

NUMBER: 12-1991  
STATUS: APPROVED  
PLACE: ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND  
DATE: FEBRUARY 11, 1991  
TEXT:



consensus and issues would develop in this arena. The other worksessions would probably follow this same format unless another way would be better. A subcommittee of the Board chaired by Ms. Gutierrez and composed of Dr. Cheung and Mr. Ewing would develop the framework for topics of the remaining worksessions. These would be laid out shortly. Public comments would be welcome either in terms of personal contact with Board members, the superintendent, Dr. Gordon, or in writing. Dr. Pitt had asked Dr. Vance to work with the Board and Dr. Gordon to put these materials together and to help staff the effort to make sure it flowed smoothly and the Board and community had the information needed. Mr. Porter would continue to inform the public about the Board's activities in these sessions. These sessions would be televised.

Mr. Ewing invited Dr. Gordon to share with the Board and audience a summary of his recommendations and thoughts related to the report. Dr. Gordon began by reminding the Board that many of the Board members had already heard that by July 1, 1991, he would be professor emeritus at Yale so that he could stop teaching and slow down and do some other things. One of his students had her five-person hearing where it would be determined if she were ready for her dissertation. Dr. Gordon described her research and some of her problems and findings, and he found that he was thankful that his life as a professor was coming to an end. Some of the things she was talking about were beyond him. The field of psychology was rapidly changing, where there were new ideas and new findings. Some things that used to be accepted were now recognized as being in error. Dr. Gordon wanted to point this out because he thought people tended to forget that they needed to continue learning. New information, trying to make sense of it, discarding old information, and finding new ways of doing things should be ongoing. If one became too lazy or too tired or too senile, it was time to become emeritus. Dr. Gordon's hope was that most of the people in the system were not as tired as he was and not as senile and who were prepared to continue learning. The Board had to assume the responsibility to enable that process for teachers to continue to learn.

Dr. Gordon reminded the Board that traditionally staff development was thought of as being something done by teachers on their own, using their own time, something that was personally motivated. Some people did try to do it this way, taking opportunities to seek knowledge, but others found that less than desirable, finding it harder to do. Current thinking about staff development was the most effective staff development was defined as part of one's professional job, not to be done solely on personal time, but as part of the job. For instance, the workloads of professors at the University were less classroom-oriented than the workloads of public school teachers. Dr. Gordon related that he taught two, three or at the most four courses in a year, with his usual load being a seminar or lecture course and a second seminar and lecture course in a nine-month period. The expectation that the University holds, however, was

that in return for that schedule, time was spent in the library and laboratory doing research, reflecting, thinking, redesigning, etc. Dr. Gordon conceded that this probably could not be duplicated in the public school arena, but thoughts about demands upon staff should be considered and time to "renew" should be made available to the teaching staff so that they could renew, reflect, retool, retread.

Some of this time could be used for relearning, for example, psychology, even though one might be an expert in the field. Many teachers needed to have time to relearn, or learn for the first time considering how things were changing so rapidly, in order to catch up with the knowledge base that was foundational to pedagogy. Dr. Gordon mentioned a paper he was working on concerning the preparation for careers in teaching. In this paper, Dr. Gordon called attention to the fact that education as a field was very much about where medicine was at the turn of the century. People learned how to be physicians by going to small preparatory training centers that were staffed largely by physicians in practice teaching would-be physicians how to practice medicine. Reflecting on that, these appear to have been more art training centers than scientific institutions. One learned the art of medicine. At about the time of World War I, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching commissioned Mr. Flexner to study medical education, and his report became the basis for radical changes in the way physicians were prepared. He concluded that the knowledge base for medicine had changed and outdistanced the training centers for medicine and that the preparation for careers in medicine needed to be brought into the university where the sciences were. The preparation for education was in the university, but the sciences of pedagogy were not necessarily a part of the curriculum of most of our schools of education. There were educational psychologists, but the field of educational psychology seemed to have moved along parallel lines with cognitive psychology. Cognitive psychology was part of a larger field of cognitive sciences. These were fundamental to mental activity, mental processing and learning. Yet what was being done in schools of education was not rooted in the sciences of cognition. There were other social sciences, biological sciences that were now recognized in form as educational processes, but education did not systematically tap these areas. These areas seemed to be moving independently. In our schools of education we tended to focus on the teaching of techniques with only a sampling of this knowledge.

It would not be feasible to send all staff persons back to schools to be re-educated and since the Board would have these persons for many years to come, Dr. Gordon thought it would be prudent and wise for the Board to enable the teachers to obtain this knowledge that would be the foundational knowledge for pedagogy in the future. People were talking about the

interfacing of anthropology and education and the ways in which the processes of learning could be informed by a study of anthropological concepts. Folk in sociology were talking about ways in which the sociology of knowledge and the sociology of learning could better inform what we do. Dr. Gordon was suggesting that one aspect of staff development needed to be the exposure of persons now in service to some of these new bodies of knowledge which could better inform what was done in education.

The second content area concerned the subject matter itself. Dr. Gordon explained that the biology he learned in college was quite different from what his children were learning as they were quite beyond what he had learned. Yet there were still teachers who were taught at about the same time Dr. Gordon was learning and they were expected to teach children today things that were not conceived of when they were taught. In specific content areas of physics and chemistry and the natural sciences and most of the social sciences, these bodies of knowledge have changed. Teachers needed opportunities to renew, catch up and be reintroduced. While some bodies have not changed drastically, i.e., languages, the context for understanding them certainly had so people teaching literature were confronted with varieties of literary expression that were not considered a part of the canon 20 or 30 years ago. There were new ways of interpretation and criticizing. In almost all areas of knowledge included in the curriculum there were opportunities for teachers to renew and refresh. Dr. Gordon's recommendation goes far beyond minority education because problems of minority education go far beyond minority status. If able people were not in the classrooms, minorities and everybody else would be cheated. It was most important for low status members of the system that teachers had the opportunities to enhance their competencies, their understanding and their knowledge. It was Dr. Gordon's feeling and observation that when one was not sure of what he was teaching and not in control of the knowledge others must learn, then that person became defensive, anxious and less able to reach out, nurture, encourage and support others.

