

APPROVED  
38-1987

Rockville, Maryland  
September 21, 1987

The Board of Education of Montgomery County met in regular session at the Carver Educational Services Center, Rockville, Maryland, on Monday, September 21, 1987, at 8:10 p.m.

ROLL CALL      Present:    Mrs. Marilyn J. Praisner, President  
  in the Chair  
  Dr. James E. Cronin  
  Mrs. Sharon DiFonzo\*  
  Mr. Blair G. Ewing  
  Mr. Bruce A. Goldensohn  
  Mr. Andrew Herscowitz\*  
  Dr. Robert E. Shoenberg  
  Mrs. Mary Margaret Slye

Absent:    None

Others Present:    Dr. Harry Pitt, Superintendent of Schools  
  Dr. Paul L. Vance, Deputy Superintendent  
  Mr. Thomas S. Fess, Parliamentarian

RESOLUTION NO. 448-87    Re:    BOARD AGENDA - SEPTEMBER 21, 1987

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education approve its agenda for September 21, 1987.

\*Mrs. DiFonzo and Mr. Herscowitz joined the meeting at this point.

Re:    BOARD/PRESS/VISITOR CONFERENCE

The following individuals appeared before the Board of Education:

1. Kathleen Lee, Quail Valley Homeowners
2. Chere Katz, Frost Action Committee
3. John Hoven
4. Joan Karasik, Montgomery County Association for Retarded Citizens

RESOLUTION NO. 449-98    Re:    UTILIZATION OF FY 1988 FUTURE SUPPORTED  
  PROJECTS FUNDS FOR CONTINUING THE JOB  
  TRAINING PARTNERSHIP ACT (JTPA) PROJECT  
  HIGH HOPES AT SENECA VALLEY HIGH SCHOOL

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

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend, within the FY 1988 Provision for Future Supported

Projects, a grant award of \$46,256 from the Montgomery College Service Delivery Agency under the Job Training Partnership Act for continuation of Project High Hopes at Seneca Valley High School in the following categories:

CATEGORY	POSITION	AMOUNT
02 Instructional Salaries	1.0*	\$30,512
03 Instructional Other		3,024
07 Student Transportation		1,800
10 Fixed Charges		10,920
	-----	-----
TOTAL	1.0	\$46,256

\* .5 Teacher (A-D) 10 month  
 .5 Instructional Assistant (Grade 10, 10 month)

and be it further

RESOLVED, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the county executive and the County Council.

RESOLUTION NO. 450-87 Re: UTILIZATION OF FY 1988 FUTURE SUPPORTED PROJECTS FUNDS FOR CONTINUING THE JOB TRAINING PARTNERSHIP ACT (JTPA) PROJECT HIGH HOPES AT MONTGOMERY BLAIR HIGH SCHOOL

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

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to receive and expend, within the FY 1988 Provision for Future Supported Projects, a \$23,683 grant award from the Maryland State Department of Education under the Job Training Partnership Act for the continuation of Project High Hopes at Montgomery Blair High School in the following categories:

CATEGORY	POSITIONS	AMOUNT
01 Administration		\$ 422
02 Instructional Salaries	.5*	16,352
03 Other Instructional Costs		1,568
07 Student Transportation		600
10 Fixed Charges		4,741
	-----	-----
TOTAL	.5	\$23,683

\* Teacher (A-D) 10-month

and be it further

RESOLVED, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the county

executive and the County Council.

RESOLUTION NO. 451-87 Re: FY 1988 CATEGORICAL TRANSFER WITHIN  
THE PROVISION FOR FUTURE SUPPORTED  
PROJECTS

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

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized to effect within the FY 1988 Provision for Future Supported Projects the following categorical transfer in accordance with the County Council provision for transfers:

CATEGORY	FROM	TO
03 Other Instructional Costs	\$1,000	
07 Pupil Transportation		\$1,000
	-----	-----
TOTAL	\$1,000	\$1,000

and be it further

RESOLVED, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the county executive and the County Council.

RESOLUTION NO. 452-87 Re: FY 1988 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION FOR  
THE PRESCHOOL EVALUATION PROJECT

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

RESOLVED, That the superintendent of schools be authorized, subject to County Council approval, to receive and expend an FY 1988 supplemental appropriation of \$118,260 from the U.S. Department of Education under the Education of the Handicapped Act, P. L. 91-230 as amended, to establish the FY 88 Preschool Evaluation Project in the following categories:

CATEGORY	POSITION	AMOUNT
04 Special Education	1.5*	\$ 94,649
10 Fixed Charges		23,611
	-----	-----
TOTAL	1.5	\$118,260

\* 1.0 Grade 23 Model development specialist (12-month)  
.5 Grade 18 Testing and evaluation assistant (12-month)

and be it further

RESOLVED, That the county executive be requested to recommend approval of this resolution to the County Council and a copy be

transmitted to the county executive and the County Council.

