

APPROVED
13-1995

Rockville, Maryland
February 22, 1995

The Board of Education of Montgomery County met in special session at the Carver Educational Services Center, Rockville, Maryland, on Wednesday, February 22, 1995, at 8:05 p.m.

ROLL CALL Present: Mrs. Beatrice B. Gordon, President
in the Chair
Mr. Stephen Abrams
Mr. Blair G. Ewing
Mr. Reginald Felton
Ms. Ana Sol Gutierrez
Mrs. Nancy King

Absent: Dr. Alan Cheung
Ms. Wendy Converse

Others Present: Dr. Paul L. Vance, Superintendent
Mrs. Kathryn W. Gemberling, Deputy
Mr. Larry A. Bowers, Acting Deputy

RESOLUTION NO. 138-95 Re: BOARD AGENDA - FEBRUARY 22, 1995

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mr. Felton seconded by Ms. Gutierrez, the following resolution was adopted unanimously by members present:

Resolved, That the Board of Education approve its agenda for February 22, 1995

Re: ANNOUNCEMENT

Mrs. Gordon announced that Dr. Cheung was suffering from the flu and had sent his regrets.

Re: INVESTING IN A COMMITMENT TO
QUALITY, AN UPDATE, CORPORATE
PARTNERSHIP ON MANAGERIAL
EXCELLENCE

Mrs. Gordon explained that the purpose of this evening's meeting was to receive a status report from the Corporate Partnership. Dr. Vance commented that the school system's relationship with the Partnership continued to be enjoyable and profitable. As he had recently informed the Board, a small cross-section of the Partnership had agreed to form an ad hoc corporate kitchen cabinet to work with the superintendent, and he looked forward to receiving their continuing assistance and advice.

Mr. Larry Shulman recalled that about a year and a half ago the Corporate Partnership had presented its original report to the Board. This had been done by the corporate sector, and the school system staff followed up at a later time with a response to the recommendations of the Partnership. Upon reflection, they decided that was not the way to make their presentations. This was a true partnership, and both groups should participate in the presentations. Therefore, this evening they would hear from the corporate sector and from MCPS staff.

Mr. Shulman stated that when they reviewed their first report they felt that they had not treated the area of information technology adequately. The last time they had asked each team to look at this issue, but they had never asked anyone to put the whole thing together. Therefore, they asked Mr. Tom Morgan, Dr. Steve Raucher, and Mr. Bob Phillips to form a team and look at a vision and a plan relating to technology.

Mr. Morgan reported that in reviewing last year's report they saw problems with information technology delivery in virtually every panel report. They got together a group of people to look at how information technology needs were generated and satisfied in the system as a whole, not just the administrative side but across the system. They found that the organization was not unlike many other enterprises. Technology had advanced so rapidly that everyone was behind the power curve. MCPS was basically crisis oriented and dealing with the hottest priorities, and in doing so missed the savings and efficiencies that could accrue from technology. They needed a true fix.

Mr. Morgan said they had a lot of things on the horizon including global access, communication technology, document image management, communications within and between schools, etc. They were concerned about all the different organizations in MCPS that touched technology. On the business side, they had the mainframe and various local PC efforts, and on the instructional side, they had global access and SIMS. There was no systemwide standard, and they were expending a lot of energy and valuable dollars by not all marching to the same tune. Their efforts were function oriented, and not system oriented. This meant that MCPS did not know how much money was being spent on instructional technology. He likened it to hiring five architects to design five rooms of one house.

Their first recommendation was to prepare a strategic information systems plan encompassing all MCPS requirements. They needed a single initiative to look at resource requirements and project them out into time and to decide what could and should be done or what could not be done. Now they were not looking at possibilities of what could be done, rather they were worrying about day-to-day solutions. MCPS had to adopt some standards, a framework for guidance to communicate and work with one another. They needed the road map first, then the building blocks, and then the development of a cost benefit process. Mr. Morgan emphasized that he did not say "cost savings," but rather "cost benefit."

Mr. Morgan reported that they had avoided recommending any organizational changes,

but he personally believed that they were going to have to have some central authority reporting to the superintendent to control these resources. He cited the examples of the logistics material management system and the personnel master system, and how deferrals and changed technology had impacted these systems. They recommended that MCPS decide what needed to be done and stick with it.

