

aware of the distinct differences in the learning styles of students, they were becoming aware there were varied learning styles for employees. This was a greater challenge for the organization to train employees for the changes required.

Dr. Vance observed that they were at a disadvantage when it came to teaching their employees. For an educational system priding itself on having one of the finest instructional programs for children in the United States, they had an extremely limited training program for adults working for the school system. They did not have the appropriate resources to do otherwise. Much of the training now received by staff was in the form of decentralized programs initiated and directed at the local level.

The System-wide Training Unit and the School Improvement Training Unit handled distinct areas of important systemwide responsibility that built upon the initiatives of local schools and departments. MCPS did three kinds of training. The first was training based on local school initiatives, the second was training based on school system initiatives, and the third was training required by local, state, and federal mandates. Tonight they would focus on system-wide training efforts and how local schools received and utilized their own funds. There was considerable research in the literature on models of staff development that guided them. They knew there were four major issues that continued to need their on-going attention. The first was coaching and mentoring among employees, the second was the use of technology as part of the global access initiative, the third was finding and securing training facilities that were appropriate for specific program and technology requirements, and the fourth was their busy schedules and overworked educational platter. The busy schedule allowed very little opportunity to employees for their own professional development.

Dr. Joseph Villani, associate superintendent, stated that each associate superintendent would give a brief overview of training in relation to his or her own unit. Each of them had a responsibility for training and would explain how they did training. When they went to the decentralized model, they went with a model that attempted to recognize and energize the tremendous talent they had in the local schools and in their offices. Instead of training being directed from the central office, their model provided coaching, support, and structuring for schools and offices to do their own training. It was based on the belief that the best training was that to which the unit had commitment.

Dr. Villani stated that within OIPD in addition to the School Improvement Training Unit staff they had extensive training carried out by that staff responsible for all the academic areas, the community and staff support area, and media and technology.

Everyone in his unit at some time during the year did training because they had to provide training to implement programs.

Dr. Elfreda Massie, associate superintendent, commented that a lot of the training they did stemmed from local, state, and federal mandates as well as from local school improvement plans and systemwide priorities. Some of the topics included basic reading skills, Americans with Disabilities, safety and security, first aid, special education initiatives, supervisory skills, gender equity, and cultural diversity. They worked with all groups of employees because some of the training was targeted for supporting services, some for student teachers, some for people aspiring to be administrators, and some for teacher groups. Both units managed processes to support credit and non-credit training, course reimbursement, student teacher placement, internships, and partnerships with universities. They were also actively involved with interagency training through the county governments and with universities and businesses. In addition, they had a teacher education center functioning through the University of Maryland.

Dr. Hiawatha Fountain, associate superintendent, stated that Special and Alternative Education had worked closely with the State Department of Education and the federal government on new initiatives and new laws. This past year they had been doing a lot of work around least restrictive environment. In February they had offered LRE training to the all building administrators, and 57 administrators took advantage of the training. They offered training in ADD, ADHD, the revised policy, ADA, 504, and SED.

Dr. Phinnize Fisher, associate superintendent, reported that this was their second year of working to put a plan together on school improvements plans. The schools focused on priorities for the year based on their analysis of data, and their plans were turned into the Office of School Administration. OSA looked at the plan and worked with the staffs of Dr. Villani, Dr. Massie, and Dr. Fountain to collaborate on how the schools could use the money from their training to select appropriate in-service. They had provided the Board with information on the supports offered and an example of a spending plan. The principals and the school improvement teams looked at what they wanted to buy and used their money to purchase substitutes, consultants, and other needs. She had also provided the Board with examples of the training. OSA went through every individual management plan to determine the training needs, and a meeting was held to determine the best way to deliver training to schools. They did the training on a school basis, a cluster basis, and countywide.

Mrs. Karolyn Rohr, coordinator of the Systemwide Training Unit, stated that they were providing training on many priorities as well as local, state, and federal laws and mandates. They did

this through pre-service, in-service, leadership and career development, and university and business partnerships. She offered an example of the training they did. If Board members went to a school they would see a bus driver who had just completed training about Success for Every Student. They might see a security assistant who had just completed a training program in non-violent crisis intervention and earlier in the year first aid/CPR training. The school secretary had just finished a training program in computerized financial management as well as a program on telephone skills. On weekends that secretary might take classes at a nearby college for which she received tuition reimbursement. In the building they would see a new teacher who took modules in the summer on curriculum and classroom management and continued to take modules throughout the year on interdisciplinary instruction. A veteran teacher was continuing his education with a teleconference on attention deficit disorder. He also was receiving tuition reimbursement to meet his recertification requirements. The instructional assistant worked part-time in the classroom and was in a program to receive her master's in teaching and credentials as a teacher. The building services manager had recently taken a class in evaluating the work performance of employees. The Board would meet the new principal who attended monthly evening meetings with other new principals. She also participated in on-going networking and problem solving, and last month she attended an A&S meeting which focused on sexual harassment. At a staff meeting, the entire staff would see a video on the Americans with Disabilities Act to help them understand the provisions of the new law.

