

bearing fruit among all students. They had a 38 percent gain in the scores of African-American students, and Hispanic students had similar results. He knew that the Board had to be pleased with these results because it showed the wisdom of the directives of the Board of Education and how the citizens of Montgomery County had committed their resources to educating all children. This should put to rest the lie that there was a brain drain in the school system.

Dr. Vance commented that the Board had his paper on flexibility in resource allocations, and he would not review the paper. He referred to the options he had presented for the Board's consideration; however, these options were not the only possibilities. The options ranged from restricted central control which was Option A to complete local school budgetary autonomy. He would prefer to recommend Option C which committed additional flexibility, but he did not think they had the budget resources to implement this. Therefore, he was recommending Option D. The matter of flexibility in scheduling could be handled by Mrs. Gemberling and her staff.

Mrs. Gemberling stated that Dr. Phinnize Fisher, associate superintendent, would describe the six options and highlight some of the pros and cons on each. Then Mrs. Gemberling would describe a couple of staffing models. Mrs. Gemberling said they found there was a perception that MCPS as it currently allocated was at one complete extreme of the continuum, and this was not the case. They did allow some staffing choices and options, and they had moved toward more flexibility as they had had to make some budget choices. The Board had taken an action to permit movement among the textbook, instructional, and media accounts. They had taken centralized staff development accounts and reallocated those funds directly to schools. They did have some background in terms of moving some of the accounts towards more school management. In terms of staffing, they were closest to what was described as Option B.

Dr. Fisher explained that in considering the options they went from the least to the most flexible. They kept in mind that increased staffing flexibility posed implications in terms of personnel practices, staff evaluation, and employee relationships. Schools might adopt plans that did not match established Board of Education goals and priorities. Personnel recruitment and placement could become extremely complex, and they could have greater variation from school to school in class size and provisions for educational services.

Option A placed all allocation deployment control at a systemwide level with no local flexibility. The advantages of that would be the consistency for all schools in staff assignment and organizational models. The budget defense would be done

systemwide. The disadvantages would be no flexibility to allow for individual school decisions for staffing variations to meet student needs. There would be limited choices for materials and supplies.

Option B would determine most staffing positions centrally based on systemwide standards with some schools receiving supplemental positions and resources. They were doing this now with "disadvantaged" positions and some of the QIE positions. The advantage would be consistency for the basic staff assignments. The disadvantage was that not all schools would have flexibility for individual school decisions on staffing variations.

Option C would be the same as Option B with the exception that additional resources would be included in the budget for all schools to have additional flexible positions. The advantage would be that they would still have consistency with the basic staffing, but all schools would have additional positions to meet the special needs of students.

Option D would disseminate positions centrally using standard formulas, but the Site-based Participatory Management Schools could redeploy positions to perform different roles and functions. This would not require any additional resources, and they would have consistency for the non-site-based schools. They would have limited flexibility to serve special needs. Some of the disadvantages included limited flexibility for the non-site-based schools and an inconsistent distribution of materials and resource accounts.

Option E would disseminate positions centrally using a standard formula, but all schools could redeploy positions. This option would not require significant additional budget resources, and individual schools would have parameters to redeploy all their positions in terms of their own school priorities. The disadvantages would include inconsistent distribution of materials and resources. Budget defense would be more difficult. It would be difficult to determine systemwide parameters while trying to maximize flexibility and maintain employee relations and job security.

Option F would provide a lump sum to each school based on a systemwide formula, and schools would have complete autonomy to decide how they would use the money to purchase or determine their staffing. This required no additional budget resources, and all schools would have total flexibility. The disadvantages would include having 180 different school systems. There would be no system accountability, and program delivery and results could become inconsistent. Budget defense would become more difficult and employee relations could be strained.

Mrs. Gemberling shared an example of a large elementary school with a high needs population using the basic staffing formula established by the Board of Education. At present they gave the principal an established number of classroom positions, and the

principal determined how these positions were to be used. In Option A, the use of these positions would be determined centrally. She pointed out what they considered to be flexible positions which included instructional support, QIE, and disadvantaged positions. In other cases, not every school received positions for ESOL, special education, Head Start, etc. which were designated to serve certain populations. The textbook, media, and instructional materials accounts were done on a per capita basis, and in Option A the school would not be able to transfer funds among the various accounts, but in Option B they could. The training funds were provided through a base amount to each school with additional funds per capita.

