



to serve kindergarten, first grade, and second grade students. In addition, the change from four to three areas caused problems in moving programs and transferring records.

Dr. Vance agreed with Ms. Craney's assessment of the situation. He explained that this was one of the areas where the FY 1993 budget was going to have to reflect an increase in resources. They had been tightly budgeted in special education, and the situation had caught up with them. Ms. Craney added that in some areas there were actual cuts in resource services when they were seeing more students and more demands for paperwork.

Ms. Gutierrez commented that she would like Ms. Craney to give her a feel for the additional resources that were needed. Ms. Craney suggested that they check with the people in the field to see what they felt was needed. She would want to see more positions for the classroom as well as the training needed to have a full inclusion model. They had a number of Level 5 school-based programs, and those students needed a whole range of other services including OT/PT, speech, and language, etc. They had to make sure these services were available to fulfill the students' IEPs.

Mrs. Fanconi stated that she was uncomfortable with a conversation about increasing services when they were looking at a failure of revenue, not an increase in funding. Ms. Craney pointed out that when they were dealing with special education, they were dealing with federal law. If students did not receive these services, they had the right to appeal and MCPS would lose appeals on the basis of this failure to meet their IEPs.

Dr. Cheung asked if there had been an increase of language-minority students in special education. Ms. Craney replied that there was. This posed a special problem because these students needed special education services but had no English skills. Did they provide ESOL or special education to these students?

Mr. Charlie Barkley reported that he was in an intermediate school which had gone to a middle school teaming approach. There were complaints from teachers that they were overburdened with the teaming concept because of the time commitments involved. He thought that morale was very low because they had more work but no additional money.

Ms. Whylla Beman said that at her school teachers were not able to get professional leave during the day. There was a shortage of instructional supplies and textbooks, but enrollment was increasing. It was only November, and they had long-term substitutes in positions for the remainder of the year. Plus, one of their office staff had been promoted and that position was frozen. She detailed several other curtailments including the loss of minigrants. She indicated that in her school the staff

was very tense about impending budget cuts.

Ms. Betty Smith reported that at her elementary schools they had lost professional leave and training activities. They had a shortage of supplies, textbooks, pencils, and Xerox paper. Morale was low, and younger teachers were worried about reduction in force. She was doing everything possible to reassure people and to inform them about the latest developments in the budget situation.

In regard to site-based decision making, Mr. Seth Goldberg congratulated the Board on the action it had taken. The part of the policy the Board adopted dealt with some of the concerns that MCEA had about the policy, particularly in regard to the scope issue. He was hearing from their members in the pilot schools about some of the things the Board had not dealt with. Within the context of the guidelines, they had the issues of the facilitator, the administrative position that would coordinate efforts. Also, they had issues related to expansion and funding.

What was supposed to be happening with the current pilot schools? Did they have money? Would they get the training this year or won't they? They needed to deal with the issue of expansion because the implementation plan developed by the committee called for expansion on a yearly basis. Should they be thinking about that this year? They had talked about training options and leadership development, particularly for principals.

Mr. Goldberg stated that they had to look at what was going to be built into the budget because it could not wait until the policy was adopted in June. They had to look at the whole process of recruiting new pilots. The Board had the goal of trying to resolve some of the issues and answer some of the questions raised by the community and staff. He felt there was a need to designate some kind of a process for that to happen and to put someone in charge of this process. He did not think they had touched on the whole business of the role of the constituent organizations in that process. There was a need to recognize there were institutional interests of all of the parties that needed to be dealt with. In the case of MCEA, there was a need for a policy to incorporate the fact they were talking about improvements in teaching as well as learning conditions. There was a need for MCEA to discuss and be party to the resolution of the accountability issue.

Mr. Goldberg reported that a major issue for MCEA was the business of time/compensation. If teachers were being asked to take on the responsibility for decision-making as part of their jobs, they should not act as volunteers. There was a need for an evolving policy to ensure a true partnership by the inclusion of some mutually agreed-to guidelines in their collective bargaining agreement. The mediator had made stipulations to this effect in the last contract.

Mr. Goldberg said MCEA had the sense that site-based management could improve education. On another level, it was important for the Board to recognize that MCEA responded to how the system considered this issue within the context of a more general issue having to do with the nature of the relationship between management and labor in a school system. They saw site-based management in the context of educational reform and the recommendations of the Commission on Excellence. They wanted to know how MCEA was included in significant issues before the Board. They had brought issues to the superintendent and needed to know about their involvement at the superintendent level. They saw these relationship issues as emblematic of whether there was a real desire for their relationship to evolve in the direction of a partnership.

In regard to the recommendation for a process, Mr. Ewing said this would be addressed by the Board on the basis of some recommendations from the superintendent. They assumed that the process would involve all of the constituent groups because that was the Board's intention. He suggested that they needed this process in the very near future. It was his own personal view that it was highly unlikely they would be able to move ahead with additional sites this year. He thought they ought to consider including money in next year's budget to sustain existing pilots and to consider some expansion.

Ms. Robinson asked if the Board had discussed the three new pilots, and Mr. Ewing replied that they had not. He hoped that as Dr. Vance developed recommendations on the process that he would discuss the present pilots. Dr. Vance agreed that he would do this. He did not think he had ever heard the issues and implications of the proposed policy better cast than the way Mr. Goldberg had just cast them. He would like to have a copy of Mr. Goldberg's remarks for his review and consideration.