RESOLUTION NO. 453-87 Re: ENERGY MANAGEMENT AUTOMATION SYSTEMS IN  
VARIOUS SCHOOLS

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

WHEREAS, Bid proposals were received on August 25, 1987, for the installation of a computerized energy management system at Kensington-Parkwood, Washington Grove, and Stedwick Elementary Schools from the following vendors:

BIDDER	BID AMOUNT
Robertshaw Controls Systems 4, Inc.	\$148,162
MCC Powers	156,568
Complete Building Services	188,560
Barber-Colman Raaf, Inc.	262,436
	268,980

and

WHEREAS, The low bidder complied with bid specifications; and

WHEREAS, The low bid is within the staff estimate, and sufficient funds are available in energy conservation capital projects to award the contract; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That a contract in the amount of \$148,162 be awarded to Robertshaw Controls to install the automated energy management system at Kensington-Parkwood, Washington Grove, and Stedwick Elementary Schools, in accordance with plans and specifications developed by Von Otto and Bilecky, P.C.

RESOLUTION NO. 454-87 Re: TILDEN INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL - PARTIAL  
REROOF (AREA 2)

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

WHEREAS, Sealed bids were received on September 10, 1987, for partially reroofing Tilden Intermediate School as follows:

BIDDER	LUMP SUM
1. Orndorff & Spaid, Inc.	\$37,841
2. R. D. Bean, Inc.	39,628
3. J. E. Wood & Sons Co., Inc.	40,140
4. Raintree Industries, Inc.	45,900

and

WHEREAS, The low bidder, Orndorff & Spaid, Inc., has performed similar projects satisfactorily for MCPS; and

WHEREAS, The low bid is within staff estimate, and sufficient funds are available in Account 999-42 to effect award; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That a contract for \$37,841 be awarded to Orndorff & Spaid, Inc., for partially reroofing Tilden Intermediate School in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by the Department of School Facilities.

RESOLUTION NO. 455-87 Re: RICHARD MONTGOMERY HIGH SCHOOL -  
CONCESSION BUILDING AND MISCELLANEOUS  
SITE WORK (AREA 2)

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

WHEREAS, A sealed bid was received on September 15, 1987, for the concession building and miscellaneous site work at Richard Montgomery High School as follows:

BIDDER	BASE BID
Smith & Haines, Inc.	\$349,500

and

WHEREAS, Only one bid was received which is considerably in excess of the staff estimate; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the bid from Smith & Haines, Inc., be rejected and that plans for the concession building be modified and the project be rebid at the earliest possible convenience.

RESOLUTION NO. 456-87 Re: WATKINS MILL HIGH SCHOOL CONTRACT  
AWARD

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

WHEREAS, The following bids were received on September 16:

CONTRACTOR	BID (EXCLUDING CONTINGENCY)
Donohoe Construction Company, Inc.	\$22,736,000
L. F. Jennings	23,050,000
Glen Construction Company	23,397,590

and

WHEREAS, The lowest bid exceeds the appropriation; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That construction bids received on September 16 be rejected and that the superintendent proceed immediately to reduce the project cost and submit a recommendation to the Board to award a contract for the Watkins Mill High School no later than October 26; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the county executive and County Council be given a copy of this resolution.

RESOLUTION NO. 457-87 Re: STRAWBERRY KNOLL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL  
CONTRACT AWARD

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

WHEREAS, Bids were received on September 17 for the Strawberry Knoll Elementary School; and

WHEREAS, The combination of the low bids for both portions of the Strawberry Knoll Elementary School exceeds the appropriation; and

WHEREAS, It is essential that work begin immediately on this project to meet the proposed August 1, 1988, completion; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That a contract in the amount of \$3,338,200 be awarded to Dustin Construction Company, and a contract in the amount of \$2,927,921 be awarded to Commercial Modular Systems Incorporation to construct Strawberry Knoll Elementary School in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by TCA architects, which includes base bid B and an alternate to eliminate six classrooms; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the county executive be requested to recommend to the County Council that an FY 1988 emergency supplemental appropriation of \$425,940 be approved to fund the six classrooms included in the deduct alternate.

RESOLUTION NO. 458-87 Re: CHANGE ORDER ACTIVITY OVER \$25,000:  
TELECOMMUNICATIONS/CABLE TV NETWORK  
INSTALLATION, PHASE V

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

WHEREAS, The technological and cost factors in the county cable system that made procurement and installation of head-end equipment impractical have been resolved; and

WHEREAS, The proposed change orders to procure and install head-end equipment at the specified schools have been reviewed by staff and recommended for approval by the project consulting engineer; and

WHEREAS, The work to be accomplished under the proposed change order is within the intended scope of work and amount appropriated; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That a change order to provide and install head-end equipment be approved for installation of a cable television/telecommunications network, Phase V, and that the current contracts be amended accordingly.