Dr. Gordon related that he had heard people claiming that they wanted to and were ready to improve minority education, but they did not know what to do. He felt that they thought there were some things peculiar to minority education that they needed to know in order to do their jobs better. And this might be true. Dr. Gordon felt it was easier for him to teach young women in his classes because he had spent a fair amount of time trying to understand his wife and two daughters. This might not have been true if he had not had this experience with women. Therefore, he felt that it was terribly important to learn something about other people. However, Dr. Gordon thought that learning about people might not be as important as understanding what it was that one was trying to teach because generally when one felt comfortable with oneself and with what he was doing, one did not

find it so easy to let his ignorances, biases or predetermined assumptions get in the way of relationships. If a teacher was not doing his job well, he usually found a scapegoat at this point and it usually was someone different from him to put the blame on.

In social psychology there was a term called "evaluative bias." This was a fancy term used to describe the finding that when you have to explain the behavior of another person like yourself, you were likely to try to find out what it was in the environment and what was happening to this person that caused this person to fail or not do well. If that person was unlike me, you were more likely to look at that person and say, "What is wrong with this student that is causing him or her to fail?" When the competence brought to the classroom was shaky or tenuous, the inclination was to look to the people with whom one was interacting. Assumptions were then drawn to like people that something was getting in the way of their learning, whereas to unlike persons, the fault was in them that they couldn't learn or the parents didn't want them to learn. The concern with staff development was basic to pedagogy itself, but it had special relevance when one talked about the youngsters served who were less wealthy.

Dr. Gordon further explained that there was a widely held perception that the expectations of staff were relatively low or lower for minority students than for majority students. This was reported in Dr. Gordon's report, noting an underlying residual bias or racism perceived to be operative in this system. Whenever racism or bias was talked about, people became uncomfortable. Dr. Gordon related that in his early life he spent almost all of his time being exposed almost entirely to black people and therefore developed a greater affinity for blacks than whites. In the course of his growth and maturation, he said he had learned to appreciate white people. He continued that everyone had baggage that was brought from the past, some of which we can take pride in and some not. As a professional person, Dr. Gordon said he could not let attitudes towards his students get in the way of the discharge of his professional responsibility. Therefore, even though his early experience made him more comfortable with blacks than whites, he had learned as a professor at Yale he could not let that unfortunate circumstance be reflected in his professional work. It had become easy for him to do that because he did know what he was doing. He knew his field. The bottom line was simply that if you wanted people to do a good job for you, to rise above the limitations that were imposed by their prior experiences, you must help them constantly work at it, constantly renew, develop new skills and competencies and confidences which would enable them to deliver the kind of services needed. Dr. Gordon said he was delighted that they were tonight talking about staff development and hoped that during the course of this discussion, they could identify areas where they could give greater attention.

Ms. Gutierrez asked Dr. Gordon to expand a bit more on the fact that his values were acquired about the age of 9 or 10. There was a common theory that that was when we instinctively acquired values from our environment. How did one recognize that some of those values may no longer be compatible, and how did you change that? He said you must know what you are doing. Ms. Gutierrez asked if he could explain about when you realized that this was not the appropriate behavior for that case. It was a value shifting that he was trying to get at.

Dr. Gordon said it would be hard for him to pinpoint where he came out of this. He remembered making some derogatory comment directed toward another group of people when he was around the age of 10 or 11 and he received some direct instruction from his mother about this. The major differences occurred in the course of his encounters with varieties of people under varieties of circumstances so that he began to naturally appreciate something that Tiage talked about and that was perspective. Some people had socialization experiences where that happened early. Others did not. He had been talking with Mrs. Katheryn Gemberling, associate superintendent for instruction and program development, about the ways education could contribute to multi-perspectivism, helping youngsters to early appreciate the importance of multiple perspectives as opposed to a single perspective. To answer Ms. Gutierrez's question, it came with experiences, learning to appreciate that others were different but just as good, different but valuable. These differences were both acceptable.

Dr. Gordon's feelings were that teachers who could help youngsters had those kinds of experiences and were better teachers than those who did not. He thought that by the year 2000, teachers would be less concerned with teaching facts than teaching ways of viewing things. When we thought about wise people, they were the people who could step back and look at the phenomena, recognizing that there were a variety of ways of understanding it and then making a judgment by yourself about what your position would be.

Dr. Cheung said that the National Academy of Science and the Institute of Medicine was thinking about developing an automated clinical information system which they called the second-coming of Flexner whereby they would have scientific facts and information to provide higher quality of care as well as a scientific base. This information system would become the key for future quality medical care and the body of knowledge in clinical medicine. Dr. Gordon added that MCPS was trying to do something similar to that with student information systems.

Dr. Pitt said that superintendents were generalists, having to know a great deal about everything and ending up knowing a little bit about a lot. Dr. Pitt introduced Dr. Stan Fagan, Director of

the Department of Staff Development, and asked him to give an idea of where he saw MCPS going or not going. He noted that there was a large number of staff in the audience and that Dr. Gordon was the draw.