Option C in this same school would mean they would have additional flexible positions. In Option D a school would have the option to trade some of their positions for other kind of positions using the site-based policy. In Option E any school would have the option of trading some positions. For example, the school might feel art, music, and physical education could be handled by the regular classroom teachers and might trade those specialist positions in to lower class size. In Option F the school would receive a check.

Mrs. Gemberling explained that they would prefer Option C, but this option would have a budgetary impact; therefore, their realistic recommendation was Option D which would provide flexibility for site-based schools. She indicated that staff would like to have the consensus of the Board to prepare for the coming budget cycle. Mr. Ewing stated that in the discussion of the matrix there was a series of statements which spoke to trades of positions. In Option E schools could trade any positions and accounts within basic safeguard parameters which would safeguard system priorities. In Option D schools could trade any positions and accounts using the SBM policy. He asked whether Option D and E would require change the site-based policy or merely to apply it as it presently existed. Schools did not have flexibility now unless they applied for exceptions to existing policies.

Dr. Fisher replied that the policy stated that schools would have flexibility in relation to staffing and resources, but with staffing as a part of Board policy in the budget book the schools would have to apply for a waiver in order to make the exchange.

Mr. Ewing found the description of the six options to be very useful as a construct to help thing about this. It made it clear there were advantages and disadvantages to each of the options. He thought that the Board would end up in the middle because it seemed to him that attempting to do everything centrally, which they did not do now, was a sure guarantee that they would operate in a way that would miss a great many opportunities for meeting very specific circumstances. The specifics of school circumstances were changing rapidly with the diversity of their

student population. On the other hand, the argument that they ought to give schools a lump sum total allocation figure struck him as being an option that obviated the necessity for having a school system unless it was accompanied by a set of very clear expectations and a substantial army of auditors and evaluators to see that these expectations were met. To simply send out the checks would mean they would have 180 school systems.

Mr. Ewing stated that there were attractions to having a school system broken up, but it seemed to him that radical solutions were normally applied in circumstances where there was something radically wrong. It was hard to believe that things were radically wrong in MCPS. He knew there were discontents, but the system's performance was steadily improving. It would be foolish to believe that radical solutions were appropriate under those circumstances. Instead, they should make changes carefully and craft them conservatively to meet and take advantage of the opportunity for change. They should not break things for the experience of breaking them.

Mr. Ewing would argue that the superintendent's recommendation was a good one and ought to have the advantage of providing increased clarity to what it means to be a site-based management school. This should increase the motivation of schools to participate. As they faced increased pressure to educate students with disabilities in the regular classroom and as the federal government had not relaxed its regulations with respect to how that was to be done, a good question would be how would they manage that. If the school undertook to educate these children in the regular classroom without any special help, they would be violating the law. He asked how they would know this under Option F. He asked how they would know in Option F whether or not the expectations of the system and the law were being observed and whether they had a mechanism to do this.

Mrs. Gemberling stated that they were not going to design a whole mechanism until they had the sense of whether it was necessary. They did discuss that the Board would have to decide what were the givens in terms of what constituted a Montgomery County school. They had made the assumption that the MCPS requirements would not change. At present, it was difficult to monitor many of the things they had in place now. They would have to have a different kind of a monitoring system or a different kind of reporting system so schools would be able to account for the required student outcomes and the required mandates.

Dr. Benjamin Marlin, director, added that the other factor would be the training to prepare people to be able to do this. The idea of having a \$3 million account would take a lot of in-service in accounting and management.

Mr. Ewing wondered how they would obey the state law that required collective bargaining. How would they undertake to pay people in a wide variety of ways which this could lead to and still have contracts. Ms. Carole Burger, director of the Department of Association Relations, replied that under the site-based policy a waiver would be required to adjust Board guidelines and to waive any contract terms with MCEA. This would be legitimate under the collective bargaining law, and this would pertain under Option F as well. Any changes in the contract would have to be negotiated by the Board with MCEA.