Ms. Carolyn Franklin, staff development specialist, explained that she worked with support staff. There were 6,800 support staff in MCPS working in 358 different job classifications. These people ranged from those with entry level skills to those with master's degrees; however, they all had one thing in common. They needed training to be more effective in their jobs. Many people worked their way up through the system to find themselves as supervisors needing training to lead people, to get commitments from people, and to make continuous improvement in their work. MCPS did provide about six different programs for supervisory training. They also provided basic reading skills for employees. In the last eight years, 102 employees from 24 different job categories learned how to read. They had discovered that most people taking the training were parents of children in MCPS.

Ms. Franklin commented that they worked with different units in the system such as security, transportation, maintenance, and food services to provide the training needed by those units. They offered tuition reimbursement of 50 percent for training that was not offered by MCPS. She recognized the support staff

in the audience who were attending the meeting to show their support for training.

Mrs. Rohr reported that since the fall of 1988 MCPS had been involved in the creative initiatives in teacher education (CITE) a partnership with the University of Maryland. Ms. Marta Duarte graduated from the second group in 1992, and she was now at Cashell ES as a fifth grade teacher.

Ms. Duarte explained that CITE was initiated to increase the cultural diversity of the teaching staff in the county. She had been working as an instructional assistant when she learned about the program. CITE helped her earn a master's degree in education and allowed her to begin a new career in an elementary school classroom. CITE allowed her the opportunity to apprentice with an experienced teacher and to apply all the new strategies she was learning. This integration of classroom and academic experiences facilitated a fluent transition from student to teacher. It also offered a multicultural approach which was now present in every aspect of her work.

Ms. Duarte said she also wanted to highlight the new teacher training program. The best college program could not prepare a teacher for the moment he or she was assigned a specific class. For her, this was manageable thanks to the new teacher training program. They provided a week of training prior to the school year as well as follow up meetings. These sessions offered curriculum review and brain-storming sessions for problem solving. She had also received training in AIDS/Teaching and Prevention and Family Life. Through an arrangement between Trinity College and Cashell ES she had taken a MAC computer course. It was her firm belief this training had contributed to the quality of her work.

Ms. LaVerne Kimball, an elementary principal trainee at Burning Tree ES, said the principal trainee program was designed to prepare people for the principalship. The on-the-job training model was an excellent one which enabled her to assume the responsibilities and role of the principal. The program was individualized to meet her needs, and her principal worked with her on a daily basis to assess her abilities and provide her with increased responsibilities. The second part of the training program she liked was the diversity which enabled her to increase her network of professional contacts within the school system. The training for interns started in the summer and continued throughout the school year. There was a supervisory team consisting of high level administrators who helped the trainees analyze and understand issues.

Ms. Kimball reported that she also participated in other training activities through A&S training including cluster meetings and OSA meetings. The third aspect of the training program was the

opportunity to fly solo and run the school for a three-month period. While she was acting principal of Burning Tree, her principal was also engaged in professional growth opportunities that would benefit him and the school. Finally, she felt that because of the intensity of the program she felt confident and prepared to handle the challenges and demands of being a principal in Montgomery County.

Ms. Kitty Blumsack, coordinator of the School Improvement Training Unit, stated that for two years her unit had been collaborating with the office of Enriched and Innovative Instruction. This was a dissemination effort to share the magnet program practices. She introduced Mrs. Gayle Mollet and Ms. Ruth Sernak.

Ms. Sernak acknowledged the efforts of teachers in the Blair cluster magnets, the Richard Montgomery International Baccalaureate Program, the Poolesville Global Ecology Program, and the Einstein Visual Arts Center. She and Mrs. Mollet had approached this new type of training with some key ideas in mind. They wanted to give teachers a chance to be in charge of their own professional development, to be trained in a conference setting, and to hear from experts in the field. They asked magnet teachers and special program staff to provide specific effective practices, units, and programs to non-magnet staff members which could be replicated and regular schools. They were also asked to share extension and enrichment activities for gifted and talented students. They planned to have 11 different conferences, but for this evening they would focus on the elementary computer conference, the middle school ecology stream study, and the best practices conferences for each level. A total of 375 teachers were allocated professional leave to attend these conferences. All conferences were to provide in-depth knowledge, use and practice in four areas which included using technology, designing minds-on/hands-on learning activities, making interdisciplinary connections, and building a community of learners.

Mrs. Mollet reported that the first practice was using technology. At the high school level, they held three separate all-day training sessions on the Internet which provided 74 teachers with the opportunity to access the information superhighway. Blair magnet staff taught teachers to telecommunicate from school to school. The training introduced teachers to an array of national and international resources available to them and their students.