They recommended that MCPS plan and budget programs on a multiyear basis. Now they started in a user department with a perceived need which gave them localized answers and parochial views. They did not get system requirements and future possibilities. They needed a vision of what technology was out there and could be used to solve problems. The strategic information system plan should look forward in time and include enough technological recommendations to solve needs. There needed to be dialogues between the technologists and the users. This could be done through the Management Review Board. They needed to stimulate user creativity and establish a process to investigate other needs.

Mr. Morgan recommended investment in a continuous training program to keep staff current with industry technology and advances. Right now MCPS had a fixed staff of technologists who were the most senior people and the least trained in new technologies. They needed a reward system for people who were willing to take a chance. Right now people tended to protect their empires because any savings in their operations affected their next year's budget.

In summary, Mr. Morgan said they found an information system that was gradually falling behind the times because of a lack of resources to maintain it and to utilize the resources of technology. At a minimum, MCPS had to make an investment to understand what its possibilities were and to come up with a systemwide view of its needed. They needed well thought-out detailed plans and to make hard choices. The group thought it was tremendously important to invest in the right planning process. They should start by getting the key executive leadership together, bring in outside facilitators, and establish a planning group. He emphasized that they needed to do this post haste.

Ms. Gutierrez felt that their proposal was on target; however, there was the implication that MCPS was not doing any of this planning at this point in time. Global access had many of the elements of their recommendations built into its program. Mr. Morgan replied that he had reviewed global access and agreed with Ms. Gutierrez. They were attempting to take a total system perspective by focusing on communication; however, global access was just one subset of the problem and was not the complete picture. When the global access people got out of the realm of communication, there would be more opportunity for errors.

Ms. Gutierrez asked whether they should continue with in-house technologists or contract out. Mr. Morgan replied that this decision needed to be part of the planning process. The industry trend was going toward purchasing more and more off the shelf

rather than building it yourself. The planning process needed to look at this and identify what technologies had the most payoff, but they would still need strong in-house people to work with this technology. Dr. Raucher added the larger the organization the more difficult it was to go with off-the-shelf packages unless they reconfigured management to go with the software. They had had successes and failures with commercial software. For example, they had bought the bus routing package, but it had taken a fair amount of in-house modification.

Mr. Morgan commented that there were reasons for building, modifying, or adapting software, but they needed to have detailed studies to show cost benefits. Sometimes a more expensive solution might be necessary to get a better pay off; however, he would carefully scrutinize any solution that did not involve a high percentage of off-the-shelf computer software.

Mr. Felton remarked that in his experience very often they did not have a culture that was supportive of information, and people tended to protect their functions. He asked what they could do to create such a culture. Mr. Morgan replied that most organizations resisted changes to process and function. All he could suggest was there be staff training and indoctrination when they made changes because he agreed they had to pay attention to the human side of it as well.

In regard to cost savings versus cost benefits, Mr. Felton stated that historically they looked for the savings and very often the savings were not there. Mr. Morgan replied that most of the small changes would not necessarily result in savings. To get the savings they would have to make some significant re-engineering and basic process changes. However, in some cases it would be difficult to figure out what the savings were because they had not done the analyses. It did not do anyone a service to say they would save money by using technology when the function was to save time or improve education.

It seemed to Mrs. King that she was hearing that they needed to head toward one system rather than three or four. Mr. Morgan agreed totally. He pointed out that MCPS was not that big an organization, and issues were interrelated. For example, bus routing was a subset of a pupil information system. Mrs. King asked if they were looking for a technology person to manage the system or if they needed input from the outside. Mr. Morgan replied that some organizations had a chief technology person, but he stressed that MCPS was not ready to make that decision until it did its planning. He did agree that someone needed to be able to arbitrate instructional and administrative needs, and right now MCPS did not have anyone in that position.

Mr. Ewing thought that the recommendations were excellent, and he expressed his appreciation for their efforts. He did have a concern, however. There was not an explicit recommendation of what they thought of the current MCPS efforts. There were those in the community and in decision-making positions at the County Council whose

view it might be that until MCPS had accomplished the first three CPME recommendations that MCPS should not be funded to do anything new. On the one hand, one could say that the justification for what they were doing was perhaps flawed, but at the same time they had to run the system and do the best they could by fighting fires and developing short-range solutions.