Mr. Ewing noted that they had state law which required them to abide by collective bargaining, they had federal laws regarding students with disabilities, they had Chapter I and Head Start regulations, and they had state laws and regulations that governed a wide variety of activities. It was in his view an illusion for people to tell them that it was possible to have total site-based flexibility and autonomy. What they were talking about were degrees of flexibility and degrees of local decision making responsibility and accountability. Given the web of law and regulation there wasn't any other option.

Ms. Gutierrez thought that options showing a continuum of flexibility were very interesting, and staff had raised good points on the advantages and disadvantages. Her basic feeling was that this approach missed the point. To her the point was not flexibility. The kind of flexibility they were looking at here amounted to moving chairs around. There was some flexibility, but there were given constraints so that the flexibility would be limited.

Ms. Gutierrez felt that the concern the long-range planning group had raised was not how to have more flexibility without seeing what it was tied to. Here they talked about flexibility in staff allocation, and some site-based management recommendations went beyond just staffing and looked for flexibility in practices, curriculum, organization of grades, innovation, and eliminating some of the controls of the bureaucracy in order to free up individual innovation in that school. That part of flexibility was not addressed here.

Ms. Gutierrez said they were talking about how to cut the pie and who got what pieces. Her issue with staffing allocation was that right now the pie was too small. No matter how they cut the pie, they were not going to get to those essential issues which went to the level of accountability or results they could expect from the different schools as they were linked to that population within that school. She saw something in staff allocation that needed to be reviewed, closer to the discussions they had had on weighted staffing allocations. This was closer to the kind of things they were doing when they recognized that within a school there were greater need students; therefore, they allocated

bigger pieces of that pie to that school. The pie before them was too small because overall the staffing that they had was not enough. They had classrooms and schools that did not have enough staff. Before they went down this path, they needed to focus on their basic staffing formulas which they were not even discussing. She thought that those were the ones that would have budgetary implications. They should look at these before they went too much further into the budget. For example, they should look at their formula for staffing English classes and decide if this was what they wanted to maintain or change. They had to look at what the formula meant to different types of schools or different conditions within schools. For example, was a small high school able to meet the programmatic needs it had to within their current basic staffing formulas. If the basic formula gave this school minimum resources, the school would not be able to provide the programs they needed.

Ms. Gutierrez thought they had had a good cut at the issue from a flexibility perspective, but in her estimation the harder and more urgent issues were not those of flexibility. The long-range planning recommendations covered many things, and she would like to see the scope of this discussion broadened. It was urgent to look at this now if they were going to adjust their formulas and get more resources because of the budgetary impact.

Mrs. Gordon stated that in the discussion of flexible staffing they were having this evening and in the discussion on the overall long-range planning recommendations, her favorite would be Option E. However, she did not think they were ready for that yet. She would support the superintendent's recommendation for Option D. In earlier discussion, it was indicated that the budget was a policy document. She did not necessarily agree with that. She thought that the budget was a tool of policy, and she did not see the budget as setting policy.

Mrs. Gordon commented that the site-based policy did have an opportunity for site-based schools to have additional flexibility. If there was a policy they wanted to be excepted, there was a way to do this. She thought they had to look at the opportunity to increase their commitment to site-based if they were serious about it, and this was a way of doing that. She would like to see all schools have the opportunity to have some discretion in how they implemented Board policies. If they looked at Success for Every Student and the management plans developed by schools, schools had to have the options they needed. However, she agreed with Dr. Marlin that they would need to do a tremendous amount of training in order to prepare people to make those kinds of decisions. Therefore, they should start with the site-based schools. If they were successful in applying their flexible programs to the policies set by the Board, this would encourage other schools to take advantage of the site-based policy. She would agree with Option D.

Mrs. Gordon asked why under Option E and D they showed an inconsistent distribution of materials and resources. They were not talking about changing the distribution that the school got, but they were saying the schools could use those differently. Mrs. Gemberling explained that from school to school they would not see the same type of distribution. They had run into situations where schools did not have texts or did something differently. This would increase those kinds of questions from school to school. It would not be an inconsistency in the original allocations but there would be inconsistencies in how the schools chose to distribute.