At the elementary school level, the technology focus extended the use of the computer beyond word processing. Over 100 teachers and principals from 26 elementary schools attended the conference at Pine Crest. Staff learned about math/science problem solving, data analysis, new software available in MCPS, distance learning,

and telecommunicating from school to school. The second area which was shared at every conference was sharing units and activities for minds-on/hands-on activities. The Takoma Park magnet staff conducted an ecology stream study training for 25 math and science teachers from 12 middle schools. Teachers collected and tested water and other samples and then went back to the classroom to use the computer to analyze data. The third area was the integration of curriculum because a major concern of education was helping students make meaningful connections with the content they were learning. Staff from 13 middle schools participated in the middle school conference which highlighted the best magnet practices in integrating math and science. Staff explored artifacts and primary documents, they build robots, and they constructed foil boats. Staff left this conference with interdisciplinary lessons from the magnet and IB programs to use in their classrooms, enrichment activities, art and creative writing, and history and literature.

Mrs. Mollet said that looking at the report for America 2000 and recognizing the need for people to be able to work collaboratively, they wanted to plan training that reduced teacher isolation and increased shared learning. They wanted to create a community of learners, and they built in time for teachers to share and network with each other, and this was the number one comment they received from teachers when the program was evaluated. They highlighted MCPS partnerships with local businesses and universities, and they encouraged teachers to use magnet and special program staff as contacts and resources. The teachers appreciated the technology training, the minds-on/hands-on activities, integrated lessons and units to take back to the classroom, and the time to network with each other.

In addition to the best practices activities, they held five-day summer training for middle school interdisciplinary teams. They disseminated 25 ready-to-use interdisciplinary units to the middle schools. They trained principal focus groups on how to support interdisciplinary teams and how to observe and coach teachers in the practice of differentiation. They disseminated 12 ecology stream study packets which had been prepared by participants. They also provided training for the middle school math team coaches.

For next year, they planned to offer additional best practices conferences. They were planning a Saturday conference to disseminate effective non-magnet school practices, and they hoped to include colleagues from surrounding counties. Finally they would be getting into video and cable television productions.

Ms. Blumsack introduced Mr. Jay Headman, principal of Churchill High School, a master teacher, a master learner, and a master principal. Mr. Headman commented that even though the restructured training program had meant more work for the local

staff, he supported the concept. He believed that staff training programs should be school focused, be on-going, provide something practical, and have follow-ups and support.

Mr. Headman stated that during the past two years his staff had been provided with many different forms of training. This evening he would focus on training in Dimensions of Learning, specifically Dimension five, productive habits of mind. Most of their funds had gone to this training for substitutes to allow teachers to be trained. Last year he and two resource teachers had attending a training workshop, and after that the three of them ran a half-day in-service program on Dimensions of Learning. This was followed up at their next in-service day which was run by staff trainers. The second workshop was different because his staff let him know that the first program did not provide them with enough practical ideals and strategies. They wanted training from people with more expertise. This year they had changed the format so that 10-15 teachers would participate in a full-day workshop where they could create lesson plans. A month later they had a follow-up meeting with the teachers. They had already run three workshops this year and planned to complete the training for all their teachers by the end of next year. There would be a workshop for resource teachers and administrators this summer so that during classroom observations they would be able to foster the use of the strategies teachers had learned. This helped with their school plan for next year with its focus on technology. Ms. Blumsack had been working with them to establish a kick-off meeting in August and training for the next school year. He supported the restructured staff development program because it gave schools the opportunity to focus its training on school needs.

Ms. Blumsack introduced Ms. Kathy Brake, principal of Washington Grove ES, and Ms. Sue McGregor, training specialist. She explained that they would have a kick-off for all the technology prototype schools so that all schools would have the same training. She also introduced Dr. Mary Helen Smith, director of the Department of Student, Community, and Staff Support, and Dr. Benjamin Marlin, director, school administration.

Ms. Brake said she would be talking about the training specialist in the role of consultant. Principals could use the specialist as a sounding board and as someone who would look at their data and help focus priorities, objectives, and resources. It helped to have someone who was knowledgeable about the school management plan and who could see a variety of effective training models being implemented in other schools. As she became more settled in her role of principal, she wanted to increase the effectiveness of her own school staff development committee. The School Improvement Training Unit invited her committee to a three-day training session in June where her staff would learn about effective training designs for use with adult learners.

She was interested in examining creative ways to implement her school improvement plan. She was looking at peer coaching as a technique to improve the use of technology in her building. Next year a training specialist would work with pairs of teachers to enhance their collaboration skills and bring about positive changes in technology in the classroom. Ms. McGregor was also working with the Gaithersburg cluster schools to design cluster-wide training. Ms. Brake felt they were fortunate to have Ms. McGregor to coordinate that training concept.