RESOLUTION NO. 459-87 Re: ARCHITECTURAL APPOINTMENTS FOR VARIOUS SCHOOLS

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

WHEREAS, It is necessary to appoint architects to provide required design services and administration of the construction contracts; and

WHEREAS, Funds were approved in the FY 1988 Capital Budget for the projects listed below; and

WHEREAS, The architectural/engineering selection procedures approved by the Board of Education on May 13, 1986, were employed in the following appointments; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Montgomery County Board of Education enter into a contractual agreement with each of the below-listed architectural firms to provide required design services and construction supervision for the following indicated capital improvement projects included in the FY 1988 Capital Budget:

PROJECT	ARCHITECT/ENGINEER	FEE
Richard Montgomery High School Alterations	Grimm & Parker Architects	\$112,000
Rock Creek Forest Elementary School Addition	Arley J. Koran	65,000
Cloverly Elementary School Modernization	William H. Doggett, AIA	145,000

RESOLUTION NO. 460-87 Re: REDUCTION OF RETAINAGE - ROSEMARY HILLS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL (AREA 2)

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

WHEREAS, The Gassman Corporation, general contractor for the Rosemary Hills Elementary School, has completed 91 percent of all specified requirements as of September 1, 1987, and has requested that the 10 percent retainage amount, which is based on the completed work to date, be reduced to 5 percent; and

WHEREAS, The project bonding company, Seaboard Surety Company, by letter dated September 1, 1987, consented to this reduction; and

WHEREAS, The project architect, Garrison Associates, by letter dated September 8, 1987, recommended that this request for reduction in retainage be approved; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the contract's specified 10 percent retainage withheld from periodic construction contract payments to The Gassman Corporation, general contractor for the Rosemary Hills Elementary School, currently amount to 10 percent of the contractor's request for payment to date, now be reduced to 5 percent, with the remaining 5 percent to become due and payable after formal acceptance of the completed project and total completion of the remaining contract requirements.

RESOLUTION NO. 461-87 Re: ADOPTION OF AFFIRMATIVE ACTION POLICY

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

WHEREAS, The Board of Education adopted a Statement on Human Relations in 1969, which contains a paragraph relating to affirmative action in employment and promotion, and it adopted a Resolution on Nondiscrimination in 1979, these statements deal both with students and with staff; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education has expressed the desire to have a specific policy on Affirmative Action; and

WHEREAS, The staff has developed the following policy on Affirmative Action, community leaders have reacted to a draft policy, the Board has discussed the proposed policy at its meeting on August 18, 1987, and some changes have been made based on that discussion; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education hereby endorses and adopted the following Affirmative Action Policy:

#### AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

##### A. Purpose

1. To reaffirm and strengthen the Board's commitment to equal employment opportunities for all persons without regard to race, color, national origin, age, sex, religion, marital status, veteran status, or handicapping condition in conformity with applicable law.



2. To assure the recruitment, employment, training, promotion and retention of qualified staff without discrimination, while making efforts to address significant racial, ethnic and gender imbalances in job categories which have been traditionally segregated in our society.

3. To enrich the educational experiences of all students by enabling them to have contact with adults from many backgrounds, thereby providing students with a wide variety of role models that reflect the pluralistic nature of the community.

B. Process and Content

1. The Board of Education reaffirms its commitment to equal employment opportunities for all persons in conformity with applicable law.

a. Employment decisions shall be made without regard to race, color, national origin, age, sex, religion, marital status, or handicapping condition, except as necessary to implement Section B.4.c and d of this policy.

b. The requirements for any MCPS position shall be directly related to performing its responsibilities effectively.

2. The Board of Education forbids any discrimination on the basis of race, color, national origin, age, sex, religion, marital status, veteran status, or handicapping condition in any MCPS personnel policy or practice in conformity with applicable law, including:

a. The recruitment, employment, training, promotion and retention of employees.

b. The administration of any MCPS program or activity, including employee compensation, benefits, reduction-in-force, MCPS-sponsored training, education, or tuition assistance.

3. The Board of Education forbids any employee to sexually harass another employee. Sexual harassment is defined as unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature when:

a. Submission to such conduct is made a term or condition of an individual's employment or advancement

b. Submission to or rejection of such conduct is used as the basis for employment decisions

c. Such conduct has the purpose or effect of unreasonably interfering with an individual's work performance or creating an intimidating, hostile, or offensive working environment.