Dr. Fagan thought it was fitting for the first worksession to focus on staff development and recalled how Dr. Gordon had emphasized this in his report. MCPS had a strong commitment to staff development. He stated that the growth and caring of children depended upon the effectiveness of a staff, and the teachers were committed to encouraging children and giving credibility to the learning process. To this end, the Department of Staff Development played a large role to promote the success of all students while enhancing systemwide efficiency. He stressed, however, that the department was only one component of a very broad based, multi-faceted staff training effort for minority education.

Dr. Fagan highlighted the 12 initiatives noted in Dr. Pitt's paper on pages 4 through 7. Secondary principals were trained by the Department of Academic Skills in math efforts focused on helping students become more attracted to the math curriculum. Teachers were trained in pre-algebra and algebra to help minority students to feel comfortable in mastering this program. Project Impact training focused on primary level teachers emphasizing active learning and manipulative materials, so students could be more successful. This program was in collaboration with the University of Maryland and the National Science Foundation.

In the science area, there were hands-on science research methods for high school students who worked with the National Institutes of Health and the Hughes Medical Institute. A new program initiative with Montgomery College enhanced hands-on science, high interest materials for elementary teachers to use in their classrooms. These teachers in turn would be demonstration teachers for others. The Math, Science and Minorities Project was started by the Department of Quality Integrated Education in eight schools with American University Center for Race Equity and focused on improving attitudes of students towards math and science. The Summer Institute for Achievement, a four-week program, worked with average students to boost them in reading and math into above-average levels. This program focused on cognitive learning strategies where students could be taught visualizing, manipulating and estimating for better performance.

One hundred sixty-one teachers participated in this program last summer. Further, 60 additional teachers were trained to observe these teachers so they could take these strategies back to their schools and expand the instruction to others. These skills were being expanded to lower achieving students.

The Successful Practices program, now in 34 schools, was designed to disseminate practices that have some validation by the

Department of Educational Accountability. Staff Development and the area offices worked together on this program. The Mini-Grant program had a strong staff development program. Dr. Fagan explained the Summer Search program where students learned to expand their career awareness was located in QIE. This was a good means of helping students to gain comfort about their potential for experiencing success in science and math and technology areas. School counselors and teachers were encouraged to participate and help recruit students to move into this program. Also within QIE was the Effective Schools Project targeted in six elementary schools, based on the national model of effective schools, which has had considerable research.

Family Math, focused on families working with their children in concert with staff, helped children appreciate that they could gain concepts in math through a hands-on materials strategy. Elementary school teachers participated in this project. This project was based on the Equals program at the University of California. The mentoring initiative, widespread at all levels in Montgomery County, was developed through QIE and many schools had adapted mentoring strategies in their own way, many of which were quite outstanding.

The Human Relations Department had a systemwide approach to advance the Board's priorities for integration. The theme of last year's Human Relations experience was "A Shared Responsibility, School and Family Community in the 90's." This year's theme was "Valuing Diversity--Maximizing Achievement." The Department of Staff Development had been working on infusing teaching strategies to promote adaptive education, multi-cultural teaching, into all credit and non-credit offerings and at all levels, including A & S, teachers and support staff. Dr. Fagan said there were several initiatives to bring minority instructional assistants into the teaching ranks through some new creative programs.

Dr. Fagan explained that the essence of these programs was MCPS's commitment to building skills for meeting the diversity of the children through a multi-cultural, multi-perspective approach and helping schools to have flexibility and capability to train for individual employee and school improvement. The current emphasis was on school-based staff development. There were five thrusts to this school-based effort. The school as a social system was involved with all staff participating in a school-wide effort. This involvement allowed for staff and community decision making and created more diversified educational treatments for children. The school-based effort trained school teams so the school could be more self-sufficient to carry out quality in-service within the building. Materials and resources were provided from central and area supports into schools. An example of this was the Computer Bank, accessible to all schools. The department was working on disseminating successful practices and strategies from

all innovative projects. Dr. Fagan said they were also working on forging a partnership with all employee organizations and the community to oversee a responsive school-based training effort which could meet the Board's priorities, especially Priority 2, to give respectful and helpful treatment to all members of the school community. The countywide staff development management team was designed to promote a more coordinated comprehensive approach with the emphasis on local school change and involvement of staff. Presently, the CSDMT was developing a staff development pilot in ten schools using this approach, and the initial reports from DEA were very promising, indicating strong impacts on staff and school improvement.

Dr. Pitt said he asked that this team be formed as a part of the Commission on Excellence Report to focus on schools in an organized way so teachers could gain areas of help where needed and to modify staff development to meet their needs. It was still in its early stages in these ten schools.

Mrs. Fanconi thought the Board needed to take some action soon. The Board needed to move toward setting up a structure to define what the Board wanted to do and how it could be done within the existing budget. Mrs. Fanconi thought that teachers wanted to succeed, and a staff development effort should acknowledge that.

Dr. Gordon was asked for his input on budget cuts and how they might affect mini-grants and departments that look at minority and multi-cultural issues. Dr. Gordon had spoken earlier about the necessity for teachers to have more individual time with students, and the budget cuts would impact this area of staff development if class sizes were larger. Mrs. Fanconi was soliciting Dr. Gordon's assistance to tackle these kinds of problems.

Dr. Pitt mentioned that the County Council had just recommended an affordability limit for the MCPS budget at \$708 million, which is \$70 million under same services. Never in his thirty years of service to MCPS had this school system suffered such a significant fiscal impact. It would be a real challenge to find ways of doing what had to be done in this area of staff development.

Mr. Ewing thought it was important to note these fiscal constraints, but also important for the Board to decide what it needed to do. If it were not possible to do what needed to be done this year, then the Board should have a plan to say it should be done in the next year and the following year, monitoring things as they went along to avoid any waste or damage that could occur. In this particular area, there had been delay to do other than what should have been done, and now it was time to do what had to be done, what could now be done and what had to be done later. He hoped it wouldn't be approached with too constrictive a view.