Ms. McGregor reported that the School Improvement Training Unit used a model where the training specialist worked with a cluster of schools. This year she had worked on several different cluster-wide training events. For several years the Gaithersburg cluster had had a common vision for its students and cluster-wide goals based on data received from their middle and high schools. This year the principals wanted cluster-wide training in math for the elementary teachers to culminate their two-year involvement in the math content connections programs. The principals wanted a national speaker followed by grade level worksessions. Each principal provided substitute time of one-half day for a teacher representative to meet with her. At that meeting they developed a year-long project which focused teacher instruction on connecting math with other curricular areas. A nationally known speaker and author from Boston University spoke to the assembled teachers about math connections. After the speaker, grade level teachers met and shared the units they had developed.

Ms. McGregor said she had also worked with another cluster on math, but here the topic was more open ended. The principals wanted to increase the communication between upper elementary and middle school math teachers, and they wanted to meet the expressed needs of teachers during any cluster-wide training. She worked with representatives from each school, gathered data, and designed the training. The training incorporated the request of teachers to have time to examine and copy effective ideas.

Ms. McGregor commented that there were several challenges in large scale training. The first was finding a facility that could accommodate 200 to 400 people and their cars. Schools had to allocate some of their staff development funds for the sessions, and these funds might be used to pay a speaker or provide materials for participants. There needed to be coordination with other academic departments. Someone had to coordinate this whole process by finding a facility, arrange for the set-up, write the confirming memos, develop the timelines for the principals to share with their staffs, arrange for speakers, train grade level facilitators, oversee registration and evaluation procedures, and compile the feedback to assure that future training continued to reflect the needs of teachers.

Dr. Smith stated that there were several challenges they had identified with their new staff development efforts. One of the ones was the facility issue. They had many different training programs ranging from hour-long meetings with large numbers of participants to multiple day trainings. In September they had identified over 1700 meetings or trainings that would be taking place during the course of the school year. They used the University of Maryland at Shady Grove and Johns Hopkins frequently. They used the Smith Center, community centers, school auditoriums, school cafeterias, school classrooms, and meeting rooms at business and industry sites. The ideal would be to have a dedicated training site, but the problem was that the school population was growing and space was needed to house students.

Dr. Marlin said he would like to talk about helping administrators deal with their changing roles. In the last four or five years the changes had been monumental with downsizing. He suggested they needed to develop training on managing change because the system had not looked into this. They had coaching now as a means of dealing with the role of principal, but if the coaching were not effective they were compounding ignorance. He thought that the idea of using summers for training was very effective because people did not have to worry about what was happening back in the school. He recalled that they used to do retreats off-site, and while this was expensive he thought they should explore this again because people were more relaxed in that atmosphere.

Dr. Marlin thought they should be looking at offering voluntary seminars to share ideas. If they shared ideas, when people went back to their schools they did not feel they were the "lone ranger." This was a very challenging time, and principals were expected to do more. He suggested they look at what they were doing and how they were doing in regards to time management and what the expectations were at all levels of the school system.

Dr. Smith stated that another challenge was expanding the use of technology to extend the impact of training. They were now using cable television as a vehicle to provide training. They had a program called, "Teacher to Teacher," that was broadcast once a month. This program ran during a time when schools could use it as part of a staff meeting. They had done shows on preparing for MSPAP, parent/teacher conferences, school improvement management plan, and other timely topics. The tapes of these meetings could also be used at a staff meeting during the course of the year.

Dr. Smith reported that they were using technology for something called a consultant showcase. People came in and did a 15- to 20-minute information session on video tape, and schools could select a speaker or trainer from these videos. Dr. Smith said their challenge was to become more and more able to use that

technology so that they could provide more information to schools in a timely fashion as well as provide models for how to use the technology. She noted that nationally almost one in five teachers was 50 or over, and these individuals did not grow up with technology. She had found out that MCPS had a large number of teachers in the one to eight years experience and another large group with 20 to 26 years of experience, and the kinds of training these people were very different.

Dr. Marlin stated that they did a lot of training during the school day by using substitutes. He thought they needed to continue on that vein of the think tank idea of staff coming in and brain storming. They knew MCPS would not get any additional funds for training and would have to be creative with the funds they had. They could go back to a full day of in-service as opposed to the half day. A creative thing to do would be to set aside time for teachers to shadow a student and follow that child's schedule. When this had been done, staff members had come back with lots of ideas. This did not cost a lot of money and was most effective. They could exchange staff across grade levels and take an elementary teacher to the middle school for a day or two and the middle school teacher to the elementary school. If a teacher had always been a ninth grade teacher, he or she could move up a grade and teach something else. These were quick ways of getting a snapshot of what was going on. This would bring on other needs for in-service and training. A lot of schools were now devoting a half hour of in-service at every staff meeting to share ideas. This was most effective and, once again, did not cost a lot of money. He thought they needed to get people together who were willing to be creative and think differently.