Mrs. Gordon pointed out that in their current system they already had that inconsistency, and Mrs. Gemberling agreed. Mrs. Gordon did not want people to think that under Option D if they were talking about flexibility they were going to change how they gave the schools their allocations. Option E stated that the budget defense could become more difficult. If they used the budget to fund programs to enhance student success and student outcomes, she wondered why it would be harder to defend it when they were increasing opportunities for schools to do just this.

Mrs. Gemberling replied that when they defended their budget in front of the Council they had made the case for the value of having reading teachers in every elementary school. The concern was in Option E there would be much more trading of positions, and a number of schools might want to trade the reading specialist for a math specialist. People might see this as a place to cut because some schools did not want this position. This was traditionally how they had defended their budget. They got counselors into the elementary schools because they had made a case for the value of these positions which became a standing position in every elementary school.

Mrs. Gordon said they were talking about now just how they would accept change within the system but how the change would be accepted outside of the system. For this reason, they should start with the site-based schools they had. She hoped that at the same time there would be a concerted effort to train administrators on how to make those kinds of decisions rather than waiting for a school to decide whether or not it wanted to be a site-based school. They needed to look at what skills an administrator needed to have to make the kinds of judgments they were trying to encourage here. How did a principal look at his or her management plan and move away from this top-down decision making? They had to be ready for their administrators to change the paradigm. They could have no new site-based schools or have 10, 20, or 30, or half of their schools. She hoped that if they moved forward with the superintendent's recommendations that the training and the flexibility would be given in stages to all schools to prepare them.

Dr. Cheung thanked the staff for presenting the options in a matrix form, and he appreciated seeing some of the sample cases. He worked in a multi-institutional system that went from a very centralized system into an Option F type system. Right now they had disastrous results and were hiring auditors to audit the individual facilities from the standpoint of accountability. MCPS was a public institution, and they had to consider how they provided accountability for the individual schools in addition to the whole system. Mr. Ewing had pointed out they had federal laws, state laws, and regulations. They had the Board's policies and the superintendent's regulations. The Board's policies could be waived if requested; however, they could not do this for the federal and state regulations.

Dr. Cheung observed that school systems and schools were really for education. This meant they had to assure that their students succeeded as outlined in the Success for Every Student plan. They assumed that site-based management schools would somehow improve student achievement. He assumed that. Otherwise, why did they do it. If they assumed more flexibility improved student learning, they had to be assured of this. The purpose of the school system was not to make people feel good; therefore, they had to have assurances that students were learning and achieving at a higher level. For principals and staff wanting to undertake school-based management, they had to be able to assume responsibility and risk. He did not think all principals were ready to do this, and training cost money. He did not believe it when the option showed that no additional budget resources were needed because they would have to make a big commitment to training. The principal had to have enough reasons to do this, and they had to look at incentives for going in this direction. They would want to get people to buy into site-based and be motivated to take responsibility.

Dr. Cheung said he would also talk about monitoring and accountability. They needed to have better information in terms of what they were doing out there related to student achievement and performance. When they talked about flexibility, there were classifications of discretionary and non-discretionary. He also looked at where a number of schools could share resources. He looked at this from the standpoint of the need to do more planning before they went in this direction. He liked the superintendent's recommendation, but he was very concerned because he had seen his own work situation collapse by swinging the pendulum in another direction leaving each part to fend for itself and become more vulnerable. The one key was to examine site-based as a means to improve student performance and student learning.

Mrs. Fanconi thanked Dr. Cheung for his thoughtful remarks. She had gone back to the task force report, and they talked about systemwide school-based management. The report mentioned

research, but she did not know what the research was in terms of student achievement at site-based schools. She thought this was critical for the Board to know, and she hoped that the new Board would put that on the top of its agenda. For example, she would like to know how other systems dealt with the issue of inequity between schools.

Mrs. Fanconi said they would have to look at whether principals wanted to take over the program design, staffing, the hiring, the technology, the contract management, etc. It seemed to her they needed to lay out variations and look at which were the things that principals would like. She asked whether they had talked with principals to find out what they wanted to have first. She thought they had people who had dealt with some flexible issues and had different skills. Before they moved forward on this, they had to go to those people and ask how they wanted this done.