Dr. Cheung asked Dr. Gordon for his response to Dr. Fagan's report and if there were any alternatives which would be more effective to achieve the goals in Dr. Gordon's report. Some of these alternatives seemed to be random innovations and Dr. Cheung did not know how they could be instituted and evaluated. What should the Board's approach be in order to be more effective and focused?

Dr. Gordon was unsure whether these questions needed answers or were they part of the Board agenda? He mentioned that he was uncomfortable making evaluative statements about the staff development program. His recommendations regarding staff development came out of his hearing that the system had been criticized because it had people who were perceived as not knowing the fact that people were prepared to move but needed more direction. Generally, Dr. Gordon said schools were in some difficulty with respect to "know how."

Dr. Gordon asked to give some immediate perceptions. After reading Dr. Pitt's memo, he was aware that the system was in no way short of good ideas. Major and promising practices from around the country had been identified in this report. However, it was difficult for Dr. Gordon to know the nature and content of staff development. For example, he could mount a tutorial program, train people to do it and get "brownie" points for doing so before tutoring began. But until the nature of the program and training were examined as regards priorities and values of the program, its appropriateness to a particular problem could not be intelligently discussed. And this was a problem in talking about MCPS staff development activities. It might be a good idea for the Board to look more closely at the content and nature of staff development and ask staff to more specifically address that. Dr. Gordon felt MCPS had a very interesting math program going. He felt that they were on target based on results he had seen. Dr. Gordon stressed that his statements were inferences because he did not really know what was being done for the teachers. It was important to know the major thrusts of the pieces in addition to simply knowing something was in place. He noted the double period algebra. From what he knew and had heard about it, it seemed like a very fine program. Regarding the other initiatives, the fact that they were on paper and in place, did not mean they could just go on to something else. It was conceivable that too many areas had been targeted. This might not be too big a "menu," but the Board should be assured that the "menu" was appropriate to the needs of the system and appropriately delivered. It was important not just to evaluate the implementation, but the outcome as well. In other words, was the patient getting the medicine. Another way to say this was, "Is what is described in the program being delivered and what is the nature of the preparation of the people delivering it."

Mrs. Brenneman went a step further by noting that it was important to see if the medicine did, in fact, effect the cure. Are these programs being evaluated to see if they were successful or not?

Dr. Pitt said there was a lot of evaluation of program. The math program was a two-year effort. Evaluation now was based on teacher grades, and 73% of the students in algebra now had a grade of C or better. Dr. Pitt noted that by any standard some of the existing programs were relatively successful. However, looking at the whole picture, Dr. Pitt said his real concern was moving the program to a lot more people. This had not always been successful. Maybe rather than moving toward flexibility, MCPS should focus on a small number and get to a larger number quickly.

Dr. Gordon said in their review of MCPS programs, they did not look at a lot of evaluation data because there were so many factors that influenced the hard data outcomes that the decision was made to determine the goodness of program rather than its impact as reflected in changed outcomes for particular youngsters. Looking across the population, it did not appear to Dr. Gordon that these programs had significantly reduced the lag in minority achievement in the county. However, if you looked at the descriptive quality of what was being done, it was about as good as what was happening elsewhere. It was a complicated evaluation task of trying to decide whether to ask if the delivery was as good as it could be or was the outcome as good as hoped. Personally, Dr. Gordon would prefer to look at outcome. This was also the case from the Board's perspective.

Mrs. Brenneman discussed attitude and behavior, especially of those persons who deal regularly with minority students, i.e., bus drivers and secretaries. Mrs. Brenneman asked Dr. Gordon if the human relations courses were adequately addressing appropriate attitudes and behaviors to this group of people. The first impressions were very important. Support staff should be included in this area as well. Dr. Gordon agreed that climate permeated the system. He would not advise the Board to invest a lot of money to teach people how to do that. He did not feel that most people needed to be taught how to be decent to others.

What had to be done was to look at factors that enabled or required people to be decent. What was sensed from the minority communities was that they felt that too many people in the system did not care about that part of their behavior and there was the perception that they could not care and could get away with it. Dr. Gordon mentioned in his report that this had to be made clear to MCPS employees that this was simply unacceptable professional behavior. These things should be expected of employees. It may be that teachers needed to be helped with their skills, but it was inconceivable to him that people had to be taught how to respect other human beings.

Mrs. Brenneman agreed with Dr. Gordon that people could not be taught how to be nice to others. That was the issue of attitude versus behavior, and she noted that it was difficult to change attitudes where behavior could be changed and taught. Some people might not be accustomed to dealing with peoples from diverse cultures, and they could benefit from learning about different cultures. On the other hand, Mrs. Brenneman mentioned special education situations where sometimes minority students were over-represented. There was uncertainty about whether some behaviors were special ed behaviors or just behaviors. If staff and teachers were aware of the differences, there might be benefit in behavior training.

