could not be answered. He asked how they really knew what it was they wanted a teacher to know before they began to discuss how they taught it, how they organized their classroom, and how they participated in the school decision-making process. How did they evaluate what the teacher knew in his or her field rather than how they assess how well that teacher taught what he or she knew. Mr. McFee replied that this had come up in the commission's discussions. He felt that how the teacher presented the knowledge and managed the classroom was

probably more important than what they knew. It was clear the knowledge of the subject matter was important, but a person had to make an effective presentation of that knowledge.

Dr. Cronin stated that he was looking at the evaluation system and how they evaluated whether a teacher was current in the field as opposed to how that teacher taught. He asked how they set an expectation level of what they wanted that teacher to know and how they wanted that teacher to communicate. Mr. McFee replied that one of the underlying concepts in the evaluation process was peer input as well as absolute measures of being up to date in the field. The professional development plans as part of the evaluation would include state-of-the-art in subject matter as well as methods of presentation of the materials.

Dr. Cronin remarked that one of their recommendations was to be sure that graduate schools and teacher training institutions were encompassing not only the field itself but also teaching of that field. He thought that schools had been tilted toward teaching methods with minimal efforts into the content area. Mr. O'Keefe replied that from surveys of principals it was the feeling that freshly trained teachers were not as well prepared as they might be both in teaching techniques and substance. One of their recommendations was that this be an issue for teachers and principals to concern themselves with in the context of the professional development plan. It was an opportunity to create a process by which teachers would be sensitive to what they needed to learn and by which the school system would give teachers the support to enable them to learn those things.

It seemed to Dr. Cronin that it was easier for a teacher to say he or she would like to improve their teaching strategies rather than for someone to say he or she did not know a part of what they were teaching. Mrs. Praisner thought it would be easier for a teacher to say he or she was not up to speed in the latest information in their field than that they did not know how to teach. Mr. O'Keefe replied that it was important to create a climate in which one could admit one was not perfect in technique or content. This was part of being a growing professional because the atmosphere had been established that there was no punishment involved if you admitted this.

Dr. Pitt pointed out that at the senior high school level they would be dropping 90 or more teachers; however, they would be recruiting an increasing number of elementary teachers. He asked if they had looked at the statistics in terms of the kind of people MCPS would need and about the recruiting and training of people in relation to that situation. Mr. McFee thought that they could predict their needs and develop a recruiting strategy based on those needs. Dr. Pitt explained that during a drop in enrollment they tended to hire few new people. Therefore, they had to retrain some of their own people. He was concerned about retraining of existing personnel and the need to bring in new blood. He also said that when the situation changed, it changed dramatically which resulted in the need for a lot of people with a certain kind of training. Mr. O'Keefe replied that

they did not look at the categories of teachers in fine detail. He noted that corporations and universities were now stockpiling people and hiring a larger number than they needed in anticipation of future needs. This might be appropriate for MCPS when they knew they would need math and science teachers in the future. These people could be used for other duties until openings appeared.

Mrs. Praisner noted that universities and corporations had the latitude of making decisions about the numbers of people they hired, but the County Council might define these overhires as administrative or nonteaching positions which did not give MCPS much latitude. It seemed to Dr. Shoenberg that Dr. Pitt was also addressing the needs of people already employed by the system. He asked if they had given thought to what they could do for teachers who were already in the school system, particularly in the secondary schools.

Dr. Cody commented that the report suggested a substantial change in the nature of teaching for all teachers. He said they had discussed teacher evaluation, and it was their view that they had to avoid such things as "less than adequate" or "less than perfect" in the evaluation process. They had to consider that everyone could improve and should have their own staff development plan. Whether this had to do with substantive knowledge or pedagogical knowledge did not matter because it had to do with how the process was described. In regard to recruiting and hiring, Dr. Shoenberg commented that the Board had already accomplished one thing which was a higher salary settlement for teachers. Now they found themselves in a guns and butter position because in order to fund the contract they might have to forego other improvements. He asked for the commission's thinking about the trade-offs and balances in this situation. Mr. McFee replied that they did not sit down and make an implicit tradeoff between salaries and improvements. In the section on compensation, the commission suggested that MCPS was about 7 percent behind in the lower and middle levels and about 16 percent behind for a 40 year old teacher. They spoke to moving in this direction over a period of time with the 16 percent increase being a part of their third tier of the career ladder. The raise the Board negotiated was about a 5 percent improvement after they subtracted cost of living which was larger than the figures the commission had discussed. These discussions were held in the context of other improvements they felt should be made, and he did not think they would have wanted to go with salary to the exclusion of other recommendations.