4. The Board directs the superintendent of schools to:

a. Continue efforts to address significant racial, ethnic and gender imbalances in traditionally segregated job classifications as permitted by recruiting and local labor market conditions.

b. Continue efforts to achieve the goals of the Board's Sex Equity Initiatives.

c. Develop annual goals for recruitment, hiring, placement and promotion in schools and other work locations to address these racial, ethnic and gender imbalances and to monitor staff performance in achieving these goals.

d. Develop annual goals for recruitment, hiring, placement

and promotion of individuals with handicapping conditions and provide them reasonable accommodations in testing and hiring procedures.

e. Develop procedures to implement and publicize this policy and related regulations, and make them readily available to all employees and other interested parties.

f. Assure that any allegations of discrimination or sexual harassment are investigated by the Departments of Human Relations and Personnel Services.

C. Review and Reporting

1. This policy will be reviewed every three years in accordance with the Board of Education review process.

2. The superintendent will give the Board of Education an annual report regarding progress in achieving the intent of this policy and in attaining goals to address racial, ethnic and gender imbalances and goals for recruitment, hiring, placement and promotion of individuals with handicapping conditions.

Re: ROLE OF THE SCHOOL PRINCIPAL

Dr. Pitt explained that he had invited a cross section of principals to sit at the Board table during the discussion. He stated that he would like to read some comments because this was such an important issue. He said that almost without exception, the spate of reports on education that had emerged over the last five years agreed that the school principal was the key to effective education and student learning. Montgomery County was ahead of many recent national studies in that during the last decade it had made tremendous strides in recruiting, selecting and training school principals, and many of its procedures were recommended as models in current national publications. He believed they now had a cadre of principals who were unequalled in American public education.

Dr. Pitt reported that nevertheless there were many local and national issues relating to the principalship that could benefit from further discussion. For example, demands on principals had increased in the past decade, student populations were much more diverse, and community and staff expectations of principals had changed. There was an increased demand for greater school accountability, and principals were being asked for more data and reports on student progress and problems. Three years ago MCPS principals began examining these demands and expectations and considering recommendations that would enable them to better cope with their increasing and changing responsibilities. Superintendent Cody had commissioned two projects to help achieve this goal, and Board members had copies of the STUDY OF THE CHANGING ROLE OF THE ELEMENTARY PRINCIPAL and the report of the Task Force on Principal Recruitment, Selection, Training and Evaluation. Last spring the Board of Education had asked that this topic be scheduled on an agenda.

Dr. Pitt thought they should discuss the role of the principal because of the local, state, and national reports and because they needed to clarify where they stood on that role. In addition, the

state was now looking at the certification of principals at the state level with some sort of assessment center being incorporated in the process. He noted that Mrs. Praisner was a member of this state commission on school-based administration. He anticipated that there would be several Board discussions on the topic, and he pointed out that the first paper focused on issues relating to the role and function of the principal and assistant principal. On October 6, they would have a discussion on issues relating to selecting, preparing, evaluating, recognizing, and rewarding school principals. Mrs. Praisner suggested they focus on a clarification of the role and function issue, demands on the principal, and on the issue of the assistant principal. She requested some information from Dr. Pitt on a sense of what their needs were going to be over the coming years as far as principals were concerned. In addition, she would like information on the reports that local schools were required to complete.

Mrs. DiFonzo remarked that one report was missing from the packet provided Board members; however, she had obtained copies of a recent report on the NAESP Proficiencies for Principals Program. She encouraged Board members to take time to look through this material which included an academy for principals.

Mr. Ewing stated that he wanted to raise the issue of accountability which was addressed somewhat obliquely in the reports. His question was how they should go about deciding what an individual school should be accountable for and to assure that the schools were accountable to higher levels in the school system. It was his view that a school should be accountable for reporting its results so that there would be some way for MCPS to give an account of its own stewardship in carrying out its responsibilities to the public. He asked if this wasn't part of the role of the school principal and a proficiency. This got them to the recruitment issue of finding people who were aware of the need to arrange things so that they could be held accountable for what they were doing. He recalled that several years ago the area offices had gone from a nurturing role to a directive role, but both roles had become mixed. He had not supported the change and thought this was something they should address.

It seemed to Mr. Ewing that the public was looking for an opportunity to be much more supportive of the public schools and wanted to have a better sense of what the schools were producing in the way of results. He thought they got good results and had a well deserved, good reputation, but there needed to be a clear notion of the nature of accountability and how they were going to account for themselves on what, when, how often, and in what form.

Dr. Shoenberg commented that the list of major issues on page two of the document was helpful. He noted that to solve these problems, other kinds of decisions had to be made. For example, they had to look at methods to assess schools, and despite their best intentions they kept coming back to examinations and had never come up with anything else. It seemed to him that if they were going to talk

about accountability, they had to talk about the criteria of accountability involving more sophisticated measures of how well they were doing than reliance on test scores.