Dr. Gordon said this was one area where he would make a recommendation to staff development. There was a major problem in the perception of the over-representation of minorities in special education, and too many of MCPS clients were distrustful of the system by which these children were assigned. If there were a priority in staff development, maybe the folk who had this responsibility should note this as a primary target, giving them the benefit of the doubt that it was their lack of understanding of diverse folk that was contributing to the "misdiagnosis." Mrs. Brenneman questioned Dr. Gordon if that wasn't where it actually started. Dr. Gordon agreed, but thought that if the task were to be manageable, it should begin with the EMT's so the youngsters that were so placed, had been placed by well-prepared professionals and were appropriately placed. At the moment, the perception was widely held that the screening process was not done with sufficient care and too many children were taken out of the classrooms. It seemed to Dr. Gordon, that under those circumstances, teachers ought to have a greater responsibility if the residual youngsters have been overscreened, that was to say that the disturbed children as well as the disturbing youngsters had been placed. If adequate resources were available, a systemwide effort at helping all teachers learn to handle a wide variety of students would be quite useful. What Dr. Gordon had recommended was that there ought to be a team of folk available to teachers to advise the teacher whether or not he or she had a problem and what then he or she should do about it if it were real. Dr. Gordon's preference was to invest his effort here rather than in "pull-out" staff development activities. At the top of Dr. Gordon's list for staff development was technical assistance. His feeling was to help the teacher in the setting where the teacher had to deal with the situation every day, rather than pull the teacher out for a hour or so a week for a special experience.

Dr. Gordon mentioned three categories of activities that the Board should try to implement. The first was a needs assessment where supervisors should be asked what they perceived the needs to be. He was not sure if Staff Development had already done

that needs assessment, but it was important to do. Beyond that, the assumption was that supervisors were spending time in the classrooms talking to teachers and that information was being generated. He felt that teachers and staff ought to be encouraged to make specific requests for group and individual efforts and, third, given the improved student data system within 23 of MCPS schools, it might be useful to start there, and this might have to be negotiated with unions, trying to identify pockets of problems. Dr. Gordon felt it was important to identify students and teachers who were regularly in trouble. He would want to begin staff development with them, sending them some technical assistance, initially diagnostic and then helping the teacher to deal with the problem. At the top of Dr. Gordon's list of staff development would be a needs assessment.

Dr. Gordon said he thought the assumption could be made that generic problems did exist in Montgomery County, and he noted that MCPS was already addressing some of these problems, i.e., adapting instruction to learner characteristics, individualizing instruction, but the most effective educational experiences were those learning experiences informed by the characteristics of the persons who were learning. That process was one that should be given a lot of attention. If there were such a model in staff development, it should be given some priority. Dr. Gordon stressed his belief in diagnostic and prescriptive instruction. If teachers did not know how to do this, they should be given help. Teachers should know how to distinguish between disturbing and disturbed behavior, children who were hard to teach as opposed to children who were uneducatable. The major thrust of the DP training for teachers would be helping them to better understand the needs of youngsters and to plan for their intervention. Some of this was not terribly sophisticated. Ben Bloom said 25 years ago that one of the best predictors of achievement was prior achievement, prior learning. If teachers knew what the youngsters knew and then built on that, they were likely to be more effective than if they took a "shotgun" approach to teaching. Dr. Gordon said that if he didn't help teachers do anything else, it would be to help them better understand what youngsters already know, what the prior learning experience was. Teachers needed to be taught how to be sensitive to this.

Third, was Bob Slavin's cooperative learning. Two of the most effective kinds of learning seemed to be discovery learning and the learnings shared with others. The notion of getting children involved in cooperative learning experiences where they helped each other and learned together and shared the learning experience was terribly important. This would be a good place to build a new staff development activity.

Dr. Pitt noted that the summer program was focused on that. A teacher could not put anyone in special education. The

Educational Management Team, made up of a number of different people, observed the youngster and there was a psychological done up and special efforts. That did not negate anything Dr. Gordon had already said, but Dr. Pitt wanted everyone to know that teachers cannot make this decision. Obviously, the skill of the teacher might have a lot to do with beginning judgments about youngsters, and Dr. Pitt agreed with that view.

Dr. Gordon said MCPS might want to invest some staff development time in the EMT. The assumption was that if the over-representation of minorities was not a function of the characteristics of those students and deliberate intent of the people making the judgment, the assumption was that there must be some error in their judgment and they might need some help in making better judgments in respect to these children. Dr. Gordon added that it would not be sufficient for that group to send larger numbers of youngsters into regular classes without some preparation on the parts of the teachers for the absorption of those kids. Dr. Gordon thought that probably the most cruel thing to do to the teacher and youngster was to send a youngster that the teacher clearly did not want, was afraid of and thought that he could do nothing with into that setting without preparation.

The last two generic issues that should be given attention to was teacher as coach, resource person. Dr. Gordon mentioned the error of tradition in education. We are a didactic profession, talking at people. This was not the most effective way to teach people things. There was a great deal to be learned from ways in which coaches worked with athletes and the way a resource person worked with people to do work independently. These people were more important than those who tried to pour something into a child's head. It was not unrelated to the last generic issue which was better use of group dynamics. About 30-35 years ago there was a new sub-specialty in social psychology called group dynamics. The simple notion was that when we functioned as a group of people the dynamics, the psychology of what we were doing, was different from when we functioned in one-to-one relationships or individually. There were techniques. There was a scientific basis for the management of groups, and a lot of teachers did not have that. To this extent, they could teach better, manage groups better, handle discipline problems better.

First it was important to focus attention on needs assessment, meeting with staff development people to discuss generic problems that needed attention, ways in which the staff development experience was delivered to teachers. Dr. Gordon began by suggesting that attention needed to be given to ways of building in that staff development experience in the work day for teachers.

Mrs. Fanconi said that MCPS did have EYE days for teachers and

had half days during the year where groups went to schools and worked with staff. This was already built in, but better use should be made of it. Dr. Gordon said that ideally it would be good to find some ways to manage large numbers of children for at least one day out of five to free up half the staff for continued education. This type of radical solution was very important for teachers who were taxed heavily keeping up with students for hours at a stretch every day. Time should be made for this. Secondly, technical assistance and demonstration were other areas where Dr. Gordon was convinced that just pulling people out of their classrooms to talk at them was not as effective as sending somebody in to show them, help them, and work with them. In addition to cooperative learning was the idea of cooperative teaching, where teachers worked together to teach. Dr. Gordon said he did not have the answers to the system's problems, but they had to work them out together. He had found that if people could get together, they generally could work out their problems.