Mrs. Fanconi noted that the task force said that MCPS might want to consult outside experts to determine which funds should be decentralized. They suggested setting up pilots to demonstrate different ways of doing things and that MCPS not necessarily move forward with the whole system at once. They also talked about budgeting by giving each school a per pupil sum based on student need rather than the way the budget was done now. She did not know the pros and cons of this, but she thought it was worth looking at. However, one of the things that might get lost was educational load. They did educational load now by giving certain staff positions, but schools would be able to trade away staff positions. She suggested that the Board ought to have a discussion on educational load.

It seemed to Mrs. Fanconi that they needed to look at accountability right now. They just received the minority student achievement report where they asked for some very specific outcomes in schools where the Board had some very specific resources. She felt they needed to focus in on those schools where they had given more resources to see how that was working out. In the budget, they needed to look at training for staff, some increased money to design some accountability measures, and the staffing allocations. She agreed with Ms. Gutierrez because when she went through the document the assumption was that the staffing formulas were correct. She wondered if they were staffed for the 1970's and not the 1990's. For example, did they need more assistant principals? She thought this had to be given some focus in the budget cycle.

Mrs. Fanconi stated that they had limited resources, but they had a commitment to make sure that what they did worked. She pointed out that principals currently had more flexibility in 01 and 03 accounts, and the Board had received testimony that principals would not be buying library books if they had this

authority. She did not know what had happened, and she thought that the Board ought to have a report on how this was working.

Mrs. Fanconi agreed with Dr. Cheung that what they were about was improving student achievement. The superintendent had just reported that more students were taking AP exams and were doing better than they ever did. The Board needed to make sure that whatever they did would not interfere with the successes they were already having. They had to be very careful because the burden placed on staff would be very different, and the supports had to be there.

Mrs. Fanconi pointed out that there were some other initiatives in the task force report. One of their recommendations was for a training institute, and she believed that if they went forward with more site-based decisions they would need that institute. She hoped that the superintendent would move forward to look at a management and leadership development training institute and an instructional training institute.

Mr. Ewing commented that this evening the superintendent had sliced out a piece of the whole issue and say to the Board that they needed to focus on staffing and resource allocations because if the Board wished to have an impact on the budget, this was the time. This was fair, but attempting to focus on one piece was difficult because of relationships to other parts of the issue. What was difficult to do was to reconcile a variety of potentially conflicting principles. He was a supporter of greater school-based flexibility. He was a strong supporter of increased accountability. He was a supporter of greater resources for public education and of higher standards and expectations. One could have greater school flexibility, higher standards and expectations, and greater accountability, but it took some very careful crafting so that these were not in conflict.

Mr. Ewing said that Ms. Gutierrez had suggested looking at formulas first. Over the years the Board had looked at the formulas, and those formulas constituted a body of policy. This was the body of policy on which, in part, the budget was based. Mrs. Gordon was correct that the budget was a tool, but it was also a policy document. The formulas reflected Board decisions, and if the Board wanted to change those, it would be up to the Board. He thought that the formulas as a whole could be said to be focused on allocating resources either in consonance with federal and state law and regulation or with regard to local preferences about allocating resources to schools on the basis of need. Over the years, they had added to these formulas with good intention. Were the formulas perfect? No, but if the Board started in to debate the formulas they would still be debating next summer.

Mr. Ewing said that the most recent example of what they were trying to do was the educational load effort. This was aimed at an allocation of resources to ensure greater equity in meeting differentiated student needs. If they went with Option F, they would still need to use formulas in order to come up with a dollar amount. He hoped they did not want to give the same dollar per pupil which would be a disaster for public education. While reviewing the formulas was a good idea, he did not think they could do it in time for the budget.

In his discussions with parents and staff, Mr. Ewing found some to be ambivalent about site-based management and allocations. On the one hand, there was the view that MCPS ought to have standards that governed all schools in the system. Therefore, if a student moved from Takoma Park to Germantown, the student would have the same kind of educational opportunity. On the other hand, people valued the opportunity to participate at the local level and make decisions that were flexible with respect to what went on in that school. The question the Board had to address was how much of each did they think they could manage and how did they manage it. Again, this was why the continuum was so valuable.