Ms. Gutierrez asked whether SPMAC was still meeting, and Mr. Goldberg replied that they had a meeting scheduled. The major item would be what they thought needed to be done most immediately. He thought SPMAC would like to play an active role in advocating for the current pilots. He did not know that the committee wanted to play much more of a major role in policy setting. Ms. Gutierrez stated that she would be very interested in seeing the next issues in regard to the policy, particularly when they thought about the budget. Ms. Craney pointed out that the staff development and induction pilot groups were also in limbo. Ms. Gutierrez asked whether the committee had discussed Dr. Gordon's recommendations on staff development. Ms. Craney replied that they had discussed it and had submitted a letter; however, they had not discussed "Success for Every Student."

Ms. Bonnie Cullison thought it would be of value to bring the

three committees together. The induction plan had demonstrated itself very clearly in preparing new teachers in MCPS. She pointed out that although the program reached only 50 new teachers, when they looked at the numbers of students touched by these teachers, it totaled 10,000.

In regard to "Success for Every Student," Ms. Robinson said that her board had not had a formal discussion on this item. As she and staff read through it, she thought about accomplishing all this within the parameters of current knowledge and budget. She wondered about the current budget crisis and its impact. She asked about the implementation process, who was involved, and how it would work. Mr. Ewing replied that these were the same questions raised by the Board itself. It was important for the Board to have answers to as many of those questions as possible before action was taken on the plan. In terms of the budget, Mr. Ewing stated that they had to be clear about priorities regarding any educational changes. While there might not be requirements for trade-offs in every case, they were going to have to make choices about priorities. Therefore, it was important to know what MCEA's priorities were. In tight times, it was not possible for a school system to do everything, but doing a little less of everything was the road to mediocrity.

Mrs. Fanconi commented that it was very frustrating to have to make these decisions. She believed that shortchanging children was shortchanging society. She would love to go through "Success for Every Student" and implement it fully. It was ironic that they were forced to make these choices at a time when they needed to be more productive and more successful. She agreed that they needed to work together.

Dr. Vance indicated that he would welcome the opportunity to participate in MCEA's discussion of the plan. He saw this as an institutional attitude of change. This was a will to educate all of the children equally as well. The leadership, cooperation, and participation of MCEA was necessary if this effort was going to be successful.

Dr. Cheung said he would like to hear some discussion about the ESOL program, particularly about the transition of students from ESOL into the regular program. He had read that one high school did not do well on MSPP because of the increased number of ESOL students. Ms. Sunni Morgan replied that she had sent home over 100 large bags of clothing to ESOL families. She felt it was a grave issue because these children had academic and English needs along with a lot of emotional needs. She thought they had a real crisis and needed more counseling services because the classroom teachers were being overburdened.

Ms. Gutierrez asked if MCEA could get a group together on ESOL issues and look at this from elementary school to the high school

level. They could identify the areas which had to be addressed quickly. She thought it would be valuable for the Board members to meet with such a committee. Ms. Morgan said they were in the process of getting a liaison committee together.

In regard to "Success for Every Student," Ms. Cullison was concerned that only one teacher was involved in the development of the plan. She did not know why people involved with students on a day-to-day basis were not being involved in the development of such an important mission. Perhaps they needed to look at ways to work cooperatively to build successful programs.

Ms. Robinson stated that they were concerned that teachers would be asked to implement this program without any additional money. Teachers were already doing everything they knew how to do to meet the needs of students. Mr. Goldberg pointed out that they were particularly concerned because the document listed rewards and punishments.

It seemed to Mark Simon that the list of issues in the document was the kind of list that people who were not in the classroom would come up with. He would like to see the MCEA board reflect on what needed to be added in from the classroom teachers who wrestled with these issues as well as mainstreaming and the increasingly diverse student population. Mr. Ewing pointed out that the Board had a worksession scheduled on December 2, and January 6 was the action session. He was eager to hear from MCEA.

Ms. Robinson asked whether the Board would be meeting on the Council's efficiency study because she had some real concerns about that particular report. One of the implications was that there was a more efficient way to deal with contract negotiations and that the school system should contract out services now provided by MCPS employees. She hoped that MCEA would have an opportunity to comment when the Board discussed the report. Mr. Ewing replied that the Board had not discussed the report. He pointed out that there were no short-term recommendations, and he had asked the chair of the committee why there were no short-term suggestions. The reply was that the school system had identified virtually everything short-term. It was his view that if the Board did consider a recommendation such as contracting out it would be necessary for them to make a full assessment with employee involvement. For example, the study suggested contracting out food services which was probably the most efficient operation in the school system. No manager was more conscious of the need to pursue efficiency.

Mr. Ewing thought the Board should discuss the county's report and receive some public comment on it. It was his judgment that the Board's volunteer committee produced far more than the study the Council contracted for. Ms. Gutierrez pointed out that this

November 20, 1991

was a consultant study to the Council and not the Board. The Board was under no obligation to take action on the study; however, it would be in the Board's interest to examine the study.

Mr. Goldberg asked whether there was an internal study on the feasibility of contracting out psychological services. Dr. Vance replied that there was not to his knowledge. Mr. Goldberg suggested that it might be well to quell this rumor.

Mr. Rick Bank commented that he had been here six years and had never seen the teachers as angry, militant, and frustrated as they were now. He agreed that the worst wasn't over regarding the budget cuts, and the teachers would be looking very closely at where the Board cut and what the Board cut. They had been telling the County Council that furloughs were the last resort, and the classroom should be the last to be affected.

Mr. Ewing thanked MCEA and expressed the Board's wish to work closely with them.

---

PRESIDENT

---

SECRETARY

PLV:mlw