The solutions may not always be liked, but people could learn from each other in this way. Teachers could benefit from that, helping each other to learn how to teach. Bob Shaker had a notion of teaching as inquiry where teachers are encouraged to experiment and learn from these experiments. If MCPS were to buy into Dr. Gordon's notion to invest more heavily in research and development, maybe one of their functions would be to help teachers get involved in research in their own work, the scholarly analysis of their practice. There was no better way to learn, i.e., looking at video tapes of oneself, listening to audio tapes, and having someone else criticize him/her.

Additionally, Dr. Gordon said it was important to have better use of academic and industrial laboratories to allow teachers of math and science an opportunity to spend more time in this area. Not to do this bordered on immorality. If it were Dr. Gordon's druthers, he would have people in the business of math and science spend time in the classrooms and have teachers in these fields spend time in the laboratories rather than the isolation that they now are in at the moment. These would be the directions Dr. Gordon would recommend now.

Mrs. Fanconi asked Dr. Gordon to go one step further in terms of accountability. Dr. Gordon reiterated that MCPS needed two levels, one to help staff begin to have a higher sense of accountability to each other and the other to have staff evaluate itself. The Board and staff could not abdicate their responsibility for repeated failures of having one in the wrong place.

Mrs. Hobbs asked Dr. Gordon if in his previous meetings in January he had talked about specific recommendations with staff and if so, what were their responses. Dr. Gordon said he did not recall anyone openly challenging the direction he was talking about in the three meetings he had that day.

Mr. Ewing made an observation of where the Board was at the moment and what needed yet to be done. Mr. Ewing said his impression of the staff development program was that it was one built over the years by highly competent people, responding to the requirements that they had been given. What MCPS had today was an accretion of successive waves of ideas, many of them excellent, about what the needs were in the staff development area. The difficulty now faced was that MCPS had a set of resources devoted to all of that that in some respects was inflexible. That was not a consequence of anything staff did. They had responded magnificently and had given excellent service in all respects. Mr. Ewing said now it was time to decide what the appropriate themes were and what priorities should be pursued. It would be necessary to take a look at the nature and content of what was being done. This was important because if it were not done, there was the possibility of eliminating the more important things and keeping the least important things. That may mean some things may have to be eliminated or downscaled because it was important to set priorities and decide what must be done to be most effective. This must be described in terms that the average citizen could understand, with simple enough language in terms so convincing that even the budget cutters would be reluctant to reach in and cut. Dr. Gordon had provided the Board with a series of priorities, themes and areas of focus and concentration and he thought the Board needed to determine if they wanted to move in that direction. It would be necessary to group the things being done into priority statements and then determine which ones should be continued. Mr. Ewing cited giving technical assistance in some form as an example. To some extent this was being done now. If, during the course of budget cutting, area office staff were cut back and this could not be done, would the Board also want to reduce central office capability to do that? He did not think so. That would mean that resources would have to be found and they would have to be identified and protected. Regarding the three things Dr. Gordon talked about, teaching skills, mastery of content and subject matter and learning more about others, this was another dimension around which adequate attention should be given. MCPS was doing a lot of things to improve teaching skills at this time, to help teachers learn about other people.

One of the things not being done much with was mastery of subject matter. Some was being done through the contract with employee unions, permitting them some money to engage in university education at school system expense. Staff development might indeed need to focus on that more.

Mr. Ewing continued that another dimension of this was the formula that Dr. Gordon talked about was not one that said more money must be spent on some aspect of this because that one aspect would help minority students. He was really saying that

staff development was important to everybody and it would be important for minority students because it would improve teaching skills, mastery and learning about others which would benefit all students. That was an important theme. MCPS should not lose sight of the importance to minority students of the effort and should pay attention to that in terms of what the outcomes were for minorities as well as for other students. Whatever was being done should be designed to benefit minorities as well as all students. Mr. Ewing said what was needed was a solid description of the efforts focusing on priorities. This should be limited to certain kinds of things and the knowledge that all things could not be done. Further, in future years there would be other things that would be done, with a formal monitoring and evaluative process so that MCPS could know whether what was being done was satisfactory. This way it could be demonstrated and shown to the world that what was being done was working with teachers and was beneficial to the students.

In short, Mr. Ewing said what was needed was a program that could be described in those terms. This now existed, but he was suggesting a different format for that program, a different design and set of priorities, upon which to focus.

Dr. Pitt said in terms of these assessments MCPS was trying to focus development on those areas related to goals in terms of program. Maybe that focus could be sharper. The elements were there. Dr. Pitt's concern was that they may be going too many different ways and in that sense not focus enough on a few areas that would be of most value. In looking at particular needs of a school and trying to develop a program for that school and teachers and staff, it must fit those students in that school. Part of the MCPS approach had been to move from a centralized approach which was now just in the first stages, assess the needs, look at how well the needs are being met in that particular school and then try to focus training to help those teachers do a better job. If this was not the right direction, they should change it now. That individualized and separated it out much more. It should be examined as to whether this was the way to go or if there was a better way.

Mr. Chang observed that two areas Dr. Gordon had mentioned had been discussed by student governments for a few years now. One was the issue of student participation, group dynamics and cooperative learning. This was being utilized more strongly in the elementary and mid-level and he hoped that it would be utilized more in the high schools because it was his understanding that students worked better when they were actively involved. From a student perspective, that would be appreciated.