Mr. Morgan replied that clearly the world did not stop to wait for their recommendations. As a citizen of the county, he wanted to see computers in the classroom as soon as possible. To stop that effort would be a mistake. Last spring, CPME had looked at global access and had written a letter of support. One had to be cognizant of the mistakes one could make by making decisions from a limited perspective, but he was reassured that global access was flexible enough to cover requirements they could project for the system as a whole. They should not stop that process, but they should realize that they had not taken a systemwide look. Dr. Raucher reported that he, Mr. Morgan, and Ms. Seikaly had had a productive meeting to assure that they had the building blocks in place that would serve MCPS well. He believed that the decision to put the schools ahead on some of the business systems was most reasonable. Mr. Morgan said there was another vital reason to move forward. In the past five or six years there had not been enough resource on how one could incorporate technology into the classroom. MCPS was setting up First Class to accomplish some significant communication, and they needed all of these efforts to serve as a laboratory for training and experimentation.

It seemed to Mr. Ewing that the corporate world was probably facing the same issues. They had to conduct efforts for strategic planning while continuing with applications to meet their immediate needs. Mr. Morgan agreed. In most cases people did not stop their current development activities, but they might proceed more cautiously and might not make major purchases. They did need a planning process to tell them what their needs were.

Mrs. Gordon stated that in her own mind she had taken a leap that not all had taken. She saw global access as the strategic plan because it contained the tripod of connectivity, software, and training. There was nothing on the business side of MCPS that was in conflict with what they were doing on the instructional side. The infrastructure would be in place to accommodate the changes they would like to see take place in management. Mr. Morgan replied that it was not a leap that he would make. From a communications perspective, it was probably true. However, there were other considerations including the world of data that must be considered from both perspectives. They were okay in the hardware department because they could buy bits and pieces, but when they got into high re-engineering such as document imaging there were materials they would have to look at which could not be done by global access. Global access took care of immediate needs, but not the data structure, long-term needs, and software decisions on data management.

Mrs. Gordon said that earlier they had talked about information systems supporting the instructional side of the shop, but who made the decisions on how to do this. Mr. Morgan replied that it happened both ways. Largely a user department needed something and received support to do it; however, this did not take into account other things that could be done with that information. Mrs. Gordon asked at what point it became the information systems responsibility to say who got what for what need. For example, a principal might need some information, and Procurement might need some information. Mr. Morgan replied that there needed to be a process in place to do that. The Board and executive management needed to be assured that decisions were being made from that higher level perspective and not just from the short-term local perspective. Dr. Raucher added that this was one of the functions of the Management Review Board, and they hoped people would work together to get both of their needs accomplished. Mr. Morgan commented that when they were dealing with severe budget limitations, they needed an executive level impetus that stated they would do the planning and set the standards while they were fighting the fires.

Ms. Gutierrez remarked that she did not know of any of the major organizations that had done this right. Obviously this was a recognition that businesses understand that strategic information planning is essential, and it was clear that global access was a good foundation. Mr. Morgan explained that he would not recommend holding off on global access while they studied the issue further. He would recommend keeping it as flexible as possible to accommodate a variety of different paths in the future.

Mr. Shulman stated that the next topic was transportation. Mr. Edward Green, director of Transportation, had been working with the Washington Gas Company.

Mr. Green said they had three areas of concern including bus depots, contracting out, and customer satisfaction surveys. On the Clarksburg depot relocation there had not been much movement because the county had not deemed it feasible to move. However, the West Farm facility on the east side of Route 29 was moving along rapidly. The architect had been selected and site plans were being developed. Community meetings had been very positive, and they were now dealing with property settlement and finalization of the funding. As for bus relocations, they were working on Colesville, Briggs Chaney, and Sherwood. They had already relocated 35 buses from Sherwood and the balance of the 65 would be moved to Einstein or an alternative location near Burtonsville. They hoped to be parking buses at West Farm during the summer of 1996 with final occupancy in January, 1997.

Mr. Shulman asked about the failure to move on the other depot site. Mr. Green replied that he was not sure about the county's rationale not to move. This was to be an effort to co-locate with the county government, and so far no decisions had been made.

In regard to contracting out bus transportation, the decision was made not to go with it; however, this had been included in nonrecommended options for reductions. Mr.

Green said that if the decisions should be made to go with contracting out, an RFP would have to be issued, and they would have to rekindle vendor interest. He pointed out that Transportation already had a number of services they were contracting out including the computer routing system. They were now in the process of getting the mapping done and coding all of the students. They would be working with Paint Branch, Wheaton, Springbrook, Kennedy, Blair, and Einstein because these clusters were served by the Randolph depot. Once they had the system in place they would move into the other depots. They had now starting training staff in the use of the new software.