Dr. Shoenberg said that the question of a balance between instructional leadership and managerial direction had at least in part to do with the whole issue of what kind of staff support they were going to be able to provide for principals particularly at the elementary level. Their rhetoric suggested they expected principals to be instructional leaders and managers, but the balance there had to do with the kind of support they were able to provide which had budgetary implications. They had to look at the role of the area offices and the central office, particularly the office of instruction and program development. He suggested that there were a whole bunch of decisions external to the role of the principal that had to be made before they could tackle these issues in any meaningful or definitive way.

Dr. Pitt commented that one of their problems was that they attacked too many things at one time so that it was almost impossible to get anything done well. He thought that if they didn't do anything else, they had to decide on an organized way of approaching this topic. Dr. Shoenberg thought they could not come up with answers for the principalship unless they consider parallel questions raised from other parts of the school system. Mrs. Praisner pointed out that they had to start somewhere, and one place to start was the local school. Dr. Cronin said he felt like someone who had been given a knife and a fork and an elephant and told to start eating. He wondered if anyone could suggest the most important issue to focus on.

Dr. Pitt explained that one approach to this would be for the superintendent to take all the reports, work with staff, and come up with some recommendations. He intended to do that, but the Board thought it was important to have some public discussion first. He did not think they should try to come to conclusions in these discussions. Dr. Cronin said that in reading the paper he thought they were dealing with the interlocking relationship of everything done by educational institutions. He wasn't sure what the first question should be and, therefore, he was glad to see the start made by Mr. Ewing. He thought that as a prime focus they could look at what they expected of a teacher in the classroom, of the principal of the school, and how they measured this.

While Mrs. Slye was glad that Mr. Ewing had raised the issue of accountability, she did not think it could be the first issue. She believed the first critical decision-making point centered around the principal's role because accountability could only be defined appropriately in terms of the role. She suggested they exchange some views about that issue and differing roles of the elementary leader and the secondary leader and the differences between managerial direction and instructional leadership. When they saw some convergence of those issues they could begin to define a way in which accountability could be assessed. Dr. Shoenberg thought they could

just as well get at it the other way. A principal could ask what he or she was going to be held accountable for and would tell them what he or she was going to do. It seemed to Mrs. Praisner that they were both saying the same thing which was how they wanted the principal to function, what was the job description, what were the responsibilities, what was the latitude, and where was the accountability, authority, and discretion.

Mr. Ewing said they ought to think about what it was they expected and wanted to hold people accountable for and let the role flow from that. He did not have any problems about the list of major functions on page four, but the important issue was how people played these out. This was a function of what they expected and what they held people accountable for. It was also a function of how they were organized. It was typical in large bureaucracies to hear that roles were not clear from one level to another, and the key issue was for them to clarify what they wanted people to do at various levels. For example, did they want the area office to provide direction and supervision or did they want it to provide support and guidance. If they wanted principals to do what was listed on page four and wanted area offices to do something else, then the "something else" needed clarification. He thought they had to agree whether the role was reasonable and then relate that set of functions to the rest of the school system to make accomplishment possible.

Dr. Pitt stated that he would question whether it was reasonable to expect principals to do certain things in a large school system. For example, in a small system, the principal would hire the teachers; however, in MCPS they had affirmative action goals and a preselection process. Another example would be staff training which in MCPS was done by the Staff Development people. While he would buy much of what was listed under the duties of a principal, his perception of what could be done might be quite different from that of a principal sitting in a particular school.

Dr. Diane Mero, principal of Einstein High School, commented that she was not even clear on the definitions they were using. While the list on page four looked good on paper, when they put these things into practice it became a massive undertaking. She was concerned about overload of the elementary school principals, and at the secondary level they were seeing burn-out in a lot of different ways. She wondered how they could convince young and capable people with administrative potential to take a pay cut to put in 20-hour days and become accountable for whatever it was they were trying to do in schools. She suggested they needed to talk at a very basic level before they got into something more philosophical.

Dr. Shoenberg thought that they were always going to expect principals to do the things listed on page four. He did not think that principals thought the list should change, but they did think they needed more help to do these things. He did not think that any principal could do all of these things well. For example, a wonderful principal might be weak in a particular area that happened to be fatal under a particular set of circumstances. He wondered

what people expected to come out of this discussion. He doubted that the job of principal would be made clearer. They might be able to clarify the role of the principal in relation to students, parents, the area office, and the central office. They might also realize and find ways of getting additional help to principals.