Another point was teachers learning from other teachers and their own students. The system now was doing a great deal with teacher exchanges and workshops. School-based management made this

easier for schools to do this; however, Mr. Chang said from a student perspective the student evaluations of teachers needed to be improved. Student government leaders were currently focusing on developing a better evaluation process.

Regarding contemporary teaching and learning styles, one thing Mr. Chang noticed that contemporary teaching called for keeping students motivated and interested. This was hard. Students got attitudes from the entertainment industry and society and used these bad role models. Mr. Chang had seen a television show about the use of videos and "rap" music in teaching. Students learned a lot from music.

Mr. Chang asked Dr. Gordon if he could counsel the Board on how to improve teachers' and administrators' respect for other cultures in order to better relate with students to make their jobs easier.

Dr. Gordon said this was easy to explain. It would depend upon the interest, goodwill and intellectuality of staff. There was a fair amount of "new knowledge." There was a feminist literature, African and Asian-American literature, Latin-American, that had been off on the side and not a part of the mainstream. Certainly the system could make that body of literature more available and encourage people to become familiar with it. Those who were intellectually serious and motivated would dig it out because it was available, but others would not want to. Dr. Gordon's impression was that most teachers were sufficiently serious about their jobs so that if they knew that this knowledge was readily and easily available, it would be used because it would be discerned as part of the job. Making this "newly" discovered knowledge available would cost some money.

Dr. Cheung added that it is very difficult to change people's behavior if people do not want to change. There needed to be some incentive, some environment where people could be motivated to change. It seemed that we were "do gooders." What kind of incentive or environment could be created to allow teachers and staff to be motivated within themselves to do something about this? This was a key element. People could do all the right things and without the incentive or climate, it was difficult for people to change.

Dr. Gordon recalled a reference made in the staff development report to the work with the two unions, and he wanted to bring this up again in this discussion. He agreed with Dr. Cheung that unless people wanted change, it would be very difficult. In his last meeting with the Board, Dr. Gordon called attention to the experience in New York City with the more effective schools. In addition to time spent negotiating salary and benefits with unions, the unions should be encouraged to talk about educational policy and where they were going and how they were going to get

there, with an effort to have them buy into the things the Board was discussing at this meeting.

Dr. Gordon said he had met with one group from the teacher's union, and they had either not had the nerve to disagree or they were not the enemy. They had told him that they wanted to see something being done. It was Dr. Gordon's feeling that they should be invited in to help.

Mrs. Fanconi responded that she thought it was important to get teacher buy-in. This could be done if the teachers were included and made part of the process. They could be asked to come up with strategies within their own schools and then asked to tell the Board what was needed to accomplish their strategies. They would in this way begin to think about what was needed. This would involve them actively in the learning process. Mrs. Fanconi gave Dr. Gordon a copy of "Attracting and Enabling Teachers" for him to read. Mrs. Fanconi said that the system had to develop an ability to accept imperfections where they could say it was OK that there was a particular area where they were not doing as well as they should, as long as they knew they could do better. It was her thought that the Board was struggling with criticism. The Board was trying to show how well they were doing, while at the same time asking for Dr. Gordon's guidance because they were not doing well. This needed to be acknowledged. All the hard work and efforts by the system were to be acknowledged, but there were still areas where help was needed. Mrs. Fanconi said often teachers, principals and children were not allowed to have these feelings. Teachers should be allowed to ask for help without having a threat of no raise or probation. She thanked Dr. Gordon for giving his criticism and asked him to give them more as to how he saw them as a Board in response to his report, how they were going about it and whether it was the most effective use of time and coming to grips with it.

Dr. Gordon begged shortage of time on that request. He was pleased to have been invited back to the Board and to continue planning with the Board. His reaction to what had thus far taken place was positive. Dialogue was going on and this was good.

Mrs. Fanconi said the Board had not gone to MCEA, MCCSSE, and MCAASP to ask for group input about how to go about it. She asked if the Board was going about their study in the best use of Dr. Gordon's time. Dr. Gordon did not want to answer off the top of his head and said he would get back to Dr. Vance or Dr. Pitt and make other suggestions after thinking about it.

Dr. Gordon added one point that he had neglected. He did not know if the Minority Advisory Committee had been involved to this point. In these discussions, he thought it was terribly important that they be included. Mrs. Fanconi added that they

should have been at the table and Mr. Ewing agreed. He added that they would be having a full meeting with the Board on February 21, and they would be invited to join the Board. Dr. Gordon said that although it might be time consuming and some of it might be confrontational, his perception was that a segment of the minority community viewed the system as not being with it. Whether they were right or wrong, if that was their perception, MCPS was in trouble. It seemed to Dr. Gordon that they had to come together to work on this.

Mr. Ewing observed that it was important for the Board to make full use of Dr. Gordon's expertise and knowledge. At the same time it was important for the Board to debate these issues among the Board membership and to come to some resolution. Dr. Gordon could not be used as a crutch forever. The Board had to make these decisions, not Dr. Gordon. At some juncture, the Board would have to look less at Dr. Gordon and more at one another and come to grips with these issues. The Board needed to come to the conclusion about what was reasonable to do and then ask for input on this. The community had the right to expect of the Board some conclusions. Mr. Ewing said the community wanted the Board, at some point, to stop talking and start acting.

Ms. Gutierrez said she saw this as an enormous project with a relatively short time to look at it, think about it, evaluate and analyze it and come up with conclusions. She hoped that Dr. Gordon would be a facilitator in this process. Ms. Gutierrez said that a lot of her questions had been answered. How do we identify where we are? How do we evaluate what was being done? How do we understand the training staff development issues in the world today, and Dr. Gordon had given them his thoughts on these questions. Ms. Gutierrez wanted Dr. Gordon's input in outcomes. How effective was the Board being in staff development? This did not appear to be a one-shot deal. It would have to have a built-in check mechanism to show that the Board was indeed staying on the right track. What kind of measures, indicators were a valid assessment of the outcome that were not long-term assessments, such as SAT's. The Board needed to have a pulse on the heartbeat.