Ms. Gutierrez inquired about the result of the pilot in terms of efficiencies. For example, were they able to eliminate some buses and routes? They needed to know this before they expanded the system. Mr. Green replied that the pilot had been expanded beyond the two clusters to give them more data, and they were projecting about a \$260,000 savings in manpower.

In regard to the customer satisfaction survey, Mr. Green reported that they had been working with DEA and had conducted a formal survey which received an 83 percent response. He said that 85 percent of those responding felt bus operators were performing satisfactorily. This survey would continue as part of total quality management. They hoped to tie it in with e-mail and first class so that principals could communicate directly with Transportation staff. Mrs. Gordon indicated that she would be interested in seeing the results of the survey once they were fully compiled as well as other customer satisfaction surveys being done in the school system.

Mr. Shulman introduced Ms. Scotty Brown, director of Food Services. Ms. Brown said that three schools were operating now with the debit card system, and in February another high school would be added. The card system allowed people eligible for free and reduced meals to use the card as if they had money on account. This protected the anonymity of these students. Parents were very comfortable with the card system and could designate which meals the child should have and could receive a printout of the child's purchases on request. They had started with a card system, but in a school with 800 students they had had to replace 800 cards in the first year. The second year they went to a key pad where students used their six-digit identification number. A plus for this was that when the number was punched in the name of the student came up, and the cafeteria staff was able to call the student by name. Ms. Brown said they now permitted parents to pay by check, but some checks had bounced. Therefore, if they expanded the system, they might have to look at using credit cards as well.

Ms. Brown stated that they had learned that they did not have a master system for computers in MCPS. Every link up was different; therefore, they were looking forward to having an integrated system.

Mr. Felton asked how they handled balances at the end of the school year, and Ms.

Brown reported that they notified students how much money they had on account and asked them to use it up. They did not accept money into the account beyond the middle of May. Mrs. King asked if they had controls so that students could not treat their friends to lunch. Ms. Brown replied that the system provided only one lunch per child each day; however, the child could buy cookies and ice cream with the system.

Mr. William Wilder, director of facilities management, introduced his partner, Mr. Thomas Doherty from Bell Atlantic. Mr. Wilder said they were working on the automated work order system for the Division of Maintenance and outsourcing possibilities for the Department of Facilities Management.

Mr. Doherty said that the work order system was on line and working. They did have to develop cost data on the major activities involved because it was important to have this information if they were considering outsourcing. Another issue was that for much of the work going on in the school system, the parts came from the warehouse. They had to know if the parts were available and, if not, when they would be available as well as how much these parts cost. All of this information together with the length of the work needed to be put into the system. The facilities people had found an off-the-shelf package, but there were limitations to the package because of the size of the school system.

Mr. Doherty said that the work order system was a small part of the facilities costs. They needed to get their arms around the total cost of maintenance, security, capital investments, assets, etc. These were systematic issues that needed to be addressed, and facilities should be a player in defining the information requirements for the entire school system because the facilities costs were second only to the cost of salary and wages for MCPS. The other issue was outsourcing, the building service worker issue. This was on hold, and they were not clear about what direction it would go in. MCPS staff had defined building services responsibilities for an RFP, but there were a number of services that MCPS workers provided that they could not get from the vendor community. For example, these workers were at the beck and call of the principals and might do cafeteria duty. In many cases, they served as role models to students. All of this would be lost if they went to vendors, whose job would be just to clean the building.

Dr. Elfreda Massie, associate superintendent for personnel services, reported that her group worked closely with the Howard Hughes Medical Institute. Most personnel processes were quite labor and staff intensive, and Personnel lacked adequate technological resources. All of the recommendations focused on technology, and since the report they had purchased computers for all staff, and they now had e-mail and voice mail. They had submitted a grant proposal for implementation of an imaging and document management system which was a part of their plan that was critical. They had met with Dr. Splaine's office and had received presentations from vendors about electronic forms. They had moved into the user testing phase of the candidate tracking system and were working with Criminal Justice on vendors to outsource finger printing.

Dr. Massie indicated that they were working with CPME in developing more attractive recruitment materials and were trying to get corporate sponsorship for those materials. They still had a need for information systems development and for putting more of their functions on line.