Dr. Kay Holliday, principal of Bells Mill Elementary School, commented that almost every principal would buy into the idea of a two-pronged approach for the role of the principal. They had a managerial and a leadership approach. Most of them would like to do more in the way of leadership, but they needed more supports to get the job done. For example, when they selected new staff they did not have a lot of knowledge about the person being interviewed. He did not have a whole lot of autonomy and had to rely on the area and the central office for a lot of things. They no longer developed curriculum with their staff. Now they were implementors and monitors, and they did need training to do these jobs. They all wanted to do a better job, but they all needed more support. She felt that the job description of the principal was really the "walk-on-water" syndrome, and she suggested they think about changing some of the items on the list because the stress level on principals was very high. It an elementary school, the principalship was also a lonely job.

Dr. Edward Shirley, principal of Sligo Middle School, reported that he tended to look at things in terms of what helped him to do what the Board wanted and what was a hindrance. He would like to see a list of the issues that made it difficult for him to do the job right. He thought there needed to be some understanding that for every reason the Board could give him as to why he should be held accountable he could come up with a lot of factors that said there was no way that a fair-minded person could hold him accountable. There had to be a clear understanding on the part of everyone involved as to what were the hindrances and what were the expectations.

In regard to Dr. Holliday's remarks, Dr. Cronin said that they had to look at organizational responsibilities from the top down and how principals could be served. In the accountability process principals were accountable up rather than down. Dr. Holliday thought they were accountable both ways. Dr. Cronin noted that community demands could also change accountability factors. He did not see anything in here about principals having the autonomy to change the organization of their schools. Dr. Holliday replied that they could reorganize if they did it within the staffing allocation they had and oftentimes this did not permit leeway. Dr. Cronin suggested that they could reexamine the allocations and the premises behind them, and Dr. Holliday remarked that the allocation could be based on the specific needs of the school, the size of the school, and the type of student population. If principals had control over what they did and the resources to help them, they could be accountable. Dr. Mero added that the accountability would be individual rather than to a county norm. The schools would be measured against themselves. It seemed to Mrs. Slye that they had too many things to do and not

enough support to do them well. In addition, they had a list of things they would like to do. She asked if there were any items on pages four and five that couldn't be done by anyone other than a principal. Dr. Mero replied that school/community relations might be the closest to it because people did not want to deal with anyone other than the principal.

Mrs. Slye explained that she had raised this question because it was easier to define on the one thing that a person could do. She said that a fairly strong case could be made that the one critical function of the principal was to both effectively influence the making of policy and procedure at the local school as well as implementing policy and procedure at the local school level. If they could develop that kind of a definition, they might be able to find a new way of handling the other tasks associated with the role of principal. She said that lacking the reality that the local principal brought to policy making, policies became unimplementable, and yet without good policy shaped with local influence from the top down, the job of administering a school became impossible as well. Mr. Ewing agreed with Dr. Shirley that there had to be some mutual understanding between those creating a set of roles and expectations for principals and what principals could reasonably be expected to do given the resources available to them. He thought there would always be tension between those because what creative people thought they needed to do the job was usually more than the County Council was willing to provide. His concern was that this situation increased the need for what he would call flexibility rather than autonomy. As in most bureaucracies they specified what all the inputs would be and did not concern themselves nearly as much with the outcomes. He would rather be clearer about what the outcomes were going to be and allow principals more flexibility in taking those outcome expectations and addressing those in a variety of ways. He would be willing to see the outcomes differ from school to school, but he did think there ought to be some system-wide goals. The impact of all of that on the role of the principal then was for them to say how they could identify what it was that needed to be fixed if they were going to do that. For example, what did they need at the secondary school to make sure the fix was there, and what did the area offices need to do. He suggested they needed to focus on what they could do to fix things if they could. If they could not, this set up a different set of mutual expectations. He would be interested on focusing on what it was that they needed to fix.

Mrs. Praisner hoped that they would not lose the issue of the assistant principalship at the secondary level as a career position. If they were talking about outcomes, she wanted to be sure that what they were talking about was going to address the issues that they were trying to resolve. Dr. Pitt commented that a number of people had defined outcomes, and all of them talking about what they ought to teach children and what they expected children would learn. The second issue was very difficult to articulate. He had defined accountability as looking at where young people were in a particular school and how far they moved in that school in relation to some countywide goals. However, they had limited test data. They had not

talked about outcome in terms of what the curriculum did and what community expectations were. This was one of the most important topics in education now, and people appeared to be coming up with a very structured and limited approach. He remarked that if he was in a school and looked at what his child learned, he could tell them what he thought happened in terms of what his expectations were about what ought to happen, but to define those in clear terms for every student became a difficult task.