Mrs. Praisner suggested they return to hiring standards, year-round recruiting, and incentives to attract highly qualified candidates in shortage fields. Dr. Cronin asked about one recommendation which said they should go out and seek the best and another which said they could cultivate the best. He asked what they had in mind in terms of teacher training because they were under pressure from the Council to do away with administrators who would be the ones to seek and train teachers. Mr. O'Keefe replied that the commission had tried not to get into trade-offs but to give the Board a sense of why a particular recommendation was important. They realized that the whole set of recommendations would have to fit into some set of budgetary

constraints. It was their intent that MCPS build relationships with teacher training institutions on the basis of whether they produced excellent teachers rather than their geographic proximity to Montgomery County. They saw student teacher training as one of those ways to build that linkage. For example, if student teachers from Vanderbilt practiced in Montgomery County, they would be more likely to take jobs here.

Mrs. Praisner asked that staff supply the Board with information about the status of relationships with teacher training institutions. Mr. O'Keefe said he would be pleased to go on record to state that they did need to invest in staff and travel funds in order to get the best teachers. Mr. Culp noted that they had to go after those institutions providing the teacher supply, but the key was that they not reduce their quality standards to accommodate a shortage of teachers under any circumstances.

Dr. Shoenberg pointed out that one recommendation was to "seek teacher candidates, specially in shortage fields, from among liberal arts graduates, persons who want to change careers, retirees and those willing to teach part-time." It seemed to him there was some inconsistency here. Deans of education might argue that it was a reduction of standards to seek people who did not have teacher training backgrounds. He said it was probably implicit that MCPS would see to it that those people got in-service training or a subsidy to receive training from a school of education in return for some years of service in the system. Mr. McFee explained that they were not talking about bringing in these people without some internship to bring them up to qualifications. Mr. O'Keefe thought they were pretty insistent about not lowering standards but rather creating special programs by which those people could come into the classroom and receive the training they needed.

Dr. Shoenberg asked for the commission's views on the three-tiered structure of the teaching profession as recommended by the Holmes and Carnegie studies. Mr. McFee replied that the career ladder system the commission was proposing had a lot of similarity to the Carnegie system.

In regard to Mrs. Praisner's question about recruitment, Mr. O'Keefe stated that the aggressive locating and identifying of candidates ought to be a year-round strategy. It seemed to Mrs. Praisner that in order to keep those attractive teachers associated with Montgomery County there were going to have to do more than just visit college campuses. This might include offering them contracts ahead of time. Dr. Pitt explained that last year they had started offering open contracts and allowing the recruiting team to find outstanding people and hire them on the spot without having a specific job opening for them. Mr. McFee pointed out that last year they had doubled the number of open contracts which needed to continue.

Mrs. Praisner thought it would be useful for the Board to have an overview presentation of the status of their present recruiting process. In this way they would be able to see what additional was

required including staffing, travel costs, and improved relationships with institutions. She suggested that the institution needed to know about Montgomery County and, in some cases, be an advocate for the MCPS. Mr. O'Keefe explained that this was analogous to what colleges were now doing to recruit top students by working with high school counselors. It seemed to Mrs. Praisner that this would require more staff with the freedom to travel to make those contacts. Mr. Culp suggested that this needed to be a priority responsibility and not a collateral duty.