Mr. Gary Levine explained that eliminating the personnel master file was their highest priority need. The personnel master file was a misnomer. It was a data base and was shared by Personnel, Payroll, and Insurance and Retirement. Eliminating it would take a lot of resources and time because it was so complex. However, when it was eliminated, it would enable Personnel to free up some resources. Replacing this 20-year old system would allow them to reduce their dependence on manual systems such as the salary cards. Right now the validation system for the personnel master file was limited in its ability to handle multiple transactions and was backed up for days. Their second highest priority was to get some functions on line to the schools. They wanted to see a candidate tracking system and a performance evaluation system on line using electronic forms. They would also like to use an imaging and document management system to get them closer to a paperless environment and an automated management system.

Ms. Georgia Johnson from Hughes said they could not say enough times that the personnel master file had to go. They needed to make sure they had enough resources in place to phase this out by July of 1996. The sole purpose of the file was to pay MCPS staff, and it was not a management or information tool and certainly not an effective use of resources. The real users of Personnel's services were the principals, and they needed to be better served by getting on line.

Ms. Barbara Humpton, IBM Federal Systems Company, stated that her group was total quality management. This past year the Office of Planning, Technology and Supportive Services had assessed themselves, established a baseline, and were implementing their own version of TQM. In spite of a significant change in leadership in the office, she felt they were still making progress in TQM. Their next steps included working with the Maryland Center for Quality and Productivity. Ms. Humpton extended their support to the work to help Board members in training with TQM.

Ms. Gutierrez asked if any thought had been given to reaching out to principals and administrators. Ms. Humpton replied that while she had not been involved, she had heard that Gaithersburg High School was now using TQM.

Mr. Bowers recalled that at the superintendent's retreat they had discussed issues related to strategic planning and TQM. Dr. Tom Tuttle of the Maryland Center for Quality and Productivity would be working with the MCPS leadership team, and meetings would continue throughout the spring.

Mr. Bowers stated that the next topic was financial management, and he introduced his partner, Mr. William Youngblood, NationsBank. He explained that most aspects of the work going on to eliminate the personnel master file were actually in the area of financial management related to payroll including leaves, temporary payroll and substitute payroll and issues related to insurance and retirement. They had a significant effort in place with a deadline of July, 1996 to eliminate that system. They had discussed some of the broader issues of technology including imaging and document management, and many offices were interested in this. They would love to shift over to imaging, but they needed a systemwide plan to do this because payroll, personnel, and insurance and retirement were tied together. As they moved forward with their quality management planning, they planned to develop functional teams across the organization which went way beyond technology.

Mr. Youngblood said he would stress the importance of phasing out the personnel master file. They thought that once this had been done MCPS would become more effective and efficient. He said they had looked into the number of reports required by the school system to be submitted to local, state, and federal agencies. They had put together a project team with representatives from MCPS, CPME, MSDE, and other school systems. They met with members of Congress and the state superintendent of schools, and they were able to secure some funds to look at reporting and how it could be consolidated and automated. They recently received the first draft of the KPM, and it was not clear how much cutting back MCPS could do. They did know that some school systems were more efficient in handling grants and the budget process. Mr. Youngblood reported that they would have further recommendations for the Board on this topic. He commended MCPS staff for their cooperation and looked forward to a continuing and positive relationship.

Mr. Giles Benson, director of the Division of Materials Management, stated that the next topic was logistics. They were already successful, but it was a multiyear project. They had looked at procurement, accounting, warehouse, inventory management, maintenance, transportation, and fixed assets. Last June they implemented the first phase of the logistics program. Now all office supplies and magazine subscriptions were ordered on line at all locations. On May 1, all schools would be able to order all their textbooks on line, and by the end of the summer all warehouse supplies should be on line. He hoped that by this time next year he would be able to tell the Board that schools would have access on line to all contracts approved by the Board.

Mr. Benson noted that logistics was a prime example of continuous improvement. They took suggestions from employees and staff was empowered to make some decisions. He felt that they had created a process improvement team and that his staff would continually question why something was done the way it was done. They wanted to be proactive and provide the support to other programs. He emphasized that training was extremely important, and it was time consuming. The logistics training had been done by the development team, procurement, and warehouse staff.

Mrs. Gordon asked whether everyone had to use on line ordering or whether purchase orders could still be submitted. Mr. Benson replied that if people were resistant they would work to train these people. In regard to office supplies, this summer if the orders came in manually his staff entered them, but there was a cutoff date. Now they had electronic data exchange with vendors, and when the person in the school placed the order it went directly to the vendor.