Mrs. Fanconi thanked the staff for a fascinating presentation. She wished that Board members could attend some of the training sessions.

Mrs. Gordon also thanked staff for an excellent presentation. She was pleased to see there were so many different kinds of training going on, and there seemed to be a much more concerted effort to work together. She and Mrs. Brenneman had raised the issue of supporting services training. She was pleased to see so many people in the audience who had received training, but she still had some concerns about the staff training at the local schools. This training was frequently done in half-day session or perhaps at a staff meeting afterschool, and frequently supporting services employees worked part-time and were not there when the training was being offered. She asked how this was being addressed in the local schools. In several of the handouts the Board received, there was an indication that the training was for all staff, and she would like to know what was meant by "all" staff.

Dr. Fisher replied that for instructional assistants they had modules, and beginning this summer they would be attending week-long modules on interdisciplinary instruction. They were also including the Chapter 1 assistants in this training. For the instructional support, if these people could not be included in the training during the school day, they would be provided with special training in the summer.

Mrs. Gordon noted that they were looking at the model where they trained trainers who went into the building in a collaborative effort; however, if they were doing that at a time when part of staff was not available for training, this was not truly a collaborative effort. She pointed out that a tremendous amount of money was spent on substitute time, and perhaps they needed to look at substitute time for supporting services staff or some model that would allow them to participate when everyone else on the staff was receiving training. Dr. Fisher replied that they would be focusing on this next.

Mrs. Brenneman thought staff had made a very good presentation. She heard what they said they were doing, but when she asked a bus driver about training, he did not know anything about training. The same thing was true of the secretaries she had talked to. She did not know how systematic training efforts were.

Mrs. Brenneman had heard about dissemination of the lessons learned from the magnets and the hope that this training would be taken back to the schools. She asked about the effectiveness of training and how they knew the training was carried on in the classrooms. She asked whether this was the most effective way of training staff. Was cable television an effective way? How did they know what was working and if teachers were using this information in the classroom?

Dr. Villani replied that the training process and the supervisory evaluation process were interactive, but they were not the same. When they did training, it was for the purpose of enhancing performance on the job or in the classroom. Whether the performance is appropriate to the job requirements was a function not of the training but of the supervisory process that went on in the staff evaluation process. Frequently in the evaluation process the supervisor would recommend or direct training to persons. The follow-up to that recommendation in evaluation was that next time the evaluation came up, it would be a matter for the evaluator to monitor the person's performance.

Mrs. Brenneman recalled that when the Board looked at the characteristics for new principals there was often a discrepancy between what the staff wanted and what the community wanted. She wondered about community input into the school management plans and in what schools asked for regarding training. She asked

whether there was collaboration between the schools and the community regarding training. Dr. Fisher said they required all administrators to have parental involvement and participation in the development of the management plan, but she could not speak to the level of involvement in all schools. The community and staff members participated and decided what the priorities would be for the coming year. OSA now required the names of the participants on school improvement management plans to assure parental involvement at the beginning level, and then they made sure information was shared with the entire community and staff after the development process. She felt they had worked very hard in terms of collaboration with communities and staff.

Ms. Gutierrez congratulated staff on the enormous progress they had made in this area. The concept had proven to be a good one because they were able to address specific needs as well as systemwide needs. She also liked seeing the list of alphabetical courses now aligned with their priorities, but she hoped that the list would get a little longer. In her own work they tried to focus on employee training and came up with a policy of so many hours per year per employee. Her company identified core needs, and she saw MCPS doing this, but it was not as clear as it might be. For example, they might state that at elementary school there would be a certain core training that everyone should have. She felt it would be helpful to have a definition of some key core training that everyone had. In her company they knew it was important to keep good records, and they developed a training profile for each employee. This helped them measure how well they were meeting their commitment to training. MCPS should be able to say that after a six-month period, they had been able to achieve a certain level of training against their target. They should be able to show how many hours and how many people they had trained. They might want to show numbers of teachers trained per school or training hours per staff on an annual basis. She suggested that they needed to capture as much information as possible in their evaluation. If they did have more statistics, they could be more accountable with their results.

Ms. Gutierrez said they had talked about the very exciting things they were doing with magnet schools. A portion of their Saturday conference was to go to non-magnet classes, and they would be doing similar training next year. She suggested that the same kind of training be provided for classes that were not for the gifted and talented. They should be exposing as many classes and as many teachers to those techniques. Enrichment helped the needy child as well as the gifted child.

Ms. Gutierrez noted that high schools were having more and more disciplinary and safety problems. Staff had commented that many teachers had been trained in another generation where attitudes and behaviors were not necessarily the ones teachers were seeing today. They need to go beyond conflict resolution and teach

teachers how to manage disruption in the classroom. One principal had invited Tony Paul to talk to teachers about handling discipline. This could easily be expanded to some courses. In the professional world, she knew there was an outward bound for teachers. It might be useful to use the Smith Center to include a dimension of outward bound.