Dr. Gordon said his prime candidate would be union involvement. First he would like to see changes in the behavior of staff. He would use indicators of good pedagogy as his criteria. If the Board agreed upon the extent to which teachers were able to involve youngsters in the production of answers rather than in the receipt of them, i.e., Socratic teaching, then he would want to know if more teachers were doing that. More importantly, was Mr. Jones doing that? Dr. Gordon related that New York and Connecticut would have problems in getting immediate agreement on this. If the unions, however, were working together on this, it would not be as objectionable, particularly if the Board bought Mrs. Fanconi's notion that a climate could be developed where it

would be acceptable to not quite be there as long as you were getting there. Dr. Gordon would want to see behavioral indicators in staff as his first line of criteria. Once this would be in place, then he would want to look at the long-term effects on student achievement.

Mr. Chang asked if the Board had questions, if they should submit them in writing or how they should be handled. Mr. Ewing asked that questions be collected. If more time were needed on staff development in the next worksession, the Board could take this time. They were not bound by these limitations. If questions could be more easily answered by a yes, or no or maybe, this could be done without a lot of time. He asked Mr. Fess to collect questions and funnel them through Dr. Vance and see if the Board had or did not have answers.

Mr. Gutierrez said she had a lot of questions on what she had received and there was just not enough time. She thought this would be a good way to handle questions and share them with the rest of the Board.

Mr. Ewing said that if the Board did need more time on staff development at the next session, by all means the Board should take it and not be inflexible about the schedule. If another session were needed, this could be done. The Board could see if Dr. Gordon would be available and make choices then. The Board should do justice to the job, and not worry about fitting everything in a certain amount of time.

Mr. Ewing felt that the Board should have ongoing planning on each of the topics. For example, the point Dr. Gordon made about knowing more about the nature and content of existing staff development efforts was extremely important. Perhaps Dr. Pitt and the staff could give the Board for each of the major programs/courses a paper that was organized in the same categories, i.e., objective, audience to which it is targeted, specific content and resources associated. That would give the Board some sense of what it was all about, what it cost and what it was intended to accomplish. Mr. Ewing thought Dr. Fagan could have provided this if the Board had given him more time. The Board should have this kind of information.

Mr. Ewing said that Dr. Pitt and Dr. Vance might want to add more things. Further, Mr. Ewing said he thought the Board needed to take steps on its own to sum up what direction the Board wanted to take. The Board might want to constitute a small committee, either of the Board or Board/staff committee, to pull together thoughts about where the focus ought to be. It might be that the Board should wait until it had the material on existing staff development efforts, because it was hard to say what should be done unless you knew what was being done. Mr. Ewing said that the Board committee could take a first look at it and come to

grips with what it wanted to do.

Dr. Pitt said it might be well to define what was meant by staff development. This was a very broad topic. Every principal in every school was expected to be a trainer, a master teacher, to help teachers assess needs and evaluation and focus on areas needing strengthening. There was a whole range. Where did the Board want to focus and put resources? This should be defined.

Mrs. Fanconi asked what was being required of principals now that was interfering with the master teacher theory and how should the priorities be changed? Who could assist? Mrs. Fanconi mentioned that there were so many layers, she was frustrated with the short period of time in which the Board had to do this job. This had to be an active process involving staff, bringing ideas to the Board. Dr. Pitt suggested that the Board should narrow their focus. Mr. Ewing had tried to set that and Dr. Gordon showed which priorities to look at. The Board should pick their priorities and define what it was they wanted to do.

Mrs. Fanconi said she saw this as taking the priority and setting out the parameters to make it happen. For example, if the Board decided that the master teacher was their priority, then the Board should remove some things, not add more on top. She saw this as the problem that the Board kept on adding and adding and adding and not taking anything away.

Mr. Ewing quoted Daniel Moynihan as saying that the thing that frustrated planners was that they soon learned that everything related to everything. Mr. Ewing said initially they should take a chunk of the world and focus on that chunk, and when the pieces started to come together, the Board would find that there were questions about the relationships of the pieces and how they did or did not fit together. It seemed to Mr. Ewing that the Board's job was to decide, based on the best data they could get, where it wanted to go, what objectives were to be achieved, what problems were to be solved. The Board would need staff help to do these things, but the Board would have to tell staff the policy parameters, the priorities, and the problems to be addressed. Dr. Pitt agreed with Mr. Ewing.

Ms. Gutierrez said that they could not overlook the fact that staff development was very much involved in evaluating teachers.

Ms. Gutierrez asked if this was directly built into teacher evaluations and how that was linked with training. That piece of the picture was necessary for the Board to have. Dr. Pitt noted that Dr. Vance was the liaison for this purpose. Ms. Gutierrez noted that the Board did not want just the training. Mr. Ewing said they would get information about each of the major areas within staff development, look at that, the Board would decide how it wanted to take next steps, which was to get somebody to focus on the Board's judgment about where to go from here, and

February 11, 1991

also how the rest of the community could be involved in looking at those issues.

Mr. Ewing thanked Dr. Gordon for his helpfulness. He said the meeting was useful and productive and gave Dr. Gordon the Board's appreciation.

Re: ADJOURNMENT

The president adjourned the meeting at 11:10 p.m.

-----  
PRESIDENT

-----  
SECRETARY

HP:nwd