Mr. Brian Porter, director of the Department of Information, explained that one of the recommendations of the CPME was the development of a more focused process for both external and internal communications. This was also one of the Board's action areas, and it would be the subject of a Board discussion this spring. They were looking at how MCPS could disseminate information in a more effective way, and the Board was interested in looking at offices beyond the Department of Information. The superintendent had asked him to take a much broader view of communications in the school system.

Mr. Porter stated that they had thought that the Information Department would benefit from an on-line automated telephone system, but based on the experiences of Personnel, Information did not plan to implement this in the near future. They thought they had a workable plan for crisis communications, but when they took a closer look at this, they discovered things they were not doing. They now had a specific plan.

Mr. Porter reported that at the moment his office was short staffed. One staff member had resigned, and the editor of the Bulletin would be moving to North Carolina. He was now working to fill those positions.

Mr. Porter said that in early January they were brought on line with First Class. They had an MCPS information conference folder, and they were attaching and downloading documents to this. There had been a tremendous outpouring of support for this effort. Hundreds of individuals were using the documents in PTA newsletters and in principals' newsletters.

Mr. Felton asked whether the internship program was exclusive to the universities listed. Mr. Porter replied that it was not an exclusive list, rather it was an attempt to find out the extent to which an internship could be initiated and maintained. He was discouraged by what he had learned because of the amount of training he would have to provide to the intern. However, he had not given up on the idea.

Mr. Theodore Urban, Ferris, Baker & Watts, explained that there had been a reorganization in the Department of Educational Accountability that better identified the functions performed by DEA staff. DEA was responsible for forms and records and for auditing; however, there was one area of DEA that received the most attention. In many ways, DEA was the face of MCPS. The reports that it prepared, the surveys it

designed, the tests it administered, and the analyses it completed formed the public's perception of the school system's progress.

Mr. Urban said that when they looked at DEA in 1993 they realized that many of the evaluations they did should be serving as critical management tools for the Board and even the Council in terms of budgetary decisions. One of the most important challenges to DEA would be how well it could maintain some flexibility in using its evaluation tools. Many of the functions performed by DEA were mandatory, and DEA had very little time left to do research for the superintendent and the Board.

Mr. Urban recalled that a year ago he had discussed the question of how they used all the data that DEA had. One of the concerns was the question of using that data to evaluate teachers. Given the wealth of data, was there a way to measure the performance of teachers, particularly as it related to student performance in fulfilling the objectives of Success for Every Student? He was pleased to see a first step in that evaluation process in the Board's proposed budget.

Mr. Shulman noted that the last topic was strategic planning. He introduced Mr. Paul Blumhardt, Martin Marietta Corporation.

Mr. Blumhardt commented that MCPS managers did an excellent job of planning, and Success for Every Student was the appropriate central planning document. MCPS had two important long-range challenges to deal with. They had a growing student population that was becoming much more diverse. They had a need to transition instruction systems to provide students with the knowledge and foundation required to find and hold a good job in tomorrow's workplace. In 1950 less than 20 percent of the workforce were professionals, and by the year 2000, 40 percent of the employees would be professionals.

Mr. Blumhardt noted that the MCPS planning process had impediments particularly when it came to implementing innovative programs that required multiyear funding. He cited the all-day kindergarten situation which had been identified as a critical area of unmet need, and he reported that loss of the program in 27 schools and their request for a six-year expansion which had just been denied by the county executive. In addition, global access had been curtailed in the county executive's budget. The reasons for the denials were affordability and insufficient information.

Mr. Blumhardt also cited a 1991 effort for major technology planning which included a six-year plan. That plan had been cut back in scope because of budget losses. Then in 1993, the Board adopted a policy which led to the development of global access. He wondered whether this latest attempt to infuse technology into the schools would also be emasculate in the context of lack of affordability.

In regard to all-day kindergarten, Mr. Blumhardt stated that the benefits of jump starting

education programs with early education was well documented. The cost of expanding the all-day program was very small compared to the overall size of the budgets for MCPS. He asked if they could continue to assign a low priority to this area. The same was true with information technology. The third annual report on outcome measures for the Success for Every Student plan showed that county student continued to make substantial progress in meeting academic standards particularly in the areas of scholastic achievement related to advanced educational placement. He reported that in many leading universities two-thirds of the students came from families that owned personal computers. Two years ago the state superintendent appointed a commission to study technology, and they recommended that \$150 million be spent over the next five years to ensure access to technology among all learners in the state.