Dr. Cody commented that for a number of years they had been going to college campuses all over the United States and setting up shop and inviting people in. However, this brought it very little return for their efforts. Last year the minority recruitment team built relationships with the senior faculty of colleges to make recommendations, identify the best students, and invite them to meet MCPS representatives. This required staff in the personnel office augmented by principals who could do this when interns took over their schools in the spring. In regard to the reinstitution of the teacher education center, he thought this had budget implications. Unless the Board had objections, he would direct staff to develop a specific plan in this area. Dr. Shoenberg thought that this would be cost effective.

In regard to seeking teacher candidates from liberal arts graduates or from people seeking mid-life career changes, Dr. Cody reported that Harvard now has such programs. About six months ago he had met with the University of Maryland education dean to work out a joint program for a MAT-like program for liberal arts graduates to be trained to be elementary school teachers. This program would probably be 12-15 months and would include earning a master's degree and being paid by MCPS for teaching a semester or teaching half time for a year. The individuals involved would receive substantial support from the university and MCPS. The faculty at Maryland was working out the details now, but no agreement had been reached. In order to do this MCPS would have to dedicate a certain number of jobs for individuals who met MCPS and university standards. These would be liberal arts graduates or mid-career changes. This might lead them to a jointly operated summer school program for practice teaching experience. Mr. O'Keefe cautioned Dr. Cody to be aware of structural impediments to such a program. For example, at present the university did not offer education courses in the evening so that employed people could study part-time.

Dr. Cody reported that he was also working with the Maryland State Department of Education to permit MCPS to offer a master's level program for initial teacher certification. Right now MCPS could do that for someone who was already certified, and MCPS was the only school system in the United States that had state program approval for certificate purposes at the master's level. However, he thought that in the long run they would be better served if this were done in conjunction with local universities because a lot of people preferred a university conferred masters degree which was recognized in other states.

Mrs. Praisner suggested that they turn to the question of the probationary teacher and an induction program. There was also a suggestion that the Board designate a number of schools to be development centers in order to focus training and the assignment of mentors. It seemed to Dr. Cody that an induction program for beginning teachers made sense. He pointed out that they did have some programs going on including the summer program for new teachers, but there was little coordination. He would ask staff to put together a detailed plan on how this might be carried out.

Dr. Shoenberg had a very positive feeling about the recommendation dealing with the teacher induction process. He had been giving some thought to the notion of an internship and its relationship to the traditional tenure process. He wondered if the commission had thought about the relationship of teachers to the school system. Mr. McFee replied that they were looking at the first two years of teaching not as testing teachers to see whether they should be let go at the end of two years, but rather as a two-year learning process with a team to support that person. It would be a commitment to try to make teachers succeed, not to test to see if they had failed. Dr. Shoenberg said he was thinking about the obligations of the parties to each other at the end of that two-year period. For example, where they had the traditional relationships established through the collective bargaining agreements. Mr. McFee thought there would be much more than professional relationships established. In fact, the commission was bothered by some of the mistrust between the system and the teachers. They hoped the system would become much more professional and that the working relationships would be established as mutual responsibilities. Mr. O'Keefe added that the evaluation for tenure would be tough, but once beyond that process there should be the notion that the teacher had been verified as a capable and trusted professional.

Dr. Cronin suggested that it might be appropriate to continue this discussion at another time before they got into teacher evaluation. He was reluctant to get into this topic at so late an hour without Mr. Ewing and without representation from MCEA.

Dr. Cody commented that in these discussions he was looking for the sense of Board members about issues rather than votes. Staff would be pursuing further detailed development and specific plans and proposals.

Mr. O'Keefe expressed the willingness of the Commission members to meet with the Board. Mrs. Praisner pointed out that the Board had taken a different route in approaching the recommendations of the commission. Rather than thanking the commission and requesting a staff response to their recommendations, the Board had decided to have opportunities for Board and commission interaction and would be seeking comments from senior staff, employee organizations, and community. She thanked the commission members for their participation.

Re: ITEMS OF INFORMATION

Board members received the following items of information:

1. Chapter I Study - Final Report
2. DEA Staff Training Report
3. Monthly Financial Report

Re: ADJOURNMENT

The president adjourned the meeting at 10:25 p.m.

PRESIDENT

SECRETARY

WSC:mlw