In regard to Dr. Gordon's comments, Ms. Gutierrez said he had suggested changing attitudes and behaviors, but they were still not hitting some of those more difficult attitudes and behaviors. She suggested strengthening this aspect of MCPS training. As they were making more progress in TQM, they might look at training in specific uses of process improvements, particularly in operations and supporting services. They could do quantitative methods and statistics and probability. In addition to telephone skills, she thought supportive services employees could benefit from some training in multiculturalism. She explained that her comments were meant not as criticism but as positive support for what she saw going on.

Mr. Ewing commented that he was a strong supporter of staff development, and he was particularly enthusiastic about the efforts that had been described this evening. He was pleased to see the continuous emphasis both on systemwide and local school efforts. He believed that they ought to expand their efforts further. It was true as Dr. Marlin stated that they had not been able to find much additional money for staff development. He thought they needed to find some additional resources because they had to recognize that an effective training and development program for an increasingly large staff in a time when demands were rising would take more resources than they presently had. The Board had identified this as one of the areas of unmet needs, and they asked for additional money; however, the County Council had selected this as an area where increases might not be forthcoming. He would like them to think about what they might do to make it clearer what the meaning was of what they were doing and why the Council should support it.

Mr. Ewing pointed out that the Department of Defense was able to continue to enjoy substantial support in the Congress in part because it was able to articulate a clear mission. The mission was "to be ready." To be ready it took training money. This was really all a peace time army did, it trained and it trained all the time. It was able to articulate its mission in terms of training more effectively than any other organization in America. Public schools were less able to persuade funding authorities that training was part of their mission. He thought that there must be more they could do to get the resources they needed.

Mr. Ewing said that this evening they had learned about how MCPS did training. He thought they needed to figure out for purposes of letting others know, how it was they decided to do what it was

they did and what results they expected and how those results were related to student learning. This was not easy to do, but until they were able to do that, they would not be able to be as effective as other organizations in winning support for a training mission. He would hope that they could come back and talk about education and training in a series of dimensions, by school level (elementary, middle, and high school); by purpose (education, training); by policy (what Board policy was supported); and by describing the balance between school based and systemwide training (was the balance the right one). It seemed to him that the schools needed resources but at the same time the system needed to be clear about the fact that it had some priorities including local, state, and federal mandates. It should be made clear that these were not options, but rather requirements. They had run aground on the shoals of required training before, but they should not back off from that issue. They had to continue to explore what they wanted to do as a system and what they wanted to mandate. Dr. Gordon suggested they make training the mechanism to change attitudes.

Mr. Ewing was concerned about priorities because it was not clear to him from the presentation where the priorities lie. He thought they ought to move in the direction of deciding on the basis of staff recommendations what the priorities were. He was also interested in knowing what it was that was not getting done. While he was impressed by what was getting done, he would like to know what was not getting done and why and how they might remedy that. He felt they had a long distance to go in providing the training that elementary teachers needed in math and science. He would like to know how far they were with this and what else they needed to do in order to get there. This brought him to the next question of what was needed in order to get them where they needed to be and did they need something as formal as a strategic plan for staff development.

Mr. Ewing said that they needed to talk about results and how they measured them. If they were going to be accountable to the public for the funds they spent on staff development, they needed to be able to determine in some fashion what the results were. It was very difficult to measure the results of training, education, and staff development. In some areas they would have to say they could not measure, but in other areas they could say they trained a certain number of people to do certain tasks and they learned those tasks as evidence by subsequent job performance. This was important in order to be able to sell the staff development program for the future. Their next step was to show results and indicate how they could be accountable in order to be able to be effective persuaders of those who held the purse strings.

Dr. Cheung said he, too, was very impressed with the presentation this evening. He congratulated the superintendent and the staff

for their work in staff development and training. He agreed with most of the comments of his fellow Board members. He was a strong supporter of staff development. They were in the education business, in the information and knowledge business, and in the human resources development business because this was what the school system was all about. They were developing children by providing them with knowledge and skills. They also needed to offer to their staff an opportunity for training because the staff were their resources. In corporate America, the American Management Association stated that 3 percent of operating resources in an average company was invested in technology and 5 to 7 percent of their resources were invested in training. According to the MCPS budget, this would be \$40 million for training, but they did not even come close to this figure. He agreed with Mr. Ewing that they should convince the people holding the purse strings that staff development was important.

Dr. Cheung said that from the point of view of staff, training was work when it was based on priorities and mandates. They had to look at staff training from the point of view of individual development and growth. If they wanted to change behavior, they had to look at individual growth. They could not force an individual change. They could not expect staff to change, if the policy makers were not willing to accept change. He said they had to ask themselves if they were willing to and open to change in terms of modifying their behavior as well as their attitudes.