Mr. Ewing thought it was important for them to look at the issue of student achievement. There was a GAO report which said there was no relationship between site-based management and student achievement. This was admittedly a small sample of schools, but it should be a sobering reminder to the Board that they needed to pay attention to what they were doing. If student achievement was not their objective in site-based management, they had to be clear about what their other objectives were and whether or not they were worthwhile if they did not contribute to improved student achievement. He asked how the staff would suggest one would go about safeguarding system priorities as indicated in the write-up of Option E.

Mrs. Gemberling replied that they would have to have input from the Board in terms of what was the process for making these decisions. If they did not use the site-based policy which had a set of procedures for looking at waivers, there would have to be some other kind of mechanism so it would be clear how much range an individual school had on making some choices. In one example, a system that had gone to site-based management went back and said they could only trade positions when a vacancy occurred rather than involuntarily transferring personnel. Staff felt that the Board had to decide on the parameters because it was again how much the Board was willing to let go of to schools.

Mrs. Gordon hoped that in an effort to make sure this was done the right way they would not limit what the possibilities were. When the Board first discussed the recommendations of the long-range planning task force, she felt anything they did needed to

be tied to Success for Every Student because that was what they were using as their guiding instrument. She hoped that by starting with the site-based schools, there would be a full evaluation of evaluating of why the schools were requesting these kinds of things and that it would be tied to their school improvement plan. Schools should be able to look at the policies, outcomes, and goals established by the Board to show they envision whatever changes they might be considering. She noted that they did not know whether any site-based school would request to do anything with staffing, but it was likely that some of them would.

Mrs. Gordon stated that they had talked about accountability, but she was not convinced that they had a fail-safe method of assuring accountability with what they were doing right now. They had measures of accountability and measures of student achievement and performance, but she wanted to know what happened when the system they had in place did not work. She did not see that the recommendation was going to set them up for additional failure, but this was one of the things they had to keep in mind as schools moved forward with this. What were the consequences when things were not working? Flexibility carries with it responsibility, and she did not know whether it would be better or worse than what they had now because she was not sure how far they had gone on the accountability issue as it was.

Ms. Gutierrez stated that in her previous comments she focused on basic staffing formulas and had not addressed other site-based issues. She believed it was important and valuable for the Board to address some of the major staffing formulas impacting schools. She appreciated it was not easy to review all the formulas; however, they changed formulas at 3 a.m. when they were approving the budget. She felt that they did have to look at staffing ratios now particularly those that impacted educational load because they had to be assured that the formulas dealt with the current situation, and she hoped the Board would do this before they took action on next year's budget.

Ms. Gutierrez indicated that Option D was okay, but as long as there were no additional budget resources being provided, she thought it was somewhat of a cop out. As a minimum, she would give the pilots some money to recognize their efforts. If they wanted to encourage people to move in this direction, they should have an incentive of additional resources. If they did pilot, they should pilot different options from within the continuum from elementary to high school. To be supportive of the site-based management policy, she suggested that they had extend it beyond just the staffing allocations. If they were going to do anything in this area, they would want to encourage movement in many of the other areas that did not have a cost. She believed that standards were key. If they had not yet come up with standards that were specific to student achievement, then if they

moved into too much flexibility, they would have missed an opportunity to ensure they were using the same measures for what the school was expected to produce. The Board might need to deal with the issue of standards prior to going beyond anything that was a pilot.

Dr. Cheung stated that decisions at the site were always better. He also supported the concept of piloting different models and different options. He would like to encourage principals to do this and not penalize them. He agreed with Ms. Gutierrez that they should have additional resources for the pilots. He thought that evaluation of the pilots was very important in terms of student achievement. He would like to see pre and post in terms of the pilot because often times they did not do this. It was important to make sure that whether they did had a broader input because site-based was more than just the principal and school staff. It was also the community. He had no problem in supporting Option D. He did not know whether this issue would come for Board action. This was an important concept for the Board to try to implement and assure the success of the site-based participatory management model.

Mrs. Fanconi asked staff to speak to schools currently operating as site-based models and what they felt those pilots had shown them or what kinds of things were being talked about. She would also like to hear about the Challenge schools. Under site-based management, she had hoped there would be some creative reorganization, but the most creative reorganization they got was from Wheaton under the Challenge. She asked what was different about the Challenge schools that brought them more creativity. Staff responded that the difference was money. Mrs. Fanconi thought they should look at this because they had had a site-based management policy that had not gotten much interest.