Mr. Ewing disagreed and thought they ought to reach this through some successive approximations. There were some expectations built into these role descriptions for outcomes. They did not relate to the community just to relate to the community. They related in order to educate and involve the community to build parental involvement in education and parental support for the public schools. There were all kinds of expectations in here in terms of what they expected of principals. The toughest of issues to generalize about were what they expected children to learn and what skills they expected them to have in terms of what they expected from principals. He suggested they might focus on some specifics. For example, if elementary school principals said they were unable to function as effectively as they should, then the Board ought to know what they needed in terms of additional resources. He thought they were starting to respond by adding elementary counselors and curriculum coordinators.

Mrs. Praisner asked if principals would like more flexibility in deciding what kinds of staff they had based on local school needs. Dr. Holliday explained that they had asked about the possibility of a noncategorical position that could be used to help the school with its specific needs. Mrs. Praisner remarked that they had tended to dole out staff without individual input from the local school. Dr. Holliday added that someone was making these decisions because some schools had a full-time curriculum coordinator because the school needed it. Mrs. Praisner remarked that there was still the expectation that at some point every school was going to have a curriculum coordinator. Dr. William Wilhoyte, principal of Farmland Elementary, thought schools should justify their requests and have the right to make a choice. Mrs. Praisner thought that if individual schools were going to look a little different based on their needs, then perhaps they needed to change the way they defined those positions and allocated them. Dr. Holliday pointed out that they could not expect all schools to have the same degree of accountability without taking staffing into account or considering their population.

Mrs. DiFonzo remarked that trying to find a decision was like trying to pick up a handful of mercury. You knew it was there, but you were never going to hold onto it. She thought they had to look at where they wanted to go and how they wanted to get there. The problem is that a principal might set out to do these things and get "zapped" because of the style of the principal or of the community. There was no right answer. Indeed, they were dealing with a moving target. In 1980 people were talking about traditional education, in 1982 it was discipline and structure, in 1984 the emphasis was on science and



math, and now in 1987 there was talk of humanities. She commented that the role of the principal was whatever society was asking for at any given point in time. She hoped that this discussion would give them a jumping off point.

Dr. Cronin remarked that one of the most valuable and yet frustrating experiences was a Middle States evaluation. This focused on the nature of the school, its objectives, and its need for resources. He had found the missing element was the lack of commitment on the part of the school system to provide the resources the report said were needed to meet the objectives. He thought they were groping toward an internal Middle States evaluation with the principal stating objectives and resources needed to meet these objectives. Dr. Holliday explained that they now did this with self studies and PRAT reports. Dr. Cronin thought that part of this ought to be whether or not the system support the principals with the resources they needed to achieve their goals.

Dr. Wilhoyte stated that in their discussions they had not considered where the teachers were and the whole movement of empowering teachers regarding decisions at the local schools. One way was to increase the amount of freedom and recognize the roles of all. However, it seemed to him Dr. Cronin was prescribing something which was another overlay with outcomes determined outside of the school rather than inside the school. Dr. Cronin explained that he was talking about a self-study in the school which determined the objectives and goals of that school. He was saying they would request the staff they needed and program their budget based upon their needs.

Dr. Shoenberg observed that he did not think the size of a school made a lot of difference in defining and dealing with all of the responsibilities of a principal. However, the point had been raised about getting someone else in the school to whom the principal could relate. He suggested that when they appointed a new principal that person should say that these were particular strengths and things he or she liked to do, and there were things he or she did not do so well or did not like to do. The principal could describe the type of person needed to complement these strengths and weaknesses. They could say that as long as the principal was there, they would provide someone to supplement what it was the principal did. This person might be a counselor, a curriculum coordinator, or a manager. In regard to Dr. Cronin's suggestion, he saw a visiting committee made up of community and school system people that would come in periodically and look at what the school was doing. The committee would look at the goals set by the school and those more general goals set by the county. They would go into the school and look at the assignments and tests given to students and well as projects, the art, and whatever else students were doing. This would get them away from the issue of test scores, and they could do this for every school every couple or three years. Dr. Wilhoyte remarked that he would be concerned about who was defining what the group was looking for. Dr. Shoenberg explained that some of the things were defined by the school system and some by the Board through policies and some would be defined by the school. Dr. Holliday thought they were just

adding another layer.

Mr. Ewing stated that if they were really interested in focusing on what the person in charge had to do, then they were interested in the kind of person who would see the job was done even though he or she did not like to do certain things. This brought them to the leadership and management responsibility issue. He believed that they did have to locate the responsibility in one place, although he did like the idea of a person identifying what he or she did not do well. He thought they needed to have an "if/then" situation. If they wanted a principal to do X, Y, and Z, they would have to provide a principal with A, B, and C. His problem was that neither part of the equation was as yet clearly enough specified. He thought they had to ask principals what it would take to get the items done on the lists on pages four and five. They also needed to know what was or was not as important. If they were able to do that, they might be able to specify needs in terms of resources. Perhaps there would be suggestions for restructuring the management of the elementary school or of secondary schools to get these things done and done well. If they faced up to this, the "if/then" arrangement could be an honest one.