Dr. Cheung agreed that they needed an individual staff development plan for each staff member. It was important for them to know how they helped individual staff become better teachers, better bus operators, better staff assistants, and better secretaries. If they met staff needs, they would have a better staff. Therefore, they had to look at not just a strategic plan but also individual staff development plans. He had not heard about staff development of principals and supervisors at the higher level. They had conferences and meetings, but this was more in terms of multi-institutional management. If they were going to have more site-based management, they need to provide training in strategic thinking, planning, and management on a multi-institutional basis. There was a difference between managing an individual school versus multiple schools. He would like to see programs to help principals train for the associate superintendency and future superintendencies. He observed this evening that the best learners were those involved in teaching. They needed to get as many teaches as staff developers as possible to help others. Shadowing students and executive staff members was a good idea. He suggested that someone might like to follow a Board member around. He would be happy to arrange having someone come in to shadow him in the federal government.

Dr. Cheung recalled that the long-range planning task force had recommended a training institute. He thought this would be important to solve some of the problems about space and coordination. He thought they had the right approach in terms of what they were doing, but he wanted them to think about a strategic plan to use their resources in the best way to meet their goals and objectives.

Ms. Converse thanked staff for explaining what went on when students had a half day off. She was pleased about the broader objectives of discipline and technology, and it was great to hear that these were a focus for staff training. She had gone through the lists of the training programs, but she did not see but one course on extracurricular activities. Dr. Villani explained that they provided training for the athletic sponsors and coaches as part of their regular job responsibility; however, this was not listed because it was not really an option. This year they had provided in-service training on gender equity. They held meetings with debate and forensic coaches, but they did not do formal training.

Mrs. Fanconi was very pleased with the model. From her reading, she believed they were on the cutting edge. It was exciting to see they were doing the kinds of training that encouraged schools and teachers and individuals to come up with their own training needs and to assist them to meet those needs. It was unfortunate that they were forced to do this on a very narrow budget. They were not short of training ideas or trainers, but they were short of funds for substitute time. All of their teachers were in charge of students, and that person could not be taken away from the job without providing another body. Business did not have to replace that person.

Mrs. Fanconi thought that the model put the priorities on where the Board had set priorities. She heard a couple of themes. When they had the discussion about BEKS and about technology, they were talking about the need to have a place, a training school, where they could have staff come in and do training over a block of time. Fairfax had an elementary training school where they brought people in for technology training with students and computers. Now staff development was suggesting the same thing. It seemed to her they need to take the lead to show how all of this could mesh together and make that vision a reality. For example, the county government is looking at a convention center. She wondered if they had talked to the county about the school system's needs. If they had a facility that would be a training facility, how could MCPS get a piece of that? How could they get business and industry more involved in assisting MCPS in training? She challenged the superintendent and staff to put these things together to get the community to see the need for this and to assist them. Mr. Ewing had talked about the Education Foundation's raising some funds. She encouraged staff

to continue to work along these lines. She believed the Board was supportive and had a commitment to move forward in this and other areas.

Ms. Gutierrez applaud Dr. Marlin's comments and ideas about training in a different way. They might want to look at using television for afterschool courses for those who might volunteer. She pointed out that there was only one course on multicultural awareness and they had zero courses on dealing with the ESOL population.

*Mr. Abrams left the meeting during the staff development presentation.

RESOLUTION NO. 341-94 Re: AMENDMENTS TO THE POLICY ON
POLICYSETTING

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Mrs. Brenneman seconded by Dr. Cheung, the following resolution was adopted unanimously by members present:

WHEREAS, On April 14, 1994, the Board of Education discussed the assessment of policy implementation; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education received a paper describing the policy development process, the various ways that policy implementation is assessed including the use of the Department of Educational Accountability for topics that warrant in-depth study, and alternatives for improving the process; and

WHEREAS, There are several ways to assess policy implementation or identify policies for review including incorporating policy directives in management goals and budget statements, monitoring federal and state mandates, receiving feedback from staff and outside groups and/or committees, and monitoring complaint processes; and

WHEREAS, The superintendent of schools should include in policy analyses alternatives, implications for the alternatives, costs of implementing a policy, and realistic timelines; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education pointed out that it should focus on results and on articulating clearer objectives and outcomes that would help to assess implementation; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education should reflect significant policy issues in its Research and Evaluation Committee agenda; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education should relate policy directives to its annual review of budget items; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education agreed with the superintendent of schools' recommendation to use the "review and reporting" section in the policy on policymsetting to require reports that are designed to provide information that will help them know how the policy is being implemented, including information about what has been done to implement the policy, what does not seem to be working, and recommendations for changes to the policy if necessary; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education agreed with the superintendent of schools' recommendation to eliminate the three-year review cycle that is currently required in Policy BFA, Policyssetting; now therefore be it

Resolved, That Policy BFA, Policyssetting, be amended as shown on the following:

POLICYSETTING

A. PURPOSE

To establish a definition of policy and uniform format for policy development and implementation

B. ISSUE

State law provides that the county Board of Education, with the advice of the superintendent, determines the educational policies of the school system. Therefore, there should be a comprehensive and uniform process for policy analysis, formulation, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation.