Dr. Fisher suggested that principals of site-based and challenge grant schools give the Board some first hand information.

Ms. Felicia Lanham Tarason, principal of Wheaton Woods ES, stated that when schools did not have the flexibility to identify staffing to match up with the implementation of curriculum this was an inhibitor throughout the school year. At her school, they could use more reading support, but they did not have the flexibility to meet the needs of students based on their CRT data, based on Chapter I testing, and based on the information about their ESOL population. They were working with what they had, but it was not enough. They would like to hold each student accountable for making specific gains each year, but they did not have the support to give to the students. When they were not able to have input regarding their staffing, they put additional stress on the classroom teacher. She would like the opportunity to have flexible staffing.

Ms. Tarason explained that she practiced site-based management based on a philosophical definition. Her definition was basically inclusion. This meant that staff, students, and the teachers should be involved in decisions. It was not so much as reaching consensus as much as reaching agreement. This was the way they had been operating at Wheaton Woods ES. She had learned this through the leadership training she received during the summer. She and her staff had gone through quite a transition, and it helped them to begin each others learning styles. They also learned that if a person was closest to an agenda, he or she should not be the one to facilitate it.

Mr. Donald Kress, principal of Springbrook High School, reported that the site-based model practiced in MCPS was different in every school. Springbrook had not dealt with the issue of flexibility staffing. Their group focused on long-range planning, goal setting, and school climate. However, the group would welcome the opportunity to discuss staffing. One site-based school sought a waiver to use part of a counselor position for some instructional assistant positions to relieve the counselors of some clerical duties. He said that administrators felt that perhaps the best option was some kind of formula that would provide a baseline level of staffing to schools with additional staffing allocated based on educational load and the needs as defined by a staffing plan submitted by the principal or a site-based group.

Dr. Steven Seleznow, director, stated that this year Dr. Jerry Marco, principal of Walt Whitman High School, had submitted a waiver to make a change in staffing for his guidance department. Dr. Marco thought he needed a guidance department that would be able to respond more effectively to the needs of students. When they talked about staffing, it was a question of whether the decisions about staffing were made centrally or made locally. The question was whether or not principals were able to make good decisions and not violate federal and state laws. Dr. Seleznow would argue that they would not, but there might be instances where a principal might determine the school needed more math classes and not offer home economics. The principal could take two home economics teachers and hire more math teachers now. The question was whether or not parents would object, and whether or not the Board would support the principal's decision.

Mr. Kress said that the site-based group at Springbrook and the social studies department agreed to run smaller classes in the national, state, and local government course and to run larger class sizes in social studies electives. This was an example of flexible staffing that he currently had to meet the needs in his building. He did not think they would find a principal who would object to enlarging the pie. However, they did believe the formulas for staffing did need to be reviewed and revised. He would encourage the Board to look at those decisions.

Dr. Marco reported that Whitman was one of the original site-based schools. They had met for a couple of years on adopting a scheduling plan similar to Wheaton's; however, when they met with the community they were told that parents liked Whitman the way it was. The staff had spent years in training and research, but the community had not approved. They had received a waiver from the Board on class rank. He believed that principals had flexibility if they were willing to work at it. He cautioned the Board that while the idea of input and involvement was a good one, some people wanted control and had their own agendas. Involvement was difficult to accomplish in a big setting such as a high school.

Mrs. Fanconi thanked the principals for their comments. She was pleased to hear that facilitated leadership was working well.

Dr. Marco hoped that the Board would look at the staffing ratios. Schools were very different in 1994 because they had demands for safety and security and were educating a more diverse population. He had no problem with the issue of equity if a given school needed additional staff to help their young people.

Mrs. Fanconi thanked staff for the very useful packet. She hoped that this was the beginning of many discussions.

RESOLUTION NO. 707-94 Re: ADJOURNMENT

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

Resolved, That the Board of Education adjourn its meeting at 9:45 p.m.

PRESIDENT

SECRETARY

PLV:mlw