Mrs. Praisner remarked that she would like to know what training and resources were provided to help those who did not have the same level of skills. For example, what kinds of needs assessment did they have for the principal to use with the school or for the system to use with the principal? She reported that they had made some movement in this direction because the material Board members received for personnel appointments was significantly different. The material now showed what the community, staff, and students considered important for the principal. She said there was an expectation that the superintendent would respond to the question of how the individual's characteristics meet the demands of the community when the superintendent made a personnel recommendation. If not, the system had to do something to insure the success of the nominee. In subsequent discussions, the Board would be addressing the issues dealing with selection, training, screening and selection that would help them to define the expectations they had for the principal. Dr. Pitt remarked that their resources were not infinite; therefore, when they talked about what they could give principals, they had to realize it had to be done in some rational way. Secondly, he noted that they now did a lot of things right by whatever measures they used. For example, more students were taking SAT tests and yet scores for MCPS students were up. This got them to outcome measures, and he said that by any definition, MCPS was doing a lot of things right. That meant teachers, parents, principals, and students were doing a lot of things right together. They might want to consider limiting their expectations instead of broadening them as to what those outcomes would be. He stated that he wanted to accentuate the positive as they went through these discussions because he worried about the perception they were developing about MCPS. For example, they talked about doing a better job in assessing, evaluating, and training, but if they looked at MCPS in comparison with other school systems, MCPS was light years ahead. This did not mean they could

not do better, but when they talked about suggestions in national and state reports, MCPS was already doing many of these things.

Mr. Goldensohn commented that he had known several principals for a number of years and everything seemed to point to a continuing expansion of what they wanted principals to do. They had more responsibility, more accountability, and more paperwork. He hoped that through discussion they would be able to come up with ways of easing the burden. They needed to share the load or get support within limited resources. He cited the case of a small elementary school with no assistant principal, no trainee, one secretary, and no one to help. The accountability load kept building on the principal without an infusion of resources. He felt for that lone principal. The teachers could not help because the average elementary school teacher was strapped just following the curriculum. He hoped that they would find the magic potion that would help these principals. Dr. Cronin reported that at Montgomery College they had reduced loads for teachers sharing administrative duties. He noted the number of principals in the audience and pointed out that they had given up their evening to listen to the discussion. Mrs. Praisner commented that it was useful for Board members to have the opportunity to talk with principals. She hoped that in the next discussion they could talk about some specific recommendations. She explained that while tonight's discussion was all over the place, this meant they were going to have to take more time to think about specific recommendations in this area. She thanked staff for their participation.

Re: BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

1. Mrs. DiFonzo reported that she had visited four elementary schools where ceremonies were held to kick off bicentennial celebrations of the Constitution. Despite having only 10 to 14 school days to prepare, teachers and students had done an exciting job with activities, and she hoped that other Board members would have an opportunity to visit these programs.
2. Mr. Herscovitz stated that the class of 1989 would have a fine arts and practical arts graduation requirement. He asked that staff look into whether journalism could be reclassified as a practical art in order to increase enrollment in that course.
3. Mr. Ewing reported that Gaithersburg had held a Constitutional celebration and Davis Kennedy had portrayed Daniel Carroll. Mr. Goldensohn said that he had participated in the ceremony and on behalf of the Board he had signed a reaffirmation of the Constitution.

RESOLUTION NO. 462-87 Re: EXECUTIVE SESSION - NEGOTIATIONS

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

WHEREAS, The Board of Education of Montgomery County is authorized by

Section 10-508, State Government Article of the ANNOTATED CODE OF MARYLAND to conduct certain of its meetings in executive closed session; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education of Montgomery County hereby conduct its meetings in executive closed session at times to be determined to conduct collective bargaining negotiations or to consider matters and issues in connection therewith; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the president of the Board of Education will announce at public business meetings when the Board of Education has held these executive sessions.

RESOLUTION NO. 463-87 Re: EXECUTIVE SESSION - OCTOBER 6, 1987

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

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

RESOLVED, That the Board of Education of Montgomery County hereby conduct its meeting in executive closed session beginning on October 6, 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.

RESOLUTION NO. 464-87 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1987-07

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

RESOLVED, That upon the request of the appellant, the Board dismiss BOE Appeal No. 1987-07, student suspension.

RESOLUTION NO. 465-87 Re: BOE APPEAL NO. 1987-17

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

RESOLVED, That upon the request of the appellant, the Board dismiss BOE Appeal No. 1987-17, student transfer.

Re: ADJOURNMENT

The president adjourned the meeting at 10:35 p.m.

-----  
PRESIDENT

-----  
SECRETARY

HP:mlw