C. POSITION

1. Definition

Policy is defined as principles adopted by resolution of the Board of Education to guide the development and implementation of educational programs and/or for management of the school system. (State laws, bylaws of the State Board of Education, and federal guidelines are, in effect, mandated policies.)

2. Policy development

- a) The superintendent and/or Board recognized the need for a policy and how it related to Board goals and objectives.
- b) The Board requests or receives a policy analysis from the superintendent and staff on the need for a new policy or new directions for existing policy

and a draft of the policy if appropriate. The analysis may include but is not limited to:

- (1) The relationship to other policies of the Board of Education and of other governmental agencies, if appropriate.
 - (2) Legal aspects, including federal, state, and local laws, court decisions, and other legal limits or conditions
 - (3) Cost implications
 - (4) Effect on school system operation
 - (5) When appropriate, impact on those affected by the policy
 - (6) Similar policies adopted by other school systems
- c) The format for the policy analysis will be as follows:
- (1) Statement of the issue(s) or questions addressed
 - (2) Description of the background, history, nature of the problems or issues, including the location of the problem, its origins, the number and kinds of staff involved, the resources involved, and other relevant background data
 - (3) The option(s) that might address or resolve the problem or issue, including for each option the cost, the benefits, the obstacles to be overcome, the strategies and actions to be employed to achieve the results, and the measures or indicators to be used to demonstrate success or failure
 - (4) A recommendation for selection of an option and reasons that include comparison of options
- d) A policy analysis will be presented to the Board as an item for discussion.
- e) When limited revisions to or rescissions of existing policies are warranted, the

superintendent will bring the proposed changes to the Board with an accompanying rationale.

- f) When the superintendent or Board member presents a proposed policy, a timeline for adoption will accompany it that will include the following items:
 - (1) A resolution that indicates the policy will lie on the table for at least one week before being voted upon (The presiding officer rules as to whether any proposed resolution is a policy. If there is an emergency, this provision may be waived without notice if all members are present and there is unanimous agreement.)
 - (2) Opportunity for citizen and staff comment
 - (3) Opportunity for public hearing (if the Board desires)
 - (4) Opportunity for the superintendent to provide advice and recommendations

- g) The Board will adopt a policy with a standard format which will include as appropriate:
 - (1) A statement of the purpose of the policy
 - (2) A description of the problem or issue that the policy addresses and purports to resolve
 - (3) A statement of the policy position or positions adopted by the Board, including a brief statement of the reasons and/or justification for these positions
 - (4) A statement of the results or outcomes desired
 - (5) The strategies to be used in guiding the implementation of the policy
 - (6) Specification of when reports are to be made to the Board of Education and the public on implementation and effectiveness, results achieved, and next steps. The frequency of reports will be specified by the Board of Education and may depend on such factors as high public interest, legal mandates, and the

experimental/innovative nature of the
activity.

3. Policy Implementation

After adoption, the superintendent will follow up with:

- a) Regulations for implementation, if appropriate
- b) Publication of policy and regulation in the handbook and distribution to affected parties
- c) Continuous monitoring of the policy and implementation and reporting to the Board as required under Section F., Review and Reporting

D. DESIRED OUTCOME

Policies that are well researched and analyzed prior to adoption or amendment and monitored by staff with results reported to the Board subsequent to adoption.

E. IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

1. The superintendent will develop a process for implementing this policy that will include coordination of policy analyses, presentation to the Board, implementing regulations, monitoring reports, and maintaining the process.
2. All regulations developed in support of Board-adopted policies shall be sent to the Board as items of information.

F. REVIEW AND REPORTING

1. An annual report is to be made to the Board of Education on the status of the review process, including the number of policies that were reviewed, revised, and rescinded.
2. The superintendent, at his/her discretion or the Board of Education's request, will report progress on or problems in implementation of this policy.
3. The superintendent will review policies on an ongoing basis in accordance with established practices for prioritizing policy matters, but the Board may call for review of any policy at its discretion.
 - a) When the review results in recommended content changes to the policy including rescinding the policy, the process for policy formulation described above will be followed.

- b) Until such time as all policies are in the appropriate format, and the review reveals that no content changes are recommended, the policy will be reformatted and reprinted and will be forwarded to the Board as an item of information. Any member of the Board may identify any of these policies for further review as needed.

RESOLUTION NO. 342-94 Re: ADJOURNMENT

On recommendation of the superintendent and on motion of Dr. Cheung seconded by Ms. Baker, the following resolution was adopted unanimously by members present:

Resolved, That the Board of Education adjourn its meeting at 10 p.m.

PRESIDENT

SECRETARY

PLV:mlw