Mr. Blumhardt said they had been asked to discuss the original CPME report with several members of the County Council. In each discussion, the issue of the potential impact of information technology on the county agencies was discussed. It was obvious that limited resources had been devoted to examining such needs. Maryland did not have a plan, but Virginia had just completed its initial six-year technology plan and was working on a new initiative to help schools put more computers in the classroom.

Mr. Blumhardt believed that there was a serious disconnect between the capital and the operating planning and budgeting process. Budgets were usually structured to fit the vision and goals of the management, but in the county the budget process was the antecedent. Management built its plans, but independent evaluators and auditors determined what was or was not affordable. The affordability issues coincided with items that were easy to reduce or eliminate rather than on what the priorities of the organization should be.

Mr. Ewing commented that planning was what one did to achieve the goals adopted by an organization. Once a vision was established, planning was the process of making some rational choices among alternatives to move the organization toward the vision. In a political setting, the choices adopted by the Board of Education were not always shared by the people making the funding decisions. This might be due to defects in the process, but it was also due to the fact that political people had agendas they did not always reveal. These had to do with winning the next election and getting their names in the headlines. School Board members were not exempt from those considerations either. The problem was that rational planning in governmental settings was far more difficult than a great many people understood.

Mr. Ewing stated that until the economy changed or the membership on the Council changed they might never get money for all-day kindergarten no matter what kind of case they made for it as long as there were people on the Council who thought all-day kindergarten was babysitting. He had worked on this issue for 15 years and admitted

to having failed to convince Council members. Early childhood education had an enormous effect on all children, but the Council found witnesses on the other side of the issue. Under those circumstances, no amount of rational planning helped. He agreed they should continue to establish visions and develop strategic plans to accomplish that vision, but he thought that entrenched political opinion might be so strong on some issues that they could not overcome it.

Mr. Blumhardt said that he saw this, but he did not understand it. He had looked at the most recent election where the conservative viewpoint had been so prevalent throughout the country, except in Montgomery County. While he did not want to pay more taxes, he believed the election showed that the county wanted first class services and was willing to pay for it. All-day kindergarten was perhaps half a percent of the total budget. When they looked at the cost of educating children once they were in the fifth grade on up. In today's environment, once a child got beyond that fifth they did not have a lot of choice. If that person could not get a good job, the person might have to be supported in some other way. Therefore, the investment in early childhood education was minuscule.

Mr. Shulman believed that it was important to get the message across on all-day kindergarten and technology. If the message was not getting across, they had to look at what they could do to improve communications and educate people. He believed very strongly in the system they had in Maryland where the decisions were split, but he agreed that in some instances they would not succeed. He said there were three things that were of major concern when budgets were being cut. The first was training because nothing was more important to the school system than training, and every time it was cut the school system suffered. The second was the stops and starts and deferral of projects, and the third was the information technology piece which pervaded the entire system.

Mr. Shulman stated that the Board had a standing offer for a course in total quality management so that they would be better able to understand these views. He noted that CPME had been in existence for over two years, and while they did not know where it was going to end, they knew it was going to end. If they believed CPME to be of value, the Board, the superintendent, or someone else needed to pick it up. He did not think the relationship would continue to exist unless there was an infrastructure. They would be happy to explore this with the Board.

On behalf of the Board, Mrs. Gordon thanked them all for their efforts. The Board had made some clear decisions on the direction it wanted to go in. They had a subcommittee on long-range planning. They had been working with Bruce Crispell in that area, and they understood the need to move forward. She was sure that Mr. Ewing, as chair of the subcommittee, would want to discuss their offer of assistance. The Board had been invited to participate with executive staff on strategic planning and total quality management, and three Board members had been able to attend. They

were looking forward to moving as a system, and they would appreciate any assistance CPME could provide them.

Mrs. Gordon did not want to see the concept of the corporate partnership end because it had played such an immensely important role. The Board needed to discuss this, and this would be one of things they considered as they looked at the strategic plan. She was committed to following through on the things they had discussed. She saw the value in what they had accomplished, but she understood there was far more that they needed to do.

RESOLUTION NO. 139-95 Re: ADJOURNMENT

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. King seconded by Ms. Gutierrez, the following resolution was adopted unanimously by members present:

Resolved, That the Board of Education adjourn its meeting at 11 p.m.

PRESIDENT

SECRETARY

PLV:mlw